UDC 316.334.3
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30839/2072-7941.2019.165079

EUROPOCENTRYSM : THEORY, IDEOLOGY AND PRACTICE

© MYKOLA, KOZLOVETS
Zhytomyr State University named after Ivan Franko (Zhitomir, Ukraine)
E-mail: mykola.kozlovets@ukr.net, ORCID iD : 000-0002-5242-912X

Annotation. Topicality of the study of eurocentrism essence is caused by progressive globalization, the assertion of the systemic integrity of the world that highlites fundamentally new accent on the nature of the interaction of individual civilizations, leads to the unification of the civilizational process, its subordination to common principles and values. In philosophical and sociopolitical thought, the question of further orientations and development priorities of countries and peoples has recently become particularly acute. **Analysis of the literature.** We used the works of the authors, who began the study of this problem: Z. Bauman, Zb. Brzezinski, U. Beck, I. Wallerstein, V. Inozemtseva, S. Kara-Murza, M. Castells, Claude Levi-Strauss, I. Osinsky, A. Panarina, A. Toynbe, F. Fukuyama, S. Huntingtona, O. Spenglera and others, as well as the work of native scientists: Y. Afonina, V. Voronkova, A. Galchinsky, O. Gnatyuk, V. Gorbulina, L. Gubersky, O. Pakhlevskoy, Y. Pakhomova, S. Pirozhkova, M. Popovich, G. Shchekina. **Purpose of the article** – philosophical understanding of Eurocentrism as an ideological phenomenon and socio-political practice. **The objective of the study** is an analysis of the essence of the phenomenon of Eurocentrism, a description of its basic principles, a place in the life of Europe and in the world as a whole, the study of the peculiarities of the Ukrainian choice in modern conditions. **The methodology of the study** relies on an interdisciplinary approach, the principles of historicism and global evolutionism, the use of methods of analysis and synthesis, synergy to solve the complex problems of the dichotomy "we / they", "West-East" and their influence on the formation of a new world order. **The results of the study:** the article deals with the historiosophical basis of Eurocentrism, European universalism and European civilization. It reveals the methodological vulnerability and limited Western-centric interpretation and periodization of the historical process, reducing the diversity of past and future specific historical forms of its implementation to one of the possible. The idea of polycentricity, the existence of other models of social development (Orientalism, Eurasianism) is well grounded. In the context of new global trends of world development, each civilization is self-sufficient, distinctive in its originality and historical experience, and should develop through the self-knowledge of thenations inhabiting it and thereby fulfill its mission on the Earth. **The conclusions** of the study – progressive globalization and the formation of the systemic integrity of the world heighlight fundamentally new accents when it comes to the "unity of civilization", the interaction and interaction of different communities and cultures. The unity and integrity of human existence presupposes its diversity, the preservation of cultural identity and features of lifestyles, the mentality of nations and ethnic groups but not the subordination to a single model of civilizational being.

Key words: eurocentrism, eurasianism, orientalism, civilizational process, European civilization, ethnocentrism, globalization, dialogue of civilizations.

Problem solving in general and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks

Globalization at the present stage has become the main vector of development, the most important regularity of which is the formation of a single interdependent world, the

unification of the civilizational process, its subordination to common principles and values. Scientists, intellectuals and politicians are increasingly raising the problem of universalism, in which some researchers see Eurocentricism. Today, the concept of "Eurocentricism" has firmly entered the scientific discourse and political lexicon.

An analysis of recent researches and publications from which the author of the problem is based on the solution of this problem

The historiosophical foundations of Eurocentrism, European universalism and European civilization have been the subject of discourse by many Western thinkers, in particular, Z. Bauman, Zb. Brzezinski, U. Beck, F. Braudel, I. Wallerstein, G. Wilson, V. Havel, R. Dahrendorf, M. Castells, G. Kissinger, Claude Levi-Strauss, E.Rytner, M. Soares, A. Toynbe , E. Toffler, F. Fukuyama, S. Huntington, E. Hobsbaum, O. Spengler, K. Jaspers and others. The problems of pluralism and dialogue of civilizations with an attempt to justify the uniqueness of the Russian (Eurasian) civilization are being actively discussed in Russia, in particular, by such researchers as A. Aziezer, L. Grinin, A. Dugin, B. Yerasov, M. Ilyin, V. Inozemtsev, S. Karaganov, S. Kara-Murza, A. Neklessa, A. Panarin, I. Osinsky, V. Tishkov.

For Ukrainian researchers, the problem of Eurocentrism has only recently been themed in the works of E. Afonina, V. Voronkova, A. Galchinsky, O. Gnatyuk, V. Gorbulina, L. Gubersky, M. Mikhalchenko, Y. Pavlenka, O. Pakhlevskaya, Y. Pakhomova, S. Pirozhkova, M. Popovich, G. Schekina and others.

Presentation of the main research material with the discourse of the received scientific results

Attempts to determine the ideology of Eurocentrism were inseparable from attempts to draw the line between Europe and non-Europe. At a time prior to the new era, this border was like the Roman limes, between civilization and barbarians, primarily non-Christians were considered under the later. In the New Age, together with the conviction that Europe is a community based on the principles of freedom and respect for human rights, a sustained view emerged in the mass consciousness about dividing Europe into the "liberal" West and the autocratic East, to which Austria, Prussia and Russia were referred. In addition, there was a division into the newest West (above all, England, thanks to its rapid industrialization) and the backward East (in fact, all of Eastern Europe, together with Austria-Hungary).

In the 19th century, the division of the world into two mega-systems, to the West and the East, became more and more expressive, which is usually confirmed by a quote from the poem by Rudyard Kipling: "West is the West and East is the East and never the twain shall meet". As a result of the colonial conquests, the conviction about the superiority of "white" Europe over lower, "colored" Asia, which accompanied the sense of civilization mission inherited from the

pre-Modern era, intensified. The American culturologist E. Said shows that this belief was also inspired by the romanticists charmed with the East, which was called "Orientalism" [1].

At the turn of the XIX – XX centuries, the European spirit was formed, even if in the form of a vague sense of belonging to Europe, experienced as a community of traditions and values and a common future. The conviction that European civilization is above all others was not only preserved but even strengthened. For some, this superiority is associated with the universal value of those solutions to the fundamental problems of humanity that Europe has found; for others – supporters of social Darwinism – the superiority of European civilization follows primarily from its powerful strength, which testifies to its better adaptability to environmental conditions. Some give Europeans the right, even the duty to remake all human communities according to their own pattern and likeness, while others give the right to make lower nations work to enrich civilizations. Both the first and the second thus justify colonial European expansion, imperialism, which was practised especially in the early 80s of the XIX century.

After the war, the background for the discussion of a united (to a greater or lesser extent) Europe was "Other Europe", born after Yalta Conference. Such a definition became a kind of addition to the concept of a united Europe and strengthened the structure of thinking that had developed over many centuries, in which the division into the West as the quintessence of Europeanness and East as the embodiment of oriental features was initially important. In the mass consciousness, the West has come to mean everything progressive in the history of mankind, it has become a source of universal values, a benchmark and a model. Ignoring the cultural pluralism of modern societies, Eurocentric theorists proclaim Western culture to be unique. The stages of other civilizations development that do not fit into the concept of Eurocentrism are considered as "semi-barbaric", are recognized as "indigenous" with respect to the victorious chariot of Western society and are denied.

Due to the changes that took place in the 80–90s of the 20th century, the concept of a new Europe appeared. However, along with the hopes associated to the communism decline, the form of that new Europe among many people, including Europeans, creates certain fears. The latter are prompted by the belief in the distinctive character of the countries of Eastern Europe, they are credited with a special inclination towards "cave" nationalism, as well as a belief in the threat it poses to all of Europe. Thoughts about the consequences of European unification are also different: some consider that big nations benefit from it, and small suffer losses, others, on the contrary: they see a chance for small communities in European integration [3, p. 72-77].

Despite the discrepancies in some details regarding the special features of the Western premodern society, the positions of scientists regarding key

institutions, traditions and attitudes coincided. These fundamental principles of Eurocentrism were: The West, as a third-generation civilization, inherited much from previous civilizations, primarily from classical civilization (Greek philosophy and rationalism, Roman law, Latin and Christianity); Christianity (first Catholicism, then Catholicism and Protestantism) is historically the most important feature of Western civilization; among other civilizations, the West is distinguished by the diversity of its languages; separation of spiritual and secular power; rule of law and legislation; social pluralism; authorities representative bodies; individualism, traditions of individual rights and freedoms. The above list of features of Western civilization is by no means exhaustive, as it is not always and everywhere present in Western society. Taken separately, these concepts, practical approaches and institutions were inherent in other civilizations, but they dominated much more in the West. Although their combination was unique to the West, which gave it specific features. In addition, today they are largely the factors that allow the West to lead in its own modernization and modernization of the world [4, p. 76-80].

The logic of Eurocentrism, according to A. Galchinskiy, reduced itself to evaluation of civilizational development process exclusively through the prism of European standards. This very simplified, single-line methodological composition, in his opinion, is based on the following principles:

firstly, historiographical postulates that absolutise European achievements of the modernity epoch and focus attention on the fact that the achievement of relevant results was impossible for other nations;

secondly, the assertion of the universalism principle, which provides the existence of single-order truths that are valid always and everywhere. Based on this principle, attempts are being made to present the historical path of the Western world as a universal model;

thirdly, one-sided interpretation of the logic of civilization development, attempts to present Europe as a single personification of such a development, a unique carrier of general civilizational values. In accordance with this, the perception of European standards is identified with the affirmation of civilization;

fourthly, Orientalism logic emanating from the fact that the states that are now at the early stages of development, not only can, but will certainly come to the point where they will become copies of those states that are currently considered advanced. In accordance with this logic, standard recommendations for all countries are formulated - the so-called "development matrices", or, as it is now fashionable to say, "road maps" regarding the mechanisms of "catch-up step-by-step modernization unified in their principles", which is implemented under the patronage of the "older" in its rank of states and their international institutions under their control;

fifthly, the monopolization of the social progress idea, its identification again with purely European values

and the interpretation of Eurocentrism not only as an analytic, but also ascribed (externally imposed) concept [5, p. 102-103].

Thus, according to the concept of Europocentrism, the West is the only civilization that has passed through its development the "right" path (the "high way") that other cultures and civilizations must inevitably go through. This is despite the fact that Western civilization was born only in the VIII – IX centuries, whereas, let us say, the Sintian (Chinese) – in the I – II millennium BC. Indian civilization has the same age. It should be noted that today the growing confidence of the South-East Asia countries has given impetus to the new Asian universalism, which can be compared with what was characteristic of the West. "Asian values are universal values. European values are values only of Europe itself". Asia should transfer Asian values to the rest of the world, export the social system of Asia and in particular East Asia; it is necessary to promote "Pacific globalism", "globalize Asia" and, thus, "resolutely form a qualitatively new world order".

It should be noted that Eurocentrism, although close, but can not be reduced to a form of ethnocentrism, which is free of any nation. If ethnocentrism as a mechanism of interethnic perception is the tendency to evaluate the phenomena of the surrounding world through the prism of the traditions and norms of its ethnic group, which is considered as a kind of universal standard [6, p. 1279], then the ideology of Eurocentrism claims to universalism and asserts that all nations and cultures go the same way and differ from each other only in stages of development. When a country is at a crossroads and determines the path of its further development, politicians, imbued with the ideology of Eurocentrism, argue that the answer to this question exists, it was given by Europe: "Follow the West - this is the best of all possible worlds." Therefore: "To achieve success, you have to be like us, our path is the only possible one". The result of this path is that humanity will acquire the same economic system and social structure: Western type.

Eurocentrism as an ideological formation, according to the Russian scientist S. Kara-Murza, contains several myths in its structure. The first myth is the myth of the Christianization of the West as the matrix that defined the social order, the type of rationality and the culture of the Western world as a whole. Depending on the historical conjuncture, this myth was presented in different variations, or muted at all. It should be noted that the current stage of Eurocentrism is characterized by an internal contradictory interpretation of the Christian myth. On the one hand, the need for consolidating myths has increased, but on the other hand, the very type of modern civilization, its ethics, value system and other components of the myth are increasingly incompatible with the tenets of Christianity.

The second myth is the legend created by "laboratory method" ad verbum, it says that modern Western civilization is a product of the progressive development of antiquity – the cradle of civilization. This

legend is appropriately embodied in all major historical sights, in particular, in the socio-economic sphere as the history of the "right" change of socio-economic formations and the continuity of progress, in the continuity of cultural evolution, etc. One of the assertions of Eurocentricism is that it was Western civilization that created the culture (philosophy, law, science and technology), which today dominates the world and determines the life of humanity, that it was the West that was originally the generator of technology for the whole world.

The third myth about an economic person – *homo economicus*, who created a market economy and is happy to live in it. Created by Eurocentricism, this anthropological model legitimized the destruction of traditional society and the establishment of a new, specific economic and social order in which labor power becomes a commodity and each person turns into a merchant.

The fourth is the myth of development through imitation of the West. Western civilization took the lead due to the fact that capitalism created powerful productive forces based on rational political economy. The rest of the society has lagged behind in its development and is now forced to catch up with the Western countries. The West will help those who obey the "teachers" – and finally, the Anglo-Saxon model of liberal capitalism will be established (has already been established) and the "end of history" (F. Fukuyama) will come (has already come). At the same time, this myth is exploited the more intensively, the more vivid and obvious the impossibility of its implementation becomes [7, p. 15-63].

Francis Fukuyama even wrote a book about the end of history. Like, we see "not just the end of the Cold War or the next period of post-war history, but the end of history as such, the end of the ideological evolution of humanity and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of government." In the opinion of the futurologist, "... democratic rule escaped from its original bridgehead in Western Europe and North America and advanced deeply into other parts of the world, different from those mentioned by political, cultural and religious traditions" [8, p. 95-96]. And if any excesses occure somewhere on the periphery of civilization, they are fast-moving. He believes that, perhaps, only China has at least some chance of formulating its own model of modernity, but even here, as Chinese society becomes richer, pressure in favor of openness and pluralism will increase.

It should be noted that even the political realities of the beginning of XXI were unable to convince F. Fukuyama. In his recent work, the scientist continues to defend the former position. Thus, in his article in Australian, he states: "We remain at the end of history, because there remains only one system that continues to dominate world politics, the system of the liberal-democratic West" [9].

The current definitions of the stages of the general civilization process, its division into preindustrial, industrial, and postindustrial civilizations relate primarily to the

characteristics of the western civilization stages. The universality of these stages is rather provisory, if not more. In fact, as Arnold Joseph Toynbe noted, the point is that "Western civilization threw the net of its economic system onto the whole world, and economic unification caused a political unification on the same basis, which went too far" [10, p. 47].

Such logic, by Toynbe's definition, is built on the rather contradictory assumption that "there is only one stream of civilization – our own, and all others either fall out of it, or are lost in the desert sands". The second contradiction is associated with the illusory notions of social progress "as a movement in a straight line", in which the specific features of a single civilization, its own energy potential are leveled. "Thus" the scientist states, "we can conclude that humanity cannot achieve political and spiritual unity, moving only along the western path" [10, p. 48].

One of the prominent representatives of structuralism Claude Levi-Strauss, criticizing the ideology of Eurocentrism, wrote: "It's hard to imagine how one civilization could take advantage of the way of life of another, except to refuse to stop being itself. In fact, attempts at such a reorganization can lead to two results: either disorganization and the collapse of one system – or the original synthesis, which, however, leads to the emergence of a third system that cannot be reduced to two others" [11, p. 335]. We see this kind of synthesis in Russia and Japan. And further: "No, there can be no world civilization in the abstract sense that is often attached to this expression, since civilization presupposes the coexistence of cultures exhibiting great diversity; one could even say that civilization consists in this coexistence. World civilization could not be anything other than a coalition of cultures on a world scale, each of which would retain its originality... The sacred duty of humanity is to protect themselves from blind particularism, inclined to attribute the status of humanity to one race, culture or society, and never forget that no part of humanity has any formulas that can be applied to the whole, and humanity that would plunge into a single image life immeasurable" [11, p. 338].

These reflections by Claude Levi-Strauss make it possible to realize the methodological vulnerability of the principles of Eurocentrism in the research of the historical process. Within the concept of a single Western (European) civilization, a false interpretation of social progress emerged as a system of initially universal impulses acting in any cultural environment. As a result, the problem of civilizational choice "ceased to exist": all nations have one way, all are constantly drawn up by the escalator of progress with a predetermined future. And if before the victorious spread of Western values was hampered by the communist ideology, after its defeat nothing can stand in the way of the westernization of the world. Such a conclusion is based on a simplified view that liberal democracy is the only alternative to communism. Meanwhile, there are many other models of social development, for

example, various forms of nationalism, authoritarianism, market socialism, corporatism, and finally, we should not forget about religious alternatives.

The concept of a universal civilization in its Eurocentrist interpretation has become, in society, a tool to justify the superiority of the West over other societies, its attempts to force these societies to copy Western traditions and institutions. Samuel Huntington writes that the concept of universalization has been perceived in the world as a "purely Western product". And the resistance to it has appropriate grounds. Non-Western societies consider everything to be Western that the West considers to be universal – this is the essence of the problem that predetermined the expected result in the end: the "expansion of the West" ended, and the "revolt against the West" began [4, p. 54]. The peculiarity of the current situation is that the West still looks at the world from its own, so to speak, egocentric point of view, while other cultures overcame this long ago. This too narrow Eurocentric perspective on politics is in conflict with the constantly expanding in space and time political horizon in the context of globalization. Another paradox of modern history was that the overcoming of such an egocentric view of the modern world happened mainly not in developed countries, but in the environs of the earthly ecumene. Islamic, Far Eastern and Hindu cultures experienced a great "shock" caused by the powerful all-penetrating "exposure" of Western civilization, as a result of which they changed their egocentric view of the world.

The West continues to enjoy the self-assured illusion of "Eurocentrism", which for two and a half centuries has been nourished by the successes of Western civilization. However, sooner or later it will have to abandon the "pure" Eurocentrism and reorient the political worldview, enter into a dialogue with other types of human communities. The processes that unfold in the modern globalized world naturally lead to this. The cultural aggression of the West has given rise to a powerful de-westernization of other civilizations, which are returning to their own origins. Virtually before our eyes we observe "re-Islamization" of the Middle East, "Hinduisation" of India, a "return to Asia" of Japan, not to mention the Confucian culture of China. In Islamic, Confucian, Buddhist, and Hindu cultures, the basic Western ideas of individualism, freedom, separation of church from state, equality, human rights, and liberalism have little support. Moreover, the propaganda of these ideas provokes a hostile reaction against the "imperialism of human rights" and leads to the strengthening of the traditional values of the autochthonous culture [4, p. 80-88].

Contrary to this, the West does not hide, but sincerely believes in its world-historic mission to promote democratic values at all latitudes of the planet. The elite of Western society has put a sign of identity between their own Western Christian in origin, liberal in content and democratic in form values and universal values. They live and act

according to the principle: "What is good for the West is good for humanity", refusing to take note of the simple fact that ethnic groups and peoples are different, that they belong to different cultures and that these cultures, whereas, are at different stages of development. By the way, today the Europeans themselves are experiencing serious problems. Here we speak about Brexit, and a certain conflict between Italy and France, the events in France itself, the separatist tendencies in Spain, in particular in Catalonia, the problems of refugees and migrants.

Paris Statement, entitled "Europe we can believe in", signed by 13 famous European intellectuals, notes that today Europe, in all its richness and greatness, is threatened by a false understanding of itself. Europe is in a very dangerous state, as it is in the thrall of a false understanding of itself and its history: "The patrons of the false Europe are bewitched by superstitions of inevitable progress. They believe that History is on their side, and this faith makes them haughty and disdainful, unable to acknowledge the defects in the post-national, post-cultural world they are constructing" [12]. The false Europe praises itself as the forerunner of a universal community that is neither universal nor a community.

The authors of the Statement call for the defense of true Europe. True Europe is not an empire, not a forced unity, but a community of nation states. The European society is deeply bogged down in "individualism, isolation and aimlessness (aimlessness, Ziellosigkeit)". In modern Europe, a technocratic formula is imposed: "there is no alternative" to the policy pursued by EU officials. This is an example of a soft but increasingly real tyranny [12]. The Paris Declaration once again actualizes the most important questions about the nature and values of the European tradition. What should be the future of European civilization? In this context, the well-known sociologist Z. Bauman notes that the specter of the absence of an alternative wanders through Europe. Of course, it is not new, but its context is qualitatively different: a globalized world [13].

The article-letter "For the European Renaissance", published in 28 major European newspapers, the French president's Emmanuel Macron has called on the "citizens of Europe" to help build a more united EU and to defeat threats that mean the bloc "has never been so much in danger". "We are at a decisive moment for our continent," he wrote. He said : "A moment where, collectively, we should reinvent – politically and culturally – the shape of our civilization in a world that is being transformed. It is time for the European renaissance". The French president's has stepped up calls for a more united EU, laying out a series of proposals for a "European renaissance". Mr Macron’s latest Europe initiative falls into three main areas: defending liberty and electoral democracy; protecting the continent with joint defence programmes and stronger borders to control the flow of migrants that has boosted anti-immigration parties; and reforming EU policies and rules on everything

from industrial competition to the environment [14].

It is believed that the current crisis of Western civilization is associated primarily with the exhaustion of the spiritual resource of the very type of civilization, with the feeling (and sometimes understanding) of the fundamental fallacy of some key ideas that lie at its base. This crisis of identity, the clash of the ideas of a man of Western civilization about themselves, about the structure of the world, about the culture that lies at its base, is manifested with new force in the era of globalism. Man realized a number of such contradictions, which in principle cannot be resolved in the near future within the structures of industrial civilization. Arab economist and sociologist Samir Amin in the book "Eurocentrism as an ideology: a critical analysis" emphasizis: "Liberal utopia and its miracle recipe (market + democracy) are just a collection of pale cliches within the dominant views in the West. Their success in the media in itself does not give them any scientific value, but speaks only about the depth of the crisis of Western thought" [*quote*: 4, p. 10].

Ultimately, the statement that all cultures should adopt a specific pattern of production, distribution, and life in general, generated by the Western world, reflects technomorphic thinking. The conviction that humanity, as a machine, should be built according to the best design, opposes another long-standing idea that humanity, like any ecosystem, is alive and stable as long as a sufficient diversity of cultures and civilizations is maintained. Today we are witnessing the destruction under the slogans of the Eurocentrism of that civilization, which was formed in Russia – the USSR and by its nature is unique and distinctive. Claude Levi-Strauss, already mentioned by us, warned that every civilization that has survived in the world after all wars and colonial destruction is necessary for mankind: "And if in some aspect it seems frozen or even regressing, it does not mean that from any point of view it is not the center of important changes" [11, p. 332].

When questioning the correctness of Eurocentrism principle, we should note that their implementation, as becoming more and more obvious, does not expand, but vice versa – narrows the possibilities of humanity, does not detract, but vice versa – deepens the contradictions of the modern world. Clearly, it is a mistake to underestimate, especially deny the unique achievements of Europe, their global significance. At the same time, it is necessary to take into account the specificity of Europe, like any other region. When it comes to the "clash of civilizations", one should realize that its main driving force is not progressive in its content formation of general civilizational principles of social development, which is affirmed on the basis of the principles of self-development of the individual, but attempts to artificial and, moreover, force unification.

It is the principle of "force unification" of civilizational development in accordance with “Western standards”, rather than convergence with the principles of natural history development, that causes resistance by non-Western

civilizations, which acquired antagonistic forms at the end of the 20th – early 21st centuries. and is further aggravating. The global crisis has undermined confidence not only in foreign economic schemes, but also in Western economic models. General attention was attracted by alternative ways of modernization and national success, the experience of China, India, Japan, South Korea, and the countries of Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia). The paradigm that is being formed can be called real multipolarity, and not only in the sense of a plurality of political "centers of power", but also in terms of development models.

Modern globalization and its antiphases not only "accelerate" time, but often, paradoxically, "slow it down". Firstly, we can observe a clearly growing gap between those countries that have adapted to the accelerated rhythm of historical time and even become the "locomotives" of a certain development trajectory (for example, the notorious "golden billion"), and those for which time slows down, that have serious brakes and, most importantly, "Growth limits". Secondly, the specific dispersion of political time affects: along with the global "axial" time, the types of "local time" multiply, so to speak, in which people really live and which limit many politicians and communities [15, p. 120].

In the context of our study, taking into account the latter circumstance is of a fundamental importance, emphasizing the limitations of Western-centric interpretations and periodizations of globalization, which reduce the diversity of past and future specific historical forms of the implementation of this tendency to one of the possible. These, in particular, are all the concepts of globalization, which link its beginning with the formation and development of European capitalism of the XVII – XIX centuries and accompanying development of science and technology, market relations, the formation of national states, the imperial breakthrough of which led to the formation of a capitalist "world system" and the subsequent westernization of the world. Namely Westernization, according to the authors of these concepts, is the only real and possible form of globalization of humanity in the past and outlined future.

The interpretation of globalization as a westernization, of course, is in good agreement with a large array of historical facts from the late XIX - mid XX centuries. However, in a longer historical perspective and retrospective, it cannot be considered acceptable, since it is based on two rather controversial hypotheses: the idea of a consistent single-vector shift of the "center" of world development from East to West and the ideas of a "unipolar world" divided into economically, scientifically, technically, politically, politically and culturally dominant "Center" (West) and "catching-up periphery" (East), which is trying hard to integrate into it. These ideas, in their turn, are based on predictions about the linear character of historical development, originate from the particular tradition of European thinking that emerged in the 17th and 19th centuries, that got in the 70s – 80s of the 20th century in

the works of Arab-Muslim, Indian, Chinese and other non-European historians and culturologists the name "Orientalism" [16, p. 9].

This characteristic for the whole European culture and, as many scientists believe, still not overcome tradition of the binary, cultural-evaluative opposition of the "energetic", "free" and "civilized" West to the "lazy", "drowsy" (sleepy) and "slave" East was stimulated and supported by a two-hundred-year practice of colonial development of the countries of Asia, Africa and part of America by the leading European empires. In the course of this, the "European identity" of the white man, the idea of his "burden", "civilization mission", was formed, which was ultimately based on the idea of racial superiority. The original geographical distribution of the world turned into geopolitical, overgrown with cultural meanings and, penetrating first into European historiography and historiography, and then into anthropology, ethnology, psychology, turned the Orientalist (West-centric) approach to the study of other nations and civilizations into self-sufficient. The researchers believe that specificity of Orientalism involves the fact that the West has always dealt not with the East or with Asia as such, but with essentially "secondary images of the East and Asia" – the system of their representations (represented in poetry, literature and academic studies) which the West created for their own needs [16, p. 78-114].

In solidarity with this observation, we note that "East" has always had and is not dealing with the West "as such", but with its numerous representations, within which, especially in recent years, the West is not estimated in the best way. Therefore, paying tribute to the research of Orientalist scientists, the results of which have enriched science with new facts and generalizations, one should not go to the other extreme – to "occidentalism" (occidentalism is the reverse side of orientalism, attributing to the West features that seem to be not characteristic of highly spiritual and collectivist oriental cultures), which shifts the "center" of the past (and present) global development from Europe to Asia. "White" mythologies are no better than "yellow" ones, and "East-centrism" and "Asian-Centrism" are not better than "Eurocentrism". Removing one-sidedness and civilizational "engagement" of the discourse on globalization, it is more convincing to rely on the whole array of historical knowledge, indicating that the "center" and "periphery" were constantly changing places. Even Eurasia has never been a "one-way street", which inevitably led to its unification on the basis of any single type of economic, socio-cultural and political development. History is not a linear process, but the result of interaction, competition and struggle of numerous individual and collective subjects of historical development: politicians, societies, states and civilizations. Accordingly, globalization, as one of its tendencies, is the resultant of many attempts to organize a single space for the common life of nations and states on the basis of "different" civilizational (sociocultural) and political models. The result of such attempts was the

dominance and spread within several geographical regions of one of the local civilizations, the political form of which in most cases was the "empire" [17, p. 10].

The distinction between the East and the West is also clearly visible in the values of social order. If in the West everything is focused on the individual, then in the East cultures are more inclined towards well-ordered communities. The key principles of the East are not individual rights, but social obligations (in relation to a wide range of common benefits and various members of society); not freedom, but submission to the highest goal and authority, religious or secular; instead of maximizing wealth – serving one or more gods or general ideas defined by a secular state. The normative position defended by the East can be called "authoritarian communalization". These values of social order are laid in the foundations of the Chinese-Confucian and Arab-Islamic civilization, as well as in many philosophical and religious teachings of the East.

For many countries, especially the Islamic world, the civilizational expansion of the Western world led by the United States has become, to some extent, an analogue of civilizational terrorism as upholding its national-cultural priorities. Analysts agree that globalization is rapidly acquiring the character of competition among civilizations (here we use the generalized concept of "civilization", without claiming to theoretical distinguish between culture and civilization), since the uncivilized nations also entered this orbit, taking up the challenge of accelerating the introduction of technological modernization. Not only economic, but also cultural and ideological differences are actualized, this is of a paramount importance for the consolidation of nations and people. This factor has become so significant due to the objective reasons for the colonial reforms of modernization following the pattern and escalation of Western values.

Another position, directly opposite to Western exclusivity, is of the opinion that the whole non-Western world is governed either by religious fundamentalism, or by a combination of others that are incompatible with Western values, which in the end will inevitably cause a clash of these opposite civilizations. Supporters of this view are, as known, S. Huntington and B. Lewis [11; 12]. According to S. Huntington: "... Western ideas of personality, liberalism, human rights, dignity, freedom, law and order, democracy, free market, separation of church and state often do not find a response in Islamic, Confucian, Japanese, Hindu, Buddhist or Orthodox cultures" [18, с. 51]. Both points of view suggest that non-Western nations have almost nothing to contribute to the global development of the political and economic institutions and values that they embody. In the context of globalization, in almost all countries of the world there is growing opposition to the erosion of sociocultural differences, it is being researched to find ways to overcome development based on mono-civilizational principles that allow sociocultural heterogeneity to flourish

and which at the same time would not lead to a "clash of civilizations" in the future [19]. In contrast to the attempts to establish a unipolar world with a center in the United States, multipolarity is being established (China, Western Europe, the Islamic world and the Asian region).

Analyzing Ukraine's historical search for a choice between Europe and Russia, we can draw a paradoxical conclusion: at the level of ideological formations and preferences, the choice is most often made in favor of Europe, and in political practice, due to circumstances, Ukraine has always been in the "arms" of Russia. Today, Ukraine again faces the problem of choice, but in a new capacity – as an independent state. Without a doubt, the vector of Ukrainian development with necessity and inevitability should be directed to Europe. World development leaves Ukraine less and less time to realize that a full-fledged "inclusion" in the European integration processes has no alternatives. Unfortunately, the Ukrainians, intuitively feeling their place in the community of European nations, were not ready for a proper comprehension of the phenomenon of Europeanness. The coming years will become a definite test, whether Ukraine will be able to overcome the gap towards Europe and take its rightful place among other European nations, to move to an innovative development model. The national development strategy is the strategy of synchronization of the processes of national self-affirmation and the integration of Ukraine into Europe. The goal of European integration, with all its positives and negatives, is one of the most significant incentives for transformation, modernization and going on for an effective European political and socio-economic model.

Conclusions and practical recommendations

Thus, the progressing globalization along with the assertion of the systemic integrity of the world place fundamentally new accents when it comes to the "unity of civilization", interaction and mutual influence of different communities and cultures. The unity and integrity of human existence presupposes its diversity, the preservation of cultural identity and features of lifestyles, the mentality of nations and ethnic groups, but not their subordination to some single pattern of civilizational being. Insisting on the priority of unity, one must not forget about the diversity of the world, which is no less valuable.

References

1. Said, E. V. (2001). Orientalizm [Orientalism]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Solomiyi Pavlychko "Osnovy", 512.

2. Pomyn, P. (2001). Yevropa ta natsiyi. Lviv: Kamenyar, 169.

3. Hnatyuk, O. (2005). Proshchannya z imperiyeyu: Ukrainski dyskusiyi pro identychnist Kyiv: Krytyka, 528.

4. Hantinhton, S. P. (2006). Protystoyannya tsyvilizatsiy ta zmina svitivoho poryadku. Lviv: Kalvariya, 474.

5. Halchynskyj, A. (2006). Hlobalni transformatsiyi: kontseptualni alternatyvy. Metodolohichni aspekty. Kyiv: Lybid, 312.

6. Naumenko, L. Y.; Grytsanov, A. A. (Ed.) (2001). Etnotsentryzm. Vsemyrnaya entsyklopediya: Filosofiya. Moscow: AST, MN.: Kharvest, Sovremenniy literator, 1279–1280.

7. Kara-Murza, S. G. (2002). Evropotsentryzm – edipov kompleks intelligentsy. Moscow: Algorytm, 256.

8. Fukuyama, F. (2005). Konets istorii ili posledniy chelovek. Moscow: AST: Yermak, 588.

9. Fukuyama, F. (2001). History beyond the end. Australian.

10. Toynbi, A. (1995). Dzh. Doslidzhennya istoriyi. Vol. I. Kyiv: Osnovy, 815.

11. Levi-Strauss, C. (1990). Antropologia structural: Mito, sociedad, humanidades. Mexico: Siglo XXI Eds.

12. A Europe we can believe in. The Paris Statement. Available at: https://thetrueeurope.eu/a-europe-we-can-believe-in

13. Bauman, Z., Donskís, L. (2017). Plinne zlo. Zhittya bez al'ternativi [Flood is evil. Life is not an alternative]. Kyiv: Dukh i Lítera, 2016.

14. Macron, E. Article-letter "For the European Renaissance". Financial Times. Available at: https://www.google.com.ua/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwiY2r2s_vTgAhW56KYKHc7eBuoQFjAAegQIBBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ft.com%2Fcontent%2Fbb07cca4-3e93-11e9-b896-fe36ec32aece&usg=AOvVaw2JJhXOX5it45BFAqMgIcnD

15. Melvyl, A. (2007). Prostranstvo i vremya v mirovoy politike. Kosmopolis, 2 (18), 117–122.

16. Said, V. (2006). Orientalizm. Zapadnye kontseptsii Vostoka. Sankt-Peterburg, 9.

17. Granin, Y. (2008). "Globalizatsiya" ili "vesternizatsiya"? Voprosy filosofiyi, 2, 3–15.

18. Hantington, S. (2003). Stolknoveniye tsyvilizatsiy. Moscow: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST», 603.

19. Pakhomov, Y. N., Krymskiy, S. B., Pavlenko, Y. V. et. al.; Pakhomov, Y. N. (Ed.) (2002). Tsyvilizatsionnye modeli sovremennosti i ikh istoricheskiye korni. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 632.

КОЗЛОВЕЦЬ, М. А. – доктор філософських наук, професор, професор кафедри філософії Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка (м. Житомир, Україна).

E-mail: mykola.kozlovets@ukr.net, ORCID : 000-0002-5242-912X

ЄВРОПОЦЕНТРИЗМ : ІДЕОЛОГІЯ, ТЕОРІЯ І ПРАКТИКА

Анотація. Актуальність дослідження сутності європоцентризму зумовлена прогресуючою глобалізацією, утвердженям системної цілісності світу, що розставляє принципово нові акценти на характер взаємодії окремих цивілізацій. У філософській й суспільно-політичній думці останнім часом особливої гостроти набуває питання подальших орієнтирів і пріоритетів розвитку країн і народів. **Аналіз літератури.** Використані праці авторів, в яких розпочато дослідження цієї проблеми: З. Баумана, З. Бжезинського, У. Бека, И. Валлерстайна, С. Гантингтона, В. Іноземцева, С. Кара-Мурзи, М. Кастельса, К. Леві-Стросса, І. Осинського, О. Панарина, А. Тойнбі, Ф. Фукуями, О. Шпенглера та інших, а також праці вітчизняних науковців Е. Афоніна, В. Воронкової, А. Гальчинського, О. Гнатюк, В. Горбуліна, Л. Губерського, О. Пахльовської, Ю. Пахомова, С. Пирожкова, М. Поповича, Г. Щьокіна. **Мета статті** – філософське осмислення європоцентризму як ідеологічного феномену і суспільно-політичної практики. **Завданням дослідження є** аналіз сутності феномена європоцентризму, характеристика його основних принципів, ролі в житті Європи і в світі загалом, вивчення особливостей українського выбору в сучасних умовах.

Методологія дослідження спирається на міждисциплінарний підхід, принципи історизму і глобального еволюціонізму, використання методів аналізу і синтезу, синергетики для вирішення складних проблем дихотомії "ми / вони", "Захід – Схід" та їх вливу на формування нового світового порядку. **Результати дослідження:** у статті розглянуто історіософські засади європоцентризму, європейського універсалізму і європейської цивілізації. Розкривається методологічна вразливість й обмеженість західноцентричної інтерпретації та періодизації історичного процесу, які редукують різноманітність минулих і майбутніх конкретно-історичних форм його здійснення до однієї з можливих. Обґрунтовується ідея поліцентризму, існування інших моделей суспільного розвитку (орієнталізм, євразійство). В умовах нових глобальних тенденцій світового розвитку кожна цивілізація є самодостатньою, вирізняється своєрідністю й історичним досвідом і повинна розвиватися через самопізнання народів, які її населяють**. Висновки** дослідження полягають у тому, що прогресуюча глобалізація, формування системної цілісності світу розставляють принципово нові акценти, коли йдеться про "єдність цивілізації", взаємодію та взаємовплив різних спільнот, культур. Єдність і цілісність людського буття передбачає і його різноманіття, збереження культурної самобутності й особливостей способів життя, ментальності народів й етносів, а не підпорядкування їх єдиній моделі цивілізаційного буття.

Ключові слова: європоцентризм, неоєвразійство, орієнталізм, цивілізаційний процес, європейська цивілізація, етноцентризм, глобалізація, діалог цивілізацій.

КОЗЛОВЕЦ, Н. А. – доктор философских наук, профессор, профессор кафедры философии Житомирского государственного университета имени Ивана Франко (г. Житомир, Украина).

E-mail: mykola.kozlovets@ukr.net, ORCID : 000-0002-5242-912X

ЕВРОПОЦЕНТРИЗМ : ИДЕОЛОГИЯ, ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Аннотация. Актуальность исследования сутности европоцентризма обусловлена прогрессирующей глобализацией, утверждением системной целостности мира, что расставляет принципиально новые акценты на характер взаимодействия отдельных цивилизаций, ведет к унификации цивилизационного процесса. В философской и общественно-политической мысли в последнее время особую остроту приобретает вопрос дальнейших ориентиров и приоритетов развития стран и народов. **Анализ литературы.** Использованы работы авторов, в которых начато исследование данной проблемы: З. Баумана, З. Бжезинского, У. Бека, И. Валлерстайна, В. Иноземцева, С. Кара-Мурзы, М. Кастельса, К. Леви-Стросса, И. Осинского, А. Панарина, А. Тойнби, Ф. Фукуями, С. Хантингтона, О. Шпенглера и других, а также работы отечественных ученых Є. Афонина, В. Воронковой, А. Гальчинского, О. Гнатюк, В. Горбулина, Л. Губерского, О. Пахлевской, Ю. Пахомова, С. Пирожкова, М. Поповича, Г. Щёкина. **Цель статьи** – философское осмысление европоцентризма как идеологического феномена и общественно-политической практики. **Задачей исследования** является анализ сущности феномена европоцентризма, характеристика его основных принципов, места в жизни Европы и в мире в целом, изучение особенностей украинского выбора в современных условиях. **Методология исследования** опирается на междисциплинарний подход, принципы историзма и глобального эволюционизма, применение методов анализа и синтеза, синергетики для решения сложных проблем дихотомии "мы / они", "Запад – Восток" и их влияния на формирование нового мирового порядка**. Результаты исследования:** в статье рассмотрены историософские основы европоцентризма, европейского универсализма и европейской цивилизации. Раскрывается методологическая уязвимость и ограниченность западноцентрической интерпретации и периодизации исторического процесса, редуцирующих разнообразие прошлых и будущих конкретно-исторических форм его осуществления к одной из возможных.

Обосновывается идея полицентризма, существование других моделей общественного развития (ориентализм, евразийство). В условиях новых глобальных тенденций мирового развития каждая цивилизация самодостаточная, отличается своеобразием и историческим опытом и должна развиваться через самопознание населяющих её народов. **Выводы** исследования состоят в том, что прогрессирующая глобализация, формирование системной целостности мира расставляют принципиально новые акценты, когда речь идет о "единстве цивилизации", взаимодействии и взаимовлиянии разных общностей, культур. Единство и целостность человеческого бытия предполагает и его многообразие, сохранение культурной самобытности и особенностей образов жизни, ментальности народов и этносов, а не подчинение их некоему единой модели цивилизационного бытия.

Ключевые слова: европоцентризм, неоевразийство, ориентализм, цивилизационный процесс, европейская цивилизация, этноцентризм, глобализация, диалог цивилизаций.

Стаття рекомендована до публікації д. філософ. н., проф. В. Г. Воронковою (Запоріжжя, Україна)

Надійшла до редколегії: 03.03.2019 р.
Прийнята до друку: 13.03.2019 р.