

**UDK: 130.2, 140.8 + 304.2**

*Domanska Olena  
PhD of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor,  
doctoral student at National Pedagogic  
University named after M. Drahomanov*

**HISTORIOSOPHIC ASPECT OF THE HISTORICAL MODEL OF  
UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN TYPES OF STATEHOOD IN THE  
CONTEXT OF ANALYZING VALUE STRUCTURES OF  
CONSCIOUSNESS**

*The article concerns the difference between types of value consciousness of Ukrainian and Russian ethnic groups as the basis for the formation of different models of statehood. The idea is substantiated that Ukrainian proto-ethnos not only became its material and territorial but also value-spiritual shield that gave the opportunity for the development of other centers of value concentration and structuring at the expense of developing its own spiritual dimension. It is shown that the mechanisms of formation of value structures of Russian and Ukrainian types of national character are radically different.*

*Key words: the value consciousness, Ukrainian model of statehood, Russian model of statehood, mentality.*

Building national cultural space is one of the most topical directions of developing the Ukrainian society amidst independence. To understand the functioning of value structures of consciousness, which play a key role in the way of development and building cultural space by human, the disclosure of mechanisms of their formation is of great importance. The concept of the value structure of consciousness has been developed for a long time in various aspects and visions of its components in psychology, philosophy, cultural studies etc. It is an established categorical combination of scientific understanding of the interaction between man and the world. In terms of understanding the value structures as part of mass consciousness, considerable improvements were made in the late 19th and throughout the 20th century by M. Moss, K. Levi-Strauss, L. Levy-Bruhl, M. Weber, G. Simmel, K. Mannheim, R. Mills, L. Mumford, J. Bell, and E. Shils. The reality and originality of the phenomenon of mass and group consciousness, as opposed to the individual one, was described by W. Wundt. Axiological context of the concept of consciousness is represented by the works of E. Durkheim, M. Weber, F. Znanetskii, J. Allport, A. Leontiev, and V. Zinchenko. In terms of research into formation of value structures of consciousness in the process of education and in the hierarchical structure of forming value and legal consciousness, this issue was regarded in the works of such domestic scientists as A. Simak [1] and N. Volkovytska [2]. However, no truly comprehensive understanding and identification of the mechanisms of formation and implementation of value mechanisms of consciousness has been provided to this day.

The article is an attempt to describe the mechanisms of formation and implementation of value mechanisms of consciousness of the Ukrainian and Russian ethnic groups, and form the models of statehood on the basis of these mechanisms.

In general, value structures of consciousness play a key role in structuring and organizing the way we perceive the world, through which the world and its phenomena are decomposed and sorted by importance and priority of perception and importance to human. In the human mind, certain values form a stable system of rules, goals, ideals etc. This system can be called a value paradigm, which, depending on the person, may appear either ossified and rigid or flexible and relational [3]. Even based on this general approach, it is clear that value structures, or, to be more exact, the mechanisms of their manifestation and implementation - and most importantly, control over them (the goals of such control are beyond the case) - are extremely significant in the context of the historical cultural split witnessed and acted out by European countries. In particular, understanding the origins of this unprecedented crisis of value consciousness covering almost all the strata of Russia's population, due to obvious reasons, is a critically important task for Ukraine.

Understanding the formation of value structures of mass consciousness, which took place during a long period of history, always faces certain difficulties. First of all, those who study their formation cannot abstract from the influence of their own value system. Secondly, they cannot guarantee objectivity of their own conclusions regarding the object of the research because there is no universal criterion of value system available. Thirdly, the research into the subject itself, when it comes to its value characteristics, is always indirect, meaning that a value under the research does not exist in its pure form but is presented in the historical section by another carrier, which also brings confusion into the picture of their understanding.

Such situation would be unsolvable if the value itself did not "shine" through all the layers of meaning as a kind of waymark for the one who recognized it as such. It is clear that, given the abovementioned, the requirement for scientific objectivity is lost, but, as known from the "spiritual knowledge" (W. Dilthey), there are also other common factors. Instead, this approach allows one to test endurance

of one value by another, which actually meets the requirement for consistency between subject and method of understanding. Based on this understanding, it is offered to analyze certain provisions of the historiosophic work "Rose of the World" by D. Andreeva. The main thesis of the material, which is given below, is the assertion that the problem of the formation of value structures of consciousness can be represented as follows: a certain historical type of consciousness that was later regarded in psychology, sociology and cultural studies also as mass consciousness is more vulnerable to the impact of ideological concepts. This vulnerability is caused by a lack of factors of cultural critical processing, resulting in neutralization, exclusion and transformation of the value information. These factors can be called a value immune system of the individual. In the course of their development, value concepts accord with the network of value protection of consciousness, centred by universal human values of humanistic orientation. In the context of analysing the following provisions one can trace the mechanism of "transforming" semantic and substantive elements of value statements into the form that leads to the appropriation of its denotation by a certain type of national carrier, which appears to be the historical form of the aggressive type of building cultural space.

History tends to store a clear reference to the source, the cause (and hence the grounds) of its own events. Thus, if viewed only from that, in fact, irrefutable position, prophecies and visions of Russia's global mission and destiny appear in a slightly different light. Given

the necessity to reveal the symbolism of the Ukrainian mythonarrative, some fragments from one of the most iconic (and rather spectacular) narratives of Russian spiritual dimension - the work "Rose of the World" by D. Andreev should be analysed. Consider the fragment describing the historical origins of Russia, which cannot be separated from the period of formation and crisis of Kievan Rus, and therefore, from the vulnerability of the latter, which can be inferred from the fact that the author expresses voluntary or involuntary position of Russia enjoying great power. Initially, the superiority of the "Ruthenian nation" is defined. The author argues that a historically reproducible type of nation-building is the type, where one nation is immediately excluded from the number of nations making up a supnation to be further considered as the leading one. That is followed by a statement that this very type of nation-building is characteristic of Russia. "Basically coinciding with centuries-long descriptions of Russia, our nation (obviously, meaning Russians - author's italics hereafter) probably belongs to the formations of the first (the abovementioned) type... principal importance of the supnation, the global value has by far rested with it (meaning the Ruthenian, i.e. Russian nation) without being given either to Ukrainians or Belarusians, or ethnic groups of Volga region and Siberia" [4; c. 126].

In fact, this refers to violent carrying the concept of "Russian people" and "Russian nation" from the period of its later formation and establishment of the value gravity centre over into the very source of such formation, when there was no concept of either the Russian or Ukrainian nations. This technique of "dragging and dropping" the energy of a meta-narrative is typical of narrators representing the "Ruthenian" cultural dimension (we shall call it "Muscovite" in order to prevent unnecessary allusions and use one of the variants the inhabitants of this value centre named themselves). This method cannot be regarded only as a deliberate distortion of meaning. For its implementation and support, a certain system of individual consciousness is also required, when everything that is revealed to a muscovite through a comprehensible language primarily entails power of the real situation, the status of evidence by means of value agglutination (bonding).

We can describe this mechanism so that the value reaction of absorption and appropriation takes place. The new element is then now seen as inseparable from the reformatted picture of the and encroachment upon it is treated and, most crucially, felt and experienced as encroachment upon "time-honoured" rights to anything, such as land, religion, language, literature, art etc. It is this mechanism of transforming perception into emotions, emotions into space and space into property, with space belonging to the owner of this type of value consciousness (Muscovite), that is a core of this type of value consciousness. In this case it is rather the type of physiological, not cultural reaction to the perception that needs to be observed in these contexts, but, of course, if belonging to a certain cultural type is realized by public consciousness and is recognized as a symptom of disorder of social (value) structure of consciousness, which spells massive violation of international order and security.

Incidentally, it was physiological incommensurability of the Russian national type that was once wittily described by academician I. Pavlov. In the spring of 1818, scientist delivered public lectures in Petrograd. Here we bring only the essence of his scientific observations that are completely relevant today. The sophist notes that in the case when "the

whole nation in its main lower mass has not gone far away from slavery, and intellectuals have mostly only adopted foreign culture, moreover, not always successfully, people who have brought relatively little of their own into general culture and science; if such nation imagines itself as a leader of humanity and begins to set patterns of new cultural forms of life for other nations, then we are facing regrettable, fatal events that could spell this nation losing its political independence" [5]. Further, the scientist brings and justifies regulations that provide insight into the properties of "Russian intelligence", including lack of tendency to focus and work hard, which is replaced with pounce and pressure; unwillingness to know the facts and verify the true state of affairs; the desire to talk more about freedom than actually reach it; unwillingness to listen to other opinions and face the facts of reality. The sophist notes that Russians do not seek to understand what they see; they do not live in "obedience to the truth" but strongly believe that Russia is the advance guard of mankind and it is going to "rub the eyes of the rotten West" in any case [ibid].

Since the formation of the Russian model of statehood could not but felt the impact of the structures of value consciousness contained in the mentality of the nation and so aptly described by the Russian scientist, they should be taken into account when concerning the narrative outlined further in the work.

Important components of a narrative are categories that, in a mythoreligious, figurative-symbolic and poetic way, build a quite consistent and coherent scheme of spiritual configuration of cultural space of (obviously) Russia, whose projection on the material geographical and territorial space, therefore, is itself regarded as legitimate and unlimited. The main point is to recognize the cornerstones of this mythonarrative construction. So, the Apostle Andrew gave his strength to Yarosvit (conventional name of the leader of Russian metaculture). The result was "a vague drawing of Heavenly Russia" [4; c. 126]. It should be noted that the affirmation about "giving strength" may and should be understood as evidence and analogue of the concept of "value energy" that develops in contemporary research in various aspects.

However, there is another significant mention. According to the author, "Heavenly Russia" emerges exactly on the banks of the Dnipro River as a result of the sacred sacrifice of the Apostle Andrew. Where are the contours of the "Heavenly Ukraine" then? Obviously, it does not make sense to ask the mentalist, D. Andreev, this question. However, it is necessary to break through the thicket of layers of symbolic language stratifications and ask: what is the actual meaning of this title (Russia), and why would Heavenly Russia and earthly Russia worship such Slavic deities as Perun, Jari, Stribog and Lada, about whom he writes? [ibid, p. 127].

Another element of the great narrative is to define the mission, purpose and destination of Russia. Here we bring forward a small piece of our own translation. "The drama of historical Christianity is that none of the churches has turned into a shape of perfect national organisation that could express and implement the will of Christianity together with its ethical and mystical essence... the reason is the fault of churches themselves as human communities. For if Catholicism, trying to replace Kingdom of God with the Pope's Kingdom on earth fell a victim... to one of the worst vampires in the world history, then the Orthodox Church, which, according to Dostoevsky, had occupied "its corner in the state" back in the Byzantine Empire, completely refused to perform that task. This task, being one

of, if not the most crucial of all the tasks that mankind has ever faced, now falls, with all its immeasurable severity and safeness of the way that is necessary for this purpose, under the hierarchy of Russian metaculture" [ibid, p. 128]. We believe that the author knew that the double-headed eagle on the emblem of the Russian Empire (now, of the modern one, too) moved there back from Byzantium. Obviously, the idea of dominance of the state in the society, which was shrewdly recognised by Dostoevsky in Byzantium, can be rightfully attributed to Russia, either. We must pay tribute to the Russian mentalist and prophet, D. Andreev: he calls a spade a spade, ideates within the coordinates of spiritual dialectics and believes that the forced birth of the predator of Russian great-power statehood is the greatest tragedy of the Russian people.

The predator of Russian statehood (as a symbolic, nonmaterial power) was growing stronger almost from the inception of Muscovy and was eventually confident enough to "have ruled the show" in its history until now. What is the relevance of this piece of the narrative to the Ukrainian myth? The same should obviously happen to Ukraine, which needs to deliver its own "predator" in order to protect and develop its own national space. Another thing is that this predator has to perform other tasks, protect other values and be different. So far, Ukraine has never defined, articulated and even approached the path that would bring it to understanding its mission and role in the fate of nations worldwide. However, every nation must not only step on this way but complete it. After all, if D. Andreev describes the perfect unity of the churches and peoples in the notion of "Rose of the World", one cannot assume that this future unity must bear in itself the "underdeveloped or "spiritually immature" nations that have never found out their mission and objectives, as well as their values.

Thus, avoiding lengthy rationale, the logic of which can be recovered if one turns to the work by D. Andreev, we shall formulate the provisions that are important to the Ukrainian mythonarrative that "shines" through the vision of the Russian mentalist.

1. Ukrainian ethnos is pagan; it has never become a conscious and consistent carrier of the Christian religious meta-narrative and its "deployment tool." Besides, there is a deep connection between paganism and natural elements, in which the expression and embodiment of a sexual, orgiastic beginning is dominant. The characteristic of this energy is its aspiration to go beyond its own limits. In addition, being spontaneous, uncontrolled, extramental and inanimate in its "outpourings", it determines a certain angle of vision of Ukrainian history. But when it comes to the deep archetypal national model, it is pagan rather than Christian (Orthodox).

2. In Russia, according to the sophist, Christianity soon came to grips with karosa (natural soul) of the people, which led to the emergence of rather fanatical clandestine forms that expressed the "mystique of sex" ("hlystuny"). However, this separation is evidence and way of religious structure, forcing of more sophisticated, refined forms of religious spirit that characterizes the process of desyncretization of faith, the path of knowledge of God in the end. For Ukraine, if we accept the thesis of its pagan, mystical and syncretic form of faith, this procedurality was not typical. But one cannot be limited to this statement. It is important to find out more. "Desyncretization of faith" is a long process that began to manifest itself in the later stages of Russian (within the empire) development. It is clear that during this period Russian Orthodoxy survived the era of development, growth, internal

and external development, and evolution. Instead, the embryo of Ukrainian self-existence remained a prisoner of its own "immaturity". In the general sense, this immaturity manifested itself in the barbaric confidence that he who is cunning and insidious is right. At that time, commitment to the national cause of the Ukrainian value consciousness, unfortunately, did not manifest itself either in historical practice, religious understanding, nor spiritual and philosophical search. For Ukraine, this question is perhaps much more critical and tragic: the key to it is found in a remark by D. Andreev that Volodymyr the Great already took the throne of the principality of Kiev through blood.

It seems that the angle of the inevitability of the first metaphysical fault of the Ukrainian proto-ethnos (and the need for redemption) has never been seriously considered as a subject of reflection in historical and philosophical, religious or journalistic opinion. Thus, the first thing that comes to mind is "what should people who have suffered through their own history redeem themselves for? Short answer is for the sin of immaturity, reluctance and impotence in becoming a full-fledged consciousness responsible for their future and the state. D. Andreev is not alluding to the original sin of the proto-Ukrainian ethnos. This is comprehensible. Russia is in the focus of his attention. It could not be the other way. Ukraine, i.e. Kievan Rus, is part of Russia's formation and its demon of great statehood. However, in this context, he unwittingly pays tribute to resistance to the challenges that shredded the material body of the Ukrainian proto-ethnos and its territory, depriving it of space and time to develop its spiritual dimension.

3. An observation that is important for Russia and especially for Ukraine is found in the picture of development of transhistory as a result of understanding opposing forces in their historical implementation: ancient Slavic world view was made popular among the representatives of the lower class, the peasants, where there was fortunetelling, gamesmanship that stirred creative elemental forces and aroused magic powers of sorcerers. At the same time, demanding austerity could become a guiding principle for the masses. Prayer of the monks did not save people from the Polovtsian invasion ... The first reminder of "inspiration of the supnation's hierarchies" is still "The Lay of Igor's Campaign", the work that has nothing to do with the Byzantine tradition and the transmyth of Christianity in general... As noted in the same fragment by D. Andreev, "It was the way that the foundations of dual faith that did not disappear in Russia until the twentieth century were laid". [See 4, p. 130]. Amid Ukraine's secondariness in its joining the Orthodox religious faith, in spite of its seemingly unquestionable historic launch among the Slavic peoples on the banks of the Dnipro River, the remark on dual faith of the Russian people appears to be even more important. After all, if even in such a "pillar of orthodoxy" as Russia, a religious and state-oriented sophist finds a cross-cutting historical line of dual faith, there will be no speculation or "stretch" in assuming that Ukraine's aiming at Orthodox religion is rather a religious-ideological myth than a sociological and cultural truth.

4. In connection with the above mentioned it is necessary to consider another point in the sophist's thought. In his view, one of the undoubted elements of the Russian transmyth is the idea of a powerful state, which is to protect and defend Russian metaculture. The phenomenon of great statehood against this background is considered by him, in fact, negatively, and this determines the characteristics of the volume of his spiritual vision and

says for the truth of his spiritual insights. So, the sophist notes that the birth of Russian great statehood is a sign of the birth and existence of negative shade in Russian lucid metaculture. However, he sees no other option, apart from the existing one, which is considering the monster of Russian chauvinism as a necessary evil. We can assume that the peculiarities of social and historic, territorial and spiritual formation of values of the Ukrainian nation should prove and discover its historic mission of overcoming the predator of Russian great statehood by developing an alternative idea of another type of statehood, the outlines of which appear today in the formation of a completely different meaning and content of organising social life in the phenomenon of volunteer movement and actual (although, not resulting from the "good life") compensation of manifests of powerlessness and virtual destruction of the social organism by means of national initiatives and movements and preparing it as a sacrifice to the Russian predator of great statehood, an example of which was the last period of Ukrainian history. The scenario of creating a new type of social organism, which is dominated by the values of tolerance and freedom, and where the state does not play a dominating role in all areas of social, political and economic life, is largely implemented in the countries of the today's European Union. Yet, their evolutionary (and previously, revolutionary) process took decades and even centuries of gradual implementation of the interaction between the people and the state on the basis of other social and historical features of their development, mentality, level of national consciousness etc. In Ukraine, this process has a chance to happen much faster. This is particularly necessary to be mentioned in this context because Ukraine has chosen the European way of development and it is crucial to understand what exactly is associated with this category except for forms of protest activity that can integrate different meanings, motives of action and understandings in this value movement of consciousness.

Summarised from the positions historiosophic, philosophical-cultural and comparative-historical approaches, it may be suggested that the true old thesis that Ukrainian proto-ethnos not only became its material and territorial but also value-spiritual shield that gave the opportunity (involuntarily, though) for the development of other centers of value concentration and structuring (Muscovy, European principalities and state formations of monarchical type) at the expense of developing its own spiritual dimension. At the same time, the mechanisms of formation of value structures of Russian and Ukrainian types of national character are radically different. Unlike the Russian one, the Ukrainian type of forming value structures of consciousness amidst the current social and historic situation makes use of the mechanisms of criticality and rationality of a European type, of course, taking into account the historical national peculiarities of their formation and implementation. In fact, the origins of Ukrainian mentality and national spirit, which are actual building materials of value structures of consciousness, include syncretism of thinking, elements of romanticizing reality and sensitivity to manifestations of nature forces, fatal sincerity, which was often to transform into its opposite fighting tough historical challenges. Eventually, the above mentioned value factors are reflected in the formation of the model of Ukrainian statehood.

The prospect for further research is the development of the proposed value-energetic approach to understanding the mechanisms of forming individual and communal sociocultural

reactions in the process of establishing historical types of national statehood. In a broader sense, meaningful and semantic development of categorical and terminological apparatus of such universals as "energy", "value", "value energy" etc. will allow their use as a single epistemological basis for the studies of various socio-cultural directions and genres (historiosophic, natural-scientific, philosophical and cultural).

**References:**

1. A. Simak. *Divergence of values in the structure of individual consciousness [electronic resource]* / A. Simak. – Access mode: [http://rusnauka.com/36\\_PWMN\\_2010/Psihologia/76634.doc.htm](http://rusnauka.com/36_PWMN_2010/Psihologia/76634.doc.htm).
2. N. Volkovytska. *Ontological and axiological elements in contemporary legal consciousness. [Electronic resource]* / N. Volkovytska – Access mode: <http://www.pravnuk.info/urukrain/1505-ontologichnij-ta-aksiologichnij-elementi-u-suchasnij-pravovij-svidomosti.html>.
3. *Structure of value consciousness [electronic resource]*. – Access mode: <http://www.philosophyday.ru/philos-220-1.html>.
4. D. Andreev. *Rose of the World* / D. Andreev. M.: Fellowship "Klyshnikov-Komarov and C.", 1992. - p. 287.
5. I. Pavlov *Intellect in general, Russian one in particular [electronic resource]* / I. Pavlov. – Access mode: [http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/History/Article/pavl\\_russum.php#pavlov13](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/Article/pavl_russum.php#pavlov13).