

"UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION" – IS THE SCIENTIFIC OBJECT OR SOURCE OF MYTHMAKING

Volodymyr Kyrychenko

Abstract. It has passed the century since the revolutionary events of 1917, which radically changed the historical fate of the Russian Empire and the peoples that were part of it. Anniversaries are provides an opportunity both for fresh rethinking hundred-year-old events, and for summarizing the results of the researches of the phenomenon revolution as a subject. The Decree of the President of Ukraine is ordered to honor the traditions of the struggle for the independence and unity of Ukraine and the military victory of the defenders of the native land, the creators of national statehood, the millennial history of the state formation of our people, the recognition of the historical significance of events associated with the liberation struggle of the beginning of the XX century and the establishment of Ukrainian statehood.

The word "revolution" has integrated into Ukrainian reality with vigour, because Khmel'nitchina is already considered today by many domestic researchers mainly in the context of the revolutionary paradigm. There is then the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921, which we celebrate today. Then finally followed by a string of recent colored revolutions completing this revolutionary movement. There is a powerful populist taste, however, with the objective perception of this "revolutionary series". Populism is an instrument of politics, and it is simply impossible in State affairs without it, besides it falls on the fertile ground of mythological thinking. The modern era has demonstrated the inseparability of myth from society. The modern myth has begun to be perceived in a negative context as far-fetched, erroneous, conditional, fantastic, moreover, it has emerged as a policy instrument. A political idea generates a political mythology which establishes the contact between those who govern and those governed. Turning into symbols, they create a symbolic space in politics, in which types of decision-making can be realized, for which mythology becomes the most important element of this process. Modern historiography devoted to the phenomenon of revolution, is represented by dozens of contradictory author's approaches, which differ from each other, first of all, its attitudinal dimension. Not only the fundamental indicators of the revolution are being debated: chronology and periodization, causes and preconditions, character, driving forces, etc., the question of the very concept of revolution is in question. The theoretical views on the phenomenon of revolution with their division into methodological approaches, from Marxist to synergetic, focusing on the search for objective truths, based on a solid source ground and adequate methods of scientific cognition are analyzed in the article. However, the efforts of Ukrainian experts to study the phenomenon of revolution cause many questions and criticism. Of particular concern in this sense is the point of view of the leading experts, whose position becomes almost official and is contained in textbooks, encyclopedias, and is being widely used. Obviously, the Soviet past has created a powerful myth about the phenomenon of revolution, made it as the value of top level it in the public consciousness. Even a large number of scholars are convinced that it is only way to reach new quality and radical social change. In fact, today there are scientific-research which refute the myth of the modernization significance of revolutions. It is not revolutions, but radical reforms accelerate the development of the state in an unfriendly environment, when there is a need to defend the independence or to catch up with someone or even overtake.

Key words: *revolution, myth, reforms, historiography, populism.*

Revolutions of various elements of the social environment, which is a part of the historical process, radically change not only the appearance of mankind, but also its essence. An objective and impartial theoretical and methodological study and research of this phenomenon is absolutely necessary, especially with regard to terminology, which serves as the basis for scientific knowledge. The word "revolution" has integrated into Ukrainian reality with vigour, because Khmel'nitchina is already considered by many domestic researchers mainly in the context of the revolutionary paradigm. There is then the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 we are addressing today and will celebrate and report over the

coming three years accordingly to the Decree of President. Then finally followed by a string of recent colored revolutions. However, with the objective perception of this "revolutionary series" there is a powerful populist taste. Populism is an instrument of politics, and it is simply impossible without it in State affairs, besides it falls on the fertile ground of mythological thinking. The modern era has demonstrated the inseparability of myth from society. But in the 20th century the content of the term "myth" has acquired a wider meaning than "the property of primitive thinking," as K. Levi-Strauss understood it [1]. The modern myth has begun to be perceived in a negative context as far-fetched, erroneous, conditional, fantastic, moreover, it has emerged as a policy instrument. Thus, A.N. Kolev notes that the political idea creates political mythology, which is for the masses themselves a sensory other-being, and for the political elite a dialectical completion of the idea. Political practice affects an array of group and national archetypes, establishes the contact between those who govern and those governed. Turning into symbols, they create a symbolic space in politics, in which types of decision-making can be realized, for which mythology becomes the most important element of this process [2].

With regard to such a powerful phenomenon as the revolution, it is indicative that those who won the revolution become its first myth-makers. It would seem that the task of scientists - the "independent" historians - lies in confronting creators of myths and their followers, however, it is noted that Ukrainian historiography in general, and its component part - the historiography of the Ukrainian revolution, in particular, acts as an active factor in the creation of national consciousness [3]. G. Kasyanov states that historians of Ukraine, both at the beginning and at the end of the 20th century, carrying out one intellectual task – legitimization of the national and state claims of the Ukrainian nation with historical arguments. We are dealing with qualitative transformation, reformulation of already known historical myths [4].

Usually, the revolution is regarded by scholars as a kind of changes that occur in society, although not all agree with this. So R. Nisbet insists that modern science has still not built up the paradigm to this day, which would convincingly explain the nature of social changes taking place in the public system [5]. And this is provided that the last century is marked by thousands of volumes of historical research. This diversity can be partly explained by the pluralism of the applied methodology, the different perception of the researchers. At the philosophical methodological level, with a certain degree of conventionality, it is possible to distinguish between two main areas of scientific research, objectivist and subjectivist. The first one is aimed at revealing the laws and the objective causality of events, represented by Marxist, civilization and modernization paradigms. The subjectivist vector is based on subjective factors and randomness and is represented by institutional, synergetic paradigms and the theory of social design. Note, that there is a galaxy of scientists [6, 7, 8], who likes the established concept of social development laid down by A. Saint-Simon, H. Spencer, G. Morgan, E. Taylor, K. Marx and F. Engels. R. Pipes suggests that the revolutionary movement of 1917 should be perceived quite differently, presenting it as a unique historical experience which is conditioned by features of particular civilizations [9]. The events that took place in the USSR and in the socialist camp in 1989 and 1991 have led to the concepts of the transitological approach in the works of S. Huntington and A. Przeworski [10, 11]. At the same time, exploring the role of peasants in uprisings and revolutions in the context of

the Marxist concept, T. Skokpol began to form a structural direction in studies of revolutionary change [12].

The concept of a single revolutionary European process deserves attention. According to P. Holkvist [13] and D. Sanborne [14], the revolution and civil war are the final stage of the European crisis, which was directly related to the wars of the early XX century. It should also be taken into account that on the eve of the XXI century among Western specialists a new vision of human evolution is emerging, a multi-vector, non-linear one is added to a unidirectional, linear concept. Actually the revolution, as a special state of society, which is in a state of chaos, is an attractive subject for synergetic analysis. The society, while at the point of bifurcation, makes a qualitative leap, the causes of which may be both randomness and objective factors (demographic explosion, undermining of the gender balance, economic crisis, natural disasters, hunger, rising strain of violence, terrorism, war, in the end). There are qualitative changes in the characteristics of a complex system are taking place during this leap - the rejection of evolutionary development, of heredity and progressivity. Many experts called for the need to use the synergetic method in the development of the theory of revolution [15, 16], but the solution of this problem requires considerable effort, processing a powerful array of information using mathematical methods of processing it. In the final decade of the last century, Western historiography became interested in a project approach in interpreting the history of revolutionary events. Actually O. Fajdes noted that the Russian revolution launched the most powerful experiment in the history of humanity in the field of social engineering, its collapse was a result of the utopian communist idea [17]. It is in this methodological paradigm the individual authors consider a series of color revolutions. Such numerous methodological approaches to understanding individual phenomena in public life require adjustments and improvements in the perception of theory of revolution by domestic scientists - a phenomenon that generates radical social changes, as well as further application of the theory in the study of Ukrainian history. However, efforts to systematize and typify revolutions by Ukrainian researchers raise many questions and criticisms [18, 19].

Of particular concern in this sense is the point of view of the leading experts, whose position becomes almost official and is contained in textbooks, encyclopedias, and is being very widely relayed both with references and without them). For example, the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine suggests to understand the revolution - the term "revolution" appeared with the publication in 1543 of N. Copernicus's book "De revolutionibus orbium coelestium" ("Revolution of the Celestial Spheres"). It had several meanings - rotation, turn, revolution. A couple of words had been adopted, that marked the dynamics of development: "evolution" as progressiveness and "revolution" as a sudden acceleration, a break in progress, a qualitative change in the previous state in the development of nature, society, cognition [20]. We will not pay attention to the fact that the author did not have a sufficient specialty to adequately borrow the definition from the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron, we will specify that in the original source in general the word "revolution" in medieval Latin were denoted a movement, a rotation, a circulation, and work of the famous author of the heliocentric system of the world (which, incidentally, marked the beginning of the first scientific revolution) is cited as an example of such use from a variety of other works. However, the meaning of a pair of words:

"evolution" and "revolution" is correct and the essence of the revolution is a qualitative change the earlier state. Moreover, when the so-called "classical revolutions" are presented all scientifically and theoretically, and although Marx is mercilessly criticized, the presentation of the essence of great revolutions takes place in the context of precisely the Marxist paradigm. The nationally conscious author could not also ignore the mention of the "Ukrainian Revolution of 1648-1676", although in fact the text of the article refers to the peasant war, and the defeat of the revolution is due to the fact that Europe has lagged behind in its development for 100-150 years. Thus, the Cossacks "failed to make an inevitable process of formation of national statehood, because they themselves were formed as a state of feudal society, and not as an economically independent class of capitalist society. The Ukrainian Revolution falls out of a series of bourgeois revolutions, but remains the revolution in which the social, national liberation and religious components are closely interwoven "[20].

This contradictory mix is inherent in almost all articles of the encyclopedia devoted to revolutionary competition on Ukrainian lands. At the same time, the in-depth analysis of the texts proves that the author understands the essence of this phenomenon, but he tries to hide the fact that the revolution leads to sharp and radical changes that have not happened in the state in an evolutionary way and without which it is impossible to be considered a "modern state" that it is built on modern models of the New or New time. In an attempt to present the "clean face of the revolution", the Israeli specialist in the comparative research of civilizations, revolutions and modernization S. Eisenstaedt identified a number of features of this phenomenon: - the existence of a liberation ideal; - the fundamental nature of the causes; - violent nature of events; - a radical break with the past; - the totality of changes [21].

In our historical past this pure personality of the revolution appears during the revolutionary competitions of 1917-1922 in the Russian Empire and, to a greater extent, Western historiography deals with these events [22]. They are also perceived and, say, by scientists from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland and Finland, that is, in the imperial dimension (which is not considered humiliating). That is, the Russian Revolution of 1917 takes place. As a result of which these peoples gained independence, they got their chance and took advantage of it. Domestic historiography, in particular, the already mentioned works on typology, singled out Ukrainian events as an independent phenomenon. In this context, we recall the opinion of V. Soldatenko, who emphasized: "Exaggerated attention of researchers only to the phenomenon of the Ukrainian revolution, as a qualitatively higher stage of the national liberation movement, have led to the design of schemes in which the interconnections of revolutionary processes were being artificially disrupted, and in a purely national dimension the February and October revolutions are presented only as Russia's (that is, Russians) phenomena, and the last one is also for the Bolsheviks, which appears as a synonym for Russianness in many cases to which the Ukrainian revolution was, presumably, completely uninvolved". Further: "Without a high risk of mistaking, it can be argued that the potentials of the Ukrainian liberation movement in 1917 were clearly insufficient to hope for an explosion of a liberation revolution not only in this but also in subsequent years. It gives us the right to assume that the prospects of a rapid revolutionary breakdown in Ukraine without February were problematic ... it is of the utmost importance

to proceed from the assumption that the revolutionary events in Ukraine evolved not in isolation from all-Russian, first of all social, but mutually intertwined, merging with them, then moving in parallel courses, or something, coming in contradiction, multi-vector, antagonistic intransigence "[23].

However, the paradox is the fact that most of the domestic experts inevitably rushed to create myths from modern pseudo-revolutions events, while a true revolution that meets all the classic features remains unexplored and an overlooked area. This is about the revolution that took place in 1991, and as a result of which a new state emerged. And de facto and de jure the state economy was destroyed, all public institutions were canceled: morals, rights, property, and education, health care, a one-party system of political dispensation was replaced to a multi-party system. Obviously this series can be continued.

Certainly that the Soviet past has created a powerful myth about the phenomenon of the revolution, has made it as the value of the highest level it in the public consciousness (recall K. Marx and V. Lenin, who considered the revolution as the "locomotive of progress"), even a significant number of scientists are convinced that it is the only way to achieve new quality. What happened to progressives, supporters of slow, ongoing development, and enemies of decisive, revolutionary measures? In fact, today there are convincing studies that refute the myth of the modernizing significance of revolutions.

In fact, there are convincing studies today that refute the myth of the modernization significance of revolutions. It is the radical reform and not revolutions which is acceleration to development of the state in an unfriendly environment, when it is necessary to defend the independence or to catch up with someone or even overtake. For instance, the most effective has been the modernization in Russia in the days of Peter the Great, in Germany at the Iron Chancellery, in Japan during the events of Meiji Jidai under the emperor Mutsuhito. Neither the Russian Revolution of 1917 nor the German Revolution of 1918 succeeded in creating such a beneficial effect. Twenty years after the Great October Revolution failed to do what was accomplished during the Second World War, when the USSR was reformed into an industrial superpower.

Too often today we can find justification of bias, politicization, researcher populism as "revolutionary expediency", and even a statement that history is a subjective science. It would seem that any historical source, in its essence, is multidimensional, which allows the researcher to interpret historical material in accordance with his worldview, political preferences, moral guidance, and even beliefs. But it is unlikely that such a researcher can be regarded as a scientist and the knowledge obtained by him is scientific. That is why the professional historian is a priori source researcher, who, first of all, determines possibilities of the source, finds out the completeness, value, authenticity and other characteristics of the historical source. It is a source study, embracing a theory, methodology and technique of studying historical sources, makes history as an objective science.

It is also worth remembering such feature of this science, like any other - the story have been rewritten and would be rewritten in the future, because new information changes the whole picture of the past. But we should accept that it is in the very nature of new knowledge acquisition had the potential to inadequacy, fantasy of representations of reality. And everyday consciousness is there resides in captivity of myths. And only the criticality

of our mind, the knowledge testing for logic, coherence, the rejection of political bias and populism, allows us to get adequate knowledge about the world.

The Soviet era has become a story, as this is over for good it is time for opposition of creators of the Soviet myths and their followers. And there are potential opportunities for that. Though, this does not mean the replacement, transformation, reformulation of the already known historical myths. However, it is much easier to create myths than to work honestly and critically with historic sources by gaining objective knowledge, which is confirmed by the modern historiography of the Ukrainian Revolution, which is an active factor in the creation of a national consciousness. It remains for us to be hoped that the centennial celebration would become an opportunity not for populist events, at least for scientists, but the reason for objective and impartial research.

References

1. Levi-Stros, K. (2000) *Mifologiki: ot meda k peplu* : v 4 t. Moskva ; Sankt-Peterburg: Universitetskaya kniga. T. 1.
2. Kolev, A. N. (2003) *Politicheskaya mifologiya*. Moskva: Logos.
3. Biljan, P. Ja. (2001) *Istorioghrafija Ukrajinskoji revoljuciji 1917– pochatku 1918 rr.* // Avtoref. dys... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.06. Ljvivskij nac. un-t im. Ivana Franka. – Ljviv.
4. Kasjanov, Gh. V. (1999) *Teoriji naciji ta nacionalizmu: Monoghrafija*. Kyjiv: Lybidj.
5. NISBET, R. (1969) *SOCIAL CHANGE AND HISTORY: ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN THEORY OF DEVELOPMENT*. NEW-YORK: OXFORD UNIV. PRESS.
6. Armstrong, D. (1993) *Revolution and world order: The revolutionary state in international society*. Oxford: Clarendon press.
7. Budon, R. (1998) *Mesto besporyadka. Kritika teorii sotsialnogo izmeneniya*. Moskva: Aspekt Press.
8. Vallerstayn, I. (1997) «Sotsialnoe izmenenie vechno? Nichto nikogda ne izmenyaetsya?» // *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*. № 1.
9. Pipes, R. (1990). *The Russian Revolution 1899–1919*. London: Collins Harvill.
10. Pshevorskiy, A. (1999) *Demokratiya i rynek. Politicheskij i ekonomicheskij reformy v Vostochnoy Yevrope i Latin- skoy Amerike*. Moskva: ROSSPEN.
11. Khantington, S. (2003) *Tretya volna. Demokratizatsiya v kontse XX veka*. Moskva: ROSSPEN.
12. Skocpol, T. (1979) *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Holquist, P. (2002) *Making War, Forging Revolution. Russia's continuum of crisis, 1914–1921*. Cambridge, MA ; London : Harvard Univ. Press.
14. Sanborn, J. (2003) *Drafting the Russian Nation: Military Conscription, Total War, and Mass Politics, 1905–1925*. DeKalb : Northern Illinois Univ. Press.
15. Gomayunov, S. G. (1994) *Kompozitsionnyy metod v istoricheskom poznanii*. Moskva: Mgu.
16. Borodkin, L. I. (2003) «Poryadok iz khaosa»: kontseptsiya sinergetiki v metodologii istoricheskikh issledovaniy // *Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya*. № 2.
17. Figes, O. (2014) *A People's Tragedy. The Russian Revolution*. London : The Bodley Head.

18. Ghaj-Nyzhnyk, P. (2017) Periodyzacija politychnoji istoriji Ukrajinjy poch. XX st.: do naukovoji superechky shhodo vyznachennja terminu j khronologichnykh mezh Ukrajinjskoji revoljuciji ta Ukrajinjskoji derzhavnosti. [Elektronnyj resurs]. Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.hai-nyzhnyk.in.ua/doc/2017doc.periodyzaciya-istorii-ukrainy.php>.
19. Krestovsjka, N. M. (2017) Typologhija ukrajinskoji revoljuciji 1917-1921 rokiv. [Elektronnyj resurs]. Rezhym dostupu: <https://www.academia.edu/s/b7b081b025/typologhija-ukrajinskoji-revoljuciji-1917-1921-rokiv?source=news>.
20. Kuljchycjkyj, S. V. REVOLJUCIJI [Elektronnyj resurs]. Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Revoliutsiia>.
21. Eyzenshtadt, Sh. (1999) Revolyutsiya i preobrazovanie obshchestv: Sravnitelnoe izuchenie tsivilizatsiy. Moskva: Aspekt-Press.
22. Hobsbawm, E. J. (1986) Revolution // Revolution in History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. C. 5-46.
23. Soldatenko, V. (2011) Revoljucijna doba v Ukrajinj (1917–1920 roky): loghika piznannja, istorychni epizody, kljuchovi postati. Kyjiv: Parlamentsjke vydavnyct

Author's contact details: Volodymyr Kyrychenko, Doctor of Law, Professor, Professor of the Department of General Law of Kharkov National University of Internal Affairs, Prospect Lev Landau, 27, Kharkiv, Kharkivs'ka oblast, Ukraine, 61000, e-mail: xramovnik6999@gmail.com.