

UDC 008(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258963

Valentyna BODAK

PhD hab. (Philosophy), Professor, Professor of the Philosophy Department named after Valeriy Skotnyi, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko str., 24, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (bodakvalentyna@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-0208-5282

Oleksandr TKACHENKO

PhD (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Philosophy Department named after Valeriy Skotnyi, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24, Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100(tkacenkoaleksandr1928@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-0674-0144

Валентина БОДАК

докторка філософських наук, професорка, професорка кафедри філософії імені професора Валерія Григоровича Скотного Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (bodakvalentyna@gmail.com)

Олександр ТКАЧЕНКО

кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії імені професора Валерія Григоровича Скотного Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (tkacenkoaleksandr1928@gmail.com)

**SUBJECTIVITY AS A STATE OF SELF-CREATION OF IDENTITY
AND CIVILIZING FATE OF UKRAINE (review of the monograph
by S. I. Pyrozkhov and N. V. Khamitov. Civilizational Subjectivity of Ukraine: from
Potentials to a New Worldview and Human Existence. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2020. 255 p.)**

**СУБ'ЄКТНІСТЬ ЯК СТАН САМОТВОРЕННЯ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ
ТА ЦИВІЛІЗАЦІЙОЇ ДОЛІ УКРАЇНИ (рецензія на монографію: С. І. Пирожков,
Н. В. Хамітова. Цивілізаційна суб'єктність України: від потенцій
до нового світогляду і буття людини. Київ: Наукова думка, 2020. 255 с.)**

The events of the first decades of the XXIst century affirm the subjectivity of Ukraine, pave the way for it to make its civilizational choice. According to S. I. Pyrozkhov (2017), it is a fateful choice of Ukraine as intention to implement its own, rather than externally imposed development strategies. And it's not just about choosing a geopolitical place in the world, avoiding the threat of becoming an object of geopolitics, but, above all, about choosing "a paradigm and strategies for self-development, which can be interpreted as a real national idea" (Pyrozkhov, 2017, p. 30). These and other current issues are covered in a number of

works of the section of social sciences and humanities of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

The monograph under review (Pyrozhkov, 2020) is a continuation of research by the Ukrainian scholars on the preconditions, state and prospects of the implementation of a new stage of civilizational development of Ukraine, as well as identifying possible threats to the Ukrainian state and national identity. Important is the key thesis that history knows many cases when giving different peoples common features of civilization was forced: “In the XXIst century, such coercion is not only unacceptable but also impossible. Civilizational changes in modern countries, especially in polyethnic ones, must take place on the basis of *a social dialogue and consensus* – they mean *the civilizational choice* made by the government, the elite and the people. This civilizational choice fully applies to Ukraine as well” (Pyrozhkov, 2020, p. 5).

The monograph “Civilizational Subjectivity of Ukraine: from Potentials to a New Worldview and Human Existence” thoroughly elucidates the process of civilizational subjectivity formation of Ukraine, at different stages of which our country decides its own civilization destiny, chooses identity and partners. In this process, as the authors of the monograph rightly point out, a productive civilizational choice is possible only if the people of the country are really consolidated. It is noted that responsibility for the choice of civilization should be assumed not only by the government, politicians, statesmen and public figures, but also by the majority of citizens. Events in Ukraine and the world confirm the main feature of the state subjectivity – the people are the source not only of power in the country, but also its subjectivity. The Ukrainian people create their own identity, courageously and sacrificially determine their civilizational destiny. Under conditions of the Russian aggression, the unity of power and people showed a high level of the national consolidation, worthy of astonishment and admiration in the world. In our opinion, one of the main achievements of the study of S. Pyrozhkov and N. Khamitov is the development of an effective methodology for understanding the progress of the country as the subject of history and geopolitics. In the analysis of such categories as “subjectivity”, “humanistic subjectivity”, “civilizational subject”, “national idea”, “worldview dimension of subjectivity”, “noosphere civilization”, “human-centrism”, “potentialism”, “meta-anthropological potentialism”, “people”, “political nation”, “modern Ukrainian nation”, “independence of the country”, “federalization”, “identity”, “limitrophy” the authors elucidate the humanistic, anthropocentric quality of Ukraine’s subjectivity, integrating developments in the field of social philosophy, philosophy of history, political philosophy, philosophy of education, etc.

We agree with the authors’ conclusion, who note that such methodology, firstly, should be potentialism – a way to develop real capabilities of the country in all dimensions of civilization, and secondly, to direct the country’s development in humanization direction – to be anthropologically oriented. Based on the outlined methodology of meta-anthropological potentialism, researchers emphasize the importance of this principle: “In order to become a full-fledged subject of international politics and civilized life, the country must be guided by internal factors, and not be subject to external influences, obviously, it should be noted that subjectivity must first be given to its citizens” (p. 38).

In the monograph it is convincingly proved that “civilizational subjectivity of Ukraine is such quality of its social existence, when it is not the object of influence of the “powers of this world”, and by the efforts of its political, scientific, artistic and religious elite it constructs its own civilizational future, way of life, values and national interests” (p. 331). In the development of subjectivity, Ukraine must rely primarily on its own strengths and potentials,

construction and implementation of its own civilization project. Therefore, the authors place a clear emphasis on the need to consolidate society within the country and development of breakthrough areas of basic science and development of original technologies on this basis.

According to the researchers, the subjectivity is weakened by the fact that “we have a constant oscillation between humanism and authoritarianism, and passion and conformism caused by internal factors, as well as a stable crisis caused mainly by external factors” (p. 338). The threat to the establishment of Ukraine’s subjectivity is a neo-feudal oligarchic social existence, authoritarian consciousness and subconsciousness of its political elite.

Reflecting on the ways of spiritual and cultural subjectivity development of Ukraine, researchers emphasize that the national idea as a choice of paradigm and strategies for self-development is of critical importance to the establishment of civilization. However, the authors emphasize that it is not just about “a set of images and values nurtured by the historical experience of statehood and the culture of memory, but also about the internal polylogue among different strata of society, national and confessional groups, in which the conventional symbolic dictionary of nation-building is born” (p. 301).

Indeed, according to many researchers, a national idea can succeed not when it is elaborated by ideologues artificially, but when it is the result of objective factors interaction of life of the country and people – economic and political relations of social groups and segments of the population, culture and history of people, their desire for independence, democracy, prosperity.

The authors’ conclusion on the role of philosophy in the civilizational subjectivity development of Ukraine is important. It is philosophy that is able to actualize the worldview structures common to the community, including values. In our opinion, the monograph focuses on the extremely important problem of humanity. After all, the society and the state must not forget that for the preservation and realization of a human existence are relevant not only philosophically oriented worldview, but also such components of a human spirituality as religion and its theoretical expression – theology. “It is within the framework of a religiously coloured worldview”, the authors note, “the idea of focusing on peaceful and equal relations between states on the basis of such value ideals as power, justice and love arises” (p. 42).

Historical retrospective of the researched issue, carried out by the authors of the monograph (Chapter 2. State Projects in the Light of Historical Traditions of Ukrainian subjectivity), is topical and extremely necessary, which confirms mentally inherent in the Ukrainian community humanistic potential in the quest to become a full-fledged subject of the world civilization system.

Researchers are right to believe that the Soviet historiography did much to level the continuity of the historical process in Ukraine and to remove the Ukrainian history from the European context. However, the authors identify at least three “outbreaks” in the history of civilization of Ukraine, which are important historical milestones of the Ukrainian statehood and civilization choice and caused this situation nowadays – these are the periods of Kievan Rus; the Cossack state; the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 – 1921 (p. 25).

The authors of the monograph focused their research on the phenomenon of the Ukrainian Cossacks: “It is the presence of the Cossacks that added some specificity to the Ukrainian history, without understanding of which it is hardly possible to explain the complex vicissitudes of the historical path of our people” (p. 94). Owing to the Cossacks, it was possible to develop national socio-political structures and maintain them for centuries despite the raging imperial pressure.

The general conclusion of the researchers is important – the emergence of the Cossack ethnocultural complex in the Ukrainian historiography is associated with the greatest transformations in the history of both the Ukrainian Ethnos and Ukraine as a socio-political organism. It is not just a border strip, but *a special country that formed the border of European civilization* (our italics. – The authors' note), separating it from the Great Eastern Steppe (Pyrozshkov, 2020, p. 95).

The formation of the civilizational subjectivity of Ukraine during the National Revolution of the mid-XVIIth century, according to Ya. V. Vermenych, in its historical significance, is not inferior to many cardinal events in the life of Europe (Pyrozshkov, 2020, p. 104). Therefore, understanding its socio-political role in the fate of Ukraine can still help us answer the question: What is the impetus for national revival? When and how do modern nations emerge? What lessons from the dramatic history of Ukraine have we learned?

In search of answers to these and other questions, the authors of the peer-reviewed monograph emphasize that independence is easier to gain than to maintain; there is possibility of unpredictability of the results of revolutions for those, who start them (revolutions raise to the surface of a political life such problems that their leaders can not always cope with); from “democracy without borders” people get tired quickly and then they look for another, firmer government (Pyrozshkov, 2020, p. 111). There is no doubt about the topicality of these lessons in our time.

Turning to the history of Ukraine, the authors of the monograph emphasize, firstly, that the socio-cultural scene of Ukrainianness as a subject of European and world history has long been defined as a borderline, more precisely, the frontline position, which often happened and was accepted as a crossroads of civilization; secondly, on the imbalance of the pace of national history, which during different periods, stages and epochs underwent the attraction of several civilizational complexes.

The last feature highlights the problem of identity, which cannot be avoided when thinking about the civilizational subjectivity of Ukraine. One cannot but agree with the authors' conclusion that in order to understand the Ukrainian project as a whole, the historical view of the national identity acquires great importance – not so much as the sum of inherent features of a certain society, but as the process of acquiring the ability of the Ukrainians to “self-expression” and self-identification, the formation and defense of the national subjectivity.

Analyzing the state projects proposed by the authors of the monograph in the light of the historical traditions of the Ukrainian subjectivity, we update what was said by M. I. Mykhalchenko (2016) about, that modern Ukraine has its own prehistory and new history, which fits perfectly into a general trend of a human development, although they have an expressed specificity.

We are aware of a simple and clear truth: Ukraine has never aspired to be the subject of a special historical mission and has never insisted on its uniqueness. It wants to be a democratic European state in which people can live with dignity, with guaranteed rights and freedoms.

In this regard, the authors of the monograph emphasize the need for a new security system. They emphasize that national security exists for the preservation and development of a civilizational subjectivity of the country, and the latter – for free self-realization of citizens, and the authors warn that changing such worldview of meanings and values can lead to dehumanization of subjectivity, the revival of dangerous manifestations of authoritarianism and the loss of both subjectivity and security.

Also, according to the researchers, the civilizational subjectivity of Ukraine depends on solving a number of problems related to multiculturalism and border control, which

are inherent in many modern societies. It is mentioned one of the main tasks of Ukraine is to overcome limitations of its position in the economy, politics, public and individual consciousness. According to the conclusion of M. I. Mykhalchenko (2016), Ukraine as a regional civilization is a limitroph in three senses: “In geopolitical terms, it is really between NATO and Russia. In economic terms, it is between countries with a predominantly market, socially oriented Western economy and Russia’s chaotic economy. In the spiritual and moral – between the totalitarian, mono-ideological uncertain past, which functions as a social utopia of a multiparty, legal, democratic state ...” (Mykhalchenko, 2016, p. 377).

In the context of these statements, we can agree with the authors of the peer-reviewed monograph that one of the options for asserting the subjectivity of Ukraine may be its acquisition of the status of an influential regional geopolitical center, which will make it impossible to continue the struggle for it among the leaders of opposing civilizations and to secure for it the status of an object and not a subject of global geopolitics.

Therefore, the issue of an interfaith confrontation in Ukraine, which the authors of the monograph emphasize, remains important nowadays. Overcoming the contradictions in the relationship between civilization and religion will be a difficult challenge on the path to a civilizational subjectivity. Moreover, these problems are extremely specific and worthy of the most in-depth and comprehensive research. In Europe and Ukraine acute debates continue to revolve around values and identities based on religious beliefs and feelings.

Drawing on the conclusions of the peer-reviewed monograph concerning nowadays, we conclude that only existence of a civilizational subjectivity can guarantee the state a real sovereignty. And nowadays, under conditions of war with the Russian Federation, geopolitically Ukraine acquires the humanistic quality of a civilizational subjectivity, the source of which is the unity of power and people.

The Ukrainian people, losing people’s lives, are defending their freedom and independence, the right to choose their own future for civilization. After all, the strength of the Ukrainian state is to live freely in more than a thousand-year tradition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Myhalchenko, N. I. (2017). *Velikiy tsivilizatsionnyiy vzryv na rubezhe XX – XXI vekov* [Great civilizational explosion at the turn of the XX – XXI centuries]. Kyiv: Parlamentskoe izdatelstvo, 504 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pyrozhkov, S. I. & Khamitov, N. V. (2020). *Tsyvilizatsiina sub'iektmist Ukrainy: vid potentsii do novoho svitohliadu i buttia liudyny* [Civilizational Subjectivity of Ukraine: from Potentials to a New Worldview and Human Existence]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 256 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pyrozhkov, S. I. (2017). *Tsyvilizatsiinyi vybir Ukrainy* [Civilizational Choice of Ukraine]. *Visnyk NAN Ukrainy. Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 1*, 30–35. [in Ukrainian]

Tsyvilizatsiinyi vybir Ukrainy: paradyhma osmyslennia i stratehiia dii: natsionalna dopovid. (2016). [Civilizational Choice of Ukraine: Paradigm of Comprehension and Strategy of Action: National Report] / red.kol.: S. I. Pyrozhkov, O. M. Mayboroda, Yu. Zh. Shaqhorodskyyi ta in.; Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. Kyiv: NAN Ukraïny, 284 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received June 29, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 25/05/2022.*