Rudenko Juliya Yu.

Ph. D. in political sciences, Associate Professor, National Academy of Security Service of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine. mr.rudenko@yandex.ua

PROBLEMS OF UNCONFORMITY OF TERMINOLOGY CONCEPTS IN ETHNIC POLICY AS A CHALLENGE TO NATIONAL SECURITY OF UKRAINE

Full text. One of the problems in the context of national security of Ukraine today is dealt with terminological unconformity of fundamental concepts used in the field of ethnic politics. Noted situation is becoming more and more tangible under conversion of category "nation" and derivative concepts into object of symbolic struggle for meaning. This struggle is carried out at the conceptual and theoretical level as well as at the program-level policy, that is at the level of policy actors struggle. However, if dominant logic in scientific field is dealing with notions "true / untrue", relations in political sphere are built by the principle "friend / enemy". The danger is that within political product – programs, political advertisements, public speeches of politicians – a very high content of information is designed for manipulating mass consciousness. "As a rule politicians speaking must be screened with special attention to political speeches which under their frequent masking as "research ones" should not conceal the essence of the case" [1, c.240]. Actuality of the article is dealing therefore with forming certain research orientations towards diversity of approaches to key concepts in the field of ethnic policy.

Significant research achievements of the issues outlined in the article can be found in the works of Ukrainian scientists: Vivcharyk M. Grytsak J., Kolodiy A. Kresina I. Kuras I., Nagorna L. Rymarenko Yu, Shkliar L. and others. However the problems outlined in the title of the article did not find their full calarification. Emphasis is done on diversity of concepts in ethnic policy, but the phenomenon of their theoretical incoherence as one of the factors which challenges national security of Ukraine is considered insufficiently.

The aim of the article is to highlight the problems that arise on theoretical as well as practical basis with due regard to theoretical incoherence of concepts in the sphere of ethnic policy, in particular the concepts "nation" and "nationalism.

Scientific literature distinguishes two basic meanings of "nation." Firstly, nation is identified with the ethnic community. Secondly, the nation is interpreted as a civil community, as a territorial and political unity. The first concept of the nation (ethnic) originates from the works of German scholars (Herder J., Shleyyermaher F.), and second respectively originates from the works of the French enlighteners. Thus, the ethnic nations are those peoples which accept their ethno-cultural peculiarity as a main source of national identity and the basis for creation of their own state. They emerged under the conditions of statelessness, where the movement for spiritual revival and

political consolidation preceded the formation of the nation-state and was carried out under the guidance of spiritual and intellectual elite, because leading political leaders under foreign domination could not develop.

Political nations are those state peoples whose representatives accept their nationality with due regard to citizenship, affiliation to a certain state, approval of its principal political values. They were formed where strong and centralized state occurred before cultural consolidation of the people, and therefore government institutions could favour this consolidation, accelerate it using even the methods of coercion [2]. It becomes clear that two vectors in defining nation emerged in the context of the algorithm of formation of this community. But today they have begun to exist independently, sometimes "clashing" at both theoretical and practical level. Moreover, the ambiguity of the term "nation" makes it impossible to find a meaningful "point of reference" for concepts nationalism, national idea etc. For example, following definition of a nation is given in a quite "official" source - a nation is defined as "a community of people regardless their ethnic origin, but united by political interests, consideration of their identity in a certain area (land) with a certain state organization (sovereignty), common citizenship, legal rights and duties, culture and traditions [3, p. 105].

Thus it is clear that this definition tends to the concept "political nation". As to A. Kolodiy, for example, "nation is an ethno-political community, which has high level of consolidation and self-awareness, involvement into the political life, creation or desire to create their own state" [4, p. 314]. There is a right questions appears - if nation always includes "ethnic" component? if so - what is it in a multi-ethnic state, ethnic group that predominates quantitatively? But if it is absent, is ethnic component in determining nation a collection of all ethnic groups living in state? That is, the substance of this concept at least is different for mono-and multi-ethnic state, or such where certain ethnic group dominates and prevailes in political and national processes.

Consequently, the question arises: if the state has been established and ethnos have already done its mobilizing and consolidating role in creation state and nation, what is it futher function and what place it should occupy in society? Answers create a wide range of considerations.

One of the most debatable term is "nationalism" as far as prevailing of a certain ethnic group, logically, is based on the content of this political ideology. As A. Kolodiy confidently asserts, "the assertion that nationalism does not disappear with the formation of national states, but only takes another form, can not be interpreted that it must become at once the official ideology. The latter was and is always dangerous for liberty of a person, people, and perhaps conscious community and will never be found compatible with the choice of democratic way of developmentof the state. The task of the state is to reduce to a common denominator, to co-ordinate group interests, to get compromises and harmony in society. And this role is unlikely to match the existence of any state ideology, including nationalism. State ideology presupposes its obligatory character and therefore spiritual and perhaps political pressure on citizens what denies

democracy and leads to totalitarianism" [2]. A. L. Nagorna stresses with great concern: " One has …to state that the end of the XX and beginning of the XXI centuries have become the time of the nationalism returning into the political arena, and this happened at the time when the ideological victory of neoliberalism seemed obvious to many (people). Nationalism revealed itself as an effective mobilization method and even as a form of legitimation of political regimes. It emerged on the political proscenium with new, "refined" by populism face and with new allies in the form of religious fundamentalism, left radicalism, anti-globalism. As ideology nationalism made the best use of the realities of the globalized world, trying to portray itself as a defender of the threatened identity under the banner of "new localism" [1, p. 222].

That is, despite the fact that the terms "nation" and "nationalism" are of the same roots, most researchers in Ukraine agree that "nationalism" is extremely right-wing ideology and its promotion can be dangerous for stability, national security and human rights.

However, today a certain number of researchers in Ukraine, not to mention the politicians, continue to put forward the position about the lack of "national sentiments" in this dimension, joining nationalism with the term "democratic", identifying it with the national revival (it is not entirely clear of what - culture , state, ethnicity, unity? – Auth.), opposing it to all "Soviet, totalitarian" (it must be read as to all of extremely left-wing character, – auth.)…

If politicians can be accused in this context of preconceived opinion, researchers can't be as most of them do not pose the purpose of manipulating mass consciousness, but rather express their conscious attitude.

Thus, it is clear that outlined facts indicate unconformity of initial positions on the definition of term "nation" and as a result, "nationalism."

Attempt to reconcile these positions were made by prominent scholar of conservative wing W. Lipynskyy at the beginning of the XX century, who determined that nationalism existed in two forms - in statebuilding form (patriotism), and stateruining form (chauvinism). The first type of nationalism was defined by scolar as "patriotism "or rather" territorial patriotism", that is as " love to land, to all its inhabitants irrespective of their ethnic origin" As to the second tipe of nationalism it was accepted by the scolar as chauvinism by defining chauvinist as a "person who accepted positively alien against fellowman" [5, p.745-746].

 But if to follow at the same time logic of one of the greatest without a doubt Ukrainian scolars, one could argue, for example, that "democracy" may be of "negative" and "positive" character and something like that. Substantial amount of these concepts is being "shaken" to a certain extent in this case. Certainly, analysis of nation and nationalism done by W. Lipynskyy was undisputed achievement of Ukrainian science and culture for his time, but our task obviously is aimed at further research of the noted subject in the context of contemporary conditions of Ukrainian nation.

The deal is that noted terminological uncertainty is not a problem of scientific sphere only ... Unfortunately, it generates value conflicts at the level of public opinion, which are more dangerous, because challenge stability of the country, stir up xenophobic sentiments, national hatred and hostility, especially under speculations of some politicians on the ethnic factor in the process of nation-building regarding objective multiethnic character of Ukrainian society. To base any modern "Ukrainian project" on Simulacra which exploit significant symbols of ethnicity is not to understand the nature of the challenges facing young states in the era of globalization. However the majority of serious scholars and analysts are sure that under the new conditions the tasks of de-politicization of ethnicity and reducing ethnic character of policy are put before world community. Properly speaking, popular in the West model of multiculturalism is also based on transfering attention from ethnic to multiculture factor.

Careless "design" of nation-building policy in Ukraine with due regard to its traumatic historical experience can also threaten territorial integrity under the process of artificial aggravation of regional differences by certain political elites. One would like to emphasize that the threat to territorial integrity of the state is being created not by regional differences and local selfidentity themselves, but by artificial speculations on this basis. And in this context one can hardly agree with the authors of the fundamental work "The Ukrainian political nation: genesis, status and prospects" that the immediate problem for Ukraine is "overcoming cultural and historical diversity of its regions, particularly those revealed in the geopolitical, ethno-cultural and religious orientations "[6, p.188].

Leveling of regional peculiarities is not only impossible in principle (at least within the lives of several generations), but also inefficient, because any diversity enriches vital palette of nation. Healthy political forces should strive not to "overcome" heterogeneity, but to civilized resolution of the problems that arise on its basis as well as to civilized oppose to attempts to politicize regional differences. Because real threat of split is made not by mismatches of orientations, but by conflicts of interest and by competition of nationalisms when they enter the stage of hostility and try to "become winner at any cost" [7, p. 278].

However, it is not awaited to accept the noted positions in dimension of misunderstanding or rejection of importance of ethnic factors in the life of contemporary Ukrainian society. It is said only that as far as ethnic and cultural conflicts have become by V. Kymlichka the most widen source of violence in the world and "there are no simple answers and miracle recipes " to soften them on the basis of defending human and civic rights, it needs to do all possible for settling the fate of ethnic and national groups not by nationalist xenophobers, religious extremists or military dictators [8, p. 15, 149]. In Ukrainian context it means first of all focus on the strategy of nationbuilding, which will minimize eventually the effect of cultural

distinctions and will influence the emergence of political, multi-ethnic nation of citizens. This in any way undermines the "sense-building" function of Ukrainian ethnos.

Thus, a promising direction of Ukrainian community development is dealt with creation of a unified multi-ethnic and multicultural nation of citizens with reservation of uniqueness and originality of each ethnic community, where everyone could feel himself Ukrainian regardless ethnic origin. But Ukrainian researchers should also play in this process an important role.

Keywords: political nation, ethnicity nation, nationalism, national security.

References:

1. Nagorna, L. (2011). *Social and cultural identity: traps of values distinctions.* – Kyiv: I. F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (in Ukr.).

2. Kolodiy, A. (1997). *Nation as a subject of policy.* Lviv: Kalvariya (in Ukr.).

3. Shemshuchenko, Yu. et al. (Eds.). (2002). *Juridical encyclopedia:* in 6th volumes. Vol 4. Kyiv: Ukrayinskaya entsyklopediya (in Ukr.).

4. Kolodiy, A. (Ed.). (2003). Political science. (2d ed.). Kyiv: Elga, Nika-Tsenter (in Ukr.).

5. Lypynskyy V. Nationalism, patriotism, chauvinism. In Rymarenko Yu. et al. (Eds.). (1997). *Small encyclopedia of ethnic and state studies.* Kyiv: Lybid (in Ukr.).

6. Krysachenko, V. S. (Ed.). (2004). *Ukrainian political nation: genesis, status, prospects.* Kyiv: National Institute for Strategic Studies (in Ukr.).

7. Nagorna, L. (2008). *Regional Identity: Ukrainian context.* Kyiv: I. F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (in Ukr.).

8. Kymlichka V. (2001). *Liberalism and rights of minorities.* Kharkiv: Tsentr osvitnih initsiativ (in Ukr.).

Stezhko Yuriy G.

Ph. D. in pedagogical sciences, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine. stezhko@mail.ru

NATIONAL AUTHENTICITY OF PERSONALITY IN NEW REALITIES OF SOCIAL LIFE

Abstract. The article expresses considerations about causes of delayed development of the civil society of Ukraine, the slowdown in the rate of its democratization. The wronged and contradictable to values of civil society thinking is hidden in mentality of Ukrainians, their non-state psychology and individualism what was written a lot of publications and articles. Following to the words of mr. Tolochko P.