Л.М.Корнієнко

Л.М.Корниенко

Л.М.Korniyenko

Сумський національний аграрний університет

Сумский национальный аграрный университет

Sumy National Agrarian University

МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРАЛІЗМ ЯК ПРИНЦИП ПОБУДОВИ СУЧАСНОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА
МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРАЛИЗМ КАК ПРИНЦИП ПОСТРОЕНИЯ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ОБЩЕСТВА
MULTICULTURALISM AS A PRINCIPLE OF CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN SOCIETY

Анотація. У статті аналізується політика мультикультуралізму в сучасному поліетнічному суспільстві і доцільність її застосування в Україні. Не дивлячись на існуючі недоліки і помилки в реалізації мультикультуралізму, альтернативи йому в сучасному поліетнічному суспільстві, яке базується на засадах гуманізму, свободи культурного самовираження, демократії, з точки зору автора, не існує.

Аннотация. В статье анализируется политика мультикультурализма в современном полиэтническом обществе и целесообразность ее применения в Украине. Несмотря на существующие недостатки и ошибки в реализации мультикультурализма, альтернативы ему в современном полиэтническом обществе, которое базируется на принципах гуманизма, свободы культурного самовыражения, демократии, с точки зрения автора, не существует.

Abstract. The article analyzes the policy of multiculturalism in modern polyethnic society and the importance of its implementation in Ukraine. The crisis of the multiculturalism is that a state and a society exist in a variety of separate formations that live together but don't cooperate and identify themselves as a united state. The way out is that a policy of a civil identity should become the basis of the state policy. Civil identity in the basis of the «western» model of the nation that considers nation as a polyethnic formation that unites people of different ethnic societies and is based on a political and is based on a political and juridical equality of its members. This model of the nation is the most favorable for Ukraine. From the point of the author's view in spite of the drawbacks and mistakes made in the realization of multiculturalism there is no alternative for it in a modern polyethnic society that is based on the

basis of humanism, freedom of cultural self-expression, democracy. It concerns Ukraine indeed.

Ключові слова: мультикультуралізм, толерантність, нація, етногенез, громадянська ідентичність, поліетнічність.

Ключевые слова: мультикультурализм, толерантность, нация, этногенез, гражданская идентичность, полиэтничность.

Key words: multiculturalism, tolerance, nation, civil identity, ethnogenes, polyethnicity.

One of the decisive signs of a modern stage in the development of society is the strengthening of its integration with the simultaneous sharp increase in its diversity. Such a contradiction raises the problem of the development and preservation of cultural differences in a particular country and the world as a whole, the coexistence of cultures of various communities (ethnic, religious) with a view to their interpenetration, enrichment and development in the universal, universal civilization of world culture. Multiculturalism as a policy, as a theory, as an ideology, as a principle is one of the options for solving this problem.

The very idea of multiculturalism arises in the second half of the twentieth century. in Europe, envisaged, first of all, the inclusion in its cultural field of elements of the cultures of immigrants from the Third World (including those from the former colonies of European countries). It was believed that migrants who served as cheap labor would leave the country when they would not need it. As Frau Merkel said, "we were glad to say to ourselves: They will not stay here, they will go away sometime", but this did not happen." Many migrants, mostly from Turkey, preferred to stay in Germany, transporting their families there, and bringing their children to their homes. Europeans who did not rely on such a long-term perspective did not put enough effort to assimilate migrants. Meanwhile, there was a second, third generation of migrants - children, great-grandsons, migrants of the first wave. If the representatives of the first wave of migration were used in low-paying jobs and were grateful for it (at last, life in the premises of the same Paris or London was much better than the existence in the African countries that gained independence). Their children have already wanted more. They felt the benefits of civilization and did not compare their position with what they had in the home of their ancestors. Their homeland is Europe, and this they are different from the first generation. Meanwhile, European societies are not ready to consider them entirely their own. And they can not find their place in European communities. The migrants themselves become part of the European society, they themselves want to live on a European level and will neglect the "black work" for which they imported and continue to import. Eventually, the critical mass of people who are aware of their condolences and less and less willing to tolerate it has accumulated. In the eighteenth century. Voltaire once noticed that although all people are born free, the inhabitants of Timbuktu do not know about it. Well-known humanist George Orwell continued the idea that in the twentieth century, and a resident of Timbuktu learned of this, and since then the world has no rest.

With the growth of national communities migratory assimilation slows down. "New Europeans" do not want to learn the language, get to know the culture of Europe, neglect civil institutions, preferring to brew in their own environment, forming closed neighborhoods that are subject to their traditional leaders and who are burdened with the laws of the state alien to them, unless they (laws) do not relate to generous social assistance and free housing. Often, they not only preserve their religion, but choose the most extreme forms of it (in particular, shariah demonstrations in the UK can be mentioned, while 40% of Muslims in Britain are in favor of officially introducing Shariah law in "mostly Muslim areas").

This behavior of migrants can not but cause rejection of Europeans. The latest parliamentary elections in the countries of the Old World have shown that many Europeans are not afraid to seem tolerant. They mass vote for representatives of the right parties who promise to return countries to the traditional European way of life or fight radical Islam. The problem of the relationship with the emigrant communities becomes the main issue of the political agenda in Western European countries.

The causes of the crisis of multiculturalism (from which the problem of immigration) lies much deeper - in the crisis of culture of Europe itself. The ideology of multiculturalism is formed by the "left" post-war movement, as a reaction to Nazism and fascism and represents another extreme. It was anticipated that a new European culture would completely abandon conservatism, nationalism and Christian religiosity - and would be a convenient medium for resolving old conflicts and adapting arriving migrants from the countries of the East to the "free world." But the opposite trend happened: the radically weakened "autochthonous" culture of Europe has not attracted migrants (except for social welfare and dreams of "beautiful life"). Moving massively to the Old World, they retain their identity and separate themselves from "faceless Europeans." In fact, in Europe, there is no conflict between Christianity and Islam, because European civilization has historically been weakened by the secularism of the New Age, which in turn replaced the Middle Ages with virtually all the latest history of European civilization. Russian religious philosopher S.M.Bulgakov so appreciated these historical stages: "The Middle Ages and the new time are so opposite and, at the same time, are so similar to each other as the concavity and bulge of one and the same relief, which is considered from different sides. The Middle Ages asserted only the divine origin in life seeking, in the name of this divine principle, to crush the human principle and its freedom. On the contrary, the new time, in its one-sided reaction against the Middle Ages, tends to be completely forgotten about the divine beginning; totally absorbed by the development of pure humanity, it stands on the border of godlessness, practically uncontrollably passing into pagan polytheism, naturalism and idolatry. The Middle Ages recognized the earthly sky and only tolerated, as with inevitable evil, with the earth; the new time knows mainly the earth, and only for the private, personal use, as if on holidays in the temple, the heaven remembers "[1,169-170]. These lines, written

in the early twentieth century, are relevant, because they allow us to understand the underlying causes of the crisis of European civilization, its weakness and infirmity before the challenges of our time. This quotation may be even more relevant if the characterization given by the author of the Middle Ages is applied to the characteristics of contemporary Islam. Islam has not yet passed until the end of its Middle Ages, which has already survived Christianity.

In today's European society, the postmodern worldview, a philosophical mentality that denies subordinate and hierarchical notions in the understanding of being, and above all in its actual human manifestations, prevails, and declares polyphony and heteroryxism (as opposed to hierarchical) to organize the phenomena of the spiritual life of man. However, subordinanism, which naturally has its limits, plays a significant organizational and regulatory role in human behavior. And this applies not only to the archaic consciousness, but also to the consciousness of a modern person.

According to historical experience, the rejection of subordinationism generates serious conflicts in human behavior, there is a blurring of the value regulators of human activity, the deepest semantic structures of behavior. Destructive, in particular, semantic structures are based on the contradiction between grandeur and hypocrisy, strength and weakness, truth and lies, meaning and absurdity, success and defeat, heroism and cowardice. Personalized ideals and "reference personalities" of society are simultaneously ideals and anti-ideals, heroes and anti-heroes. Alternate cohabitation starts to intertwine, the boundary between the poles gradually disappears. In such a situation, the rejection of the hierarchical notions of the world and man ends with a complete ideological and value confusion. Such "decentralization" may result in the fact that the liberation of the diversity of the cultural-activity activity of man from the unity of the only beginning will arise at the same time as the liberation of the forces of self-destruction of culture. This danger is increasingly spoken by culturologists, its painfully worrying politics, it has touched all spheres of human life.

The image of the life of modern Europeans is aimed at life for the sake of the present, the whole meaning of human activity is reduced to endless enrichment, to consumerism. Life for the sake of money generates impotence, destroys the personality of harmony of mind, intuition and feelings, which is a source of stress, degradation, massive disintegration of families, personal exclusion and painful isolationism.

Tolerance as a social value that ensures human rights, freedom and security, the preservation of diversity, the natural right to difference, dissimilarity begins to be interpreted as moral nihilism, indifference to the various manifestations of immorality, to those values that have been formed for centuries. By the way, tolerance, which is to give the other the right to live in accordance with their outlooks, should not give others the right to be tolerant. In order for tolerance to work, it must be recognized by both parties, which is unacceptable for representatives of some religious and ethnic communities.

The crisis of multiculturalism in Europe is that the state and society appear in the form of separate disparate entities that live side by side, but do not cooperate, do not identify themselves as a single state. According to the well-known Russian expert, the head of the Center for the Study of Xenophobia and the Prevention of Extremism, the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Emil Pina, observes that the basis of state policy in the field of ethnic society "should be a policy of civil identity".

Civil identity forms the basis of the "western" model of a nation that views the nation as a polyethnic entity, as a community that unites people of different ethnic communities, based on the political and legal equality of its members. In the opposite "eastern" model, a nation is a community of people, united by common origin. The place that has the law in the western civil model, in the ethnic model is folk culture, first of all the language, customs, traditions. In one model, rule has the law, in another - the tradition.

The objective criterion for the progress of ethnogenesis should be sought not in the state of the ethnic groups themselves, but in those ties that arise, on the one hand, between the individual and the community, and on the other hand, between the communities in the course of historical development, and which are described by the categories " freedom "and" necessity ". With sufficient efficiency for an objective criterion of progress in ethnogenesis it is possible to accept the growth of the degree of freedom. Even Hegel noticed that "the East knew and only knows that one free Greek and Roman world knows that some free, Germanic world knows that all are free" [2,98]. And although Hegel clearly exaggerated the development of bourgeois relations in Prussia, however, the general trend is, in our opinion, right. History is interpreted by Hegel as a progress in the realization of freedom and its objectification in political and legal forms and institutions [2,98-99]. The progress of the ethnic phenomenon, which is the dialectical unity of the natural-biological and social aspects, can be logically presented as the process of substituting natural determinants of ethnogenesis for social ones. Natural and social notions should be distinguished not only as two phases of the formation of ethnic groups, but also as phenomena that exist and interact throughout the history of mankind. The degree of development of freedom (an objective criterion for the progress of ethnogenesis) is directly proportional to the degree of domination of the social characteristics of the ethnic over the natural and biological.

The leading nation-states and their citizens have historically passed all the floors of ethnogenesis. As for immigrants from "traditional" states of culture, they are "stuck" in the elevator of the blood-kin (tribal) stage. Therefore, criticism of multiculturalism is aimed primarily at the fact that the policy of multiculturalism is supported not only by culture, but also by communities that take on the mission of representing the interests of the entire ethnic group. Such community support stimulates the development of group identity, replacing the identity of the individual, consolidating the power of the community over the individual. Thus, there is an artificial preservation of traditional-communal

relations, and the individual integration of representatives of different cultures in civil society is impeded.

In connection with the processes of globalization, national states more and more from demotic-unitary, where the basis of the national state is a certain ethnic group, turn into ethno-pluralistic, where the union of society does not occur around a certain ethnic element, but around a certain political idea . To this objective process, many countries, including European ones, were not prepared.

More prepared were those countries of formation which practically happened with the settlement of their territory (the United States of America, Canada). These countries successfully cope with the process of international migration, creating a supranational model, integrating millions of emigrants. The American nation is a vivid example of a "Western" model, the components of which are the historical territory, the political and legal equality of members, the common civil culture (and not the culture of a certain ethnic group) and ideology. Civil culture is developing not with ethnic cultures, but with them. For example, in the United States, there is no official language, English is not legally constituted as the state language of the country (at the federal level), in some states legally several languages as official are fixed.

The experience of politics of multiculturalism in Western Europe, the USA and Canada is valuable and instructive for Ukraine. In Ukraine, the process of forming a civil (political) nation is quite difficult. If the Ukrainian ethnic nation - a product of history, which has absorbed the experience of centuries, then the Ukrainian multiethnic nation - it is rather a phenomenon of the future. The Ukrainian multiethnic nation is the citizens of the state, who perceive themselves as the only "we" without a distribution according to ethnic characteristics.

In a polyethnic society, ethnic characteristics of language, customs, traditions can become factors that do not unite, but on the contrary disconnect society. V.Lipinsky's ideas remain in his letter to Bohdan Shemet, written in Reichenau on Dec. 12, 1925: "If you want the Ukrainian State to be - you must be patriots, not chauvinists. "

This means, above all, that your nationalism must rely on the love of your fellow countrymen, not the hatred of them, because they are not Ukrainian nationalists. For you, for example, there should be a closer Ukrainian Moscovophil or Polynophyl than a foreigner who would help you to escape from Moscow or from Poland. You must mind all your feelings and your whole focus on finding an understanding, finding a common political language with the local Mussofil or Polynofil - in other words: to create with them a separate state on the Ukrainian Land.

Being a patriot means all the forces of one's soul should want to create the human, state and political coexistence of people who live on the Ukrainian land, and not dream about the drowning in the Dnieper of most of their own fellow countrymen. Being a patriot means, first of all, that you demand good and good deeds from yourself, as from a Ukrainian, and not primarily to hate others

because they are "not Ukrainian". Instead, to be a chauvinist, it means to cover up my spiritual netting with fanatical cries about "Ukraine's native language", about "native language", "we are Ukrainians!", about the courses of the "Muscovites and the Leo", etc. Let God save you from this kind of "nationalism", which can bring only what has already brought: the ruin of Ukraine. "[3,745-746].

An important consolidating factor of a nation should be, first and foremost, a sense of citizenship of Ukraine, which equally cares about its sons and daughters, without separating them from ethnic, social, racial, religious or other grounds. It is an objective process that should be sustained and developed on the basis of the ideals of freedom, fraternity, respect for the sacred rights of man and citizen. The process of national emancipation should take place in the direction of the general democratic, pro-European.

Thus, despite the existing shortcomings and mistakes in the implementation of multiculturalism, there is no democracy in it, in the modern multi-ethnic society based on the principles of humanism, freedom of cultural expression, and democracy, including Ukraine, if it sees itself as a European, democratic country.