

VOLOKH O. (Ukrainian Engineering and Pedagogical Academy)

CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF CONSERVATIVE RENAISSANCE IN EUROPE (the origins of the European conservatism origins in the context of civilizational confrontation and formation)

The article deals with the insufficiently explored factors of occurrence and the development of European conservative ideology in cultural and historical aspects. Very important for understanding the principles of conservative ideological and value components of the paradigm of traditional spiritual and mental organization of European ethnic groups were gotten the cultural and philosophical coverage.

Keywords: conservatism, liberal project, «abstract» - «true» property alienation.

Волох О. КУЛЬТУРНО-ІСТОРИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ КОНСЕРВАТИВНОГО РЕНЕСАНСУ В ЄВРОПІ У статті розглянуті у культурно-історичному аспекті маловивчені фактори виникнення і розвитку європейської консервативної ідеології. Дістали культурофілософського висвітлення вельми важливі для розуміння засад консервативної ідейно-ціннісної парадигми складові традиційної духовно-ментальної організації європейських етносів.

Ключові слова: консерватизм, ліберальний проект, «абстрактна»-«справжня» власність, відчуження.

Волох О. КУЛЬТУРНО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ КОНСЕРВАТИВНОГО РЕНЕСАНСА В ЕВРОПЕ В статье рассмотрены в культурно-историческом аспекте малоизученные факторы возникновения и развития европейской консервативной идеологии. Получили культурфилософское освещение весьма важные для понимания основ консервативной идейно-ценностной парадигмы составляющие традиционной духовно-ментальной организации европейских этносов.

Ключевые слова: консерватизм, либеральный проект, «абстрактная»-«настоящая» собственность, отчуждение.

The middle of the second decade of the twenty-first century reflected by the exacerbation of inter-civilizational confrontation and intensified struggle between rival ideologies. The influence of various ideological and traditionalist currents of radical character has notably increased. The problem of non-acceptance the so-called values of a united Europe, the theory and practice of creating multicultural environment based on the absolutization of the market relations of the liberal and globalistic progressivism by ideologists of the European neo-conservatism has acquired an acuteness. Paradoxically, The European «New Right» even coalesce with the Left and tend to support the current political governance of Russia in its conflict with the EU in their hostile attitude to the values eurointegral paradigm. In modern Ukraine, by contrast, the most ardent supporters of European integration are the most conservative representatives of national and radical ideology. Finally, the role and significance of conservative and ideological discourse in Europe at the beginning of the XXI century has extremely increased. We can talk about

real neoconservative renaissance that actualizes the problem of scientific and philosophical understanding of conservative ideology itself, including the context of understanding the traditional, historically rooted in the spiritual and mental organization of many European ethnicities of archetypes in the attitude to money, land, property itself, etc. Indeed, the ideological construction should be considered from the very origins in particular from the typical for conservatism on the one side and for liberalism from the other side, manner of relating to the sensitive concrete reality of the space. These two types are clearly demonstrated in a famous essay by K. Mannheim «The conservative thought». Mannheim relies on the concept of possessions «the specific nature of the conservative concrete is nowhere so clearly manifested as in the concept of possessions, which is different from the usual modern bourgeois understanding of this phenomenon» [3, 602]. There are primarily two types of possessions, providing different forms of connection between property with its possessor. The traditional type, which was talked about by conservative theorists, notably J. Maser, that it is “real property”, predicted the existence of the “living” mutual connection between the property and its possessor [5]. The modern abstract type, where the property is not related to the possessor in the other way than the conditionals of the contract confronts it. In the first case, the property and its possessor represent a part of the same body, and it's essentially impossible to break their relationship completely. Following the Mannheim Meser shows that property in the true sense gave the certain privileges to its possessor. For example, the right to vote in the various public meetings (if the property qualification exists), to right to hunt, the right to be included to the number of jurors. It was connected with the personal social relevance. In a sense, the property can not be lost. For example, in France and in Germany, when the possessor of the land had changed, to right to hunt didn't pass, it remained to the previous possessor, which indicated that the new possessor was «false». The same was fair in the feedback. The attitude of property, was not only indestructible, that was maintained in spite of the legal acts of the change of the possessor, but it also couldn't be «arbitrarily» by means of legal act where it did not exist. So, Mannheim explains, the noble gentleman buying an estate in un noble man could not move the «true» property based only the ground that he belongs to the old nobility.

A. Gurevich connects a feeling of direct connection between the property and its possessor with an earlier «abarbolic» era. He recalled that the Normans, for example, (the same applies to the ancient German), appreciated the precious metals and, however trying to seize them in any ways (especially robberies), did not let them in the circulation of commodities, did not use them to purchase essential items but buried coins in the land, swamp, drowned in the sea.

Such use of coins is issued mysterious, unless you consider that according to the belief, which was common in these nations, man's personal qualities embodied in treasures, which he had and focused his happiness and success. Get rid of them meant losing a hope of happiness and success, and perhaps even die. So to bury gold in the ground did not mean to lay the treasure in the modern sense of the word, that is to hide money for their reservation because of expectation of adversities in everyday life or military life. They were hidden not to pick up later.

Treasure, while he was lying in the ground or at the bottom of the swamp, kept the fortune of his possessor and it was inalienable. It was the property of the possessor, but not just because of the fact of the possessions, not because of the right of possessions (even if it existed), not because of his involvement in economic interactions, but primarily because of its identification with the person of the possessor, or if you use the terminology of Mannheim, because of the presence of deep inner connections between the possessor and property. Money was the most fluid and unstable form of property - thus was deprived of its function as a general agent “substantivized”, got personal substance.

The same was concerned with the land. Possessions of the land existed, a «commercial» land circulation also existed. However, in special cases, certain parcels of land were granted by personal characteristics and were removed from commercial circulation.

There have been a custom of «Weregild», it meant to pay for the murder or mutilation of a man or other serious crimes. Weregild was paid by money or by property. But weregild could not be paid by any property. Thus, if the weregild was paid by the land, for example, the Norwegians accepted only «Odal» as a payment, it was ancestral land that was owned by the family for many generations and was practically inalienable property. Just purchased «bought» land could not be given for the «Weregild». Similarly, the land that was received for the Weregild could not be sold by the relatives of a murdered person. It was not simply a legal norm. Some allotments have a symbolic function. Part of the land «substantivated», identified with the family of the possessor or with his own personality.

Later the appropriate symbolic mediation were postponed to the feudal relation, or, as it was called by Mather, the «true» property. It was far from being private property in contemporary bourgeois terms. «If Roman law, as A.Gurevich said - defined the private property as the right to free possessions and free disposal of property, the right to unlimited use it until the abuse (jus utendi et abutendi), then the right of feudal property was in fact another» [2, 232]. Firstly, the land was not subject to the free alienation. Possession of the land, with the rights such as the right to profit from the land (besides not completed), imposes many duties, in particular its commercial use. Secondly, the possessor of the land generally was not considered as the possessor, but «tenant», because the land was given to him by Mr. based on the certain conditions, the implementation of which was mandatory. Thirdly, land possessions has always been directly connected to an individual possessor. «If bourgeois property directly opposed to factory workers, land tenants - as impersonal wealth, the feudal land possessions has always personified: it confronts the farmer as Signor and integral of its authorities, judicial authorities and traditional connections. Bourgeois property can be completely anonymous, however a feudal property always has its own name and gives it to Mr.; in this case the land for is not only the object of possessions, but it is also the birthplace with its history, local customs, beliefs, superstitions» [2, 233]. That is why the noble names in Europe have the same name as their land (region, village, district, county).

Conservative understanding of property that was revived in the political battles of the nineteenth and in the early twentieth century, was an attempt of articulation of this before-theoretical disarticulated experience that embodies the direct connections between the possessor and his property. Mannheim refers to a well-known conservative writer A.Muller who considered estates as a continuation of the human body and feudalism depicted as an amalgam of a man and things. Muller was convinced that the disappearance of this communication is a guilty of Roman law and he called the Roman law as the «French Revolution of Romans» [6].

Thus, the dilemma of “to be or to have” that has arisen in modern times in a traditional society and in a traditional consciousness did not seem as dilemma did not foresee the need to define «be» and «have», they mostly meant the same thing. Existence and the «estate», if they did not match, they were in the connections of indissoluble interdependence. The gap between existence and property designated as the development of the monetary economy. Money, acting as a universal reflection of any value, thereby relativized all values. The unity of existence and possession have predetermined the existence of qualitatively different life styles and ways of life, and also qualitatively different personalities, which throughout the history has been a prerequisite for all rigid systems of social hierarchy - from caste to social class hierarchy. In this sense, the above-mentioned use of money by barbarians as treasures was profoundly conservative act. The money was used contrary to their usual relativized functions as a way of conservation,

maintaining the unique personality of their possessors. In a very paradoxical way it was needed to remove them from circulation, to deprive them of the economic role.

Later «abstract» property, which the Conservatives opposed the «true» property, was born out of the money that became common agents. Money terminated the natural relationships between things, as well as natural and «true» relationships between things and persons. «Possession» came off the existence. This fact had varied effects as socio-cultural and ethical ones. The social hierarchies that previously seemed to be natural were destroyed (though the new ones appeared instead of them, they did not seem to be natural, such as they being rooted in the nature of things), the degree of human freedom increased (although it was largely «negative» freedom, which was understood as freedom from things, traditions, duties, etc.) the change of the nature of moral ought itself took place. The ratio of property has lost their specificity and completeness of emotional connectivity of the possessor and the things and they prescinded in the form of legal norms. Things have become obstacles to change without property possessors parting and things are not meant losses for the possessor, if the loss is fully compensated by money.

Very strange is the fact that the attitude of Marxism to the property largely reflects a conservative approach. «The Communist Manifesto», for example, represents a critique of the abstract nature of interpersonal relations under conditions of capitalist formation. Alienation of the worker from the product of his labor is, in fact, the alienation of the things of the possessor. A medieval craftsman invest himself to the thing, and the thing, made by him was, in fact, the embodiment of his personality qualities, according to Hegel, «a projection of his will». In capitalist production, this dependence disappears. The reason for that appears to be not only the possessions of the means of production: that mass production, where the same things descend from the conveyor, but the workers who are interchangeable, also becomes a source of alienation. Another source is the mediating role of money, they are the equivalent of spent strength and skills. In any case, the alienation is available. The Marxist critique of alienation of the thing and possessions, resulting in criticism of the capitalist social order in general, makes from this criticism a conservative critics.

If we trace the modern development of property concepts which are appropriate for Left ideologies, including the after-Soviet Union areas, especially ideas about land possessions, then deeply conserved motifs can be traced. Firstly, it is the idea of limited land possessions and the connection of the property with a lot of responsibilities of the possessor. Secondly, it is generally a limitation of land possessions and the practical construction of the role of the possessor to the role of the tenant, at the same time when the real possessor is a state, acting as «Signor». Thirdly, the restriction of commercial circulation of land possessions. Fourthly, the establishment of a close connection between the land possession and the personality of the possessor, which is embodied in the slogan «land to those who work it!». Only those who directly works on the land, who invests can be the master of the land. The possessions must fully become «amalgam» of a man and a thing, in this case the land.

The reverse liberal project involves the complete elimination of any restrictions which are connected with the possessions of land. Land can be the subject of the buying and selling without any restrictions, leased out, be subject to any use up to abuse. It becomes the same abstract commodity like any other commodity. All personal, family, history, and other symbolic associations related with it can be considered in its value (to get the same abstract cash equivalent), and can be discarded as irrelevant. In any way, the land becomes a subject of alienation.

Two types of the attitude to the land as a possession are reflected in the attitude of «liberal» and «conservative» to the land as a territory. Land is a basement, the state is based and developed on, it also acts a leading factor for historical process for conservative man. Neither some historical personalities nor the people as a aggregates of individuals

(the masses in the Marxist sense), but the land as the event location, which actually the history happens on.

Literature

1. Берк Э. Размышления о революции во Франции. М., 1993. с.54
2. Гуревич А.Я. Категории средневековой культуры. М., Искусство, 1972,
3. Манхейм К. Диагноз нашего времени. М., 1996, с.602
4. Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Манифест Коммунистической партии //Маркс К., Энгельс Ф.Соч. Т.4. с.444.
5. Moser J. Von dem echten Eigentum. Samtliche Werke. Berlin, Bd. 4.
6. Muller A.H. Die Elemente der Staatskunst (1809).Цит. по: Манхейм К. Диагноз нашего времени. М., 1996, с.610.