https://doi.org/10.31516/2410-5325.060.017
UDC 130.2:316.3:316.628](477) “654”(045)

M. V. Aleksandrova, candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv

marina.dyadina@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2722-398X

S. V. Chastnyk, candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv

stanchast@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2147-4945

SOCIAL SOLIDARITY IN MODERN UKRAINE AND ‘YOUNG UKRAINE’: CULTUROLOGICAL PARALLELS

The authors of this article draw culturological parallels between the traumatic phenomena in today’s Ukraine and ‘Ivan Franko period’ with particular attention to the high level of solidarity attained during both periods. The emerging social solidarity is the result of group traumas. Traumatic events in present-day Ukraine bring about a consolidation of society; at the same time, a lack of common aim for society as a whole becomes obvious. Understanding the nature of negative experiences may serve as a basis for revitalizing the national idea and patriotism.

Keywords: *social solidarity, trauma, trauma discourse, consensus, identity.*

М. В. Александрова, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків

С. В. Частник, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків

СУСПІЛЬНА СОЛІДАРНІСТЬ СУЧАСНОЇ УКРАЇНИ ТА «МОЛОДОЇ УКРАЇНИ»: КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНІ ПАРАЛЕЛІ

Актуальність. Актуальність теми зумовлена необхідністю усвідомлення українським суспільством своєї історичної перспективи.

Мета статті — простежити культурологічні паралелі між сьогоденням та «франківським періодом», коли українське суспільство сягало сучасного рівня солідарності, акцентуючи саме на сучасному контексті травматичних подій в Україні.

Методологія. Базовим є культурологічний підхід. У розвідці застосовано методи опису, компаративного аналізу й узагальнення.

Результати. За часів «Молодої України» українське суспільство сягало такого рівня солідарності, яке має місце сьогодні в медіапросторі. У сучасних умовах української дійсності на фоні травматичних подій відбувається, з одного боку, посилення консенсусу та формування солідарності, а з іншого — виявляється відсутність спільної мети для суспільства загалом. Усвідомлення суті негативного досвіду може стати основою актуалізації національної ідеї та патріотизму. Українське суспільство має пройти ще тривалий шлях становлення, протягом якого травма набуває ознак культурного процесу, що підтримується різними формами репрезентації. Ідеться про створення дискурсу, у якому важливими є як академічний наратив травми, так і її медійні репрезентації.

Новизна зумовлена вибором аспекту дослідження. Суспільна солідарність сучасної України порівняно з «франківським періодом» досі не була предметом культурологічного аналізу.

Практичне значення. Матеріали і висновки розвідки посприяють ліпшому розумінню специфіки трансформації нинішнього українського суспільства; можуть бути корисними під час викладання нормативних курсів та спецкурсів з історії української культури та літератури.

Ключові слова: *суспільна солідарність, травма, дискурс травми, консенсус, ідентичність.*

М. В. Александрова, кандидат философских наук, доцент, Харьковская государственная академия культуры, г. Харьков

С. В. Частник, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Харьковская государственная академия культуры, г. Харьков

ОБЩЕСТВЕННАЯ СОЛИДАРНОСТЬ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ УКРАИНЫ И «МОЛОДОЙ УКРАИНЫ»: КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ПАРАЛЛЕЛИ

Проведены культурологические параллели между современностью, акцентировано именно на современном ракурсе травматических событий в Украине, «франковским периодом», когда украинское общество достигало современного уровня солидарности. Возникновение общественной солидарности является последствием коллективных травм. В современных условиях Украины на фоне травматических событий, с одной стороны, происходит усиления консенсуса и формирование солидарности, с другой — очевидно отсутствие общей цели для общества в целом. Стабилизация негативного опыта может стать основой актуализации национальной идеи и патриотизма.

Ключевые слова: *общественная солидарность, травма, дискурс травмы, консенсус, идентичность.*

Problem statement. This study is motivated by the need in Ukrainian society to reflect on the country's historical perspective proceeding from its current socio-political situation. Fundamental changes in social development bring about a reappraisal of values and ideology. Today the search for values should be based on the experience acquired by humanity, on the studies providing answers to important historical and phylosophical questions and suggesting conceptual solutions for understanding values of existence and society.

It is obvious that Ukrainian society becomes hostage of a paradox which cultural sociologist D. Kurakin mentions in his studies (Kurakin, 2013). Referring to J. Alexander's viewpoint that consensus in western societies was built around traumatic events such as the Holocaust or Watergate (Alexander, 2013), Kurakin speaks of irreconcilable contradictions of

opponents around traumatic events in 'non-western' societies which reduce solidarity to a critical level.

This situation presents a real challenge to modern Ukrainian society: on the one hand, in the time of traumatic events consensus is intensified and civil structures are formed (e.g. the phenomenon of volunteer movement), and on the other hand the lack of a common goal and an 'ideal' for the whole society in the state of Ukraine becomes obvious. Franko's understanding of an ideal can be accepted in the process of reconstructing cultural codes; the hidden meaning of such codes (probably not quite clear prior to modern socio-cultural events) has a real impact on society. Searching for and interpreting such cultural codes become relevant in the process of understandng the traumatic events by society.

Of great interest is currently Pierre Nora's theory in which he denies the notion of historical continuity. According to this author, history is not a continuum of the so-called historical facts. It is an 'object' of a construction placed in a time filled with 'actual past' rather than being empty and homogeneous (Nora, 1999, p 86). Facts are transformed into images and are not sorted by time; all of them are the reality of the present (Nora, 1999). When such 'actual past' appears in the media space where the instant communication of information and instant reaction to it are possible and where time and space practically disappear (Marshall McLuhan's 'implosion' as an instantaneous compression of information/ time/space continuums), history as 'reality of the present' joins today's reality discourse. This discourse itself becomes a 'merging point' of solidarity in modern Ukrainian society.

Previous research. Current interest in scientific aspects of trauma discourse can be traced back to the Russian translation (2013) of J. Alexander's 'The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology' (Alexander, 2003) dealing with the traumas of the Holocaust and Watergate. It is around them that the researcher builds his notion of the consensus in western societies. Referring to Alexander, Russian cultural sociologist D. Kurakin speaks of irreconcilable contradictions of opponents around traumatic events in 'non-western' societies (Kurakin, 2013).

In his article 'Cultural trauma in modern foreign historiography: concept and method' (Ohienko, 2011) Ukrainian recearcher V. Ohienko summarizes various approaches to the study of trauma and analyzes the most important ideas concerning the term 'cultural trauma'.

Among numerous studies devoted to the life and work of Ivan Franko, a prominent figure in Ukrainian culure, of great interest today are the works of O. Zabuzhko 'The philosophy of the Ukrainian idea and its European context: the Ivan Franko period' (Zabuzhko, 1992) and Ya. Hrytsak's 'A prophet in his land: Franko and his contemporaries' (Hrytsak, 2006).

The aim of this article is to draw culturological parallels between modernity, focussing on the traumatic phenomena in present-day Ukraine and the 'Ivan Franko period' when society attained a current level of solidarity.

The main text. The current level of solidarity was last reached by Ukrainian society at the turn of the 20th century during the period called 'Young Ukraine' by I. Franko, the movement's prominent representative and leader. In Franko's time this name emphasized the ideological and political affinity between the end of century generation and European national liberation movements of the 19th century, from 'Young Europe' created in 1834 that united 'Young Germany', 'Young Italy', 'Young Poland', etc., to 'Young Chekhs', the party of Chekh national revival. However, 'Young Ukraine' differed from them in not having been formally organized; the name was conceived as a metaphor implying the unity of Ukrainian intellectuals of 'Franko period' (Zabuzhko, 1992, p. 15).

It is this metaphorical nature that is important in this context, for because of it 'Young Ukraine' never became a 'construction point' for Ukrainian society divided between two empires. Ukrainian culture attained its structural perfection (for the first time ever all its components were evolving organically: aesthetics, art, science, religion, and politics), yet only at the level of educated intellectuals; the whole society never consolidated at that time.

The 1905 revolution seemed to have created conditions for legalization and intensification of Ukrainian national liberation movement on the whole territory of Ukraine. Characrerizing the situation at that time, V.Vynnychenko, one of the leaders of Ukrainian national liberation movement, pointed out: 'Actually, at that time we were gods who undertook to create a whole world from nothing'. I. Franko called that new period 'a springtime, when the ice of absolutism crackles, when people's force amidst the awful catastrophies search for a new path and new forms of activity'. In 1905 these words were addressed to the generation to which Franko appealed in 'An outspoken letter to Galitian Ukrainian youth', and whose rebellion he and his associates had been preparing all their lives.

It was this generation that was destined to make efforts and accomplish the task formulated by I. Franko in one of his speeches: 'To transform the huge ethnic mass of Ukrainian people into Ukrainian nation, a complete social and cultural body capable of independent cultural and political living, resistant to other nations' assimilating attempts, from wherever they may be coming, but at the same time capable of integrating in the widest sense and at the quickest pace those universal achievments of mankind, without which none of the states, however powerful, can succeed. It was at the height of

those efforts that a Ukrainian independent state came into being'. (Horskyi, 1997, p. 223).

However, the following events did not bring about a consolidation I. Franko had called for; on the contrary, the confrontation inside the Ukrainian society itself aggravated the situation. The short-lived Ukrainian independent state, dramatically affected Ukrainian nation's destiny in the later periods, which could be attributed to immaturity of Ukrainian national liberation movement and decreasing of social solidarity to critical levels. Creating a new state was impeded because the process of national formation had not been completed. As a consequence, Bolsheviks' propaganda spread among Ukrainian citizens (while in 1917 it had been accepted by only 3% of Ukrainians), and on Dec 19, 1919 Kharkiv was proclaimed the capital of the Ukrainian Social Soviet Republic as opposed to Kyiv, the capital of the Ukrainian People's Republic.

Comparable to current political events is the situation with solidarity in society and the discourse of «Two Ukraines» (although geografically they are somewhat different now). This discourse divides, or attempts to divide the country into 'European Ukraine' in which civil society seems to have been established and democratized, and Eastern Ukraine which remains pre-modern and requires integration into 'national identity'(Zhurzhenko, 2003).

In this context it would be quite interesting to recall Franko's thoughts on 'lackey's mind' in his article 'Beyond possible'. Franko points out that when sciences are in question, this kind of reasoning is incompetent. But when it concerns social life, politics, sociology, it is summoned as a witness or even a judge. 'This reasoning is not simple for it was deformed and is still being deformed by thousands of superstitions and restrictions; neither is it sound, for it is a result of thousands of generations and reasonings, often very sick and broken'(Franko, 1956, p. 354).

This statement contains several interesting points which will be later touched upon in Franko's works and should be seriously consireded today. This is, on the one hand, a purely romantic view, but on the other hand it presents an absolutely practical problem of identity and crowd, described in Franko's poems 'Moses' and 'The Burial'.

No wonder that that a person of such magnitude could not stand aside from the theme of the Messiah. If people are not aware of themselves and their interests, who could lead them out of this situation? (Isn't it one of the current urgent problems?). Who if not the Messiah? Having good knowledge of history and the Old Testament, Franko could not stand away from biblical plots, moreover biblical texts were well known and understood by the entire Ukrainian Christian community.

Though convinced that 'world history is not a story of heroes, but a story of mass movements and changes', Franko yearned for 'quintessence of nation' — passionary individuals, as a necessary element of nation-making movement. To Franko the hero is a saviour of his epoch (Zabuzhko, 1992, p. 75).

'Moses' is a compendium of Franko's life phylosophy, the apex of his creative biography' (Bass & Kaspruk, 1983, p. 123). Caracteristic of his ideology is Franko's choice of the theme of Moses, the creator of national religion and actually of the first national history in the ancient world. According to O. Zabuzhko (Zabuzhko, 1992) Franko regarded the story of Moses as a mythologized model, a canonic example of essential transformation of ethnical mass into a new type of community (nation) through the efforts of a Messiah, the awakener. Consequently this theme had a symbolical meaning to Franko.

In his introduction to the second edition of 'Moses' Franko himself points out that Moses' death (a prophet not recognized by his people) is not a biblical, but his own theme. Early history does not know prophet-heroes not accepted by their people. And in Franko's poem Moses is rejected not by a nation, but by an 'under-nation', 'those lazy nomads'; only the prophet's death turns the crowd into a nation. Franko and his hero believe in the nation's vitality; once awaken the crowd should becomes a nation with a sense of its identity.

The worst for Moses is the futility of his faith in his mission. Thus, the poem presents a certain model of the state position and prospects for Ukrainians. This is a problem of relationship between the elite and the people: should the nation be led or not, and what are the moral foundations of building a nation?

In Franko's works, paricularly in 'The Burial', such prospects for the nation look quite pessimistic. Franko's Moses belongs to the poet's time and solves contemporary (to Franko) problems of a nation's future/ Of course, one can also say that Franko anticipated the problems facing modern Ukraine. The main problem is: who would lead this nation and where, and what does the nation itself aspire to?

Franko was a radical, and neither he nor his 'party' had any real support from the people. Galitian peasantry supported their clericals. Such people as Pavlyk and Franko were lonely in an amorphic and politically undeveloped crowd. Hence the sentiments of elitarism and spiritu al aristocracy, the desire to form an ideal (Popovych, 1998, p. 486).

A sense of national identity as condenscending admiring the 'people' provokes resentment and anger in a blacksmith's son from a godforsaken Carpathian village. He hates that humble everyday life from which he

has broken free himself and dreams to free his nation. Hence two points: messiahnism and 'models' of its implementation. Hence is also the theme of a split personality. Myron, his lyrical hero (at the end of the 19th century Franko often uses this pseudonym) simply leads to death the rebels who follow him to battle.

Myron, a prophet and aristocrat of spirit, explains his attitude to the people and the motives of his betrayal: he drove his people, like cattle, like Moses did, to eradicate 'all plebeian instincts'. Yet he realizes that the victory of masses is the victory of 'brutal forces, plebeians and unconcsiousness...'. Therefore Myron dooms his comrades to death: ' a heroic death now is better than a plebeian victory'. For, despite having a lot of strength, people had no ideal 'of great struggle and faith...'.

In his reply to the general Myron 'transforms' his own betrayal, interpreting it as a call for reform the backward people, '...to kindle, to ignite their souls so that their coal turns to diamond': for the rebels, although they 'fought like eagles, In their souls they still were dark and treacherous, The same old slaves as they used to be', so the easily won victory would be a Pyrrhic one to them. A martyr sacrifice, 'a heroic death' of fighters were needed to give people at such price that only thing that makes it a nation in spiritual sense: 'an immortal power, the ideal'.

Relevant today seems E. Renan's argument that a nation can attain a high level of solidarity that is established by a sense of past and future sacrifices (Renan, 2010). Events taking place in modern social, political and cultural space of Ukraine reaffirm the importance of the problems contemporary to 'Young Ukraine' and justify a new philosophical perception of Franko's understanding of the ideal.

In such circumstances, social solidarity arising as a reaction to traumatic events, 'performs the function of a social hope for the better' (Karas, 2001). According to J. Alexander, solidarity is a natural consequence of social traumas. A traumatic experience could be regarded as the main consolidating element in the nation if it has the same traumatic subject, the agressor. Worth mentioning in this respect seems A. Neil's approach who studies a case of major American national traumas and argues that the reaction to trauma usually determines the progress as well as new opportunities for change and innovation (Kurakin, 2013).

Chech philosopher Jan Patočka defines solidarity as a phenomenon that emerges under the influence of perception of a fact of violence and human rights violation. Solidarity is not a simple reaction to an act of violence, rather it is hope and openness of man to future joys. Therefore solidarity gains historical significance gradually, but it plays an increasingly important role in the 'ontological constitualizing of human existence' (Patočka, 1981).

Conclusion. The current level of solidarity was last reached by Ukrainian society in the time of 'Young Ukraine'. Solidarity in modern conditions emerges both due to the common character of individual losses and a sense of collective identity. Ukrainian society still has a long way to go; it is something that J. Alexander calls 'the trauma process', during which a trauma acquires signs of cultural process formed and sustained by different forms of representation (Alexander, 2003. p. 94). A discourse emerges having such important features as academic trauma narrative and its media representation. In media space this discourse becomes both a basis and a necessary condition for civil society's functioning in Ukraine. It is in media space that a language able to convey a traumatic experience is sought for. Geographic boundaries between communities disappear in media space where any individual can join social public activities and thus enhance social solidarity. Solidarity arising in today's Ukraine is one of the markers of public activity. One can say that modern public structures being formed for the first time since the destruction of peasant public structures by 'collectivization', are being restored at last.

Currently we are in the topos of an ongoing trauma: traumatic events occur, they are being studied, and their consequences are being discussed. In such circumstances solidarity is based on the sentiments of individual losses as well as the sense of collective identity. The need to understand the experience of modern traumatic events answers the question whether there is a civil society in Ukraine. It is thanks to media that solidarity of society becomes obvious, and society's civil structures prove to be so effective. Nowadays trauma discourse in media space becomes the focal point of emerging solidarity in modern Ukrainian society. In the current 'post-Maidan period' (Kravchenko. 2015, p. 189) national issues go beyond the limits of academic discourse and attain the same general importance as in Franko's time.

References

Alexander, J. (2003). *Cultural trauma and collective identity. The meaning of social life. A cultural sociology.* Oxford: Oxford: University Press [In English].

Alexander, J. (2013). *The meaning of social life. A cultural sociology*. Moscow: Praksis [In Russian].

Bass, I. & Kaspruk, A. (1983). *Ivan Franko: Life and work*. Kyiv : Naukova Dumka [In Ukrainian].

Beniamin, V. (2000). On the notion of history. *New literary review*, 46, 81–90 [In Russian].

Franko, I. (1956). *Selected socio-political and philisophical works.* Kyiv: State publishing house for political literature [In Ukrainian].

Horskyi, V. (1997). *A history of Ukrainian philosophy*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka [In Ukrainian].
Hrytsak, Ya. (2006). *A prophet in his land. Franko and his contemporaries* (1856–1886). Kyiv: Krytyka. [In Ukrainian].
Karas, A. (2001). The ethics of freedom and solidarity in a civil society. *Independent culturological journal 'Yi'*, 21. Retrieved from http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n21texts/karas.htm [In Ukrainian].
Kravchenko, O. (2015) Key issues of modern cultural policy in Ukraine. *Culture of Ukraine*, 49, Kharkiv, 188–199 [In Ukrainian].
Kurakin, D. (2013). *Solidarity and the theury of trauma*. Retrieved from http://postnauka.ru/video/16191 [In Russian].
Nora, P. (1999). *The problems of the places of memory. France — memory* (pp.17–50). S.-Petersburg: S.-Peterb. Univ. [In Russian].
Ohienko, V. (2011). Cultural trauma in modern foreign historiography. *National and historical memory,* 1, 148-160 [In Ukrainian].
Patočka, J. (1981) *Essais heretiques. Sur la philosophie de l'histoir*e. Paris: Ed. Vernier [In French].
Popovych, M. (1998). *Essays in the history of Ukrainian culture*. Kyiv: ArtEk [In Ukrainian].
Renan, E. (2010). What is a nation. In O. Protsenko & V. Lisovyi (ed.) *Nationalism: Anthology*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp [In Ukrainian] .
Zabuzhko, O. (1992). *The philosophy of Ukrainian idea and the European context*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka [In Ukrainian].
Zhurzhenko, T. (2003). A myth of two Ukraines. *Modern Times*, 4, 78–83 [In Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редколегії 04.03.2018 р.