

УДК 32: 001. 891.3 (075)

*Voronianskyi O., Kharkiv National Tehnical University of Agriculture  
named after Petro Vasylenko*

### NATIONAL INTEREST AS A FORM OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION

*The essence of the category "national interest" from the point of view of social dialogue is analyzed. The author substantiates the position that the basis of national interest are relations that are in this society in the process of distribution of resources and values. The antagonism of these relations is a major obstacle to the consolidation of society on a national basis. The nation, as a political community, performs the function of combining the small power resources of all citizens into a mega-resource, which is delegated to the ruling elite. The latter also implements, on behalf of the nation, an authoritarian redistribution of resources in society. However, since the vast majority of citizens are in fact unable to exercise control over the actions of the ruling elite, at this stage there is the alienation of state power from its formal source - the nation. The political interest of the ruling elite, which is domination over society, always contradicts the political interest of the majority in political equality and political freedom. National interest as a result of the aggregation of diverse social demands in society reflects a competitive struggle for access to resources and public goods through the mechanism of a national state.*

**Keywords:** *national interest, nation, national state, redistribution of resources.*

Actuality and problem statement National interest is traditionally considered the basis of the integration of modern Ukrainian society. However, the understanding of the essence of this interest, both among academics and active politicians, is rather uncertain.

The analysis of publications shows that the overwhelming majority of researchers in defining the notion of national interest traditionally comes from representing the political homogeneity of the nation and the Anglo-American interpretation of the nation as a politico-state category. Such an approach determines the identification of the concept of national interest with the notion of public interest (the classic example of such an approach is the concept of G. Morgenthau). Thus, national interest appears as an integrated interest, which eliminates contradictions between the interests of the state and civil society. It is considered that the interests of nations are formed in the competitive environment of the international struggle for spiritual values and access to world resources. Therefore, most contemporary Western scholars (K. Boulding, L. Kozer, R. Darendorf, G. Simmel, R. Park, etc.) consider the problem of national interests in the paradigms of the conflictology of international relations.

In domestic science in the Soviet period, the problem of national interests was not specifically developed. Although one of the basement concepts of Marxism was the recognition of the political subjectivity of peoples. And on the ethno-social side of the nature of national interests, historians first of all paid attention to the theorists of the socialist movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. (E. Renan, R. Springer, K. Kautsky, R. Luxemburg, V. Lenin). Nevertheless, in the theoretical and historical-sociological terms of the work of Soviet researchers Yu.V. Harutyunyan, E.A. Bagramova, Yu.V. Bromley, A.F. Dashdamirov, M.I. Kulichenko, P.M. Rogachev played a positive role in the development of many issues related to the study of issues of national interest.

In modern Ukraine, the point of view of a nation (at least Ukrainian) as a biological and cultural community is generally accepted. Therefore, national interest is considered first of all in the context of cultural development, political and civilization identification of the Ukrainian people [1]. Indicative in this regard is the thesis that national interests are concentrated primarily in the spheres of politics and culture. Therefore, for the nation as a political entity, the most important is the preservation of its identity and cultural-linguistic identity in the form proper to this particular nation [2]. However, this approach ignores the fundamentals of political science (the political heterogeneity of the nation, the competitiveness of relations in society, the influence of the economic environment on the political system, etc.). It is completely unsuitable for the analysis of real reality. Apparently, this is why domestic experts over two decades of the existence of a sovereign state have not achieved any significant success either in terms of the category of national interests, nor in their formulation at the political level.

The purpose of this article is to study the political nature of national interests and their

subjectivity.

Presentation of the main material Any long-term political interest is not independent. It is determined by the economic and social interests that exist in a particular society over a specific period of time. These interests are not unchanged. They reflect the needs and relations that are being maintained in the process of consumption and distribution of material resources and cultural values. That is why, in some historical situations, the state is perceived by the politically active part of the population not as "the highest manifestation of the will of the people to unite," but as a mechanism to secure their own interests. For example, the gentry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, wishing to receive the privileges of the gentry of the Kingdom of Poland, made in 1569 the actual accession of the Lithuanian State to Poland. This example is not unique even in domestic history.

As the world experience shows, any society builds its political structures around the problem of social distribution. The political interest of the subject of power - the exercise of power in the exercise of his domination - has the ultimate goal of privileged access to resources and values [3]. In society itself, it involves the struggle between different social groups and classes. This struggle of political interests that reflects the economic interests of different groups of society (in some cases antagonistic) is the basis of the entire political process [4]. The question of the cultural and linguistic interests of social communities from the point of view of power relations is secondary. It has been proved that even the real social communities that have been created not on the basis of blood-related unity over a period of time form a common culture and social institutions. Historical development of such communities may lead to the fact that they acquire the features of an ethnic group with their own ethnic and even national identity. Most of the ethnos known to the researchers were formed in this way. On the other hand, those bloodily related communities that live in different conditions, form their own subcultures and even language systems that over time can grow into a separate culture and language [5].

Thus, national unity forms the interest of access to resources and values, if the latter can be secured precisely on the basis of such unity. Without such access, cultural consolidation is also impossible. Since the type of cultural development of a social group is largely determined by its status in the economic system of society. If access to resources is provided within the limited boundaries of society, then national unity forms. In this case, political interest is legally embodied in the principle of sovereignty of the nation over the territorial political organization - the state. Hence the need to maintain the stability of the political system, including through integrative ideology. Its role in modern society is fulfilled by a national idea.

The unity of all parts of society on a country-wide scale is possible only on the basis of the unity of the main long-term interest - the interest in the preservation and development of society as an economic and political unit that is able to confront other societies in a competitive struggle for resources. It is the state that accumulates a significant part of its resources and carries out its (authoritarian) distribution in a definite order. Therefore, the subject of policy to manage the mechanism of the state must ensure that such a concentration of power resources, which will be sufficient to make a decisive impact on the adoption of state decisions. However, the realization of political equality is limited by the real ability of all citizens to have equal access to the resources of power.

The nation, as a political community, performs the function of combining the small power resources of all citizens into a mega-resource, which is delegated to the ruling elite. The latter implements, on behalf of the nation, an authoritarian redistribution of resources in society. However, since the vast majority of citizens are in fact unable to exercise control over the actions of the ruling elite, at this stage there is the alienation of state power from its formal source - the nation. Political interest of the ruling elite is domination over society. This interest always contradicts the political interest of the majority of the nation in political equality and political freedom. Any power elite tends to monopolize in its hands the resources of power, which creates a continuous tendency to overturn the democratic system of government into oligarchic[6].

Favorable access to resources and management of their distribution gives business groups that control the process of making state decisions, a priority opportunity to use the resources of the country, their monopolization. Thus, according to Forbes magazine, all large business groups in Eastern Europe received their capital primarily due to "proximity to state power" and the redistribution of ownership realized by it. The state policy of the countries of "old Europe" and the USA traditionally involves support by the state of large corporations and banks at the expense of the state budget. And for the

development of business groups in Ukraine, Russia, the USA, Germany and France, access to natural monopolies, financial resources of the state (through direct state investments, corporate expenses reimbursement, public investment servicing and payments by commercial banks), as well as tax breaks [7].

The result of this unevenness was the deepening of the gap in profits between different parts of society and, accordingly, the possibilities of access of different social strata to spiritual values (education, culture, information). It causes within the modern nation not only antagonistic contradictions, but also the existence of different types of rather subtle cultural subcultures with their own extra-national identity. Uneven access to resources causes a split in society - not only socio-economic, but also socio-cultural. Hence - the antagonistic interests of different parts of society.

In today's globalized economy, there is a free movement of capital and labor. It contributes to spontaneous formation of communities not on the basis of a separate society, which is limited by certain state borders. Modern communities are formed on the basis of group and corporate interests. As these interests need to be provided politically, there are extra-national policy actors. An indicator of the fact that group and corporate interests today dominate the national ones is that the most influential actors in the modern world are not national states, but TNCs, which use state mechanisms in their own interests.

Thus, the question of national interests can not be considered without an analysis of what the nation represents in the socio-economic context. The fact that the Ukrainian nation as a community is interested in its own state is somewhat corrected by the fact that about 12% of the country's able-bodied population constantly works and resides abroad. Most of these people want to be naturalized as a citizen of the country of residence. The relation of the business elites to the Ukrainian state is clearly evidenced by the fact that capital is wasted out and large property - economic interests are not related to the state. This does not indicate a pathological shortage of patriotism, but that a significant part of the nation does not see the ability to satisfy its interests within its own state. These processes are characteristic of the whole modern world, except for the few most powerful states. Migration comes from countries with low social protection and low investment attractiveness, which results in low levels of production and low purchasing power of the majority of the population. Therefore, the thesis that the interests of the nation are concentrated primarily in the spheres of politics and culture needs to be clarified: first of all, it should be borne in mind that politics is a means of achieving economic interests.

#### **References:**

1. Безрук О. О., Денисенко І. Д. Українське суспільство: теорія та практика демократичного транзиту // Сучасне суспільство. – 2013. – №. 2. – С. 13-27.
2. Денисенко І. Д. Модернізація України в контексті сучасних політичних досліджень та соціальних практик // Вісник СевНТУ. Серія: Політологія. — Севастополь: СевНТУ, 2011. — Вип. 123. — С. 83—86.
3. Parsons T. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. / T.Parsons – New York: Prestig-Hall, 1966.— P.129.
4. Касьянов Г.В. Система владних відносин у сучасній Україні: групи інтересів, клани та олігархія // Український історичний журнал. — 2009. — № 1. — С. 160-180.
5. Михайлюк О.В. Селянство як «уявлена спільнота» // Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету. — Запоріжжя: ЗНУ, 2009. – Вип. XXVII. – С. 89-98.
6. Романюк О.І. Посткомуністичні трансформації: системний аналіз структурних особливостей // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія: «Питання політології». — Харків, 2009. — № 839. — Вип. 14. — С. 40—49.
7. Кулішенко Т.Ю. Децентралізація влади в європейських країнах в контексті впливу ресурсозабезпечених груп // Гілея. Історичні науки. Філософські науки. Політичні науки: Наук.вісник: зб. наук. праць.—Київ: Вид-во НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова, 2016.—Вип. 108.— С. 297—299.

#### **Воронянський О. В. Національний інтерес як форма суспільної інтеграції**

*Аналізується сутність категорії «національний інтерес» із точки зору суспільного діалогу. Автор обґрунтовує положення про те, що в основі національного інтересу лежать відносини, які складуються в даному суспільстві у процесі розподілу ресурсів і цінностей. Антагонізм цих*

відносин є головною перешкодою консолідації суспільства на національній основі. Нація як політична спільнота виконує функцію об'єднання дрібних владних ресурсів всіх громадян в мегаресурс, який делегується правлячій еліті. Остання й реалізує від імені нації авторитарний перерозподіл ресурсів у суспільстві. Однак, оскільки основна маса громадян фактично не в змозі здійснювати контроль над діями правлячої еліти, на цьому етапі виникає відчуження державної влади від її формального джерела — нації. Політичний інтерес владної еліти, який полягає в пануванні над суспільством, завжди вступає у протиріччя з політичним інтересом більшості до політичної рівності та політичної свободи. Національний інтерес як результат агрегування різноспрямованих соціальних вимог у суспільстві відображає конкурентну боротьбу за доступ до ресурсів і суспільних благ через механізм національної держави.

**Ключові слова:** національний інтерес, нація, національна держава, перерозподіл ресурсів.

**Воронянский А. В. Национальный интерес как форма общественной интеграции**

Анализируется сущность категории «национальный интерес» с точки зрения общественного диалога. Автор обосновывает положение о том, что в основе национального интереса лежат отношения, складывающиеся в данном обществе в процессе распределения ресурсов и ценностей. Антагонизм этих отношений является главным препятствием консолидации общества на национальной основе. Нация как политическое сообщество выполняет функцию объединения мелких властных ресурсов всех граждан в мегаресурс, который делегируется правящей элите. Последняя и реализует от имени нации авторитарный перераспределение ресурсов в обществе. Однако, поскольку основная масса граждан фактически не в состоянии осуществлять контроль над действиями правящей элиты, на этом этапе возникает отчуждение государственной власти от ее формального источника — нации. Политический интерес властной элиты, заключающийся в господстве над обществом, всегда вступает в противоречие с политическим интересом большинства, который заключается в политическом равенстве и политической свободе. Национальный интерес как результат агрегирования разнонаправленных социальных требований в обществе отражает конкурентную борьбу за доступ к ресурсам и общественным благам через механизм национального государства.

**Ключевые слова:** национальный интерес, нация, национальное государство, перераспределение ресурсов.