UDC 930.85:008(4+477)

O. Mostyayev, Phd, Senior Researcher
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION AND THE PLACE OF UKRAINE IN IT

The article systematically presents the main approaches to the definition of civilization by criticizing organismic and reductionist approaches to its definition. The author develops a systematic approach to the consideration of civilization, for the first time identifies its dimensions and five criteria for its definition. According to it the position Ukraine in European civilization is determined.
Key words: *Organism, Civilization, European Civilization, Systems Thinking, Meta-Narrative Texts.*

With the receipt of independence of Ukraine, the process of civilizational self-determination Ukrainians got a new context: official identification of Ukraine as a component of artificial creating on some ideological and political signs "Soviet civilization" collapsed. After that the question arose: to which civilization the Ukraine belongs – the European, Christian Orthodox or Eurasian? Although political and economic factors play an important role in the selection of such identification as connecting our country with neighboring civilizations, yet the spiritual and cultural factors play a greater role too. However, even with the theoretical study of identification the certain methodological problem arises due to vagueness of the concept of "civilization" and various political speculations, which the scientific problem of civilizational identification is transferred into the plane of ideological struggle.

We will focus on the concept of "civilization" (because, the interpretation of it determines the ground of understanding civilizational identity and civilizational approach as such), and well as on criteria for identifying of civilization. This problem has still not received the theoretical and methodological clarity in Ukrainian or, in particular, in the Russian scientific thought, though to some extent it developed in Europe and the US.

The classics of civiliology O. Spengler and A. J. Toynbee had understood the civilization as limited in space and time the sociocultural formation. It is the most authoritative and still. However, in reality they both did not gave clear definitions of civilization. O. Spengler believed that a civilization is the final stage of a culture. Herein, he believed that a culture is "living organism" closed for other cultures, whose substantial basis is a "soul". Culture goes through a "life cycle" about 1000 years [27]. In his view, the civilization is decline or downfall of a culture. Arnold Toynbee seen the civilization as: "intelligible field of study", the kind of highly organized societies, the main component of the historical process; but he never gave a clear definition of civilization. Although, as follows from his works, when distinguishing of civilizations he gives largest advantage by the religious criteria, in particular creating by civilizations of authentic "universal churches"; however he is not adhered always consistently this approach [22]. Even before them, M. Danilevsky had defined socio-cultural analogues of civilizations: "cultural-historical types" are the larger sociocultural formations located in the historical time and space, set of which constitutes world history. He thought that constitutive features of cultural-historical type (after referred to CHT) are – the uniform language group, the special spiritual composition ("morphological beginning"), the political independence, attributive unique cultural and civilizational features that are not transmitted peoples other CHT [6].

These theorists had defined the civilization (or CHT) as the main subject of the historical process and in their fundamental works have shown that they really were by such subjects; however because they had not gave clear and meaningful definition to the concept of "civilization" , their approaches have generated theoretical and methodological lacuna in the further development of civilizational approach. Therefore, founders

of civilizational approach in the list of civilizations singled out different number them: depending on the preferences of language and cultural position, N. Danilevsky reduced to ten CHT; O. Spengler, in accordance with strict segmentation of human macro-communities by "culture", had reduced to the eight great cultures; in both, a small peoples, such as Caucasian, African, Southeast Asian, Indians, fell outside of the classifications; A. Toynbee was unable to definitively determine the number of civilizations giving them various list in different volumes of own a multivolume work (from 21 to 13, in addition identifying 16 civilizations-satellites and frozen). This theoretical legacy is still not overcome by: differences in the definition of civilizations and their of number in the world remained.

After, the theorists of civilized approach tried to give the concept of "civilization" more specific meaning. Since the 60's. 20 cent. scientists are trying to give a clear definition of the concept of "civilization" and to generalize selection criteria it. Also, tangents concepts are emerged substituting similar concepts, instead of the civilization: thus, in theory L. Gumilev, "the superethnos" is analogous to the concept of "civilization" [5].

The main approaches to the definition of civilization will be considered briefly hereinafter.

Among the contemporary civiliologs two approaches is – the descriptive and the systematic. Within the first approach researchers are trying to identify list of grounds or an essential property of civilization that distinguish it among socio-cultural systems of the different levels.

The descriptive definitions were developed by school of Russian and Ukrainian civiliologs. Most of them are based on the concept of *cultural-historical type* created by nations or groups of nations similar in language, traditional culture, spirituality, area of residence and common historical destiny. Building on this approach, the Russian civiliologs concretize it through such properties as a common civilizational identity (M. Maler [9]); during formation long affiliation to the common state, long and close cultural interaction, similarity between the institutional forms and mechanisms of social organization, the values, the means of social regulation (A. Fliier [23]).

On the other part, *systematic approach* to identifying of civilization develops. It is accented on allocation of *the integrative properties* deducing beyond the list of civilizational properties. Although some are too abstract such as the following definition: "civilization is commonality of certain substantial features of being human" [7].

One of the first attempt has been to define civilization as *an integrated system* which parts are determined by the relation between them, and, to civilization as a whole [29]. In the second half of the 20th cent., as in classical civiliology, the culture was considered by the main integrative factor in civilization. Sic, by F. Braudel, civilization is a "space", a "cultural area", "a collection of cultural characteristics and phenomena" [1]. Also the definition of classic civiliology late 20th cent. S. Huntington is: "A civilization is thus the highest cultural grouping of people

and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species. It is defined both by common objective elements, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions, and by the subjective self-identification of people" [24, p. 43]. I. Wallerstein identified that civilization is "a particular concentration of worldview, customs, structures, and culture (both material culture and high culture) which forms some kind of historical whole and which coexists (if not always simultaneously) with other varieties of this phenomenon" [24, p. 41].

That is, as follows from the above definitions, a civilization is the highest form of bringing people by the level of culture, and most comprehensive principle of their cultural identity, a form of identity, and a historical whole. Substantially these definitions are supplemented with interpretation of civilization as "macro-cultural model" based on a specific *complex of cultural texts* fixed in writing tradition. This model defines the limits of variation forms of cultural and social expression of human communities belonging to the civilization [25]. Namely, *the complex of metanarrative texts* significantly affects the interconnections within civilizations, laying the symbolic, self-reflective and discursive basis not only in religious activities, but also in literature, law, political systems and so on. Due to this during a cultural process is being created coherent system of the functioning and the improving. Because a civilization we can be seen as systematic expression of a culture. Next definition reasonably supplements this approach: "The civilization is a large integral socio-cultural system with its regularities which are not limited by the regularities of functioning of states, nations and social groups. The civilization as a complete system includes various elements (religion, economic, political, social organization, education and training, etc.) which are consistent with each other and are closely interlinked" [18].

The development of a systematic approach takes place in Ukrainian civiliology, although most the Ukrainian civilizational theorists not concentrate on its definition. It should draw attention to the writings of T. Voropaieva, defining civilization as: the macro-cultural socio-historical organism covering various subjects (countries, people, nation, state) that share common socio-normative principles of supra-ethnic level, similar ethical and religious systems, fundamentals of mentality, the fundamental ideals and core values, resistant characteristics of business and economic, political, legal and socio-cultural organization, expressed in the relevant type of vital activity. As she considers, civilization is the peculiar and self-sufficient spatiotemporal integrity clearly localized in space of Culture and time of History; it is the highest degree of self-organization and development of human society where stable elements outweigh unstable. The criteria for selection (and comparison) civilizations she recognizes: ecological and geographical, geocultural, anthropo-demographic, economical, religious, ethical, political and legislation, geo-political, socio-cultural, technical, technological and scientific innovation, educative, informational, axiological and spiritual, ideological factors, and also general trends in the development of cities, writing system and state [3; 4].

As you can see in the above definition of civilization, systematic approach is supplemented with descriptive list of features, so it is quite difficult to perceive. In fact, the researcher lists factors that have identificational and integrative value. However, controversial component of the definition is the "social-historical organism." The organism is a species of

material systems. Is it possible to use such a term for social systems, in which plays an important role the idealism?

Let us turn to the principles of a systematic approach [19–21] regarding the civilization as a kind of integrity united by the relationships and connections. Usually the following signs are present in the definitions of system: (1) this is a totality (complete) of elements (units) (2) coherent with each other, (3) being in certain relationships, (4) organized in a certain way, and thus (5) formed into the integrity, isolated from other systems rigidly or softly.

Normally item, (1) does not cause major disputes: each system is composed of elements. However, one more a question is: what are the elements of a system constitutes?

(2) Relative to the elements, the system is the phenomenon of higher order determined by the integrative factor or factors allowing by the elements act in concert. It supposes a way of cooperative behavior of elements, relations between them, whereby self-organizing of system occurs. To indicate this behavior in synergetics and systematic approach, the term "coherence" is used: at the conditions of coherence, the elements behave as integer, as if the system is a repository of long-range forces having macroscopic character [15]. Therefore, exactly genes in the organism are the cause of a coherent behavior determining various measure of energetic and biochemical metabolism, what determines the behavior of those or other cells. Nevertheless, other mechanisms are in society. It should also be noted that the organism is composed of physically integrated components (cells, biochemical combinations) but society and civilization consist of physically isolated components.

(3) The relationship between the elements can have triple nature: the material (metabolism), the energetical (energetical relationship between donor and acceptor), and the informational (when there is an exchange by informational messages). In case of the priority of material relations the elements of the system behave deterministically, as their behavior depends on the characteristics of the physical interaction and the available energy reserves. Therefore, the material interaction cannot be separated from the energetic interaction, but energy itself is a characteristic of the movement and interaction of matter (system or element). However, a matter also carries information it is able to cause motion and interaction by random or specified choice. In the social systems information affects on the direction of energy through certain channels, itself without being dependent from energy (because presented in the texts). It depends on the nature of information analysis by the receiver of information. Therefore, systems with dominating of information (and it is a man and society) operate and reproduced not on the principles of determinism, but probabilistically and doing personal choice. In them, the information may to be the cause activity (energy resources for which are obtained from the lower forms of existence of energy) [15].

Modern natural-science interpretation of "system" does not coincide with its philosophical and humanitarian interpretations. In the context of the structure (item 1), each system has its own set of required elements. Obviously, social systems are different from the physical body in that they are made up of individuals, which have some freedom of choice using the personal analysis of information.

For items (2) and (3) we also see significant differences. In the human sciences, it is sufficient of availability of any communication (interaction) between the parts in order to recognize the studied object by system. In the philosophy and

the social and human sciences (which include civiliology) *the fact of the relationship* is important (substantially in informational dimension); while the exact and natural-geographical sciences recognize the importance of *the functional connections* (feedback and managerial relations, energetic and biochemical metabolism, chemical reaction, physical rubbing or pressure, gravitation, etc.; and they carry information for self-organizing systems). Therefore, in some human sciences is given fundamentally other definitions of, for example: "Under the system is understood the set of elements combined by relationships, which generate integrative or system property, differentiating a given totality from the environment, and attaching to this quality of each of its components" [26].

According to the criteria specified in item (4), existing in the universe systems are ordered (organized) with specific way. They can be ordered through the properties of elements (eg, functional relationships between them). Alive system's the genes are important factors of ordering (they determine differentiation of the embryo of organism, and it is a behavior in the mature period), in the multicellular animals it is also the brain. They act as orderers and controllers of biochemical processes, and as complementary control centers, directing functional relations between elements. However, in social system the organization depends on information and freedom of choice, which can serve as a motive for a particular behavior, sake a ordering (i.e. to direct energy in a channel). Therefore, for example, the metanarrative texts were generated by consciousness, and they is available only to a certain type of consciousness, which is able to analyze in a specific metanarrative context; the text can act as indirect factor of ordering of society. The same applies to the traditions, social archetypes, and other a-priori-fixed phenomena in society.

Therefore, the ordering of social systems determinates not as much by material and energy interactions as formalizes by consciousness including it beliefs, traditions, archetypes and stereotypes. Consciousness is formalized by certain *metanarrative texts*: religious, juridical and other; they are a manifestation of social information and form a kind the *metalanguage of society* (of course, this is not the spoken language). Being a resource, that fixes the logical tools of reflection on the information codes texts, meta-language defines various aspects of them:

1) cultural or referential code (framework of regulations what we use in interpreting of everyday experience);

2) communicative (connotative [or Semic]) code (semes, sequential thoughts, traits and actions constitute character);

3) symbolic code (the inscription into the text of the antithesis central to the organization of the cultural code);

4) "the code of actions" (any action initiated must be completed; the cumulative actions constitute the plot events of the text);

5) "hermeneutic code" ("the code of enigmas or puzzles") [8].

The text has priority in the organization of society: law, rights, legitimacy, etc. are expressed by means of text. As well, the texts are the phenomenon of fixed information and the informational heritage transmitted from past generations. Namely, the texts act as a factor of coherence in society by spreading the symbols, the concepts, the metaphors, the modes of behavior etc. Incidentally, the money also is a text as expressing not just cost and quality, but characteristics of the issuer, its role in the global market and so on. Money is the text describing the issuer and its economic viability (See: [15]).

Here we come to the most significant characteristics of integrative criteria by which we can extract a particular

civilization. And it principle, by which we should exclude the interpretation of the social system that it is the organism: the metanarrative text, being comprehensive and privileged tool, identifies the discourse and behavior of individuals as members of society. It is not determines, but offers a choice from a whole kind of social aspects – archetypes, images, options, opportunities. Because metanarrative text, such as the Bible or the Qur'an, reveals to the reader-interpreter a certain form of community, let him ideally, but referentially, and a meaningfully, because it is laying social foundations of sacred faith, sanctifies public order. Of course, order to metanarrative complex and privilege has been implemented, it must be interpreted and applied, but within a particular society it occurs mainly just on the foundation of metalanguage of metanarrative texts, and it lays the foundation of a developed civilization, and civilizational process unfolds against the backdrop of found by them the principles of socio-cultural organization.

Therefore, the limits of ideological acceptance of metanarrative texts are the limits of spread of civilizational influences.

Should also be noted some comments on item (5) is. Sometimes it is hard to distinguish the boundaries of the natural system. Where are boundaries of the Sun? Is there a clear boundary of the atom? These issues cannot be resolved at the level of theory of physical objects in the Newtonian sense. Especially it concerns the social systems, whose the boundaries are often blurred. However, namely the organism usually has clear boundaries coated with epidermis, skin and so on.

From the perspective of these preliminary remarks, we consider: whether are the social systems, in particular civilizations, organisms?

Indeed, there are similarities the civilization and the organism (which, in fact, is caused the analogy between societies, civilizations and organisms); in particular:

– Coherence of elements;

– Genetic code (which is analogous to metalanguage of civilizations, which positioned within the "genetic" metanarrative texts);

– In the frameworks of civilization "metabolism" exists (but, as noted, it mediated by information);

– Civilizations seek to growth and survival; they have cycles of development similar to the organism (as noted by O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, D. Volodihin, A. Zinoviev, and others.);

– Civilizations have mechanisms of inheritance (metanarrative texts, institutions, traditions), able to generate other civilizations ("child", by A. Toynbee), and capable to variability (to the creation of new forms).

However, listed in the following table 1 differences are so substantial and fundamental, that it not suggests about civilizations as organisms.

Overall, from the above arguments, we can conclude that the term "organism" is a metaphor which was generalized in the era of modernity for various communities including the social; but in its discursive essence it is biologistic and deterministic term and it can not be used to define the concept of "civilization". But, in what other concepts can define civilization?

It may be useful the works by P. Sztompka, in which he develops the concept of society as an *information field*. He thinks that the society as well as its components (groups, organizations, etc.) is not rigid ("hard") system or an organism, but a "soft" probabilistic field of relations. The main elements of this understanding are:

Table 1. Differences between the properties of the organism and the civilization

Organism	Civilization
(1) is composed of integrated physically and biochemically interrelated elements: cells (unicellular with subcellular components)	(1) is composed of physically isolated components (countries, peoples, nations, states)
(2) is deterministic system of the coherence cells ensured by the genetic code and biochemical metabolism (that determines their existence, in particular, the life cycle)	(2) is a system whose components have the capacity for free choice, independent of biochemical factors; coherence is ensured through by metanarrative texts; its components exchanges the information primarily; and because they have a certain freedom of choice, it is made of the available options and with consciousness
(3) cells exchanged between matter, energy and information directly, but the latter is transmitted only through matter and energy and is the result of chemical interaction	(3) material exchange is always mediated by the information tools (above all it is communication and money); without being dependent from energy the information directs the flow of energy through certain channels
(4) organism has a center or more control centers (including the genetic and nervous system)	(4) civilization has no control centers (excluding the religious centers and the governments of state-civilizations, but they do not affect all structures of civilization)
(5) organism is separated from the environment by a shell but exchanging the matter, the energy and the information	(5) civilization is relatively isolated from the rest, but between civilizations are no clear boundaries, there is a mutual influence and interpenetration of information and goods

– "Processual image" of society, that is the perception of him in constant motion;

– Strictly "image of field", ie the desire to consider the society not as a material object [28].

Processual image of civilization is a constantly continuing stream of events. Society and civilization is existing untill events are occuring, something is happening, processes are occurring, something is changing. Therefore, civilization not is static formations, they have a life cycle, but it is cycle of "a social life", and not cycle of living organism. Civilizational process is: the flow of changes of different speed; the synthesis and spreading of civilizational influences and forms of culture; parallel civilizational processes, outrunning and delay in the development of different countries from the same civilization; expanding or reducing their territories; isolation or information exchange between civilizations, etc. [16].

The development of civilization begins with the *primary civilizational synthesis*, in the course of which the creation and the creative integration of the various socio-economic, political and legal, social and cultural elements, particularly on the basis of the religious, political, legal, moral and ethical, socio-cultural and others integrating factors is occured.

Civilizational synthesis on the first stage of civilization development on a defined territory is a creative association of local components with borrowed [12; 14].

Local civilization arises when a minimal complex of socio-cultural landscape was formed: proto-state, proto-cities, proto-writing, elements of stratified society, national religious pantheon et al.; Local civilization arises when a minimal complex of socio-cultural landscape was formed: proto-state, proto-cities, proto-writing, elements of stratified society, national religious pantheon et al.; it becomes formed with: a state (usually the early-state empire), the urban lifestyle, the writing, social stratification, codifying the national religion (or borrowing version of world religion), and so on. Being in civilizational synthesis the society transfers from tribal to the estates of the realm, the class or other social-structural condition; in contacts with other societies and civilizations it is becoming more equality; from a passive entity that is situationally attached to the interactions between civilizations; it becomes the only subject of local civilization (or one of the subjects of subcontinental civilization). Thus at least at the

regional scale it acquires the capacity to respond to civilizational challenges – the political, the cultural, the economic, and others.

Subcontinental civilization is the Community, being the definite complete of the socio-cultural communities – the countries, the peoples, the nations, the states, the confessions; where there is a network of information exchange based on the social, the political, the economic, the religious, and other relations; where not only the forms and the styles of cultures the exchange is happening, but this all is based on joint the meta-language or several meta-languages fixed in the general-civilizational metanarrative texts, international agreements and other ways. This is a specific social environment uniting the subjects of civilization, and being in constant development. Communities we can be considered as specific "the nodes", complexes, interlacement of various information and material relations fundamentally important for the life of civilizations. For human individuals, they are not just a means of self-identification, but the means of information analysis and choice, as they have the following *dimensions* [28], which reveal its essence as macro-cultural socio-historical field. It is:

• The metalanguage, fixed in metanarrative texts that include ideas, thoughts and beliefs of individuals;

• The regulatory field, containing the patterns of behavior (above all the sphere of morality and law);

• The field of action (more about the meaning of the term, see [11]), which may be friendly or hostile, cooperative or competitive, to promote of division, isolation or integration;

• The field of interest forming a hierarchy, coinciding or being in conflict.

In all these dimensions, the social field of civilization is constantly in changes such as:

• Interpretation, legitimation or reinterpretation of ideas, the appearance and disappearance of ideologies, beliefs, doctrines, theories, and also dissemination them among communities;

• Institutionalization, revision of norms, values, rules or abandoning them, the emergence of new normative codes and systems of law;

• Creation, differentiation, rearrangement of channels of interaction, organizational and other links between communities;

• Crystallization, consolidation and rearrangement of capabilities, interests and perspectives; the rise and fall of the status of social-cultural communities.

I propose to consider the civilization as the community. According to the Modern Explanatory Dictionary and Great Encyclopedic Dictionary [17], *the community* is a certain complex of people with common social features, for example – the social group, vocation, place of residence, religious affiliation, etc. This information is generated, which is a leading factor in human activity. Informational nature of civilization is defined by the metanarrative texts that undergo continuous reinterpretation and improvement, the new metanarrative texts are created; but forgetting, that is out of date. Some really creative processes lead to fundamental innovations: it is the emergence of completely new social circumstances, states of society, social structures, etc. Processes of this type are denoted by the term "*morphogenesis*" [28]. In the context of the civilizing process, these include, for example: creation of new states, confessions, organizations, political parties; justification and the introduction of new legal or moral standards; creation of significant religious, scientific and artistic works; spreading of new lifestyle and technological invention with all the far-reaching consequences, and so on.

Civilization as a community has the centers of production of information, of which various *information areas* (of political, social, cultural, ethnolinguistic, etc.) are spreaded. It is a flexible field of relationships existing on the basis of sustainable economic, political, legal and cultural principles; however, which is developed under the historical challenges, and depend on individual choice and morphogenesis initiating by certain individuals or social groups. So civilization is a complex entity, each sphere of which has separate values:

Sphere of identity: each component (country, people, nation, state) somehow identifies with a civilization or particular characteristics its according to the social and cultural traditions, and ways of interacting, and axiology of certain civilizational context;

Sphere of material exchange: economic interaction carried: in the past every civilization has evolved as the *world-economies* (I. Wallerstein); even now, in times of global economics these countries have similar technical and technological and socio-economic structure;

Sphere of information exchange: the metanarrative texts remain the information core of civilization including a religious, legal, philosophical; which form a kind of *metalanguage of civilization*, which do not linguistic communicative means as much as logical and symbolic tools for evaluation and reflection (interpretation) of the meaning of texts and social behavior, but this is complemented by intermediary language (Koine [including sacred], lingua franca, pidgin, etc.);

Sphere of management: in social institutions (not only political but also economic, religious, educational, etc.) within each of civilization are spread *the specific methods of decision-making, choice and expansion*; of course, firstly the international and interconfessional interaction (political and other management systems, contacts, alliances, wars, international agreements that signed by within of civilization frequently than outside it) is regulated by; so the political institutions of states operate under similar to each other rules, that determine the trend to integrate interstate relations;

The common historical destiny and remembrance of constituents of civilization stems from the first four spheres, but expansion, conquest from other civilizations could complicate its development or violate its integrity. And right here principle

of relative isolation is particularly important: four previously selected sphere generate field of interaction and information sharing, which are weakened according to the distance from the centers of civilization; interaction also determines certain identification, informational, political and economic isolation; although it is being overcomed in the process of globalization and the establishment of world civilization; but it remains a core of civilization types; why boundaries between civilizations is not entirely distinguishable, and each civilization can be structured according to the principle: *Centre, Province, Peripherals, Borderlands*.

What the conception of European civilization is a Community it allows objectively enough to attach to the Ukraine. Indeed, if considering it as the organism, it is specifying a clear civilizational function: each country is the integral part of European civilization, without which it's "organism" cannot exist. But is it? We cannot imagine a Europe without the Italian Renaissance, the German Protestantism, English and German classical philosophy, music, and so on (and related with them metanarrative texts being spread within Europe); but that actually Ukraine as a European country gave to Europe: that had influenced significantly on the culture and the history? Most of all, that being "visor for Turkish and Tatar attacks", it was a functional part of the European borderlands, its frontier [13]. But most European influence in Ukraine was sometimes quite sporadic. In the past they were separated from Europe – the Orthodoxy, Cyrillic alphabet, the weak influence of the Renaissance. And the mentality, Christianity as a common moral and ideological basis, the character of the political system, democratic tradition, dynastic and political ties with European countries in the Princely era had been converged. Finally, it is common historical destiny, which is expressed not only in the fact that politically Ukrainian territories was subordinate at least 300–500 years, by other European states, but that the Ukraine played a role (not only economic but also political) in European affairs even as a colony of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union [16]. The Ukraine recognizes the present EU legislation as a reference, and is a member of PACE and other contemporary cultural, political and economic metanarratives of European civilization. Do all of the above is not a sign of belonging to it?

On the other part, the Ukraine is located on the edge the East European plain that was the scene of the formation of Muscovy-Russia, which has undergone significant political influence of Eurasian Mongol Empire. However, common historical destiny of Russia and Ukraine for more than 300 years not denies that both countries belong to the European civilization; however, influence of European cultural field on Russia was even weaker than in Ukraine. But a common fundamental basis (Christianity, spread of European philosophy, ideas, science and culture, the most – in Princely era and the with 18 cent.) permits asserting that Russia is part of European of civilization. All efforts to invent an "Eurasian civilization" does not have a real socio-cultural reasons. Above all, we can talk about a most measure of orientalization of Russia than Ukraine, and nowadays, obviously, Russia appears as the more European country than Turkey, which aspires to EU membership.

Finally, it is possible to improve and simplify too descriptive character of the definition of civilization by T. Voropaieva. While agreeing in general with its definition of civilization, but given the importance of geopolitical factors in the development of civilization, I propose the following definition: *the civilization is the macro-cultural community of subjects (countries, peoples,*

nations, states) tied together by the main forming factors, history of development, the specific geographical position, and within this limits acting the business and economic, political, legal and socio-cultural processes.

References

1. Brodel F. Materialna tsyvilizatsiia, ekonomika i kapitalizm, XV–XVIII st. [Per. z fr. H. Filipchuk] / Fernan Brodel. – U 3-kh t. – K.: Osnovy, 1997.

2. Vallerstajn I. Istoricheskij kapitalizm. Kapitalisticheskaja civilizacija / Immanuil Vallerstajn. – M.: Tovariwestvo nauchnyx izdanij KMK, 2008. – 176 s.

3. Voropaieva T. Ukrainstvo v yevropeiskomu tsyvilizatsiinomu prostori: teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady doslidzhennia / Tetiana Voropaieva // Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh. – 2013. – # 11. – S. 79–83.

4. Voropaieva T. Ukrainstvo v tsyvilizatsiinomu rakursi / Tetiana Voropaieva // Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh. – 2012. – # 8. – S. 9–13.

5. Gumilev L. N. Ehtnogenez i biosfera Zemli / L. N. Gumilev. – L.: Gidrometeoizdat, 1990.

6. Danilevskij N. Ja. Rossija i Evropa: vzgljad na kulqturnye i politicheskie otnoshenija Slavjanskogo mira k Germano-Romanskomu / N. Ja. Danilevskij. – SPb.: Izd-vo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta – Glagolj, 1995.

7. Diligenskij G. G. “Konec istorii” ili smena civilizacij? / G. G. Diligenskij // Voprosy filosofii. – 1991. – #3. – S. 33–36.

8. Ilqin I. Poststrukturalizm. Dekonstruktivizm. Postmodernizm / Ilqja Ilqin. – M.: Intrada, 1996. – S. 154–175.

9. “Istorija”. Izdatelqskij dom “Pervoe sentjabrja”. –http://his.1september.ru/article.php?ID=200300801.

10. Koncha S. Mistse Ukrainy sered tsyvilizatsii svitu / Serhii Koncha // Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh. – 2013. – # 11. – S. 95–103.

11. Krylov V. Ju., Morozov Ju. I. Kiberneticheskie modeli i psixologija / V. Ju. Krylov, Ju. I. Morozov. – M.: Nauka, 1984.

12. Matiakh V. Ukrainskyi tsyvilizatsiinyi protses rannoho novoho chasu v naukovykh proektakh Instytutu istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy / Valentyna Matiakh. – K.: In-t istorii Ukrainy NANU, 2011.

13. Mostiaiev O. Vyznachennia mistsia ukrainstva u svitovomu tsyvilizatsiinomu protsesi / Oleksandr Mostiaiev // Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh. – 2012. – Vyp. 8. – S. 20–25.

14. Mostiaiev O. Etapy tsyvilizatsiinoho protsesu v Ukraini: osoblyvosti periodyzatsii / Oleksandr Mostiaiev // Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Seriia “Ukrainoznavstvo”. – 2012. – Vyp. 16. – S. 4–10.

15. Mostiaiev O. Svit yak zatrymanyi rozpad: Rozdumy shchodo evoliutsii vidkrytykh system / O. Mostiaiev. – K.: “MP Lesia”, 2004.

16. Mostiaiev O. Ukrainstvo u tsyvilizatsiinomu protsesi: osoblyvosti poshyrennia yevropeiskykh vplyviv / Oleksandr Mostiaiev // Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh. – 2013. – Vyp. 11. – S. 45–50.

17. Obwnostq // Bolqshoj ehnciklopedicheskij slovarq. – M., 2002.

18. Parxomenko I.T., Radugin A.A. Kulqturologija v voprosax i otvetax. – M.: Centr, 2001.

19. Peregudov F.I., Tarasenko F.P. Vvedenie v sistemnyj analiz / I. T. Parxomenko, A. A. Radugin. – M.: Vysshaja shkola, 1989.

20. Protasov V.N. Teorija prava i gosudarstva. Problemy teorii prava i gosudarstva. Voprosy i otvety / V.N. Protasov. – M.: Novyj Jurist, 1999. – 240 s.

21. Sistema // Bolqshoj Rossijskij ehnciklopedicheskij slovarq. – M.: BREH, 2003. – S. 1437.

22. Toinbi A. Dzh. Doslidzhennia istorii: Per. z anhl. U 2-kh t. / Arnold Dzh. Toinbi. – K.: Osnovy, 1995.

23. Flier A. Ja. Kulqturologija dlja kulqturologov: Uchebnoe posobie / A. Ja. Flier. – M.: Akademicheskij proekt, 2000. – 496 s.

24. Huntington S. P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order / Samuel P. Huntington. – N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1996. – 368 p.

25. Chlenov M. A. Evrejstvo v sisteme civilizacij (postanovka voprosa) / M. A. Chlenov // Diaspory. – 1999. – # 1. – S. 34–56.

26. Shabrov O. Politicheskoe upravlenie / Oleg Shabrov. – M.: Intellekt, 1997.

27. Shpengler O. Zakat Evropy. Ocherki morfologii mirovoj istorii [Per. s nem.] / Osvalqd Shpengler. – T. 1. Geshtalqt i dejstvitelqnostq. – M.: Myslq, 1993; T. 2. Vsemirno-istoricheskie perspektivy. – M.: Myslq, 1998.

28. Shtompka P. Sociologija socialqnyx izmenenij [Per, s angl, pod red. V.A.Jadova] / Petr Shtompka. – M.: Aspekt Press, 1996.

29. Melko M. Nature of Civilizations / Matthew Melko. – Boston: Porter Sargent, 1969.