

УДК 141.7:168.522

G. G. Fesenko

PhD, docent,

Associate Professor of Department of History and Cultural studies
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv

THE CULTURE OF STATE-BUILDING IN SLOVENIA AND UKRAINE: THE COMPARATIVE ANALISE

Nowadays growing difference in nation-building achievements among the post-communist countries, despite similar socio-economic and political conditions of state building in 1991, is noted. It has led to discussions regarding the factors, which have influenced it. It has been found that the human factor has the determining role in providing the success. In particular, Slovenia and Ukraine have a huge gap in the human development. According to the Human Development Index (HDI) Slovenia occupies the 25th position in the ranking while Ukraine's position is only the 81th [15].

Whereas the progress of countries depends on their ability to valorize the human potential, it is necessary to study the factors determining differences and all the impact exerted by culture. The research of the process of sustainable development must be a socio-culturally sensitive one since the human factor has the determining role in achieving success, and all these points are tightly connected with the cultural matrix of a country [18, p. 329]. Culture as the silent code of human development [19, p. 13] refers to the universal human ability to classify, codify, and transfer knowledge and experience symbolically and intergenerationally. It can be defined as a process of "mentality environment" or mental framework resulting from the values, beliefs, symbols and social ideals shared by the members of a community or a social group [18, p. 331].

Under these conditions, the necessity of philosophical understanding of the role of culture in nation-building is also proved by the existence of plurality of cultural types in national cultural and political space [14]. It is important to identify those cultural forms that may contribute to the acceleration of political, economic and social growth.

The analysis of recent researches and publications has shown that the idea of cultural aspects' determining role for a country's progress is not a recent one. The sociologist Max Webber supported the idea of "protestant ethics", which made possible the spectacular economic growth registered by the countries of Western Europe in the 16th century [1]. Francis Fucuyama in his book "Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity" assured that in the contemporary era a social capital may be as important as a physical capital, only those societies with a high degree of social trust will be able to make progress [6]. Some authors have formulated opinions according to which socio-cultural and behavioral factors have a decisive importance in the processes of national development [3; 9; 11]. They note that culture may be regarded as a factor that generates state development under such aspect as a component of the environment where political agents carry out their activity.

In general, the interest to the study of the influence of some cultural factors belonging to the national-building system has been present in the works of many foreign researchers, the phenomenon of political culture being in the spotlight. In particular, American researchers Edward Weisband and Courtney I.P. Thomas noticed that political culture refers to the ideas, beliefs, values, traditions, and practices that provide the foundation of a political system. And even a state has its own unique political culture, because it is the product of history, contingency, environment, and other variables that interact to frame social, political and economic attachments [19, p. 13]. Marc Ross is a supporter of the idea that cultural frames the rules that can guide political action even in the absence of strong institutions to enforce them [17]. An American political analyst, the most famous expert in the field of theoretical and comparative politics, Gabriel Almond, has illustrated the relationship between the political orientations of citizens and functioning of the political system [7].

Understanding political culture is possible in comparative research, with important insights into specific context at particular periods of time. At that time, the analysis of recent researches and publications has showed that in Ukrainian humanistic science the applied comparative focus is not sufficiently outlined. In Ukraine, it covers the areas mostly of Ukrainian-Polish, Ukrainian-Russian and Ukrainian-Belarusian "battles for history" and discussions on "common memory cards". The comparison of Slovenian and Ukrainian cultural and historical research is fragmentary, for example, researches by Lyudmila Kancedal [4] and Anton Glushko [2].

This article is aimed at philosophical interpreting political cultural frameworks influencing the state development of Slovenia and Ukraine.

Achieving this objective presupposes fulfilling the following tasks:

- to highlight the issue of singling out the features of political culture formation within the past twenty five years in the two countries (Slovenia and Ukraine) from historiosophical point of view;

- to compare the mental transformations which took place in Slovenia and Ukraine within the time-space "sovereignty".

The study of the effect of national cultural context on state development supposes firstly to present important aspects that may significantly influence the state-building and national-building results obtained. Each nation state possesses its own sets of narratives that indicate the ways of self-understanding within each political culture. The political culture study refers to the consideration of cultures and cultural values, meanings and institutions focused on governance and its legitimacy [19, p. 19]. All nation states seek recognition of their legitimacy in two ways: first, internally relative to governing domestic society; second, internationally in terms of their rights to act as a sovereign agent among other sovereign entities in the international society of sovereign national states [12].

This article focuses on the decades during which these countries (Slovenia and Ukraine) have been moving from communism towards democracy. Slovenian and Ukrainian independent states were formed as a result of two socio-political processes: the break up of the socialist system in early 1990s and the disintegration of multi-ethnic states in Eastern Europe (USSR, Yugoslavia) [13].

Two Slavic communities claimed for the right of self-determination in the same year – 1990. It was the time of establishing their sovereignty. Ukrainians had the historical event – proclamation of sovereignty ("Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine") that was adopted by the previously elected parliament of the Ukrainian SSR on July 16, 1990. This Declaration established the principles of self-determination of the Ukrainian nation, ruling of the people, state power, and citizenship of the Ukrainian SSR, territorial supremacy, economic independence, environmental safety, cultural development, external and internal security, and international relations. In the context of the events of 1990 adopting the Declaration meant the proclamation of sovereignty of Ukraine. The peculiarity of the declaration adopted during the Soviet Union period was striving for consolidation of the Ukrainian SSR which directly referred to further European process. The results of the Slovenian independence referendum (*Plebiscito samostojnosti Slovenije*), which took place on December 23, 1990, were officially proclaimed on December 26, 1990. More than 88% of the electorate voted for a sovereign and independent Slovenia. These important political events demonstrated the devotedness of the two peoples to the idea of national sovereignty.

Speaking about the importance of a political culture for the building of a nation state it is necessary to distinguish the particular values and meanings, which arise during the historical development of a political culture. Achievement of the internal sovereignty was the starting point for further political events in 1991. Then the sovereignty has been strengthened legally. On June 25, 1991 Slovenia, by the decision of the plebiscite, adopted the Declaration of Independence (Deklaracija o neodvisnosti Slovenije) and the basic constitutional charter of the independence and sovereignty of Slovenia (O samostojnosti in neodvisnosti Slovenije). "The Act of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine" was adopted by the Ukrainian parliament on August 24, 1991. The Act was adopted in the aftermath of the coup attempt on August 19, 1991 when conservative Communist leaders of the Soviet Union tried to restore central Communist party control over the USSR. The same day, the parliament called for a referendum on support of the Declaration of Independence. This act was supported by 90,32% of the nationwide Ukrainian referendum on December 1, 1991.

The adoption of the Declarations of independence meant that Slovenia and Ukraine have implemented their internal functions. It is important, that the two peoples became the states as subjects of international law. It should be stressed that Slovenes in 1991 for the first time in its history, got their own country [14]. These important events in the end of the XX century that determined the formatting of Slovenian and Ukrainian statehoods played their role in historical way to freedom.

To add to the number of common stages in the development of the two countries, linguistic similarities occurring in the researched sphere can be mentioned. In Slovenic political discourse such lexemes as *samostojnost* (independence) – *državnost* (statehood) – *suverenost* (sovereignty) are frequently found. The meanings of these words include many shades in the conceptual focus. In their semantic meaning they are similar to the Ukrainian ones: *самостійність* (independence) – *державність* (statehood) – *суверенність* (sovereignty).

These three key features expressed by unity/єдність were composed to establish a link between:

- the public and the government;
- citizens (civic culture based on level and type of political participation and the nature of people's attitudes toward politics).

Following the typology of political culture (Gabriel Almond [7]) we can single out the key features referring to the relations between the public and the government. In the case of Slovenia, we can say about "consensus", which represents the key link between government and public agreement and appeasement. From the viewpoint of social capital terms of Francis Fukuyama, we can say about the high level of trust in the Slovenian society. Social capital is defined by the system of relationships that the individuals belonging to a society establish between them and the tendency manifesting within this network to support each other for attaining of objectives and tasks. One of the important effects of social capital is improving the functioning of authorities and institutions, especially of those elected by voting [6].

In the case of Ukraine, we can say about the gap in the relations between the state and people. Such relations should be aimed at executing the program, which was the rendition of the principle of independence. They are able to change the social order, a vigorous social justice and to allow the forces of transformation to grow. In this context, Ukraine has been considerably less progressive, than Slovenia. Ukraine had political crises, including two Revolutions in 2004 and 2013–2014.

The Orange Revolution (Помаранчева революція) was a series of protests and political events that took place in the immediate aftermath of the run-off voting of the 2004 Ukrainian presidential election, which was claimed to be marred by massive corruption, voter intimidation and direct electoral fraud. Nationwide, the democratic revolution was highlighted by a series of acts of civil disobedience, sit-ins, and general strikes organized by the opposition movement. The protests succeed-

ed when the results of the original run-off were annulled, and Ukraine's Supreme Court ordered a revote for December 26, 2004. Under intense scrutiny of domestic and international observers, the second run-off was declared to be "fair and free". The Revolution of Dignity (Революція гідності), on November 2013 – February 2014, became gripped by unrest when President refused to sign an association agreement with the European Union. The political movement known as "Euromaidan" demanded closer ties with the European Union, and the ousting of President. This movement was ultimately successful, culminating in the February 2014 revolution, which removed President and his government.

These events confirmed on the one hand the existence low level of trust in government, and on the other the existence of the strong civil society. This testifies the presence of the public sovereignty in Ukrainian political culture as the belief that ultimate authority is vested in the people themselves, expressed in the idea of the general will. This means that Ukrainians shared the idea about the power that must be elected and supported by the people, and the main goal must be the people's welfare.

At the same time, the civic culture outlined different types of political culture from the perspective of internal sovereignty, when there is a state consistency by the government, which has been elected by the people and has popular legitimacy. Ukraine, unlike Slovenia, was not able to demonstrate the ability for leadership to prevent these violations.

Also it is necessary to note that the current level of political culture in Slovenia and Ukraine can be explained by the dependency of the political culture on the "system memory". It is about the presence of nostalgia for the Soviet past. In Slovenia, the memory about the Soviet past is much less than in Ukraine. In general, in the political systems of countries of Central Europe, twenty five years after regime change, elements of Soviet political system as heritage of forty years of Soviet dominance in the region are still present. These elements influence political parties, political culture and actual political development and political strategies of different political parties [10, p. 36]. Today a struggle is being waged to get rid of the baggage of "colonized discourse", and such a struggle requires considerable and systematic effort [5, p. 234].

According to many humanitarians in the twentieth century, we had people like "homo soveticus", which were born in the totalitarian state of the USSR. This type of human is noted for inherent slavish behavior, social and political apathy [16]. "Homo soveticus" is accustomed to the fact that he has stability in his present and future, is used to the caregiving role of the state and relatively static social structure. "Without private property, citizens lost their ambition and work ethics. Without civil society citizens have lost the ability to organize anything, whether it's economic activity, entertainment, education, politics and charity", has noticed Anna Applebaum [8]. It is noteworthy, that the presence of the communist heritage affects Slovenia, although not to such extent as Ukraine.

Now lifestyle of "homo soveticus" is partially ousted, however, a new kind of Ukrainians has formed. It can be called "homo Ukrainicus". Such people are carriers of democratic changes in the country; they actively participated in the dramatic events of Euromaidan 2013–2014, sacrificing their lives for the establishment of European values in Ukraine. These "new Ukrainians" are constructing a symbolic space, in which there is the national history. They feel strong emotional connection with the history of their people; their "scars" "hurt" (mass executions of intellectuals, the Holodomor of 1932–1933). Therefore, they are changing the semantics of their living space, are refusing from totalitarian symbols and referring to national values. They haven't lost interest to their own influence on the political system, as it must be in the classical studies described by Gabriel Almond [7] and define this volunteer activity and participation in political decision-making actually as the very essence of modern liberal democracy.

It is worth mentioning that the concept of "foreign power" plays central role in understanding of independence. Now-

adays we see the situation where no country, no matter how powerful, can remain outside the field of influence and magnetic field of other world powers. The comparative analysis of the impact of this factor on the state building discovered that the external threat for Slovenia (from Yugoslavia) was eliminated in 10 days. On October, 25 1991 the last Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) soldier was withdrawn from the territory of present-day Slovenia. The negative external factor for it ended with the disappearance of Yugoslavia. Since no country questions the Slovenes right to independent existence. And now Slovenia is under "the security umbrella" of NATO and EU.

As for Ukraine, the external factor is more negative and dramatic. After the Soviet collapse, Russia, proclaiming itself the legal successor of the USSR, formally recognized the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine, but didn't let from the orbit of its influence. The process of liberation from this dependence is a slow and difficult. Now we are witnessing Russian military intervention in Ukraine since 2014 to the present time. The defense of independence became a serious matter for Ukraine.

In this regard, it can assess the strength of influence of the "Russian factor" on the political culture of Ukraine for the past 25 years. Ukraine with dignity faces the political opponent, greatly prevailing in its resources and tools for political influence. This gives reason to believe the core of the political culture of Ukraine is viable for democratic values.

Summarizing the foregoing, the following conclusions are offered:

– Ukraine and Slovenia in the same historical period gained sovereignty and independence. However next step in development of political culture of the two countries had significant differences. The historical and political transformations of the Slovenian nation were happening in a specific logical political sequence defined in concepts (sovereignty, independence, statehood). Ukrainian state building demonstrates nonlinear dynamics with a significant lag in the development of democratic political culture;

– the political culture as time-space structure inside a complex system of nation-building had different conditions (both external and internal) for the creation of democratic forms in Slovenia and Ukraine.

This study was carried out as a part of the INFINITY project supported by Erasmus Mundus program of the EU. Cultural-philosophical description of Ukrainian nation building in comparison to similar transformations in other post-Soviet countries is seen as demanding thorough investigation. The perspectives of further studies will be connected with working out cultural matrixes of two nations, considering the fact, that their wellbeing is fully dependent on worldview framing of the political space.

References

1. Вебер М. Протестантська етика і дух капіталізму / М. Вебер; перекл. з нім. О. Погорлого. – К.: Основи, 1994. – 261 с.
2. Глушко А. Образ «перманентного зовнішнього ворога» як національній автостереотип українців і словенців / А. Глушко // Культура історичної пам'яті: європейський та український досвід / [Ю. Шаповал, Л. Нагорна, О. Бойко та ін.]; за загальною редакцією Ю. Шаповала. – К.: ІПЕНД, 2013. – С. 502–513.
3. Кальніш Ю.Г. Концептуальні засади формування політичної культури громадянського суспільства в Україні / Ю.Г. Кальніш // А.С.О. Агентство стратегічних досліджень. – 2012. – 04/01. – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://sd.net.ua/2012/01/04/politichnfi-kultura-gromadyanskogo-suspilstva.html>.
4. Канцедал Л.Д. Українсько-словенські літературні взаємини кінця XIX – початку XX ст.: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.01.04; 10.01.02 / Л.Д. Канцедал; НАН України, Ін-т л-ри ім. Т.Г. Шевченка. – К., 1995. – 191 с.
5. Томпсон Е. Історія Центральної Європи як постколоніальна нарація / Е. Томпсон // Україна модерна. – 2010. – № 5 (16). – С. 227–334.

6. Фукуяма Ф. Доверие: социальные добродетели и путь к процветанию / Ф. Фукуяма. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ»: ЗАО НПП «Ермак», 2004. – 730 с.

7. Almond G. Comparative politics Today: A World View / Gabriel A. Almond, Russell J. Dalton, Jr. G. Bingham Powell, Kaare Strom. – Verlag: Pearson, 2005. – 348 pp.

8. Appelbaum A. The fate of individual liberty in the post-communist Europe / A. Appelbaum // The American Spectator. – 2008. – Vol. 41. – № 3. – [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://spectator.org/articles/42038/fate-individual-liberty-post-communist-europe>.

9. Connolly C. Independence in Europe: secession, sovereignty, and the European Union / C. Connolly // Duke Journal of comparative & international law. – 2013. – Vol. 24:51. – P. 51–105.

10. Ehl M. Sovětské dědictví v politických systémech střední Evropy: postkomunistické strany, krize liberalismu a nová ruská geopolitika / M. Ehl // ACTA Fakulty filozofické Západočeské univerzity v Plzni. – 2009. – № 3. – P. 36–49.

11. Fink-Hafner D. Policy analysis developments in Slovenia / D. Fink-Hafner // ACTA Fakulty filozofické Západočeské univerzity v Plzni. – 2009. – № 3. – P. 50–69.

12. Firth S. Sovereignty and Independence in the Contemporary Pacific / S. Firth // The Contemporary Pacific. – 1989. – Vol. 1. – № 1/2. – P. 75–96.

13. Hafner-Fink M. Državljanstvo, (nacionalna) identiteta in odnos do tujcev / M. Hafner-Fink // S Slovenkami in Slovenci na štiri oči. [ur.: B. Malnar, I. Bernik]. – Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, 2004. – S. 55–80.

14. Granda S. Iz kulturnega v politični narod / S. Granda // Oddržav na Slovenskem do slovenske države [ur. I. Kordiš]. – Kočevje: Pokrajinski muzej, 2004. – S. 105–134.

15. Key to HDI countries and ranks, 2014; Human Development Report 2015 [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/ranking.pdf>.

16. Prologue: Going beyond Homo Sovieticus in: Capitalism from Outside? Economic Cultures in Eastern Europe after 1989; [edited by V. Zentai, J. M. Kovacs]. – Budapest: Central European University Press, 2012. – 360 pp.

17. Ross M.H. Culture in comparative political analyses / M.H. Ross // Comparative politics: nationality, culture, and structure [edited by M. Lichbach, A. Zuckermann]. – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – P. 134–161.

18. Talmaciu M. The influence of cultural variables on sustainable development: an analysis in the European context / M. Talmaciu // Regional development and integration: New challenges for the EU; EURINT 2015: Eurint Conference Proceedings, May 22–23, 2015. – Iași: Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" Iași, 2015. – Vol. 2. – P. 328–341.

19. Weisband E. Political Culture and the Making of Modern Nation-States / Edward Weisband, Courtney I P Thomas. – Boulder, London: Paradigm Publishers, 2015. – 323 pp.

Summary

Fesenko G. G. The culture of state-building in Slovenia and Ukraine: the comparative analyses. – Article.

The article provides historiographical review of nation building processes in two post-Soviet states in 1990–2015. It is also mentioned, that for deeper understanding of a nation's phenomenon it is important to take into account the specificity of mentality through correlation the ways of understanding independence/freedom in one's personal space and a nation's wellbeing. Comparative analysis of cultural-political phenomenon of nation-building in Slovenia and Ukraine has been carried out. It is mentioned, that a new form of social structure, namely nation state, has appeared in both countries due to such social factor as self-awareness of their own unique identity. Differences in historical transformations of the two states according to the level of social capital development have been described. Special attention is given to the way "memory policy" functions within contemporary space of the two post-Soviet countries. The level of political culture maturity is evaluated from the viewpoint of dominating in the society "mental disposition" to "homo soveticus" or "homo democraticus" way of life.

Key words: nation, culture, sovereignty, "homo soveticus", social capital.

Анотація

Фесенко Г. Г. Культура державотворення Словенії та України: компаративний аналіз. – Стаття.

У статті подано історіософський огляд державотворення двох пострадянських країн протягом 1990–2015 рр., а також зазначається, що для культурно-політичного розуміння феномена нації важливо звертатися до особливого бачення – через співвіднесення смислів незалежності/свободи у світі людини й бутті нації. Запропоновано компаративний аналіз культурно-політичних феноменів націєтворення Словенії та України. Зазначається, що в обох народів, завдяки такому культурному чинникові, як самоусвідомлення нацією власної унікальної ідентичності, склалася нова форма соціального буття – нація-держава. Описано відмінності в історичних трансформаціях двох країн крізь призму рівня розвитку їхнього соціального капіталу. Звертається увага на те, як саме функціонує «політика пам'яті» в сучасних політичних просторах двох пострадянських країн. Рівень зрілості політичної культури оцінюється з погляду домінуючих у суспільстві «ментальних тяжінь» – до буття “homo soveticus” чи “homo democraticus”.

Ключові слова: нація, культура, суверенність, радянська людина, соціальний капітал.

Аннотация

Фесенко Г. Г. Культура государственного строительства Словении и Украины: компаративный анализ. – Статья.

В статье приводится историософский обзор государственного строительства двух постсоветских государств на протяжении 1990–2015 гг., а также отмечается, что для культурно-политического понимания феномена нации важно обращаться к особому фокусу – через соотнесение смыслов независимость/свобода в мире человека и бытии нации. Представлен компаративный анализ культурно-политических феноменов национального строительства Словении и Украины. Отмечается, что у двух народов, благодаря такому культурному фактору, как самоосознание нацией своей уникальной идентичности, возникла новая форма социального бытия – нация-государство. Описаны различия в исторических трансформациях двух стран сквозь призму уровня развития их социального капитала. Обращается внимание на то, каким образом функционирует «политика памяти» в современных политических пространствах двух постсоветских стран. Уровень зрелости политической культуры оценивается с точки зрения доминирующих в обществе «ментальных притяжений» – к бытию “homo soveticus” или “homo democraticus”.

Ключевые слова: нация, культура, суверенность, советский человек, социальный капитал.