

CONCEPTS OF PATRIOTISM FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This paper discusses ideology of patriotism and its different interpretations, from Ancient Greece to nowadays. The author reviews the most influential works on patriotism and focuses on some specific issues such as: whether or not a patriot should always support the national government; what degree of criticism is justifiable for a patriot in time of crises; what tools of defending Fatherland's interests are moral; how to escape exclusiveness of patriotism. The most influential contemporary concepts of patriotism, such as "Robust", "Moderate", "Constitutional", "Civic", "Associated Duties", "Critical", and "State" are reviewed and discussed. The author is especially interested in the concept of patriotism, implemented in today's Russia.

The analysis reveals that the thinkers of the 19th – early 20th centuries did not necessarily regard patriotism as a virtue. Some of them, like Leo Tolstoy, considered it immoral and harmful. Many scholars criticized simplified understanding of patriotism, and promoted a "good citizenship" as its key component. The author argues that all concepts of patriotism represent two types of the ideology – moderate and extreme. Moderate type has a strong critical component. In this case, patriot addresses negative trends in his or her country's development. The extreme type is featured by unconditional devotion to the Fatherland and its authorities, and a "blind" advocacy of the state's interests without their critical analysis. This type of the ideology is found in contemporary Russia. There is no salient academic discourse on patriotism in Ukraine. However, it is required to clearly understand which concept our patriotic education is based on.

Key words: *patriotism, concepts of patriotism, patriotism in Russia, moderate type of patriotism, extreme type of patriotism.*

Patriotism is a powerful ideology that shapes a person's identity, unites people into a political nation, and serves as an effective tool of their mobilization. Understanding of patriotism defines our actions as citizens, including willingness to sacrifice our resources and life to defend our Fatherland from aggression. However, the nation-aggressor has its own understanding of patriotism, different from the previous one, which promotes the aggression. Different concepts of patriotism exist, and debates on its understanding intensify at the times of crises, and, especially, wars. The issue "what kind of patriotism is a virtue" is intensively discussed in the United States and the Western European nations. In other countries, including Ukraine, this fundamental question usually is not asked. The ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war (since 2014) has actualized the issue and encouraged us examining the ideology of patriotism and its different concepts more closely.

This paper intends to discuss an ideology of patriotism and its different interpretations in historical perspective, from Ancient Greece to nowadays. The author reviews the most influential works on patriotism that aroused an academic discourse (Niccolo Machiavelli, Leo Tolstoy, Mark Twain, Alasdair MacIntyre, Stephen Nathanson, Paul Gombert, Jürgen Habermas, Cecile Laborde and others) as well as the works of contemporary Russian scholars to reveal interpretations of patriotism in today's Russia. This paper focuses on some specific issues in the academic discourse on patriotism, such as: whether or not a patriot should always support the national government; what degree of criticism is justifiable for a patriot in time of crises; what tools of defending Fatherland's interests are moral, and how to escape exclusiveness of patriotism. We are especially interested in the concept of patriotism, which has been implemented in Russia.

Patriotism is usually understood as a person's love to his or her country, identification with it, and a special concern for its well-being [29, p. 34–35]. However, it is a complex phenomenon with a variety of definitions and interpretations. Sometimes patriotism is regarded as a natural expression of a person's attachment to the country, in which he or she was born and raised, and a gratitude to the nation in which he or she lives, for benefits it provides. Sometimes it is considered a form of loyalty to one's country or pride for it. Some authors emphasize a spirit of sacrifice as its major element. In some authors' opinion, patriotism is morally mandatory, and is a central human virtue. Other scholars focus on the negative features of patriotism, such as partisanship, exclusiveness, and prejudice. For example, Herbert Spencer believed that

"patriotism is nationally, what egoism is individually" [21, p. 510]. Especially moral philosophers, who understand morality as essentially universal and impartial, think of patriotism as a type of group egoism, which is dangerously exclusive, contrary to demands of universal justice and common human solidarity. For them, love of one's own country often goes together with dislike of and hostility to other countries that encourage militarism, international tensions and conflicts [15].

Thinkers spoke and wrote on patriotism since V–IV B.C., when the terms "patriotism" and "patriot" (Greek πατριώτης – compatriot, fellow countryman, πατρίς – Fatherland) appeared. We can find references to the terms and their interpretation in the works and speeches of Thucydides, Pericles, Aristophanes, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Lysurgus, Dinarchus and other statesmen and scholars during the Golden Age of Greek civilization. Some scholars find the roots of the phenomenon in the earlier Homer period of IX–VIII B.C.

From the very beginning, different interpretations of patriotism existed. The mainstream view on patriotism was expressed by a prominent Athenian statesman Pericles (c. 495–429 B.C.). For him, a patriot is a citizen, "who loves his polis and stands above a self-interest" [5]. Another prominent Athenian statesman, Alcibiades, in description of Xenophon, provided an alternative vision of patriotism. According to it, citizen's patriotism is justifiable until the Fatherland provides him with civic rights. When the principle is violated, the citizen can resign a loyalty to it [5, p. 348–349].

Unlike this interpretation, Russian scholars I. Bocharnikov [1] and E. Rung [9] argue that patriotism always, both in the Ancient Greek times and nowadays, means a loyalty to a state, and priority of Fatherland's interests over the personal ones. According to I. Bocharnikov, a forerunner of patriotism was an ideal of valour that indicated a citizen's striving for performing a feat of arms. Both in the Ancient Greek and Roman times, the highest form of patriotism as a virtue included participation in wars, disregard of its character – defensive or aggressive. Romans valued Rome's might most of all and its superiority over other peoples and states [1, p. 514–515]. The author believes that Rome's decline occurred for two reasons. Firstly, because of erosion of values and state-formative core (namely, Romans), and, secondly, because of appearance of a new ideology (Christianity), which was a negative factor until its political role was re-thought, and authorities began to use it (after 325 A.D.) for strengthening of the Empire. Everyone can easily apply these remarks to

contemporary Russia and find them relative to official interpretations of patriotism in this country.

During the Middle Ages, Europe was heavily dominated by Christianity and there was no place for patriotism. The ideology reemerged during Renaissance. In 1513, Niccolò Machiavelli wrote his influential work "The Prince", published in 1532, after his death [6]. It became famous for description of dishonest and immoral but effective ruler's behavior. Machiavelli's name, associated with the phrase "the end justifies the means", became a synonym of unscrupulous politics. According to Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Machiavelli presents an "extreme" type of patriotism, which is adopted by politicians and common citizens when their country's major interests are thought to be at stake. According to it, the paramount interests of one's country override any moral considerations with which they might come into conflict. In the U.S., the idea is expressed by the saying "our country, right or wrong" [30].

We believe that Russia's behavior on the international arena since August 2008 war against Georgia represents the similar type of behavior. Not surprisingly, Russian scholar I. Bocharnikov evaluates N. Machiavelli very positively, and maintains that his personality and works were undervalued in the Soviet Union. In his opinion, Machiavelli described patriotism at the major purpose and duty of a citizen that included concern for "glory, greatness and freedom of his Fatherland" [1, p. 518]. The Fatherland, according to Machiavelli (and I. Bocharnikov) is not only a self-dependent free city, managed by everybody in common interests, but a large Italian state as a bulwark against a foreign interference.

Shaping of patriotic concepts was heavily influenced by American (1775–1783) and French (1789–1799) revolutions. It was time when a word "patriot" became widely spread. French revolution linked the concept of patriotism with the ideas of freedom, equality and fraternity, as well as nationalism. It was a French nation, not a king, who possessed sovereignty in those days France. After the revolution, the ideas of nationalism spread across Europe and the world, though with different intensity. Ideology of nationalism promoted liberation of subordinated nations, national unification, and foundation of national states. When the goals were reached, in the national states ideologies of patriotism and nationalism merged.

The multinational states, like Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Russian Empire, condemned nationalism and promoted "state" patriotism. In Russia, "state" patriotism since 1833 had been based on the ideology of "official narodnost" with three pillars – autocracy, Orthodox Church and "narodnost" (a unity of people and a monarchy). In late Austro-Hungarian (Habsburg) Monarchy, it was a "dynastic patriotism", which promoted state unity through its multinational population's loyalty towards the ruling house [32].

In the late 19th – early 20th centuries, decades before the Great War, nationalism and patriotism were dominant world ideologies. Unlike other influential ideologies (liberalism, conservatism and socialism), they united the nations – "us" contrary to "them", that is, foreigners. On the other hand, some thinkers criticized a simplified understanding of patriotism, and even considered the concept harmful. For example, American scholar James Leedom argued that unequivocal patriot was blind, and his support to the government, given by mere patriotic enthusiasm was uncertain. "Really strong support is given by the cool, clear-headed man who seeks justice and desires peace and plenty for all" [21].

George W. Hoss [17, p. 89–90] and Lucia Ames Mead [25, p. 372–373] distinguished "true" and "false" patriotism. They promoted its new manifestation – not by

taking up arms in behalf of the country ("false patriotism"), but by free public service, inventions, internal improvements, relief of the poor, extermination of the great evils that affected society. Lucia Ames Mead encouraged patriotism as a good citizenship, which is relevant today. In her words, "true" (pure) patriotism is a constant daily public service, accompanied with the development of the sense of obligation and responsibility to one's own country. The deeds of the service, achieved by painful sacrifice, are "essentially patriotic" [25, p. 373].

One of the most cited opinions on patriotism belongs to a great American writer Mark Twain: "Remember this, take it to heart, live by it, die for it if necessary: that ... patriotism is medieval, outworn, obsolete". For him, the modern, true, rational patriotism means loyalty to the Nation all the time, but loyalty to the Government only "when it deserves it" [24]. The words were directed at the citizens of Russia in response to the tsar Nicholas II's 1905 Bloody Sunday Massacre. The phrase delivers a clear idea that the best interest of a country and its people, and the best interest of a government are frequently at odds. Therefore, patriotism should value reason above blind devotion [14].

Some authors called upon to abandon patriotism as needless and dangerous. A great Russian writer Leo Tolstoy underlined absolute incompatibility of patriotism with Christianity and even with the lowest demands of morality. For example, in a letter of 1896 to a correspondent in England on the dispute between the U.S. and Great Britain on Venezuela, he called patriotism "artificial feeling" and "the cause of war", because of "the desire for exclusive welfare of one's own people" [13]. In his opinion, patriotism no longer united, but disunited. It could be possible to deem it as beneficent if there was only one, for example, English patriotism. However, there was also American, Russian, German, and French patriotism, all opposed to each other. Leo Tolstoy suggested preparation for war in all nations as "the fruits of patriotism", and argued that there was no "evil" or "good" patriotism. "Patriotism cannot be good". Even if patriotism was not "unaggressive", people wished to keep their former conquest that was possible only by violence. As for "rehabilitative" patriotism of conquered, oppressed nations, he regarded it as the worst, because it was "most embittered and most calling for violence". In his opinion, "to destroy war, patriotism must be destroyed" [13, p.109]. Leo Tolstoy's criticism (in some assessments, "nihilism") created a platform for debates on patriotism for many decades ahead.

In 1913, Paul Blanshard, an American professor of the University of Michigan, asked: "Why do men fight?", and answered: "Men fight today for patriotism. Patriotism is the cause of war" [12]. He called it "savage" and "war" patriotism. However, unlike Leo Tolstoy, he promoted not abolishing patriotism, but changing its principles. He appealed to throw off the prejudices of nationalism to become patriots of not a nation, but the world, and promoted "worldism", that is, "patriotism of the world" to make wars impossible. However, national patriotism prevailed. In 1914, all nations engaged in the Great War with the spirit of patriotism and nationalism, which meant the same for the national states. Russian Empire, the sub-national states in the age of nationalism, fought for "velikoderzavnost" (its national "greatness") and "panslavism" ideas. Very similar Russia's politics have been implemented in Ukraine since 2014.

On the third year of the Great War, the journal "The Advocate of Peace" wrote that "patriotism" was a word of many meanings. From the author's point of view, it represented devotion to the principle of nationalism, and like nationalism, had two faces. It might be directed inward to the benefit of its own people or outward to the harm of its neighbors. In the author's opinion, patriotism, i.e. "a national

spirit which goes to make fatherland better", might be worthy. However, it was tested in its attitude towards other fatherlands and other people [19].

The end of the Great War gave a birth to new national states in Europe. As a result, principles of patriotism and nationalism intertwined more closely, until nationalism was heavily discredited by the German National Socialism. Soviet Union, founded by Bolsheviks at the ruins of Russian Empire, embraced the concept of "Soviet patriotism" and "proletarian internationalism" as an alternative to "bourgeois" patriotism and nationalism. Patriotism was a mandatory characteristic of any Soviet citizen. Suspicion of a lack of it was followed by a severe punishment, however different in Stalin and post-Stalin times.

A Soviet person would have been surprised to find out that some thinkers in the West did not consider patriotism a virtue or, at least, distinguished its "false" forms. For example, in the U.S. the issue of patriotism was intensively debated in 1960s during Vietnam War, when the slogan "My country, right or wrong" became popular among many Americans. At the same time, many representatives of the anti-war movement regarded patriotism as vice. The debates restarted in 1980s, partly because of a remaining great divide in the American society on the understanding of patriotism, and partly because of appearance of groundbreaking works on the issue.

One of them was a publication of Alasdair MacIntyre's lecture "Is Patriotism a Virtue?" [23]. Unlike Leo Tolstoy, he argued that patriotism was not contrasted with morality. Moreover, he believed that patriotism was a person's central moral virtue, because a particularistic morality of the patriot was rooted in a particular community [23, p. 15]. According to A. MacIntyre, a core of patriotism is loyalty of a person to his or her country and polity that means a preference for the well-being of his own country over another. That does not mean that a patriot will support any government in power. One can oppose his or her country's government in the name of its true character, history, and aspirations. To that extent, this type of patriotism is critical and rational. However, some practices and projects of the "*patria*", some of its "large interests," must be beyond questioning and critical scrutiny. Thus, true patriotism, according to A. MacIntyre, is "a fundamentally irrational attitude" [23, p. 13–14]. For example, patriots are bound to fight for their country whether its cause is just or not.

The type of patriotism, described and defended by MacIntyre, was defined as "Robust" [30]. His arguments on fundamentally irrational character of patriotic loyalty, especially in the context of the Fatherland's "large interests" aroused a lot of questions and provoked further debates. For example, who defines which national interests are "large", and, therefore, require citizen's complete loyalty? This question is especially relevant in case of authoritarian regimes. In this context, is Ukraine a "large" Russia's interest? The answer depends on the type of political regime in Russia and an official concept of its identity. It makes both Ukraine and Russia's citizens "hostages" of Putin's (Lenin's or other Russia's leaders') interpretations of the Fatherland's "large interests".

In response to A. MacIntyre, Steven Nathanson offered a constrained version of patriotism that "thoughtful, morally conscientious people can be comfortable to" [28, p. 535]. In his opinion, patriotism is a virtue so long as the actions it encourages are not themselves immoral" [28, p.538]. "Moderate patriotism" is not exclusive. Its adherents have special concerns for their country and compatriots, but that will not prevent them from having concern for other countries and other peoples. Unlike proponents of both extreme and robust types of patriotism, who love their country

unconditionally, and stand by it whatever it does, "moderate" patriotism is not uncritical, unconditional, or egocentric. It does not order a patriot to promote his country's interests under any circumstances and by any means. It acknowledges the moral constraints, imposed on the pursuit of any individual and collective goals. Opposite to "extreme" and "robust" patriotism, it requires a patriot to fight for his country only if the war is just.

"Moderate patriotism" is also represented by a contemporary "Critical patriotism" concept. According to it, having special affinities for one's nation and one's compatriots should not spoil one's capacity to think critically about those attachments, and channel them in ways that are justice-promoting. "Critical" patriotism recognizes that criticism means rather exhibition of a passionate determination to reform and improve the country, than unpatriotic feelings [26, p. 19]. In that way, "critical" patriotism is morally impartial and universal.

This approach is represented in the article by the American professor Robert Jensen on the U.S. global war on terror after 09/11 terrorist attacks "Journalism should never yield to patriotism" [18]. He argues that patriotism becomes inhumane if it requires supporting acts, which violate international law and use immoral tactics. In this case, patriotic feelings encourage people to support brutal policies. However, for the U.S., patriotism is first of all allegiance to American ideals of freedom and democracy. So, while highlighting the many positive things, patriots have to work to change what is wrong.

German thinkers, concerned about avoiding association of patriotism with hostile nationalism, have developed the concept of "Constitutional patriotism". It is based on the idea that a state is an association of citizens, bound together by norms, rules and universal values, specified in a liberal democratic constitution, rather than national and cultural identities. The term "Constitutional patriotism" was coined in 1979 by German political theorist Dolf Sternberger, who suggested a new understanding of the Fatherland as "the republic, which we create for ourselves". "The Fatherland is the constitution" [30]. The concept was later developed by Jürgen Habermas in the context of overcoming national and cultural loyalties in public life, and supplanting them with a new, post-national, purely political identity embodied in the laws and institutions of a free and democratic state [16]. This type of patriotism seeks to separate political loyalty and cultural affinity, and reinforce a new identity of a citizen (a political member of a state) as a solid foundation for contemporary ethnically and culturally heterogenic European states.

An alternative to "Constitutional patriotism" is represented by "Civic patriotism" concept, offered by Cecile Laborde [20]. From the position of social democracy, she focuses on two major issues – social justice and inclusiveness (mostly for immigrants), and explains how they can be provided with the instruments of "civic" patriotism. She maintains that it is neither possible nor advantageous to reject "cultural affinity" that "constitutional" patriotism proposes. "Civic" patriotic strategy takes seriously nationalism, as well as the need for cultural mediations between citizens and their institutions. According to the concept, only those democratic institutions will be legitimate, which can effectively secure the loyalty of all citizens, including members of cultural minorities [20, p. 607]. Shared values, promoted by "constitutional" patriotism, might be too thin foundation for social democracy, while the shared collective identity, defended by nationalists, will be too thick to be able to accommodate minority groups [20, p. 608–609]. A path between them C. Laborde sees in a strong political culture that can provide a solid but inclusive basis for democratic legitimacy. Thus, "civic" patriotism seeks to

promote a mainly political identity, whose predominantly political nature makes it compatible with a variety of practices and beliefs but whose thin particularistic content justifies citizens' commitment to specific institutions and practices" [20, p. 609]. Since inclusiveness (especially for immigrants) is a relevant issue in the increasingly multicultural European countries, the "constitutional" and "civic" patriotism concepts are widely discussed [22; 34].

Other contemporary concepts of patriotism include "Associative Duty", "Ethical", "Symbolic", "Environmental", et cetera. The "Associative Duty" concept of patriotism is grounded on the principle of a patriotic duty for the well-being of one's country and compatriots, which is often a form of *gratitude* for benefits a person gets from his or her country and compatriots. According to it, everyone, compatriot or not, has a claim to our respect and concern, however, compatriots take priority, because we owe it to them as a matter of reciprocity. Patriotism in this case is a political obligation of a patriot as a citizen. For example, we have a moral duty to abide by the laws of our country. Failure to do so means taking advantage of compatriots, and acting unfairly towards them [27].

There are also different versions of "State" patriotism. One of them has been implemented in today's Russia. The official concept was shaped in 2012–2016 as the authorities' reaction on the wave of political protests in Moscow and Saint Petersburg in late 2011 – spring 2012, and then, on Western sanctions on Russia because of its aggression against Ukraine. Patriotism became the major theme of political discourse in Russia in 2012, after V. Putin was elected on his third presidential term. It was defined as "a consolidation basis for Russian politics" [8], and later as Russia's national idea [31]. In February 2016, V. Putin stated that Russia does not have "other unifying idea, except patriotism..." This is a national idea, which is not connected with any political party's activity or any social strata. Instead, "it is connected with the common unifying principles" to make a state "more effective". In V. Putin's words, to make the idea work, it must occupy everybody's minds and become a part of people's consciousness. That is why it is necessary "to talk about it everywhere, at all levels, constantly" [4].

According to Russia's leaders' public speeches, media and academic writings, Putin's model of patriotism considers a strong Russia's state the highest civic value. Attitudes toward the state have become the main criteria in judging historical and contemporary figures and ordinary citizens. The Russian state is believed to be the center of a Russian world, which also includes most of Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, and the Russian diaspora around the world. Russian state is also a civilization with its spiritual roots in Byzantium and Orthodox Christianity [33].

Russia's concept of patriotism is based on a conservative pivot to cultural and historical heritage with the Russian Orthodox Church as its central pillar. It emphasizes a special way of development, embraces the imperial thinking of the past, and promotes the country's return to a former greatness. The Russian "traditional values" contrast to the Western liberalism. A state has monopolized interpretation of History, and glorifies "strong" rulers, including Stalin. A lot of analogies can be traced between Putin's "state" patriotism, on the one hand, and the tsar Nicholas I's "official narodnost" and Soviet ideology on the other [10; 11] (though the Communist party was replaced by the Orthodox Church).

Perhaps, unintentionally, implementation of the concept has caused a growth of Russian ("ruskiy") nationalism, xenophobia, chauvinism, and hostility to representatives of other cultures, both inside and outside the country.

Promotion of Russia's patriotism is accompanied with a growing hostility to non-ethnic Russians, who compose about 22 percent of Russia's population. According to public opinion polls in February 2014, 34% of respondents suggested that representatives of non-Russians nationalities were responsible for the country's troubles. 73% of respondents supported the idea to limit the number of newcomers to Russia. Comparing with the early 2000s, the figure increased by 28% [2]. Some Russian critics of Putin's regime write about a substitution of concepts – Russian ("ruskiy") nationalism instead of patriotism, and official propaganda instead of national idea [2; 7].

Importantly, Russia's patriotism is directed not only inward but also outward, and addresses to Russian-speaking population ("Russkymir") in the neighboring nations. In that way, Russia's authorities seek to justify interventionist and expansionist policies with patriotic rhetoric. Russia's patriotism has been stimulated by the images of "enemies", including Muslims, Americans, homosexuals, feminists, and Ukrainian nationalists [3]. After the beginning of so called "Ukrainian crisis" (i.e. Russia's aggression against Ukraine), Russia's patriotism has become more associated with defense of the country against any verbal attacks and accusations, as well as with military readiness. The Soviet concept of "besieged fortress" has been restored to unite society around the conservative government, which defends "traditional values".

In conclusion, the ideology of patriotism is represented with different concepts. In the course of history, some concepts evolved, and new ones appeared. The major issue of academic and public discourse on patriotism in different times and environment was the same, namely, the meaning of being a "true" patriot. All concepts of patriotism represent two types of the ideology – moderate and extreme. Extreme type is featured by unconditional devotion to the state and its authorities, a "blind" advocacy of the state's interests, often at the expense of other nations. Moderate type has a strong critical component. In this case, patriot addresses negative trends in his or her country development. From Ukraine's perspective, Russia's "state patriotism" represents an "extreme" type of the ideology that fosters loyal citizens, proud but "blind" supporters of the authoritarian political regime and its aggressive foreign politics. Patriotism in today's Ukraine has been shaped by two revolutions (of 2004, and 2013–2014), and ongoing Russia's aggression. There is no salient academic discourse on the issue. However, we should clearly understand which concept our patriotic education is based on.

List of used sources:

1. Бочарников И. В. Феномен патриотизма в мировой политической истории. [Online] / И. В. Бочарников // Международные отношения. – 2013. – №4. – С. 513-518. DOI: 10.7256/2305-560X.2013.4.9271.
2. Брук Б. Подмена понятий: патриотизм в России. [Электронный ресурс] / Б. Брук // Институт современной России. – Режим доступа: <http://bit.ly/2NEMh3T>. [Accessed: 20.06.2018].
3. Брук Б. "Что в имени моем?" Понимание патриотизма в России. [Электронный ресурс] / Б. Брук // Институт современной России. – 2016. – 24 с. – Режим доступа: <http://bit.ly/30dK3cU>.
4. Встреча с активом Клуба лидеров [Электронный ресурс] / Официальные сетевые ресурсы Президента России. – 2016. – Режим доступа: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/51263>.
5. Карпюк С. Г. Взгляды Ксенофонта на патриотизм / С. Г. Карпюк // Мнемон. Исследования и публикации по истории античного мира. – 2014. – №14 – С. 347-357.
6. Макиавелли Н. Государь / Н. Макиавелли. – М.: Планета, 1990. – 80 с.
7. Патриотизм в России: национальная идея или официальная пропаганда? [Электронный ресурс] // Институт современной России. – 2016. – Режим доступа: <http://bit.ly/30c2fDY>.
8. Послание Президента Федеральному Собранию. [Электронный ресурс] // Официальные сетевые ресурсы Президента России. – 2012. – Режим доступа: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/17118>
9. Рунг Э. В. Понятие "патриотизм" и его древнегреческие коннотации / Э. В. Рунг // Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры. – 2013. – 40(02). – С. 304-314.

10. Янов А. "Русская идея" и Путин [Электронный ресурс] / Александр Янов / Институт современной России. – 2013. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2LjG23r>. [Accessed: 22.06.2018]
11. Янов А. Лексикон Русской идеи [Электронный ресурс] / А. Янов // Институт современной России. – 2014. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/30Dpjfb> [Accessed: 22.06.2018]
12. Blanshard P. The Evolution of Patriotism [Online] / P. Blanshard // *The Advocate of Peace* – 1913. – Is. 75(8). – P. 177-179. – Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
13. Count Tolstoy on Patriotism // *The Advocate of Peace*. – 1896. – Is. 58 (5) – P. 108-110. [Online]. – Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25750883>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
14. D'Arpino A. American Authors on Patriotism [Online] / A. D'Arpino // *The Airship*. – 2014. – Retrieved from: <http://airshipdaily.com/blog/07022014-authors-on-patriotism>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
15. Gomberg P. Patriotism is like Racism [Online] / P. Gomberg // *Ethics*. – 1990. – Is. 101 (1). – P. 144-150. – Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2381896>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
16. Habermas J. Citizenship and National Identity / J. Habermas // *The Condition of Citizenship* [Online] / Ed. by B. van Steenberg. – London : Sage Publications, 1994. – P. 20-35. Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2znLVob>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
17. Hoss G.W. A New Patriotism [Online] / G.W. Hoss // *The Advocate of Peace*. – 1900. – Is. 62 (4). – P. 89-90. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25751565>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
18. Jensen R. Journalism Should Never Yield to "Patriotism" [Online] / R. Jensen // *Common Dreams News Center*. – May 29, 2002. – Retrieved from: <https://archive.commondreams.org/views02/0529-02.htm>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
19. Jordan D. S. Patriotism, Nationalism and Peace [Online] / D. S. Jordan // *The Advocate of Peace*. – 1916. – Is. 78(2). – P. 43-45. – Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
20. Laborde C. From Constitutional to Civic Patriotism [Online] / C. Laborde // *British Journal of Political Science*. – 2002. – Is. 32(4). – P. 591-612. – Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4092375>. [Accessed: 27.06.2018].
21. Leedom J. The Fallacy of Patriotism [Online] / J. Leedom // *The North American Review*. – 1891. – Is. 153 (419). – Pp. 509–513. – Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
22. Lerman A. Towards a New Civic Patriotism [Online] / A. Lerman // *The Guardian*. – 2009, November 27. – Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/nov/27/new-civic-patriotism>. [Accessed: 27.06.2018]
23. Macintyre A. Is Patriotism a Virtue? [Online] / A. Macintyre. – [s.l.]: The University of Kansas, 1984. – 24 p. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2jWCTdE>. [Accessed: 21.06.2018].
24. Mark Twain. The Czar's Soliloquy [Online] / M. Twain // *North American Review*. – 1905, April 29. – No. 580. – P. 8. – Retrieved from: https://archive.org/stream/jstor-25105366/25105366_djvu.txt [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
25. Mead L. A. True and False Patriotism [Online] / Lucia Ames Mead // *The Journal of Education*. – 1906. – Is. 63 (14). – P. 372-373. – Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42809766>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
26. Merry M. S. Can Patriotism Be Critical? [Online] / M. S. Merry // *Handbook of Patriotism* / Ed. by Mitja Sardoč. – Cham, Switzerland : Springer Nature, 2019. – P. 3-16. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2kjQbRW>. [Accessed: 28.03.2019].
27. Moore M. Is Patriotism an Associative Duty? [Online] / M. Moore // *The Journal of Ethics*. – 2009. – Is. 13 (4). – P. 383-399. – DOI: 10.1007/s10892-009-9064-0.
28. Nathanson S. In Defense of "Moderate Patriotism" [Online] / S. Nathanson // *Ethics*. – 1989. – Is. 99 (3). – P. 535-552. – Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2380865>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
29. Nathanson S. Patriotism, Morality, and Peace [Online] / S. Nathanson. – Lanham : Rowman & Littlefield, 1993. – 227 p.
30. Primoratz I. Patriotism [Online] / I. Primoratz // *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. – 2017. – Retrieved from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/patriotism/>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
31. Putin: Patriotism is Only Possible "National Idea" for Russians [Online] // *Russia Beyond*. – 2016, February 4. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2lGqKdC>. [Accessed: 24.06.2018].
32. *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy* / Ed. by L. Cole and D. L. Unowsky. – New York ; London : Berghahn Books, 2007. – 258 p.
33. Trenin D. Looking out Five Years: Ideological, Geopolitical, and Economic Drivers of Russian Foreign Policy [Online] / D. Trenin // *Russia in Global Affairs*. – 2017, August 23. – Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2m3pbGK>. [Accessed: 28.06.2018].
34. Wimmer A. National Identity and Political Power. How Representation Breeds Patriotism [Online] / Andreas Wimmer // *Foreign Affairs*. – 2018, April 16. – Retrieved from: <https://fam.ag/2lBRFai>. [Accessed: 28.06.2018].
3. Bruk, B. (2016). "What's in Your Name?" Understanding Patriotism in Russia. *Institute of Modern Russia*. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/30dK3cU>. [In Russian]
4. Meeting with the core group of the Leaders Club. (2016). *Official Internet Resources of the President of Russia*. Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/51263>.
5. Karpiuk, S. (2014). Xenophon's Views on Patriotism. *MNEMON. Investigations and Publications on the History of the Ancient World*, 14, 347-357. [In Russian]
6. Machiavelli, N. (1990). *The Prince*. Moscow: Planeta. [In Russian]
7. Patriotism in Russia: National Idea or Propaganda? *Institute of Modern Russia*. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/30m1cRX>.
8. Address to the Federal Assembly. (2012). *Official Internet Resources of the President of Russia*. Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/17118>
9. Rung, E. (2013). Patriotism and Its Ancient Greek Connotations. *Problems of History, Philosophy, Culture*, 40(02), 304-314. [In Russian]
10. Yanov, A. (2013). Putin and the "Russian Idea". *Institute of Modern Russia*. Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2Y2fslc>. [Accessed: 22.06.2018]
11. Yanov, A. (2014). Lexicon of the Russian Idea. *Institute of Modern Russia*. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2JEDutx> [Accessed: 22.06.2018]
12. Blanshard, P. (1913). The Evolution of Patriotism. *The Advocate of Peace*, 75(8), 177-179. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
13. Count Tolstoy on Patriotism (1896). *The Advocate of Peace*, 58 (5), 108-110. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25750883>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
14. D'Arpino, A. (2014). American Authors on Patriotism. *The Airship*. Retrieved from <http://airshipdaily.com/blog/07022014-authors-on-patriotism>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
15. Gomberg, P. (1990). Patriotism is like Racism. *Ethics*, 101 (1), 144-150. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2381896>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
16. Habermas, J. (1994). Citizenship and National Identity. In: B. van Steenberg (Ed.). *The Condition of Citizenship*. London: Sage Publications. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2znLVob>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
17. Hoss, G.W. (1900). A New Patriotism. *The Advocate of Peace*, 62 (4), 89-90. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25751565>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
18. Jensen, R. (2002, May 29). Journalism Should Never Yield to "Patriotism". *Common Dreams News Center*. Retrieved from <https://archive.commondreams.org/views02/0529-02.htm>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
19. Jordan, D. S. (1916). Patriotism, Nationalism and Peace. *The Advocate of Peace*, 78 (2), 43-45. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
20. Laborde, C. (2002). From Constitutional to Civic Patriotism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(4), 591-612. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4092375>. [Accessed: 27.06.2018].
21. Leedom, J. (1891). The Fallacy of Patriotism. *The North American Review*, 153 (419), 509-513. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20666772>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
22. Lerman, A. (2009, November 27). Towards a New Civic Patriotism. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/nov/27/new-civic-patriotism>. [Accessed: 27.06.2018].
23. Macintyre, A. (1984). *Is Patriotism a Virtue?* [s.l.]: The University of Kansas. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2jWCTdE>. [Accessed: 21.06.2018].
24. Mark Twain. (1905, April 29). The Czar's Soliloquy. *North American Review*, 580, 8. Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/jstor-25105366/25105366_djvu.txt [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
25. Mead, L. A. (1906). True and False Patriotism. *The Journal of Education*, 63 (14), 372-373. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42809766>. [Accessed: 25.06.2018].
26. Merry, M. S. (2019). Can Patriotism Be Critical? In: Mitja Sardoč (Ed.), *Handbook of Patriotism*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. P. 3-16. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2kjQbRW>. [Accessed: 28.03.2019].
27. Moore, M. (2009). Is Patriotism an Associative Duty? *The Journal of Ethics*, 13 (4), 383-399. DOI: 10.1007/s10892-009-9064-0
28. Nathanson, S. (1989). In Defense of "Moderate Patriotism". *Ethics*, 99 (3), 535-552. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2380865>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
29. Nathanson, S. (1993). *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
30. Primoratz, I. (2017). Patriotism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/patriotism/>. [Accessed: 26.06.2018].
31. Putin: Patriotism is Only Possible "National Idea" for Russians (2016). *Russia Beyond*. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2lGqKdC>. [Accessed: 24.06.2018].
32. Cole, L. & D. Unowsky. (Eds.). (2007). *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*. New York & London: Berghahn Books.
33. Trenin, D. (2017, August 23). Looking out Five Years: Ideological, Geopolitical, and Economic Drivers of Russian Foreign Policy. *Russia in Global Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2m3pbGK>. [Accessed: 28.06.2018].
34. Wimmer, A. (2018, April 16). National Identity and Political Power. How Representation Breeds Patriotism. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://fam.ag/2lBRFai> [Accessed: 28.06.2018].

Н. Городня, д-р іст. наук, доц.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

КОНЦЕПЦІЇ ПАТРІОТИЗМУ В ІСТОРИЧНІЙ ПЕРСПЕКТИВІ

Обговорюється ідеологія патріотизму, здійснюється огляд її основних концепцій, простежується їхнє формування продовж історичного періоду – від Давньої Греції до сьогодення. Аналізуються найбільш впливові філософські праці на тему патріотизму, що спричинили наукові й суспільні дискусії та заклали теоретичну основу різних концепцій ("Міцний", "Поміркований", "Конституційний", "Громадянський", "Асоційованих обов'язків", "Критичний", "Державний" патріотизм). Акцентуються окремі питання у науковому дискурсі про патріотизм, такі як: чи завжди патріот повинен підтримувати національний уряд; яка міра критики є виправданою для патріота в умовах криз; які засоби захисту інтересів Вітчизни є моральними; як уникнути ексклюзивності патріотизму. Особлива увага приділяється інтерпретаціям патріотизму в сучасній Росії та концепції, яка там реалізується.

Показано, що продовж історії сформувалися різні концепції патріотизму. Мислителі XIX – початку XX ст. не завжди оцінювали патріотизм як чесноту. Деякі з них, як Лев Толстой, вважали патріотизм аморальним, таким, що є причиною війн між народами. Інші критикували спрощене розуміння патріотизму і вважали більш змістовною концепцію "гарного громадянства". Загалом усі концепції патріотизму можна поділити на два типи: поміркований і крайній (екстремальний). Концепції поміркованого типу мають сильний критичний компонент. У цьому випадку патріот критикує негативні тенденції розвитку держави й намагається протидіяти їм. Екстремальний тип характеризується безумовною відданістю патріота державі та її властям, некритичним підходом до захисту її "національних інтересів". Таким прикладом є концепція патріотизму, яка реалізується в сучасній Росії. В Україні ідеологія патріотизму сформувалася під впливом двох революцій і особливо війни з Росією. Водночас, у нашій державі відсутній академічний і суспільний дискурс із цього питання. Проте він необхідний, щоб добре розуміти, на основі якої концепції здійснюється патріотичне виховання молоді.

Ключові слова: патріотизм, концепції патріотизму, патріотизм в Росії, поміркований тип патріотизму, екстремальний тип патріотизму.

УДК 94:930(477)"19/20

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2640.2019.141.2>

А. Істоміна, здобувачка
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ПОДАТКОВІ ОРГАНИ В НАДДНІПРЯНСЬКІЙ УКРАЇНІ В ПОРЕФОРМЕНИЙ ПЕРІОД: СУЧАСНА УКРАЇНСЬКА ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ

Ліберальні реформи, проведені в Російській імперії впродовж 1860-х – 1870-х рр., суттєво відобразилися на фінансовій сфері велетенської країни. Вони мали також свої особливості на території губерній, заселених українцями. Особливо суттєво було зреформовано податкові служби, які стали більш сучасними й копіювали принципи та методи своєї роботи з аналогічних структур західноєвропейських держав. У середині XIX ст. в Наддніпрянській Україні фактично не існувало спеціальних податкових органів. Ці функції виконувалися низкою владних інституцій, а координацію їхньої діяльності на місцевому губернському рівні здійснювали казенні палати. Після поразки Російської імперії в Кримській війні її уряд змушений був провести ряд системних реформ. Одним із напрямків реформування Російської імперії стала реорганізація сфери державних фінансів, зокрема й органів фінансового управління та фінансового контролю.

Упродовж останніх десятиліть українська історична наука звертала окрему увагу на функціонування податкових органів імперії на землях сучасної України. З огляду на це, у статті проаналізовано сучасну українську історіографію питання функціонування податкових органів Російської імперії в Наддніпрянській Україні в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. Розглянуто основні вітчизняні дослідження діяльності тих владних інституцій, які виконували функції податкового контролю в українських губерніях Російської імперії. Особливу увагу приділено працям, у яких висвітлювалися регіональні особливості роботи податкових органів. Окреслено перспективні напрямки подальших досліджень даної проблеми.

У статті визначено, що проблеми діяльності податкових органів у Наддніпрянській Україні в пореформений період стали предметом дослідження багатьох сучасних українських науковців. Можна констатувати навіть факт формування наукових шкіл із проблем історії фінансової політики в Україні. Це Київська історична школа професора О. Ресни, Харківська історико-правова школа професора О. Головка і Кропивницька школа економічної історії професора В. Орлика. Проте залишається ціла низка аспектів проблеми, які потребують подальшого глибокого вивчення.

Ключові слова: історіографія, Наддніпрянська Україна, українські губернії, податкові органи, казенні палати, податні інспектори.

Постановка проблеми. На сучасному етапі розвитку української та зарубіжної історіографії проблеми державного управління в Російській імперії розглядаються у кількох напрямках, зокрема досліджуються і питання діяльності податкових органів. Проблеми історії оподаткування та податкового контролю в Наддніпрянській Україні у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. стали предметом вивчення у працях багатьох сучасних українських дослідників. Їхні змістовні розвідки доповнили наукові здобутки попередніх поколінь учених і, безперечно, значно збагатили історіографію цієї вагомий наукової проблеми. При цьому слід ураховувати, що складність дослідження питань історії податкових органів зумовлена їхньою зосередженістю в точці перетину декількох наук: історії, економіки та права. Автор цілком погоджується з тезою сучасного українського вченого В. Орлика про те, що "наукове пізнання проблем економічної історії не зводиться до опису фактів і подій історичного минулого,

воно передбачає концептуальне й теоретичне їх осмислення, що вимагає використання багатьох наукових методів пізнання" [14, с. 59].

Аналіз досліджень. Необхідно зауважити, що спеціальних узагальнюючих історіографічних досліджень порушеної проблеми практично немає. Виняток становлять праці В. Жвалюка [10], В. Орлика [13], О. Головка [7–9], проте з часу опублікування їх минуло вже більше десяти років. Навіть дисертація Л. Годунової [6] була захищена п'ять років тому. Окрім цього, більшість науковців у своїх історіографічних дослідженнях, присвячених імперським владним інституціям у Наддніпрянській Україні чи проблемам дослідження фінансової політики [24], лише побіжно розглядали проблеми сучасної історіографії податного контролю в Наддніпрянській Україні в пореформений період.

Метою статті є розгляд особливостей наукового осмислення сучасними вченими діяльності податкових органів у Наддніпрянській Україні.