

Филипчук И. В. Формирование демократических настроений в чехословацком обществе в конце 50-х – начале 60-х годов XX в.: интеллектуальный фактор.

В статье рассматривается влияние интеллектуального фактора на процесс эволюции демократических настроений в чехословацком обществе в конце 50-х – начале 60-х годов XX в. Анализируются условия, в которых возникали демократические настроения, а именно влияние идей XX съезда КПСС и восприятие его решений в Чехословакии, этапы развития этих идей, вклад в этот процесс чехословацкой социологии, а также их роль в процессе распространения демократических взглядов идейного противостояния чехословацких писателей и власти, эволюция этого противостояния на II и III съездах Союза писателей Чехословакии.

Ключевые слова: демократизация общества, XX съезд КПСС, Союз писателей Чехословакии, научно-техническая революция.

Filipchuk I. V. Formation of democratic dispositions in Czechoslovak society in the late 50's early 60's of XX century: intellectual factor.

The article deals with the impact of intellectual factors on the evolution of democratic dispositions in Czechoslovak society in the late 50's and early 60's of XX century. The conditions that make the emergence of democratic dispositions contribution of Czechoslovak sociology to this process and ideological confrontation of Czechoslovak writers and authorities are analyzed. As well as their role in the spread of democratic views ideological confrontation Czechoslovak writers and authorities. The evolution of this confrontation on the II and III Congress of the Writers' Union of Czechoslovakia.

Keywords: democratization of society, the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the Writers' Union of Czechoslovakia, scientific technical revolution.

УДК 94(367):930.1

N. I. Samoylenko

SOCIAL HISTORY ISSUES OF BULGARIA IN THE UKRAINIAN HISTORIANS' INTERPRETATION (THE MID 1950s – THE MID 1980s)

Историческая болгаристика традиционно развита в Украине. Хотя в ней социальная история Болгарии еще не представлена в качестве самостоятельного научного направления, в статье в общепринятых рамках базовых концептов социальной истории рассматривается прошлое болгарской нации в исследованиях украинских специалистов середины 1950 –х – середины 1980-х гг. Автор приходит к выводу, что эмпирическая база украинской болгаристики не утратила своего значения, однако требует новой интерпретации. Ключевые слова: социальная история, Болгария, историография, социальная группа, социальный институт.

Ключевые слова: социальная история, социальная группа, социальный институт, Болгария, историография

Bulgarian studies are traditionally developed in Ukraine. Though the social history of Bulgaria is not presented as an independent scientific field in Ukraine, the article deals with the main issues of the social history of Bulgarian nation from the mid 1950s to the mid 1980s in Ukrainian scientists' researches. They are expounded in the generally accepted frames of subject matter of social history. The author makes the following conclusions: (1) Ukrainian historical Bulgarian studies' empirical data of the mid 1950-s–the mid 1980-s are still significant to investigate social issues of Bulgarian nation's past, and (2) the data need new interpretations. Key words: social history; Bulgaria; historiography; social groups; social institutes.

The interest in the problems of the social history of Bulgaria in the beginning of the XXI century is not accidental. The special role of historio-social knowledge in researches and professional education of historians, economists, demographers, anthropologists and representatives of other social and humanitarian areas is obvious. The analysis of contemporary processes, socio-economic development projections could be deprived of historical basis and scientific validity without knowledge of social history.

It is generally recognized that social history can serve as a center of historical knowledge, so the loss of interest in it is considered by some researchers as the risk of losing their own identity [1]. It could not be disagreed with. Naturally, in this regard, the relevance of the analysis of the social history of Bulgaria was stressed by participants of the III International Congress of Bulgarian studies in Sofia on 23 - 26 May 2013, in particular, by Russian historian E.L. Valeva in her report.

The complexity of studying social history is that its subject matter is underdetermined [2, p.114]. In the 19th-20th centuries the range of its subject and methodology, as well as understanding of its essence due to the needs and level of the national historical science development in each country, were now expanded, now narrowed by historians. They always had been the subject of international debate [3].

The range of these oscillations has extended from the study of the working class and the other oppressed to all kinds of non-political and non-economic interactions of different social strata and social institutes. Anti-authoritarian in its nature social history is constantly absorbing and processing different parts of the humanities [4, p.84].

In the Bulgarian science in the late 90s of the 20th century – in the beginning of the 21st century the firm understanding of the subject of social history was formed against a background of considerable attention to the problems of history, consonant with those in the world historiography. Its thematic field was primarily associated with economic development, economic policy and social changes caused by them [5, p.163]. Sometimes the term "social history" was used as a synonym for the term "economic history". That approach continued the tradition, what had emerged in Bulgarian historiography earlier. In addition, in the situation when Bulgarian researchers were solving the problems of including national humanities into the global academic culture, the themes of socio-historical research in the 90s of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century expanded thanks to gender studies, micro-history, urban history [5, p.117]. In Ukraine, the development of socio-historical researches has been based on the national historical experience with reference to the history of social groups, social mobility, the history of ideas, and the historical conflictology.

The article made actually the first attempt to summarize Ukrainian historians' observations for the problems of the history of Bulgaria, which have traditionally been claimed as the basic concepts of social history, viz. mass social movements, revolution and violence, historical transformations and crises, classes, social groups and social institutes. The chronological scope of the article is stipulated by certain community of the development of the main trends both in Ukrainian and Bulgarian historical researches.

The middle of the 1950s marked the beginning of the weakening of command-administrative pressure period. In the late 1960s the bureaucratic methods of society and state government became dominant; the pace of historical development had slowed down until the new wave of liberalization in the middle of the 1980s. That was replaced by the collapse of the socialist system, a complete rejection of socialist modernization of the society. From the mid 1950s to the mid 1980s there was a period of the humanities development under minimal cultural distance between Ukrainian and Bulgarian scientists. In subsequent years, both countries' researchers solved the problems of new interpretation of the past. The openness to the most relevant approaches, methods, and global science topics has become the characteristic feature. On the one hand, it allows to determine the place of national humanities in the world science. On the other hand it inevitably puts the question on the agenda of the status of historical knowledge gained in the previous period, when the humanities developed in conditions of scientific autarchy in both countries. In this regard, it is important to find out what has not lost its value in the Marxist historical tradition, and what has not withstood the test of time.

Therefore, the reference to the period of the middle of the 1950s –the middle of the 1980s, is completely natural. The above mentioned processes couldn't have helped influencing the home researchers' position and their social history of Bulgaria studies.

Other circumstances had some impact too. Particularly, improving researchers' professional skills, and opportunities to use Bulgaria's archives and libraries' holdings. The Bulgarian studies in Ukraine began its institutional shape just in the late 1980s. Though in the period under review not only its traditional centers – Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv and Odessa – were active [6, p.109] - but also other regions grew their interest in Bulgarian studies. The problems of the social history of Bulgaria were not separated in institutional way and were analyzed at the Departments of Modern and Contemporary History, History of Southern and Western Slavs of Ukrainian universities, at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (hereinafter, the UAS Ukrainian SSR), thanks to the activities of scientific boards in "History of Socialist Construction in the European People's Democracies", "History of the International Workers' and National-Liberation Movements", " History of the Socialist Countries" at the Institute of History of the Ukrainian SSR [7, p.169 – 170]. They were also actively discussed at scientific congresses of various levels of representativeness (including international rank and Ukrainian Slavic conferences). At that stage, the scientific exchange of Ukrainian and Bulgarian historians through scientific visits, participations in international conferences and congresses both on bilateral and multilateral basis became more intense. [8, p.208]

There were also circumstances of nonscientific nature. According to the observations of S.V.Vidnyansky, the stage of the second half of the 1960s - early 1980s was the stage of the active implementation of the Soviet Union' policy to "promote progressive forces" and Brezhnev's doctrine of "limited sovereignty". It was characterized by the increasing interest in the history of foreign countries, including Bulgaria, among Ukrainian researchers [7, p.170]. The active state and party support factor as other one played its own role. The factor along with other ones led to a constant increase in the number of Bulgarian studies publications. For example, during the period 1956 – 1960 only 143 works were published in Ukraine, compared with more than 260 in 1976 - 1980 [9, p.113]. Thus, there is every reason to conclude that the deep and lasting interest of Ukrainian scientists in Bulgarian studies was formed in the analyzed period. That period partly coincided with the heyday of social history in Western science in the 60s. [10, p. 18] Then the domestic humanities developed as a whole under scientific autarky. Could it mean that the long stay on the virtual periphery of the world academic culture had left no chance to reliably reconstruct Bulgaria's past in the frame of social history for Ukrainian researchers?

In the mid 50s - mid 80s, Ukrainian historians repeatedly analyzed the problems that from the standpoint of modern historical knowledge, and in the frame of the most general definition (the history of social institutions and structures, processes and phenomena), were the subject of the social history of Bulgaria. However, the social history of Bulgaria as an independent scientific school in Ukrainian historical science has not yet been presented. Occurring attempts to generalize about historiographical development of the Bulgarian studies were devoted to Soviet science as a whole. The Ukrainian scientists' contribution was not a subject of a self-contained research, or related to researching history of Bulgaria in Ukraine, but did not particularly consider the study of the social history of Bulgaria [11]. It is possible to mark out several groups of Ukrainian scientists' works related to subject of social history basic concepts in the period under review. The proposed classification takes into account thematic priorities

change in Bulgarian historical studies in Ukraine as it was determined by the researcher's need to touch upon social history problems. In the second half of the 50s - early 60s the study of the national liberation struggle of the Bulgarian people against the Ottoman rule came to the fore. Since the mid 60s the socialist modernization of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Russian-Soviet-Bulgarian contacts became the main issues [12, p.45].

The works, which dealt with the contacts of the two countries at various stages of their history (especially the revolution in October 1917, the post-war crises as a turning point in the development, socialist modernization), including contacts on multilateral basis within the framework of the socialist system, in different spheres of society can be attributed to the first group (the largest). They systematized rich data devoted to Bulgarian working class, intelligentsia, Bulgarian Diaspora in Ukraine, as well as individual and social characteristics of the revolutionary and national- liberation movement, the spiritual culture of Bulgarian society. The second group along with other issues was concerned with the development of the Bulgarian state on its different stages and allows us to trace the dynamics of the social structures of Bulgarian society, certain social institutions (primarily educational and scientific), their interactions. The next group was the smallest. It virtually raised the problem of social history and treated them as an original object. A few publications in the genre of historical Biography Studies adjoin it [13, 14].

The emphasis on the widely understandable impact of Soviet and Russian cultural, historical, and social content on Bulgarian society as a whole was a characteristic feature of all three groups. In addition, as a rule, the nation was not seen as a formative principle of history by those three groups, in contrast to European tradition[15].

In the analyzed period Ukrainian historians inevitably turned to the problems of Bulgarian social history, studying the turning points or deep structural changes in the life of the Bulgarian nation. In particular this applied to the Bulgarian National Revival in the second half of the 19th century. Speaking about the social structure of the Bulgarian society of that time, Ukrainian historians primarily used the definition "workers". They always treated the economic situation of workers, referring to the country's socio-economic development until 1944. On the one hand, that approach reflected the low degree of Bulgarian society differentiation and its incomplete social structure (from point of view of the preconditions of modernization) [16, p.5]. On the other hand it was the result of insufficiently developed concepts of "people" and "social group" in Soviet scientific tradition [17, p.p. 14 – 15, 24, 25].

Studying the Bulgarian national- liberation movement, Ukrainian historians were trying to define its social composition, as well as to find out which of the participant and why [18, p.p.11,14,19] were able to head it. In this regard, it was about the chorbadji status, various strata of the bourgeoisie (trade, industry, agriculture, and petty), its goals and fears, the social status of peasants, craftsmen, city petty producers, the protest moods of lower classes and intellectuals [13, p.p.8,10 – 11; 19, p. 118 – 119; 20, p. 124;18, p.p. 6,7]. The issue about chorbadjis whose social nature had remained unclear for a long time deserved special attention. The understanding was established of the social group as a part of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, which was economically and politically connected with the whole system of the Ottoman domination [21,p.p.26 – 27, 156].

Speaking about the social ideals of the movement's leaders [13,p.p. 26 – 27, 156], historians in such a way characterized the educated part of the Bulgarian society, primarily, the intelligentsia. More details of their social activities, as well as cultural-educational function were considered in connection with the Bulgarian-Ukrainian and Russian-Soviet-Bulgarian relations.

Ukrainian researchers paid due attention to the change of the Bulgarian society social structure after the liberation of the country in 1878 [22, p.163].They did not regard it as a complexification, but connected it with the development of production relations. [23, p.89] That implied the feature of the study of various social groups and their interactions: the concentration of research interest in their political and economic activity.

Regarding the 80s of the 19th - early 20th century Ukrainian historians primarily talked about business strata and its efforts to protect economic interests, using advantage of state institutions. Researchers analyzed working class strike movement as a manifestation of its social activity [23, p.p. 89-90, 96-97; 24, p.p.151, 158, 164; 25].They distinguished youth among other social groups. Their ideological preferences were marked such as an interest in socialism, which was more attractive than Christianity [24, p.p.77, 79, 80]. But it was the working class in the period of formation of industrial society in Bulgaria that Ukrainian historians paid the greatest attention to. Particularly, in 1955th – 1960s about a quarter of their historical Bulgarian studies publications were devoted to the working class status and its political struggle during the 90s of 19th - the mid 20th centuries [26].

It was the political struggle of the working class and the proletarian solidarity movement as an expression of its social activities, that primarily represented Bulgarian society life in the period after World War I until the establishment of the regime of "people's democracy" in the works of Ukrainian historians [27; 28; 29; 30; 31, p. 157; 32, p.p. 22, 27, 28; 33]. Probably such close attention which ruled out any study fragmentariness can provide the basis to determine the typical features of its development recorded by Bulgarian studies in Ukraine. In this regard, researchers focused on its size growth against the background of difficult economic status, the high level of collectivism and social solidarity. The question about the number of the working class and its composition was revealing in terms of determining this social group the level of study. Historiography of the Soviet period was generally characterized by a broad interpretation of its social boundaries and numbers [34, p.78], that was reflected by the Bulgarian studies in Ukraine. Thus, in the mid 40s some researchers (A.A. Kopylov) brought its share in the economically active population to 20%. Views differed towards the question of the labor aristocracy - from allegations of its scarcity (G.Y.Chernyavsky) to a complete denial of its existence (A. A. Kopylov). It is obvious that the common understanding of who should be considered as a worker in conditions of the Bulgarian society life has not existed yet during the period under review.

The educated elite and intelligentsia should be mentioned among other social groups, which characteristics (though not complete) were recreated on the background of a long historical period in studies of Ukrainian historians. It was captured in numerous works about Bulgarian-Ukrainian-Russian historical contacts. Many sorts of

facts illustrating them, reflected the function of the social group as a cultural mediator through educational and propagandistic activities at different stages of the relationships. The researchers recorded the beginning of Bulgarian educated elite's cultural mediation in the bilateral exchange starting from the early Middle Ages [22, p.p. 44, 70, 71, 91, 169 — 171, 267].

As a rule, in connection with cultural exchange [22, p.p. 65, 75, 81, 91, 113, 166 — 171; 35; 36; 37, p.p. 133, 134, 179, 299; 38, p.p. 194 — 215, 232 — 240; 39; 40; 41; 42] historians only regarded infrastructure and operation, the effectiveness of certain social institutions (education, science, culture, and health care). Indirectly, this issue was touched by a number of unpublished theses (E.P. Bakhmat. The Cooperation of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Kyiv, 1973; V.A. Kruglov. The Economic, Scientific, Technical and Cultural Cooperation Between Bulgaria and the USSR During the Second Five-Year Plan (1953 - 1957) .Uzhgorod, 1980; N. Mukhina. The Soviet-Bulgarian Cooperation in the Field of Literature and Art. Kyiv, 1981; E.V. Shevchenko. Soviet-Bulgarian Cooperation in the Field of Training of Specialists (1970's). Kyiv, 1983; G.P. Pisareva. The Cultural Development in the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Soviet-Bulgarian Cultural Ties (70 years) .Kyiv, 1984; S.Yu. Strashnyuk. Soviet-Bulgarian Cooperation in the Field of Artistic Culture (1971-1981) . Kharkiv, 1985). The scanty information about it could be found in the work of G.N. Popov [43, p.p. 41, 99, 121, 139].

Since the second half of the 1960s researchers have been summarizing the data about the bilateral contacts of representatives of other social groups and classes, such as political exiles, the working class, rural population, and youth, including their participation in cultural activity of non-governmental organizations [44; 45, p.p. 19, 22 — 26].

This kind of social activity in the scientific interpretation of the studied period stood as a means of reception (in various forms) of the experience of class struggle and socialist modernization of society, as well as the exchange of social experience in the period of "real socialism", or was linked to the development of bilateral relations.

It should be specially mentioned about such a social group, as the Bulgarian Diaspora in Ukraine. The traditions of its study laid by M.S. Derzhavynym were interrupted for some time. The Bulgarian Diaspora of the period of 1920s-1930s was viewed as the Bulgarian political emigration field of activity. The studied range of its social ties came to nothing more than the participation in the process of socialist modernization [51] of Soviet society.

Analyzing the deep structural changes in the life of the country after 1944, the researchers not only correctly noted the changes in the psychology of the traditional social groups of peasant and youth [52], but strongly defended the thesis that has not stood the test of time. It was the idea about the consolidation of all social groups as leading trend in the development of the social structure of the Bulgarian society [53, p.p. 59, 64, 112; 54, p.p. 25 — 26]. In this case, the emphasis was made on the extremely beneficial social role of the state [53, p.p. 68, 107, 112; 55, p.p. 121, 123, 140; 43, p.p. 139, 143, 205]. Speaking about the process of socialist modernization of Bulgarian society, historians followed the positive role of the state in its life, that was traditional for researches within the social history. They justified it by broad evidence base, primarily archival materials. The main stages of Bulgarian history in social history frames were expounded by Ukrainian authors of the second half of the 1950s - mid 1980s to different extent.

The most holistic view of society life was represented for the first two decades of the twentieth century, mainly through researches by V.A. Zhebokritsky. The social stratification consideration was influenced by a number of factors, including the state policy in relation to different social groups and classes.

In this regard, the authors noted the erosion of the marginalized (the term "marginalized" itself was not used). In particular the Esnaf Law (1903) could serve as the evidence. Social groups inside the bourgeoisie were determined on the basis of the nature of its business (agricultural, commercial, financial, and industrial) and of the property size. Proceeding from the analysis of the Congresses of the Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce, the relations of various strata of the bourgeoisie class with the state, the conclusion was made about the sufficient level of its maturity and realising its own interests [56, p.p. 87, 34-35, 36-37, 38, 47, 48, 58, 61].

In contrast to the agrarian bourgeoisie, even having its own political party in the face of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union, the peasantry was less consolidated and was subjected to social illusions. The peasantry was seen in close connection with the state of the agricultural sector. As factors that determine peasantry's status, not only the nature and the size of the property were analysed (the availability of land and its area, an inventory and machinery equipment, etc.), but also the fiscal policy, various forms of discrimination (including that from the state and moneylenders) [56, p.p. 14, 25, 26, 36, 37, 68, 71, 76; 57, p. 292].

The position and state of the working class was represented by its qualification, level of real income, working hours, working conditions, and the administration attitude. Its age and sex composition was characterized as well as the degree of concentration of enterprises, educational level [56, p.p. 42, 82; 57, p.p. 257-258; 58]. In connection with the working class' state, it was also said about the results of the operation and the low efficiency of health and education social institutions [56, p.p. 88, 89, 92]. Showing the results of the Balkan wars, authors revealed the existence of the common socio-psychological feature of lower classes', namely, patriotic moral, which manifested itself indirectly through the Bulgarian army soldiers [57, p. 295]. In connection with the needs of industrial development it was mentioned about the Bulgarian intellectuals of the first decade of the twentieth century and the social group's professional composition was defined [56, p. 57].

In some works the research methodology was characterized by a typical social history feature. It was a matter of multidisciplinary approach, i.e., appealing to creative methods of other sciences, in particular to the economic history (V.A. Zhebokritsky, A.K. Martynenko, A.I. Cherny, V.J. Golub), and to the complex and multidimensional sociological research (S.I. Sidelnikov [59], to determine the revolutionary organizations composition in 1869-1873).

However, it was rather an exception rather than the rule. The positivism approach dominated in social history studies.

Thus, the socio-historical problems of Bulgaria in the works of Ukrainian authors were not the subject of special study, but it constantly got involved in their field of scientific communication. Appealing to the problems was not only the evidence of sustained interest in the history of the country in general, but it was a condition for searching the answer for other questions that were considered to be relevant in the national Slavic science of the period under review. Among them, there is the study of the revolutionary and democratic movements in the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe, the historical ties of the Slavic peoples [60].

Despite some limitations, fragmentariness, based on theoretical and methodological basis of Marxism, Ukrainian scientists' studies of the social and historical themes according to the method of observation contributed to the establishment of the comparatively ordered, although devoid of information integrity, of Bulgarian nation social life at different stages of its development.

These studies convincingly proved the process of the scientific knowledge increasing in the field of Bulgarian studies in Ukraine. It is unlikely to be a new interpretation of the social history of Bulgaria without their objective evaluation.

The analysis of the Ukrainian studies dealt with the social history of Bulgaria undoubtedly brings nearer the solving of the philosophically oriented problem of historical knowledge reliability and continuity, and it promotes the system approach to the study of the past and present of social groups and institutions, its interactions in the perspective.

The experience of addressing the issues of the social history of Bulgaria by Ukrainian scientists leads to the conclusion that the long-term macro-processes, political interactions of some social groups and classes (especially the working class) were preferable. Less attention was paid to the role of social institutions in the life of the Bulgarian society. In general, this description shows that the empirical heritage of Bulgarian studies of the mid 1950s – the mid 1980s in Ukraine including the social history issues is still relevant. The prospective of future research consists in interpretation of its data in a new way on both the regional and global level, taking into account the systemic crises of capitalism and socialism.

Footnotes

1. Уваров П. Доклад / П.Уваров: [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: www.hse.ru/news/recent/38007787.html
2. Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. Теория исторического знания / И.М.Савельева, А.В.Полетаев. – Санкт–Петербург: Алетейя. Историческая книга, М.: ГУ ВШЭ, 2008. – 522 с.
3. Заярюк А. Історія після linguistic turn: або про те. Як соціальна історія стала культурною / А.Заярюк: [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступа: www.uchni.com.ua/istoria/265/-index.htm.
4. Орлов И.Б. “Человек исторический” в системе гуманитарного знания / И.Б. Орлов. – М.: ИД Высшей школы экономики, 2012. – 192 с.
5. Марчева И. Изследванията по социална история на България през ХХв в историографската перспектива на периода 1990 – 2005 г. / И.Марчева // Историческата наука в България – състояние и перспективи. – София: Ин-т по история при БАН, 2006. – С.163 – 177.
6. Калениченко П.М. Вивчення історії Болгарії на Україні / П.М.Калениченко // Український історичний журнал (далі – УІЖ). – 1962. – №1. – С.107 – 114.
7. Віднянський С.В. Рецепції всесвітньої історії на сторінках “Українського історичного журналу” / С.В. Віднянський // УІЖ. – 2007. – №6. – С.166 –180.
8. Віднянський С.В. О научно-исследовательской работе отдела международных отношений социалистических стран Института истории АН УССР / С.В.Виднянский // Новая и новейшая история. – 1983. – №6. – С.205 –210.
9. Сохань П.С. Советская болгаристика на Украине / П.С.Сохань // Советская болгаристика. Итоги и перспективы. – Москва: Наука, 1983. – С.112 – 119.
10. Кока Ю. Современные тенденции и актуальные проблемы исторической науки в мире / Ю.Кока // Новая и новейшая история. – 2003. – №3. – С.17 –20.
11. Іванцев І.Д. Радянська історіографія революційного руху в Болгарії (1923 – 1939) / І.Д. Іванцев // УІЖ. – 1983. – № 11. – С.145 – 150; Чорний В.П., Кузько О.Г. Дослідження радянськими вченими українсько-болгарських історичних зв'язків / О.Г. Кузько, В.П. Чорний // Проблеми слов'язознавства. Вип.18. – Львів, 1978. – С.116 –123; Калениченко П.М., Павленко В.В. Дослідження вченими Української РСР історії Болгарії та радянсько-болгарських зв'язків / П.М.Калениченко, В.В.Павленко // Історичні дослідження. Історія зарубіжних країн. Вип. 6 – Київ, 1980. – С.76 – 89.
12. Пачев С.І. Тематичні пріоритети української історичної болгаристики / С.І. Пачев // Гуржівські історичні читання. Вип.4. – Черкаси, 2011. – С.45 – 46.
13. Сидельников С.І.Болгарський революціонер Георгій Раковський: життя і діяльність.1821 – 1866 / С.І.Сидельников. – Харьков: Вид-во Харків. ун-ту, 1959. –174 с.
14. Сохань П.С. Пламенный революционер: Жизнь и революционная деятельность Георгия Димитрова / П.С.Сохань. – Киев: Изд-во АН УССР, 1962. –216 с.
15. Стельмах С., Хаусман Г. Українська історіографія в міжнародному порівнянні / С.Стельмах. Г.Хаусман: [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступа: [www // history.org.ua/index.php?article=socium_2002_1_245](http://www.history.org.ua/index.php?article=socium_2002_1_245).
16. Гришина Р.П. Лики модернизации в Болгарии в конце XIX – XX вв (бег трусцой по пересеченной местности). Серия “Человек на Балканах” / Р.П.Гришина. – Москва: Ин-т славяноведения РАН, 2008. -- 256 с.
17. Барулин В.С. Социальная жизнь общества: вопросы методологии / В.С.Барулин. – Москва: Изд-во МГУ, 1987. – 184с.
18. Сидельников С.И. Борьба течений в Первом Болгарском революционном центральном комитете / С.И.Сидельников. – Харьков: Изд-во Харьков. ун-та, 1962. – 116с.
19. Чорний В.П. Героическая эпопея болгарского народа (Апрельское восстание 1876г.) / В.П.Чорний. – Львов: Выща школа, 1976. – 135с.
20. Чорний В.П. К вопросу о возникновении революционной ситуации в Болгарии в середине 70-х гг. XIX в. / В.П.Черний // Вопросы первоначального накопления капитала. – Москва: Наука, 1972. – С.120 – 128.

21. Сидельников С.І. До питання про класовий характер чорбайджійства в Болгарії в період турецького панування / С.І. Сидельников // Учен. записки Харківського ун-ту. Т.69. Труды історич. факультету. Т.4. – Харкеів, 1956. – С.189 – 203.
22. Сохань П.С.Очерки истории украинско-болгарских связей / П.С.Сохань. – Киев: Наукова думка, 1976. – 292с.
23. Мартыненко А.К. Русско-болгарские отношения в 1894 – 1902 гг. / А.К.Мартыненко. – Киев: Изд-во Киев. ун-та, 1967. – 258с.
24. Мартыненко А.К. Русско-болгарские отношения накануне и в период первой русской революции 1905 – 1907гг. / А.К.Мартыненко. – Киев:Вища школа, 1974. – 176с.
25. Кулінич І.М. Робітничий рух в Болгарії в 1908 – 1912 pp. / І.М. Кулінич // Наук. зап. Ін-ту історії АН УРСР. Т.12. – Киев, 1958. – С. 22 – 50.
26. According to: Балканистика в Украинской ССР. Библиографический указатель. 1917 – 1980 / Составители: Д. Димчева-Вирчева, А.Т. Балабушевич, М.И. Кирсенко. – Киев: Наукова думка, 1983. – 239с; Историческа българистика в чужбина. 1944 – 1980. Библиографски справочник / Съставители: Ц.Славчева. – София: Изд-во на БАН, 1983. – 1002с.
27. Рущенко П.Т. Великий Жовтень і революційний рух у Болгарії в 1923р. / П.Т.Рущенко. – Харків: Вид-во Харківю ун-ту, 1967. – 180с.
28. Чернявский Г.И. Рабочее движение в Болгарии в период частичной стабилизации капитализма (1925 – 1929) / Г.И.Чернявский. – Харьков: Изд-во Харьков. ун-ту, 1968. – 200с.
29. Чернявський Г.И. Проблеми єдиного фронту в робітничому русі Болгарії / Г.И. Чернявський //Питання нової і новітньої історії. Вип.14. – Київ, 1972. – С. 15 – 22.
30. Хакимова У. Становище трудящих Болгарії та їх боротьба за свої права (1923 – 1930) / У.Хакимова // УІЖ. – 1976.– №6. – С. 94 –99.
31. Ганевич И.Б. Борьба болгарского народа под руководством коммунистической партии за национальное и социальное освобождение (1941 – 1944) / И.Б.Ганевич. – Киев: Изд-во Киевск. ун-та, 1959. – 322с.
32. Копылов А.А. Отечественный фронт и народно-демократическая революция в Болгарии / А.А.Копылов. – Львов: Изд-во Львовск. ун-та,1985. – 222с.
33. Сохань П.С. Революційні болгаро-російські зв'язки (1907 – 1944) / П.С.Сохань. – УІЖ. – 1962. – №5. – С. 68 – 72.
34. Самыгин С.И. К вопросу об оценке численности рабочего класса НРБ в середине 40-х гг. XX в. в болгарской историографии / С.И.Самыгин // III Дриновские чтения. Проблемы источниковедения, историографии и культуры Болгарии, истории болгаристики. – Харьков: Б.и., 1994. – С.77 –79
35. Степовик Д.В. Українсько-болгарські мистецькі зв'язки / Д.В.Степовик. – Київ: Наукова думка, 1975. – 215 с.
36. Бичваров М.Д., Горський В.С. Українсько-болгарські філософські зв'язки (Друга половина XIX ст.) / М.Д.Бичваров, В.С.Горський. – Київ: Наукова думка, 1966. – 183с.
37. На магістралях дружби і братерства. Участь Української РСР у співробітництві Радянського Союзу з європейськими соціалістичними країнами (1966 –1970) / Відп. ред. І.М.Мельникова. – Київ: Наукова думка, 1974. – 350с.
38. Сохань П.С. Народная Республика Болгария в содружестве стран социализма / П.С.Сохань. – Киев: Наукова думка, 1984. – 287с.
39. Пашковский Л.О. Академик М.С.Пашковский і радянсько-болгарські культурні зв'язки в 20 – 30-х роках / Л.О.Пашковский // Архіви України. – 1971. – № 4. – С. 77 – 81.
40. Чернявський Г.И. Радянська наука і прогресивна громадськість Болгарії (1923 – 1933) / Г.И. Чернявський // Питання нової та новітньої історії. Вип. 24. – Харьков, 1978. – С. 30 –35.
41. Бойко В.В. Радянсько-болгарські мистецькі зв'язки 1944 – 1948 pp. / В.В.Бойко // УІЖ. – 1973. – №8. – С.29 – 37.
42. Костюк Є.Ю. Радянсько-болгарські науково-технічні і культурні зв'язки / Є.Ю.Костюк // Історичні дослідження. Історія зарубіжних країн. Вип.6. – Київ, 1980. – С.68 –72.
43. Попов Г.Н. Болгарские коммунисты в борьбе за осуществление культурной революции. 1944 – 1948 / Г.Н.Попов. – Харьков: Изд-во Харьков. ун-ту, 1966. – 232с.
44. Станчев М.Г. Развитие культурного сотрудничества між радянською і болгарською молоддю / М.Г.Станчев // УІЖ. – 1979. – № 11. – С.104 – 107.
45. Палвенко В.В. Солидарность трудящихся Украинской ССР с революционной борьбой рабочих и крестьян Болгарии.1923 – 1934 / В.В. Павленко. – Киев: Наукова думка, 1977. – 140с.
46. Жук В.Н., Кушнір М.С. На Шипці народжена / В.Н.Жук, М.С.Кушнір. – Харків: Прапор, 1975.– 118с.
47. Знаменская М.В. Дружба миллионов / М.И.Знаменская. – Киев: Наукова думка, 1978. – 167с.
48. Туривненко Н.И. Сотрудничесвто общественных организаций СССР и Болгарии (1944 – 1948) / Н.И.Туривненко. – Киев – Донецк: Наукова думка,1984. – 167с.
49. На магістралях дружби і братерства. Участь Української РСР у співробітництві Радянського Союзу з європейськими соціалістичними странами / Ред кол. І.М.Мельникова. І.М.Кулінич, П.С.Сохань. – Київ: Наукова думка, 1974. – 320с.
50. Міщенко М.Є. Радянсько-болгарське співробітництво в галузі сільського господарства / М.Є.Міщенко // УІЖ. – 1977. -- №11. – С.109 –114.
51. Дихан М.Д. Болгари-політемігранти у соціалістичному будівництві на Україні (1924 –1929) / М.Д.Дихан. – Київ: Вид -во Київ. ун-ту, 1973. – 158с.; Пашковский Л.О. Роль болгарської політичної еміграції у розвитку культурних зв'язків між СРСР і Болгарією / Л.О.Пашковский // Питання історії народів СРСР. Вип.8. – Харків, 1965. – С.172 – 179; Жук В.Н. Перша інтернаціональна комуна на Україні / В.Н.Жук // УІЖ. – 1975. – С.56 – 73.
52. Голуб В.И. Роль БКП у зміцненні союзу робітничого класу та селянства в період будівництва соціалізму / В.И. Голуб // УІЖ. – 1970. – №5. – С.51 – 58.
53. Голуб В.И. Болгария социалистическая. Союз рабочего класса и крестьянства – основа развития социалистического сельского хозяйства / Голуб В.И. – Киев: Вища школа, 1976. – 191с.
54. Жебокрицький В.А., Черній А.І. Народна Республіка Болгарія / В.А.Жебокрицький, Черній А.І. – Київ: Вид-во Київ. ун-ту, 1969. – 50с.
55. Черний А.И. Болгарская коммунистическая партия в борьбе за социалистическую индустриализацию страны. 1948 – 1958 / А.И.Черний. – Киев: Вища школа, 1976. – 152 с.
56. Жебокрицький В.А. Болгария накануне Балканских войн 1912 -1913 / В.А.Жебокрицький. – Изд-во Киев. ун-та, 1960. – 300с.
57. Жебокрицький В.А. . Болгария в период Балканских войн 1912 -1913 / В.А.Жебокрицький. – Изд-во Киев. ун-та, 1961. – 300с.
58. Мірзаєв А. Становище і боротьба робітничого класу Болгарії напередодні Першої світової війни / А. Мірзаєв // Питання нової та новітньої історії. Вип.11. – Київ, 1970. – С.32 –38.

59. Сидельников С.И. О численном и социальном составе Первого болгарского революционного комитета 1869 – 1873гг. / С.И.Сидельников // Историко-социологические исследования. – Москва: Наука, 1970. – С.254 – 282.
60. Марков Д.Ф., Виноградов В.Н. Институт славяноведения и балканистики: некоторые итоги и перспективы научной деятельности / Д.Ф. Марков, В.Н.Виноградов // Новая и новейшая история. – 1983. – №4. – С.19 – 32.

Самойленко Н. І. Соціальна історія Болгарії у дослідженнях українських істориків (середина 1950-х – середина 1980-х рр.)

Історичне болгарознавство традиційно розвинуте в Україні. Попри те, що в ньому соціальна історія Болгарії ще не представлена у якості самостійного наукового напрямку, українські дослідники в межах загальноприйнятого розуміння предмету соціальної історії висвітлювали минуле болгарської нації. Автор з'ясовує, що узагальнена впродовж середині 1950 – середині 1980-х рр. емпірична база їх розвідок не втратила свого значення та потребує нової інтерпретації.

Ключові слова: соціальна історія, соціальна група, соціальний інститут, Болгарія, історіографія.

Самойленко Н. И. Социальная история Болгарии в исследованиях украинских историков (середина 1950-х – середина 1980-х гг.)

Историческая болгаристика традиционно развита в Украине. Хотя в ней социальная история Болгарии еще не представлена в качестве самостоятельного научного направления, в статье в общепринятых рамках базовых концептов социальной истории рассматривается прошлое болгарской нации в исследованиях украинских специалистов середины 1950 –х – середины 1980-х гг. Автор приходит к выводу, что эмпирическая база украинской болгаристики не утратила своего значения, однако требует новой интерпретации.

Ключевые слова: социальная история, социальная группа, социальный институт, Болгария, историография

УДК 94:327

Л. С. Матлай

ЧЛЕНСТВО ІСПАНІЇ В ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ ОБ'ЄДНАНИХ НАЦІЙ (1955–2015 рр.)

У статті розглядаються умови вступу Іспанії в ООН. Країна є активним членом міжнародної організації з 14 грудня 1955 року. Іспанія також обиралася до Ради Безпеки ООН у 1969-70, 1980-1981, 1993-1994 і 2003-2004 роках і брала участь у численних миротворчих місіях, надаючи війська, гуманітарну допомогу потребуючим країнам, включаючи Афганістан, Східний Тимор, Ліван, Косово та Гаїті. Генеральна Асамблея ООН знову обрала парламентську монархію непостійним членом Ради Безпеки терміном на два роки, починаючи з 1 січня 2015 до 31 грудня 2016 року.

Ключові слова: Іспанія, міжнародні організації, ООН, ізоляція, непостійний член Ради Безпеки ООН, діалог, превентивна дипломатія, миротворчі операції.

У зовнішніх зносинах на початку третього тисячоліття все більшого значення набуває превентивна дипломатія та посередництво в рамках міжнародних організацій, зокрема, Організації Об'єднаних Націй, яка була створена 24 жовтня 1945 року. Вона складається з Генеральної Асамблеї – дорадчого органу всіх без винятку держав-членів; Ради Безпеки; Економічної та Соціальної Ради та Секретаріату на чолі з Генеральним секретарем ООН. Доречно акцентувати, що Рада Безпеки ООН залишається єдиним органом у світовій системі міжнародних відносин, який наділений правом застосування політичних, фінансово-економічних та військово-силових санкцій проти порушників міжнародного права. Рада Безпеки складається з п'ятнадцяти членів. З них, п'ять постійних членів – Франція, Великобританія, Китай, Російська Федерація і Сполучені Штати Америки володіють правом вето на рішення даного органу. Інші десять непостійних членів обираються Генеральною Асамблеєю на два роки без права вето. Рішення в Раді Безпеки приймаються двома третинами голосів членів за одностайності всіх постійних представників. Постійні та тимчасові члени Ради Безпеки мають можливість захищати як власні національні інтереси в рамках організації, так і впливати на всі колегіальні рішення. В останні роки можна спостерігати, як позиція непостійних членів була перепонуою для прийняття проектів резолюцій Ради Безпеки, які пропонувалися окремими постійними членами. 16 жовтня 2014 року Іспанія вп'яте обрана непостійним членом Ради Безпеки і з 1 січня 2015 року є частиною вищого органу прийняття рішень глобального масштабу. Саме тому, досвід членства Іспанії в ООН та її позиціонування як претендента на місце непостійного члена Ради Безпеки цікаві для дослідження та узагальнення.

Тема актуалізується прагненням України стати непостійним членом Ради Безпеки ООН у 2016 - 2017 роках, оскільки місце в зазначеному органі дає державі право голосу у питаннях, що стосуються миру та безпеки, у тому числі при розв'язанні проблем українсько-російських відносин, пов'язаних з анексією Криму та неоголошеною війною на територіях Донецької та Луганської областей; в санкціях проти Іраку, Сирії, Північної Кореї, терористичних організацій та угруповань; а також у рішеннях щодо проведення миротворчих операцій.