

УДК 94(477):32. – 027.21(73) «19/20»

<http://doi.org/10.17721/2521-1706.2016.01.94-100>

Tetiana Orlova
D.in History, Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

MODERN UKRAINE IN THE LIGHT OF CONCEPTS BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS

Abstract. *The article describes the conclusions of modern American scholars on the general tendencies in the development of the world and its specific parts in their meaning for Ukraine. For the first time in Ukrainian historiography, Ukrainian reality and prospects are analyzed in the light of conclusions by renowned American scholars. Great attention is paid to next concepts: R. Collins's concept of the collapse of the USSR – place and role of Ukrainian independence establishing in disintegration process on Soviet political area; Zb. Brzezinski's view on the geopolitical and security role of independent Ukraine at the European continent, its meaning to the imperial intentions of Russia and American position in the region; S. Huntington's theory of the “clash of civilizations”, its conclusions for Ukraine as civilization-separated country; Ukrainian modernization process are analyzed through A. Toffler's thoughts on the Great Waves and the future shock; prospects of Ukrainian society's evolution through the characteristics of the post-industrial society by D. Bell and other analysts. The author concludes, through summing the ideas of named scholars and applying their methods to analyze modern Ukraine history, politics and economy, that the humanity entering the era of post-industrialism is the second crucial and unique chance in the newest history for Ukraine, after its independence, to succeed in building the national state, economy and nation, for the entire Ukrainian society in consistence with modern demands.*

Key words: *civilization, Great Waves, future shock, post-industrial society, modernization.*

The subject of the conference is aimed at exploring experience and using it in practice. To define the paths of Ukraine's further progress, it looks reasonable to account the conclusions of American scholars on the general tendencies in the development of the world and its specific parts. The more so, as history confirms the soundness of these conclusions. By the laws of synergetics, for the sake of further successful existence, a system has to react adequately to changes in the environment. By the «system» one can mean a state as well as an individual. Still, there have been no attempts to join the

theoretical constructions by American social scientists with resolving the current and prospective Ukrainian problems. So this is the task of the present inquiry.

The complex characteristics of the current moment include a post-Soviet component. The Soviet Union may be regarded as a reincarnation of the Russian Empire, whose next embodiment is the contemporary Russian Federation. Even one-third of a century ago the collapse of the Soviet Union seemed impossible. Although in 1980 R. Collins, an American sociologist, forecasted the split of the Soviet Union on the grounds of the geopolitical theory built on sociological generalization of the facts of history. According to this theory [8], the power and sustainability of a state depends on three factors – resources (the more the better), geographical location (marginal locations have advantage over central ones) and the stability of frontiers. The USSR was behind the USA in terms of resources, population and income per capita, thus experiencing deficiency in means for supporting the Socialist system. Compared to the USA, the location of the USSR was less advantageous: set between Western countries, Japan, China and the Islamic world, it had to spend a lot of resources to protect extremely long frontiers. Moscow suffered from excessive geopolitical expansion, as one could see by weak control over its satellites, and the center surrounded by several ethnic entities ready to resist. That is, by the geopolitical theory, the Soviet empire (the USSR with all the countries where Soviet troops were quartered) was doomed to fragmentation for lack of resource, disadvantageous central location and overexpansion that consumed enormous funds.

Now and then speculations occur over the disintegration of the Russian Federation. If we remember the grounds of the Soviet Union's collapse, defined by R. Collins, they turn out hazardous for today's Russia as well: insufficient resources, disadvantageous central location and overexpansion that consumes colossal funds (suffice to mention the annexation of the Crimea). Characterizing the policies of President V. Putin, analysts point at his attempts to revive the greatness of the Soviet Union (the Russian Empire). Another well-known American and an old friend of Ukraine Z. Brzezinski reiterates in his speeches that, without Ukraine, the Russian empire is impossible (particularly during the hearings on Ukraine in the US Senate on July 10 2014 [11]). In his famous work «The Grand Chessboard» he wrote: «...if Moscow regains control over Ukraine, with its 52 million people and major resources as well as access to the Black Sea, Russia automatically again regains the wherewithal to become a powerful imperial state, spanning Europe and Asia» [2, p. 46]. As for Ukraine, the American politologist considers its independence if not the most important factor of the Soviet Union's collapse and also gives it an important role in the world politics: «...I consider Ukraine's independence to be truly a major historical event of great international significance... An independent Ukraine has redefined the frontiers of Europe...» [3, p. 70], significantly influencing the balance of powers at the continent at large.

The balance of powers at the European continent, as well as in the whole world, is also determined by the clashes of civilizations, described by S. Huntington, an American political scientist, since early 1990's [14; 15]. He singled out nine existing local civilizations: Western, Islamic, Hindu, Sinic (Chinese), Japanese, Latin American, Orthodox, Buddhist, African. When his article first appeared in the Post-Soviet space, the civilization approach was new to Ukraine. Early 1990's were the period of crisis in historical studies, for a long time dominated by the Marxist-Lenin-Stalin concept of formations. The conflicts arising at the territory of the former USSR were explained by the national controversies coming to surface: they existed throughout long decades, but

«were pushed deep down and left unresolved». One was just afraid of speaking about the «clash of civilizations». But gradually foreign concepts percolated into domestic scholarly circles. The issue became topical in recent years, which is evident by the appearance of quite a few research and media articles in the Ukrainian context [1; 4; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10]. A major role was played by the aggressive policies of Russia towards our country.

Ukraine is most exposed to the outcomes of the clash between the Orthodox civilization (also known as Russian or Eurasian) and the Western civilization (else Euro-Atlantic, often divided into European and North American). Actually, the preceding history also gives a lot of examples of this. But now the conflicts feel particularly acute as they affect everyone who lives in Ukraine. Its strife away from the orbit of Russian influence and back to the European, Western historic and cultural community, where the Kievan Rus had belonged in its time, evoked the aggressive reaction from the Russian Federation – the hybrid warfare against our country. The Kremlin is pressed by realizing that the processes in Ukraine are questioning the current state of affairs in Moscovia. Which is a threat to its powers-that-be and to those more or less satisfied by them. The idea of the «Russian World» is not only a justification to «protecting the rights of the Russian-speaking population» (even if it is not asking for that), that is, the cover-up of imperialism, but also a strife to promote and expand its social model, opposing it to the Western one. Russian mass conscience is irritated by the «realities of Gayrope». The strain of anti-Americanism has reached unprecedented, up to anecdotal heights, when people blame the delays in pension payments on the American president, not on their own one. There's even a byword: «It has never been so bad in Russia like under Obama». In turn, Putin's popularity is beating records. In the mass conscience, the President is distanced from economic problems. He is responsible for the «glory and greatness of the country», that is, for the foreign policies. And Russians are proud of their President to «have got Russia up of its knees» and of «Russia respected all over the world».

Every civilization has its own «code», its essential features that determine any kinds of manifestations in various spheres of life. The essential features of the present Russian civilization are manifested in the policies of V. Putin. His line in general and in relation to Ukraine particularly is a challenge to the whole world. The course of the Russian government leads to the breach of the world order. Even broader, to imposing its own order. This requires an ideological cover-up. Like in the Middle Ages the power of Arabic khalifat was spread over foreign lands, and now attempts are made to install the power of the Islamic state abroad under the slogans of combat for the «true faith» (Islam), so the idea of the «Russian world» is currently used for the similar ends, to be brought to rule in Ukraine too.

The territory of Ukraine is the site not only to the clash of local civilizations as cultural and historic entities limited by time and space. The typology of civilizations also has a stadial approach. Here fits the well-known work of an American philosopher and social scientist A. Toffler «The Third Wave» [12]. He suggested that history should be viewed as a succession of the waves of change. The first wave – the instatement of the agrarian civilization, the second wave – the industrial civilization, the third one – the post-industrial civilization. Now at the Ukrainian territory all the three are colliding with different intensity and outcomes. The book was published in 1980, when there was no independent Ukrainian state yet. But look how prompt is the definition of the situation caused by the collision of the Great Waves now: «The conflict between Second and Third Wave groupings is, in fact, the central political tension cutting through our society today.

Despite what today's parties and candidates may preach, the infighting among them amounts to little more than a dispute over who will squeeze the most advantage from what remains of the declining industrial system. Put differently, they are engaged in a squabble for the proverbial deck chairs on a sulking Titanic.» [12, p. 17]. One more quotation, very important to present Ukraine: «The more basic political question, as we shall see, is not who controls the last days of industrial society but who shapes the new civilization rapidly rising to replace it. While short-range political skirmishes exhaust our energy and attention, a far more profound battle is already taking place beneath the surface. On one side are the partisans of the industrial past; on the other, growing millions who recognize that the most urgent problems of the world – food, energy, arms control, population, poverty, resources, ecology, climate, the problems of the aged, the breakdown of urban community, the need for productive, rewarding work – can no longer be resolved within the framework of the industrial order» [12, p. 18]. To each of us, especially for the younger generation, it's vital to recognize who we are: «...either Second Wave people committed to maintaining the dying order, Third Wave people constructing a radically different tomorrow, or a confused, self-canceling mixture of the two» [12, p. 17]. Respectively, increases the importance of education that should help identify the references.

The most developed countries – the USA, the EU, the «dragons» and «tigers» of Asia Pacific – are now characterized as those most advanced towards the post-industrial society. Whereas the term «post-industrial society» was brought into use by D. Risman, an American, in 1958, and the idea was formulated as early as at the dawn of XX c. by Englishmen Kumaraswamy and A.Penty, it is considered that the most important contribution to the development of the new concept belongs to a renowned American sociologist D.Bell and his fundamental work «The coming of post-industrial society: A venture of social forecasting», dated 1973 [13]. This work gives a comprehensive characteristic to the features of the emerging society. The concept is centered around the information factor, and the society is characterized as the society of knowledge. If the main productive resource in the agrarian society was muscular power, and machine technology in the industrial one, then in the post-industrial, or information society, it is knowledge and intelligence. The goal is not the amount of goods produced but their quality, and more broadly, the quality of life. Later on, other researchers, including A.Toffler, have outlined the following signs of transition to the new type of society: gradual transition from traditional fossil fuels to clean energy; high technologies with high added value sold at the global market; a shift in corporate organization towards less bureaucratic forms, more specialized and task-oriented; reliance on the «intellectual capital»; mass production substituted by strictly customer-targeted products and services; predomination of post-material human needs associated with the priority of self-fulfilment; «work as creativity»; change from nuclear family to «multiform» household; de-massification of media facilitated by the evolution of cable television, satellite connection etc. The main features of post-industrial society are: identifying information as the main resource, subject and commodity of production; shifting the weight center of economic activities from producing goods to providing services; the leading role of professions associated with high density of knowledge and information.

Understandably, the notion of the «post-industrial society» is highly abstract. Real life offers various types of societies shaped up on the grounds of post-industrial economic setups. But it's at this model that a country and an individual should orient, if they aim at dignified existence in the modern world. In its own time, Communism had decayed for

its inability to face the challenge of post-industrialism because of political and informational seclusion, state control of information, invalid market and restrictions on truly free creative development of individuals. In post-Communist age those restrictions were lifted. But what are Ukraine's prospects for subsequent progress? There are two variants, roughly called «pessimistic» and «optimistic». The first one insists that the country is completely devoid of possibilities for fast admission to the circle of post-industrial nations. Hence it's worth aspiring to become a developed industrial state, like a lot of other states in the world. But, as the post-war historic experience has shown, the establishment of information society in developed countries (countries of the Center) depreciates industrial labor and industrial production at the demi-periphery, causing its loss of competitive ability at the global market. The direct consequence of such depreciation is capital flight from developing economies. The second variant orients at gaining ability to catch up with post-industrial countries. The advocates of this variant consider the humanity entering the era of post-industrialism as the second crucial and unique chance in the newest history for Ukraine, after its independence, to succeed in building the national economy and of its entire society in consistence with modern demands.

If Ukraine does not want to find itself at the curb of the general progress of humanity, it should account its leading trends. The core question of the day, posed to the countries, is how to react to the challenge of modernization. The development of specific countries demonstrates different answers. It happened that, in public conscience, the current processes in Ukraine have overshadowed the understanding of the essence of post-industrial modernization. Such modernization requires concentrating joint efforts on such decisive directions:

- comprehensive development of science and broadest implementation of its achievements into various spheres of life. Since the main resource of information society is human capital, utmost attention is to be paid to all means of improving the conditions of people's living and activities. Ensuing is the need for intense development of education and healthcare, consistent upgrade of work qualifications (in the newest sense). All this helps to shape and develop people's ability to live and work in the new technological setup of post-industrialism, to make use of the achievements of the modern information world and to take part in its evolution and improvement;

- complete technical and technological re-equipment of economy simultaneously with restructuring it according to the demands of post-industrial society;

- diversification of ownership and organizing the productive cooperation between owners on the basis of socially oriented market economy;

- in the course of overcoming the crises, gradual diminishing of governmental interference with economy, replaced with creating conditions for the functioning of self-regulatory economic mechanisms.

Certainly, all these tasks are very complicated. But the general vector of global progress is directed towards complication. Concentrating on simple tasks for the country is the token of lagging irreversibly behind and transformation into «burnt land», ultimately useless in competition. Economies and workforce are competitive only if their production and labor are highly complex. Hence, figuratively speaking, Ukraine can survive only using its intelligence for solving complicated problems of the modern times. But it's been for a quarter a century that Ukraine experiences a process of destroying the society's intelligence, its scientific and technological potential, unseen in the modern world. It contrasts with the experience of countries like South Korea, which have turned

from backwaters into powerful global players in a comparatively short period of time. The key premises to their success include the breakthrough towards high knowledge and newest technologies. The urgency of a breakthrough into post-industriality for our country is caused by fundamental changes in all the daily practices of Ukrainian society at the turn of XX – XXI c., its institutions, norms, values, goals. Many of these changes proceed very rapidly. In general, there is a term for the «future shock», or «the shock of facing the future». It is owed to A. Toffler's book [16], which highlights the humanity's unpreparedness to fast change and the importance of respective preparation. The Ukrainian society turned out to have a low adaptive potential. Therefore the importance of education and inculturation based on newest approaches is evident.

We represent education in history. It needs modernization as well, since it is focused on the past while we must prepare people for the future. We must understand and explain both the old and the new, the agrarian and the industrial systems where most of us were born, as well as the Third Wave civilization, where the new generations will live. The past is part of history. Like A. Toffler wrote, «...each of us, no matter how seemingly unimportant, is a living piece of history» [12, p. 17]. So let's respect our past, present and future. Let's build our lives, guided by the experience and knowledge relevant to moving towards the information society.

Literature

1. Божко Я. Кримський вузол як символ зіткнення цивілізацій / Я. Божко. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://initiativenational.blogspot.com/2015/01/crimea-is-ukraine.html>.
2. Бжезинський Зб. Велика шахівниця. Американська першість та її геостратегічні імперативи / Збігнев Бжезинський / Пер. з англ. – Львів-Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2000. – 236 с.
3. Бжезинський Зб. Україна у геостратегічному контексті / Збігнев Бжезинський / Пер. з англ. – К.: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. – 102 с.
4. Войтенко Ю. М. Зіткнення цивілізацій і Україна: геополітичний вимір / Ю. М. Войтенко // Гілея: науковий вісник. – 2014. – Вип. 85. – С. 295-298.
5. Гавриш С. Зіткнення цивілізацій. / Степан Гавриш [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: // http://gavrysh.org.ua/view_article.php?id=115
6. Гречка М. Зіткнення цивілізацій чи «євразійська альтернатива» / Михайло Гречка // Персонал плюс. – 2008. – № 18. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.personal-plus.net/270/3224.html>.
7. Дрогомирецький В. Хантингтон предупреджал... / В. Дрогомирецький. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/columns/2014/07/15/7031876/>
8. Коллінз Р. Макросистория: Очерки социологии большой длительности / Пер. с англ. / Рэндалл Коллінз – М.: УРСС, 2015. – 499 с.
9. Нічого М. Зіткнення цивілізацій посеред України... / М. Нічога. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2010/06/11/5126765/>
10. Пасько В. На теренах України відбувається «війна цивілізацій» / В. Пасько. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: // <http://www.kobu.kiev.ua>
11. Стенограма виступу Збігнева Бжезинського на слуханнях Сенату США щодо України. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://uainfo.org/blognews/261501-stenograma-vistupu-zbgneva-bzhezinskogo-na-sluhannyah-senatu-ssha-schodo-ukrayini.html>
12. Тоффлер Э. Третья волна / Элвин Тоффлер / Пер. с англ. – М.: ООО «Фирма «Изд-во АСТ», 2010. – 331 с.
13. Bell D. The coming of post-industrial society: A venture of social forecasting / Daniel Bell. – N.Y.: Basic Books, 1973. – 507 p.
14. Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations? / Samuel P. Huntington // Foreign Affairs. – 1993. – Summer. – P. 22-49.
15. Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order / Samuel P. Huntington. – L.: Simon & Schuster, 1997. – 368 p.
16. Toffler A. Future Shock / Alvin Toffler – N.Y.: Bantam Books, 1970 – 561 p

Тетяна Орлова, доктор історичних наук, професор, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, м. Київ, Україна.

СУЧАСНА УКРАЇНА В СВІТЛІ КОНЦЕПЦІЙ АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ НАУКОВЦІВ

Анотація. У статті описуються висновки сучасних американських вчених щодо загальних тенденцій в розвитку світу і окремих його частин та значення даних висновків для України. Вперше в українській історіографії поданий аналіз українських реалій і перспектив крізь призму висновків відомих американських вчених. Значна увага приділяється наступним концепціям: напрацюванням Р. Коллінза щодо розпаду СРСР, зокрема місцю і ролі встановлення української незалежності в дезінтеграційних процесах на радянському політичному просторі; поглядам Зб.Бжезинського на геополітичній і безпековій ролі незалежної України на європейському континенті, її значення для імперських намірів Росії та американської позиції в регіоні; теорії С.Хантігтона про «зіткнення цивілізацій», його висновки для України як цивілізаційно розділеної країни; українські модернізаційні процеси аналізуються крізь призму ідей А. Тоффлера про «великі хвилі» і «шок майбутнього»; перспективи розвитку українського суспільства через характеристики постіндустріального суспільства за Д. Беллом та інших аналітиків. Автор, підсумовуючи ідеї названих вчених і застосовуючи їх методи для аналізу сучасної історії, політики і економіки України, приходить до висновку, що вступ людства в епоху постіндустріалізму є другим важливим і унікальним шансом в новітній історії для України, після встановлення її незалежності, щоб домогтися успіху в розбудові держави, економіки і нації.

Ключові слова: цивілізація, Великі хвилі, футуришок, постіндустріальне суспільство, модернізація.