

THE BASICS OF UKRAINIAN GEOPHILOSOPHY. AT THE TURN OF TWO CULTURES

To understand the true causes of the events that have been occurring in Ukraine throughout its history. Firstly, it is necessary to understand the peculiarities of geophilosophy in the regions. The author offered the main characteristics of geophilosophy in the regions, which form the Ukrainian mentality for centuries. Geographically modern Ukraine is located at the crossroads of two powerful cultures in the Eurasian continent: Asian and European. The author has used the dialectical, system-structural, structural-functional research methods as well as the methods of comparison, analysis and synthesis. The author's main contribution in the study of this actual complex topic is another attempt of the objective research of the historical and cultural connections between Moscow and Kyiv, the Russians and the Ukrainians. The novelty of the study is to show Ukraine and the Ukrainians inside the country, with all their contradictions and the attempts establishing their own cultural markers of identity.

Key words: *geofilosofiya, Ukraine, Russia, Moscow, Kyiv, European culture, Asian culture, Kyivan Rus, the Grand Principality of Moscow, the empire*

At the turn of the Asian and European cultures. To understand the true causes of the events that have been occurring throughout the history of Ukraine. Firstly, it is necessary to understand the peculiarities of geophilosophy in the regions.

The author offered the main characteristics of geophilosophy in the regions, which form the Ukrainian mentality for centuries. Geographically modern Ukraine is located at the crossroads of two powerful cultures in the Eurasian continent: Asian and European. Such important and complex fate befell Ukraine in the beginning of the 13th century. In 1237-1240 the Mongol Empire's troops, in the course of the Western invasion of the Mongols (Kipchak Khanate) led by Batu and the Mongol warlord Chingizid Subutai, seized the territories that had already disintegrated by that time as the result of feudal fragmentation of the Old Russian State with the capital in Kyiv. Thus, since the 13th century on the territory of Eastern Europe the communication space with epoch-making high energy, the unique junction of European and Asian cultures began forming. More than 250 years of Mongol occupation led to the fact that on the territory inhabited by Eastern Slavs, new generations were born, however, in their mentality Asian values dominated, such as:

- respectful and deferential attitude to elders;
- belief in the strong power and a centralized state;
- respectful attitude to the traditions and culture;
- dominance of the community interests above personal needs and interests;
- helpfulness, submissiveness and worship to the authority;

– minimalism and asceticism in everyday life and personal needs, and others.

New generations of Eastern Slavs became regularly practicing raids upon the brothers: the southern and the western Slavs, as well as jointly princely and the Golden Horde campaigns to Lithuania, Poland and Hungary. With each generation on the occupied territories by the Mongols, all Eastern Slavs became more different from the western and the southern Slavs, Germans, Celts, Balts and Finno-Ugric peoples, whose descendants had laid the foundation of European culture.

From the 14th century, thanks to the support of the Horde, the previously suburban principality of the Old Russian state, The Grand Principality of Moscow started to gain momentum and expanded its territory at the expense of the neighboring Russian principalities manifold. It began «gathering of the Russian lands» around the new political centers. In the North-Eastern Russia this process was headed by the Grand Principality of Moscow, which was in alliance with the Mongols and under their influence. In the South-Western Russia the Grand duchy of Lithuania was engaged in gathering of the Russian lands.

In the 14th century as a result of the internal contradictions of the might of the Mongol Empire weakened significantly. It let the Grand duchy of Lithuania win back the land already since the 14th century, which was formerly owned by the Old Russian state, thereby expanding the boundaries of Asian culture to the East. In the North-Eastern Russia the Mongol-Tatar Yoke was staying up to 1480.

The Old Russian state as a political organization was not revived later. The city of Kyiv, the capital of the Old Russian state according to the various sources, was founded in the 6th-7th century; in 1240 the Mongols sacked and destroyed it almost to its very foundations. From 1362 to 1569 Kyiv was a part of the Grand duchy of Lithuania, and from 1569 to 1654 it was a part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1654 anti-Polish and Lithuanian uprising occurred, and Kyiv was passed «into the hands of the Tsar of Moscow». However, up to the middle of the 18th century Kyiv (Pol. Kijów) remained under a significant influence of Polish culture. From 1654 to 1991 Kyiv was under the influence of Moscow. In 2015 in Kyiv the population is about 2.9 million. It is the seventh largest city in Europe.

As in the Grand Principality of Moscow (1263-1547), Russian Tsardom (1547-1721), Russian Empire (1721-1917), the Soviet Union (1917-1991) as and Russian Federation (1991), the original culture of the Old Russian state was already present in much smaller degree. Almost two hundred and fifty years of the Mongol Yoke invasion played a role in the formation and development of the mentality of the ancient ethnic group. Now, it included the attributes of Asian culture and traditions, which in different periods of history, to a greater or lesser extent were different from European culture. In the early twentieth century, an authoritative Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev researched profoundly

differences between Asian and European soul of the Russians. Arguing with Maxim Gorky, who in his article «Two Souls» appealed to the Russian people: «We need to deal with the Asian layers of our psyche, we need to be treated» [Gorky 1918: p. 180], Berdyaev wrote: «Truly in the Russian soul is «Asian layering» and they always felt in a very radical type of Gorky Westernism» [Berdyaev, 1990: p. 127].

Not all Russians felt ashamed for Asian layers in their culture. For example, Prince Nikolai Trubetzkoy, the author of the concept of cultural and historic regions, believed that the main task of the Russias is to create a completely new culture, their own culture, which would not resemble the European one. In the book «The Legacy of Genghis Khan», published in 1925, Nikolai Trubetzkoy affirmed that Russia-Eurasia was the conscious heir to and bearer of the great legacy of Genghis Khan, and the Russian people were connected with the Eurasian people by a common historical destiny. Nikolai Trubetzkoy denied the relevance and viability of the Old Russian state in the implementation of the construction in Russia. In his understanding the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union were geopolitical continuation of the Mongolian monarchy, founded by the great Genghis Khan (Trubetzkoy, 2012).

So, even after the liberation from the Mongol Yoke, the territory of modern Ukraine continued to be the watershed between the Asian and European cultures, The Grand Principality of Moscow and the bearer of European culture, the Grand duchy of Lithuania. Subsequently, this confrontation acquired more ambitious forms: more than 800 centuries on the territory of modern Ukraine the «civilizational» split was between the orthodox and the western civilizations in the terminology of Samuel Huntington (Huntington, 1996).

Culture of Grand Principality of Moscow. I want to clarify the terminology, namely, the definition of the culture of Grand Principality of Moscow, the legal successors of which were: the Russian Tsardom, the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union and finally the Russian Federation. In the western scientific discourse the culture of Grand Principality of Moscow, which reached the maximal borders in the time of the U.S.S.R., was designated differently at different times. For example, in the early 20th century Oswald Spengler named it «Russian Siberian» world culture (Spengler, 1998; Spengler, 1999). A little later, Arnold Toynbee named it «Russian civilization» (Toynbee, 1995). At the end of the 20th century, Samuel Huntington named it «Orthodox civilization», significantly expanded its boundaries (Huntington, 1996). None of these terms in the Russian culture got acclimated, because they reflected neither the ambition nor the true state of affairs.

In fact, the culture of Grand Principality of Moscow, which was extant, consists of different cultural layers that really give the right to speak of it as self-sufficient *Eurasian* culture. In order of priority we can highlight the following cultural layers:

1. Byzantine culture, since the reign of Ivan III (1440-1505), the Russian Tsardom was assigned by the legal successor. In connection with the decline of

Kyivan Rus as the political center (after defeating of the Mongols in 1240), at the end of 1325 the location of the Kyiv Metropolitans was Moscow. It was there, with the growth of the power of Grand Principality of Moscow the legend was invented according to which, the spiritual and political decline of Byzantine Empire, the only stronghold of Orthodoxy became Moscow, received the dignity of the «third Rome». Starting from the 15th century and to the present day the aim: Moscow – the «third Rome» is a determinative for understanding of Russian culture and imperial ambitions of the Russian rulers.

2. Asian culture. Under Asian culture, first of all, I understand multiculturalism in the Mongol Empire in Genghis Khan's era. In the making of Grand Principality of Moscow the significance of Asian culture was as important as Byzantine culture. Thanks to the invasion of the Mongol Empire into the Russian lands, and then the friendship (and support!) with the khans of Horde, the ordinary Russian principality got a chance to win more powerful principalities of the Old Russian state and to expand its sphere of influence. For this reason in the 16th century, after the collapse of the Golden Horde, Moscow historians have added the aggrandizing adjective «golden» to the word «Horde». Until 1566 in Rus in all the manuscripts the Tatars were simply called «Horde». The friendship with the Tatars became truly «golden» era for Grand Principality of Moscow.

Speaking about the «Asian layers» in Russian culture, Berdyaev warned: «...should not be confused dark, wild, chaotic Asian East culture with the ancient East, representing the original spiritual type, attracting the attention of the most cultured Europeans. The ancient Near East is considered the cradle of the great religions and cultures» (Berdyaev, 1990: p.127). Therefore, in our study, when we talk about «Asians» or Asian cultural manifestations in the post-Soviet space, we do not mean the richest culture of the Asian East, which has played a crucial role in the development of many world's cultures, and we mean its side-negative manifestations and extremes, such as pomposity, officialism, arrogance, cringing, worship and servility to rank as well as bribery, corruption, love for luxury, haughtiness and many others.

3. European culture or according to Samuel Huntington's terminology – the western civilization. The impact of European culture on Eurasian culture of the Moscow principality and its successors was significantly weaker than Byzantine and Asian cultures. However, the Russians themselves have always recognized with reservations this influence, while completely denying the dependence of their culture (remember that Moscow – the «third Rome»!) from the western one. Much of the history from The Grand Principality of Moscow to the Russian Federation is the internal unacceptance (up to the isolation) of European culture or the competition against it for the right of dominance in the western part of the Eurasian continent.

4. Culture of the Old Russian state. In self-sufficient Eurasian culture of the Russian empire the culture of the Old Russian state was present. However,

we must take into account the most important historical fact: in the Old Russian state with its capital in Kyiv, the Principality of Moscow was on the outskirts, which was located at a distance of more than 800 kilometers from the capital. In 11th century it was a great distance! For Kyiv, in regard to the era of the Old Russian state, Moscow had a reputation of the most remote province. That is why the understanding of cultural heritage of the Old Russian state has always been strikingly different between Moscow and Kyiv. To put it in modern terms, while in the culture of ancient Rus Moscow esteemed conservatism, rituals and attributes, Kyiv adopted the spirit of freedom, greatness of mind and openness to innovation and changes. That is why, as paradoxical as it sounds, the Ukrainians are more Rus than the Russians, because the history of the Old Russian state for the Ukrainians is *Kyivan Rus'* one, and for the Russians it is Moscow's perception and assessment of events in *Kyivan Rus*.

Western researchers do not understand the important difference between Kyiv and Moscow, the Ukrainians and the Russians. It may seem at the first sight that they are one nation and culture, however, they are (were and will be) always different. Kyiv, as an ancient and rich cultural center with a certain territory of influence and the Ukrainian ethnos, as a guardian of the culture, has not been able to reunite in the old boundaries and achieved independence since the 13th century. For 8 centuries the attempts to revive the Russian state (in the understanding of Kyiv!) have arisen more than once. For example, a) the second third of the 12th century – 40th years of the 15th century, the period of the existence of the Galicia-Volyn principality, inherited the traditions of Kyivan Rus; b) 1340 – the last quarter of the 15th century, the Ukrainian lands became part of the Grand duchy of Lithuania, which is referred in the latest historical researches as the Lithuanian-Russian state. 9/10 of the Lithuanian-Russian population were the Ukrainians and Belarusians; c) from 1648 to 1764, the existence of Zaporozhskaya Sech (Hetman state or Hetmanate); d) from 1917 to 1921 the period of the Ukrainian national liberation movement; e) finally, from 1990 to the present time, the existence of Independent Ukraine. All these periods of the formation of Ukrainian statehood relied on the history of *Kyivan*, and not Moscow Rus, which is an indisputable shrine for the Ukrainians and an inexhaustible source of struggle for independence.

Unlike Ukraine and the Ukrainians, who are still trying to set the historical record straight about their statehood, the Principality of Moscow was able to write *its own* history, not less, and perhaps even greater than the Old Russian state had. The question is only in the details, dates, which are significant, but not to that extent. If the Principality of Moscow could lay claim to the «third Rome» and a culture bearer of Kyivan Rus, but then the whole subsequent history of its greatness and significance is really comparable with the history of the Old Russian state, the Roman Empire and the Mongol Empire. This is the history of a great nation, which was able to create a self-sufficient Eurasian culture. Owing to the breakthrough of the culture, at present Kyiv is as outskirts, the remote province with high self-esteem for Moscow, «... a poor

relative, you always stand with the outstretched hand» – the words of ex-President of the Russian Federation, Prime Minister of the Russian Federation Dmitry Medvedev, written in Facebook, March 2, 2014.

That is why, in my view, the culture of the Russian Federation would be reasonably named Byzantine-Asian culture that emphasizes its real importance, grandeur and imperial ambitions. In this culture, Ukraine with its inexhaustible desire to restore the greatness of the culture of Kyivan Rus and to prove its historical significance is as a foreign body, pathology for Moscow, with which now it is reconciled, now is trying to remove. If we add another equally important factor that the territory of modern Ukraine consists partly of the territories that never belonged to it (for example, the Crimea, Galicia, Volhynia, Polesye), thanks to the behest of Kremlin rulers the lands became Ukrainian. Now it has become clear the full rejection of Ukraine as an independent state by the rulers of the Russian Federation. That is why over the territory of Ukraine there is a boundary between Byzantine-Asian culture of the Russian Federation and Western civilization, the part of this territory is included in Modern Ukraine (Galicia, Volhynia, Polesye and others).

Confrontation between two cultures in the European part of the continent. Over the last few centuries, as a result of constant wars and territorial disputes, European culture was significantly under the influence of Byzantine-Asian one, having expanded it to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. The main representative of Byzantine-Asian culture in Europe was Russia, as the U.S.S.R. and the Warsaw Pact, in the second half of the 20th century, which was able to extend Byzantine-Asian cultural influence far into Europe and to impose competition to European culture at its very heart: at the borders of France and Germany, the latter was bisected. The fact that in the 18th century, it was not possible to do as a result of the Mongol invasion, the Soviet Union did at the Yalta (Crimea) Conference of the Allied Powers, February 4-11, 1945. So-called post-war world order was established, which meant the penetration of Byzantine-Asian culture into Central Europe.

Conclusion. The Yalta Conference with the leaders of the Allied powers in February 1945 and the formation of the Warsaw Pact in May 1955 reduced the civilizing pressure for a while on the territory of Ukraine. The high energy frontier, associated with the confrontation of Byzantine-Asian and European cultures, shifted to the Baltic countries, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia. Ukraine which was reunited at last, plunged deep into Byzantine-Asian culture and got the opportunities for rest and recovery of its potentials within a few decades. However, in 1991 after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the border between two civilizations put again back to its original position and on the territory of Ukraine. Every year Ukrainian Independence Day is a frontier confrontation between Eastern and Western cultures; it is a turn of Ukraine to the side of Moscow under Vladimir Putin's adapted model of democracy, or to the side of European choice.

REFERENCES

- Berdyaev, 1990* – Berdyaev N. (1990) *Sud'ba Rossii*. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'. S. 127-128.
- Gor'kii, 1918* – Gor'kii M. (1918) *Stat'i 1905-1916*. Sankt-Peterburg. S. 174-187.
- Huntington, 1996* – Huntington, Samuel P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Shpengler, 1999* – Shpengler O. (1998) *Zakat Evropy: Ocherki morfologii mirovoi istorii*. T. 1. *Obraz i deistvitel'nost'* / Per. s nem. N. F. Garelin. Minsk : OOO «Popurri».
- Shpengler, 1999* – Shpengler O. (1999) *Zakat Evropy: Ocherki morfologii mirovoi istorii*. T. 2. *Vsemirno-istoricheskie perspektivy* / Per. s nem. S. E. Borich. Minsk: OOO «Popurri».
- Toinbi, 1995* – Toinbi A. (1995) *Tsivilizatsiya pered sudom istorii (Sbornik)*. Moskva: «Progress» «Kul'tura».
- Trubetskoi, 2012* – Trubetskoi N. (2012) *Nasledie Chingiskhana. Vzgl'yad na russkuyu istoriyu ne s Zapada, a s Vostoka*. Moskva: Algoritm, EKSMO.

УДК 005.35;316.3(477)

Oksana Gayevska

ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN UKRAINE'S
MODERN INFORMATION SPACE

The major historical human error of the state organization lies in the fact that people have always viewed education as a sector of the economy or culture. Neither the former nor the latter is correct because education is not a branch, but a way of human existence, and the basic condition of people's existence, because only education allows people to create and master the tools of production, without which our physical existence as a species is not possible, as it is impossible without the transfer of experience from generation to generation (meaningful or not).

Therefore, the organization of education as a global civilization foundation of the society, including its spiritual production, should be fundamentally based on aspects corresponding to its organizational clarity.

Education doesn't follow the way other industries are supposed to do because they appeared as a result of the social division of labor and specialization. So consequently they can depart as a historical phenomenon, if they do not meet public needs, so thus products are those that are not in demand. After all, education must be considered to be as one of the main conditions of physical and spiritual existence of mankind and should be presented as the main argument for its definition as a self-governing social subsystems.

This understanding is initially important as education is not just part of the social system and its fundamental basis as the process of transmitting meaningful human experience, our sufficient Knowledge, which provide society's information security. It is a prerequisite for its civilization movement.

In this context, particularly, educational institutions are not a simple means of acquiring needed for particular profession expertise, they are perceived as the most efficient means of transmitting the array of scientific and experiential information, certain guarantee of the survival of humanity as a bio-social species. And survival takes place at both national and global levels, as a spiritually meaningful life of any social formation of the perfect organizational principles which should eventually become the sole source of human development.

And therefore managing a national educational system is supposed to be on the basis of universal civilization managerial experience as the basics of management science, and at the same time, the theoretical interpretation of national managerial experience dealing with true management problems of education. This approach should be fundamental in reforming education in Ukraine.

Key words: education organization, management problems of education, national education management, science in higher education.