

Philosophy of history

DOI: 10.34170/2707-370X-2023-58-76

UDC: 314/316

Zorina Vykhovanets

PhD candidate

National Pirogov Memorial Medical University,

Vinnytsya, Ukraine;

zarina.vyhovanec@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1653-5873

Hanna Shevchenko

PhD candidate,

associate professor of the Department of Philosophy

of the National Aviation University

Kyiv, Ukraine

an_shevchenko@ukr.net

SOCIAL PHENOMENON OF ALIENATION IN UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUAL DISCOURSE

*We are looking for happiness in regions, in ages, in states,
while it is everywhere and always with us, like a fish in water,
so we are in it, and it is near us looking for us.*

Hryhoriy Skovoroda

Abstract. *The social phenomenon of alienation in the Ukrainian intellectual discourse. In this publication, an analysis of the features of modern communicative discourse on the impact on the manifestation of feelings dehumanizing tendencies and the possibility of overcoming it through the restoration of authentic communications, which ensure the successful functioning and interaction of all social institutions, as well as individual citizens as members of common communication, has been developed. The transformation of views on the essence of the phenomenon of alienation, the form and features of its manifestation in modern historical-cultural and socio-economic conditions in the Ukrainian intellectual discourse is highlighted. It is argued that culture as a*

form of objectification of human activity includes being and non-being, and alienation, as a consciously imposed process, ensures their personal and mutual movement. The possibility of counteracting the total rationalization of the lifeworld of a modern person through the acquisition of communicative competence in the process of socialization, thanks to the cultivation of internal resistance to the colonization of everyday life, has been proven. Communication acquires the meaning of the universal reality of social existence, and in the conditions of building a democratic state, the Ukrainian community must recognize the importance of reflexive control of everyday collective activity and achieve social harmony through the practice of communicative mutual understanding.

Key words: *person, sociocultural communication, information society, social phenomenon of alienation, discursive practices, rationalization of the lifeworld, dehumanization, cognitive appropriation.*

Анотація. *Вихованець З.С., Шевченко Г.М. Соціальний феномен відчуження в українському інтелектуальному дискурсі. У даній публікації здійснюється аналіз особливості сучасного комунікативного дискурсу впливати на прояви дегуманізуючих тенденцій відчуження та можливості його подолання через відновлення аутентичних комунікацій, які забезпечують успішне функціонування та взаємодію всіх суспільних інститутів, а також окремих громадян як членів спільноти комунікації. Висвітлюється трансформація поглядів на сутність феномену відчуження, форми та особливості його прояву в сучасних історико-культурних та соціально-економічних умовах в українському інтелектуальному дискурсі. Стверджується, що культура як форма об'єктивації людської діяльності включає в себе Буття і Небуття, а відчуження, як свідомо покладений процес, забезпечує їх рух та співіснування. Доведено можливості протидії тотальній раціоналізації життєвого світу сучасної людини через набуття комунікативної компетенції у процесі соціалізації, завдяки вихованню в собі внутрішнього спротиву колонізації повсякденного життя. Комунікація набуває значення універсальної реальності суспільного буття, а в умовах розбудови демократичної держави українська спільнота має визнати важливість рефлексивного контролю повсякденної колективної діяльності та досягти за допомогою практики комунікативного взаєморозуміння соціальної злагоди.*

Ключові слова: *людина, соціокультурна комунікація, інформаційне суспільство, соціальний феномен відчуження, дискурсивні практики, раціоналізація життєвого світу, дегуманізація, пізнавальне привласнення.*

Actuality of research topic. *In today's technocratic society, experiencing a crisis stage of its progress, our shared livelihood is put in jeopardy by a sharp dehumanization of man's everyday life, a feeling of drastic loss of ones worth, the phenomenon of fragmented psyche, coupled with an increased threat caused not just by natural catastrophes and cataclysms, but from bureaucratic, economical and administrative structures in certain counties. This situation causes an increase in the processes of separation of a man from a man and a man from a community, which contributes to*

the deepening of the state of alienation. In the society of mass consumption, the pursuit of doubtful pleasure and the desire to consume more and more material goods and tangible services, gradually deprives one of a positive perception of various events of everyday life. Modern man is more concerned about “having” than “being”. At present, planetary resources are no longer able to support such a civilizational project and are putting humanity in a situation of an urgent choice that necessitates the need to search for the vital and consistent meaning to understand the course of history, make important decisions with humanistic orientation, all of which requires the ability to sympathize, to be aware of personal and public significance. Reflecting on spiritual principles in the 21st century, S. Krymsky notes: “Civilization makes people gods prior they become worthy of human status”¹. As we can see, at the turn of the millennium, a threatening collision between civilization and existence arose, caused by the bifurcation of the spiritual world of man and the total dominance of technical rationality, which deepens the alienation of a modern man. Consequently, when a person feels that their individual participation in the affairs of society is valuable, they begin to understand the importance of their life.

The solution of the fundamental problems of human existence in its personal and social dimensions, viewed through the prism of communication and discourse mechanisms, proposed by such outstanding Western philosophers as K.-O. Apel, O. F. Bollnow, M. Buber, D. Bogler, L. Wittgenstein, H.-G. Gadamer, E. Goffman, E. Husserl, W. Dahlmeier, V. Kulman, N. Luhmann, M. Riedel, P. Ulrich, J. Habermas, V. Hoslo, K. Jaspers and many others. The study of the transformation of discursive practices in various directions of modern philosophical thinking meets the current needs of today. The ambiguous concept of discourse is introduced into modern philosophical knowledge by structuralists, and the most detailed theoretical substantiation of a structural and semiotic understanding of the concept of discourse is carried out by Greimas and Courtés. In their work, they interpret discourse as a semiotic process, which is implemented in the diversity of discursive practices and, above all, imply a specific way or specific rules of organization of linguistic activity. Discourse is a common mechanism for reflecting social mechanisms, according to Laclau and Mouffe, independently becomes material formation, that is, it creates a socio-economic world in itself. As a reflection of reality, discourse is considered in Marx, Gramsci, and Althusser. M. Foucault, analyzing the role and place of man in the modern world, appeals to the concept of discourse as a practice of linguistic entry into the public space or a set of specific forms of cognition inherent in a specific historical era that form their level of “cultural knowledge”, called by the philosopher an episteme. In modern language practice, it is implemented as a strict code, a code of prescriptions and prohibitions. As we can see, today the verbal alienation of the personality is really growing, which threatens control over human worldview through language. Word turns into a cliché that defines language and writing and thus makes a significant obstacle to agreement in social and interpersonal relationships.

1 Krymsky S. B. “Principles of spirituality of the 21st century” In *Two Rus*, ed. L. Ivshyna. 4th ed. Kyiv: Ukrainian Press Group CJSC, 2005. P. 469.

In contrast to Jaspers's individual existential dimension of communication, Habermas and Apel's teachings highlight the problem of social communicativeness, moral and ethical norms and principles in practical discourse, in the world of everyday communication are substantiated². Apel attaches great importance to the principle of responsibility for all types of human activity, which in the conditions of a globalized world have a macro effect and contain a threat to survival of the human race. "For the first time in the history of the human race, people were faced with the task of adopting solidarity responsibility for the consequences of their actions on a planetary scale. It should be understood that this requirement must meet the intersubjective importance of norms, or at least the basic principles of liability ethics"³. Significant contribution to the study of relations that exist between the discursive and practical consciousness in the conditions of social interaction is added by the E. Goffman's ideas, who proposed his typology of interaction. The problems of communicative philosophy, discourse are actively developed by such Ukrainian philosophers such as E. Gerasymova, A. Yermolenko, V. Liakh and others.

The process of alienation of the individual is determined by such characteristics that, in principle, cannot be alienated – this is an individual worldview, world perception, world attitude, national spirit – giving rise to the separation of a person from his ancestral essence, his essence. Such tragic moments for the individual are recorded in the works of such famous Ukrainians as H. Skovoroda, T. Shevchenko, M. Hohol, I. Franko, et al. Their ideas were picked up and reinterpreted in V. Pidmohylnyi, M. Khvylovyi, and V. Stus' works and recorded the total destruction of the human essence in a totalitarian society. Separately, the reflections of famous philosophers from the Ukrainian diaspora, who have not found themselves abroad by their own will, should be briefly highlighted. Among them are L. Shestov, D. Chyzhevskiy, B. Tsymbalystyi, V. Vynnychenko, D. Dontsov, V. Lypynskiy, et al. For example, the author of the original concept of "Ukrainian personalism", O. Kulchytskyi, relied on the ideas of Western European thinkers regarding the development of culture through crisis situations. Investigating the peculiarities of the crisis of modern culture, he comes to the conclusion that it was caused by a change in the hierarchy of values. True values – ethical, aesthetic, religious, etc. – are replaced by economic and technical ones, which define a new type of technocratic culture that has a destructive effect on an individual. Depersonalization, inner devastation, automation are all signs of human alienation, which is growing in the conditions of a new culture. The philosopher tries to understand the meaning of human existence from the standpoint of a philosophical and anthropological approach. He gave great importance to the process of self-discovery and realization of a person as a creator in accordance with his vocation.

Modern Ukrainian philosophers did not remain aloof from the research of this topical issue. V. Gorskyi, I. Boychenko, A. Yermolenko, and M. Mikhalchenko paid attention in their research to the historical and philosophical analysis of the phenomenon

2 Lyakh V.V., Pazenok V.S., compiler. Modern foreign philosophy. Currents and directions. Kyiv: Wakler, 1996. P. 7.

3 Lyakh and Pazenok, Modern foreign philosophy, 362.

of alienation, and the specificity of alienation as a complex and contradictory socio-cultural phenomenon is presented in I. Bychko, O. Bilyanska, G. Kovadlo, O. Lyovkin, V. Tabachkovskiy, N. Khamitov and many other researchers' works.

Therefore, domestic philosophers at the end of the 20th – beginning of 21st century record in Ukraine, as well as in the whole world, the growth of the existential and anthropological crisis, the breakdown of worldview points of reference. They try to understand the actual problems of human existence in the conditions of modern social transformations and to determine the evolutionary movements of national history. In the process of creating a modern living space, a person overcomes the destructive collisions that accompany them on this path. It comes to intra-communicative relations with the world, to new communication and interaction with it, according to the type of H. Skovoroda's "kinship work".

Objectives setting. The purpose of the article is to analyze the peculiarities of modern communicative discourse, its impact on the manifestations of dehumanizing tendencies of alienation and the ability to overcome it through the restoration of authentic communications, which will ensure the successful functioning and interaction of all public institutions and citizens as members of a shared communication community. To comprehensively highlight the evolution of views on the essence of the phenomenon of alienation, forms and features of its manifestation in modern historical, cultural and socio-economic conditions in the Ukrainian intellectual discourse.

Presentation of the main material. Communication is known to be an integral part of various types of human activity: economic, political, social, cultural, scientific, etc. In each of them, it acquires its specific features and characteristics. At the end of the last century, observing the complicated dynamics of society, scientists make an attempt to combine classical and modern approaches into a single theory capable of analyzing the socio-cultural dynamics of modern societies both at the micro and macro levels, taking into account the reflection of different individuals, social structures and irrational tendencies of social life. In solving these tasks, J. Habermas, creates the activity-structural theory of communicative action on the basis of a critical rethinking of classical and modern paradigms. It is based on the analysis of human communication, cooperation and the possibility of a discursive approach. He develops the theory of communicative action on the basis of a critical rethinking of Marxism and neo-Marxist school, including those created by representatives of the first generation of Frankfurt School. The scientist's attention is drawn to the concept of alienation, which was developed by K. Marx, who did not investigate human communications, which were distorted by the alienated influence of later information and political structures of capitalist society. According to the philosopher, it is the statement of the problem that is important because it affects the interests of the whole society more than the problem of alienation in one economic sphere. Unlike Marx, for whom labor is the natural need for human life, and emerging economic and political structures bring the effect of alienation in the sphere of labor, for Habermas communication is the most important socio-cultural phenomenon that expresses the essence of man. Analyzing human communication from the standpoint of historical and cultural dy-

namics, he concludes that at some stage of human history there was a natural, inalienable communication. Mutual understanding was achieved through direct communication in almost culturally closed society, which allowed to maintain the stability and linearity of the identity of semantic images and social realities. Thus, the economic, political, information structures of society that arise in the day of capitalism begin to actively influence people's consciousness. Regardless of people's will, they began to impose their own understanding from the outside, to encourage certain stereotypes of thinking and actions, alienating them in this way from natural, unsettled communications and themselves. An important place in J. Habermas's theory is occupied by the concept of communicative discourse. In its interpretation, discourse means a perfect linguistic situation where external circumstances do not affect the arguments that are used to explain the various phenomena of social being. It is the force of arguments released from external influences that can highlight which process is true. According to the philosopher, free public discourse can determine the rational-humanistic nature of human communication in all spheres of public life: "The communicative mind, despite its purely procedural, free from any religious metaphysical content, is directly involved in the social process, the act of mutual understanding starts functioning of mechanism of coordination of actions. The set of communicative actions feeds on the resources of the lifeworld and at the same time forms an environment that reproduces specific life forms"⁴.

According to J. Habermas, communication, but not the economic sphere of society, forms the socio-cultural phenomenon that expresses the essence of man and determines the nature of his interaction with other people. The factor forming a modern communicative discourse is the public sphere, which creates a kind of buffer social space between state power and the private life of the individual. The development of the public sphere itself is a rather complex and contradictory process that was facilitated by the democratization of society and the formation of market relations. It is in the public sphere, as the least involved, there is a favorable atmosphere for free discussions, because it cannot be directly influenced by both the interests of the state and the interests of individuals. In the public sphere, the most pressing problems of economic, social, political, cultural life of society are discussed. This creates conditions for communicative discourse, released from external coercion. In the context of building a democratic society in modern Ukraine, democratic parliamentary discussions, television debates, publications in the press, etc. may be an example of released communicative action. The development of the media contributes to the free discussion of the values and norms of society, which has recently been closed for public discussions. Although, according to J. Habermas, the strengthening of the capitalist foundations of society, and accordingly, the media, led to the fact that they began to express the interests of narrow social groups, the interpenetration of private property and public sphere occurred. As a result, the Enlightenment becomes supervision, the provision of information – advertising, and education is transformed into manipulations, which today, unfortunately, we can observe in Ukrainian society.

4 Habermas J. The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Moscow: Ves mir, 2003. P. 326.

Permanent structures of the modern social system become the forces that colonize the living space of the individual and create barriers on the way to possible natural communication. They ensure the dominance of formal rationality (technical or instrumental), while the human lifeworld exists thanks to substantive rationality, the basis of which is formed by ethical norms and values. The formal rationality, based on purposeful actions, contributed to the rapid growth of production forces. The result of the scientific and technological revolution was the phenomenon of technological control over the living space of people. The dependence of the safety and life of people on digital technologies has become the main problem of the modern civilization progress of society, and an obstacle to the achievement of mutual understanding between people is the formal rationality that is deprived of humanistic content.

Thus, the development of modern structures of the social system under the influence of growing dynamic complexity is becoming more and more independent and makes them alienated from the living space of the individual. Forms of interaction such as bureaucratic procedures, financial and monetary relations, the position of force pressure and control displace communicative and linguistic means of communication. People's interaction becomes so anonymous and minimal that it loses its purely human importance. All this contributes to the alienation between the system and the lifeworld of people who develop in different tempo. Today, bureaucratic social structures of the state are rapidly losing the support of social groups and specific people. That is why J. Habermas proposed his vision of social interaction, based on humanistic cooperation of people in all spheres of public life and leads to understanding. He opposes formal rationality to the rationality of communicative action, cleansed of external coercion.

It should be noted that modern communicative discourse is increasingly gaining the nature of the "masquerade" of debate. It is said that privately owned media become commercially focused on large profits and political impact, they push the audience and readership to uncontrolled thoughtless consumption. The development and strengthening of modern media positions leads to the replacement of an autonomous and independent subject of discussions in the public sphere with a mediator, which brings inadequate information to the media in order to manipulate public opinion. It is from these circumstances that the formation of an independent communicative discourse derives, which will make it impossible to manipulate people's consciousness. Unlike Marx, who believed that the way to overcome alienation is the destruction of capital as private property, in the era of post-industrial changes, this way lies through the elimination of external deformations on the way to natural communication.

Today, visual means of information – cinema and television – have huge, practically unlimited opportunities for manipulation of people's consciousness, creating simulacrum and distorting natural communications. According to J. Baudrillard, the fourth stage of image transformation occurs when it ceases to be connected with any reality and turns into its own pure simulacrum. At this stage, the discourse is lost, reality is no longer taken into account as the image acquires the full power. The designed image of "hyperreality" in detail gives the viewer to see what the world looks without its real

participation in it, images “speak” for it, the loss of which increases the loss of social content and history.

The people’s belief in the fact that the media reflect reality, unfortunately, is increasingly removing us from reality. Our existence today, according to some scientists, is increasingly determined by the interaction and agreement with the image and simulations that have ceased to be intermediaries between us and reality. Trusting a certain source of information, people stop looking for confirmation of the received messages in other sources and exchange views in direct communication. The loss of such real contacts inhibits public discussion and increases the dominance of all known sources of virtual reality. Overcoming the negative consequences of virtualization of human life space, which is so successful with the help of the latest technical means and communicative technologies is a complex task of today, when Ukrainian society continues to experience the consequences of the global economic crisis that has affected all spheres of human life. In addition, according to E. Herasymova, in the conditions of permanent socio-economic and political crisis, a person has an urgent need for the development of self-awareness and self-affirmation, for which they often uses illusions and virtual worlds. In this sense, they can turn out to be a way of creating the necessary natural attitude to the objective world, taking the form of a special emotional environment⁵. Through illusions and virtual worlds, people try to reduce emotional tension, decorate the everyday life of their existence, justify misses and failures in their lives, get rid of a sense of inferiority and alienation. It remains open whether the process of humanistic activity and structural rationalization is possible in our Ukrainian society, in which the deformation of the lifeworld of people by state structures in the form of “colonization” and alienation would make it impossible.

Based on the thesis that the social world is always structured through certain linguistic means, its original way of understanding the existence of a modern man and the study of the dynamics of thinking systems in the historical context was proposed by M. Foucault. The basic ideas are stated in the theory of archeology, which, in his opinion, allows to reproduce the nature of knowledge about social phenomena of both past and present. M. Foucault focuses his attention not on what people say, but on the study of discourse as a practice, especially in the context of “knowledge and power” or “truth and power.” He sees the task for himself not to consider discourse as a set of signs, but to comprehend them as practices that systematically form the objects they speak and offer their method of researching discursive practices. The method consists of two interdependent techniques: the first is the deconstruction of the discourse on its components. With this technique, it is possible to define the rules for the formation of a particular discourse in a certain historical era and to avoid a subjective human factor that could be potentially present. Starting with M. Foucault, deconstruction as a technique began to be developed and used in other schools, for example, in poststructuralism and other theories of a postmodern nature.

5 Herasymova E.M. Economic knowledge in the discourse of the formation of the globalized world. Chernihiv: ChDIEU, 2008. P. 36.

The second technique is an inductive transition from specific discourses to a generalized episteme and a general system of thinking, scientific theorizing characteristic of a specific historical stage of development. In the history of human civilization, respectively, the theory of archeology of knowledge, the forms of epistemes have repeatedly changed, depending on the focus dominated in scientific theories of certain historical periods. In the middle of the 20th century, the socio-political sciences are in a crisis, M. Foucault precisely sees the cause of this phenomenon in an outdated episteme that does not reflect the realities of today⁶.

Separately, it is necessary to focus on the provision that from the end of the 18th century central importance in social and humanitarian reflections becomes a new status of a man. However, this episteme is accompanied by the involvement of knowledge, which leads to the imposition of distorted forms of worldview and world attitude. The way out of the crisis can be, according to Foucault, the transition to a new episteme based on a “linguistic component” or a linguistic organization of human knowledge. It is the sign and symbolic systems of language, as relatively steady factors of order, that determine the existence of objects that are able to more adequately reproduce the diffusion and chaoticity of the modern social world. As already mentioned, Foucault was of great importance to study the discourse in the context of “knowledge – power” and believed that the forms of epistemes are directly related to the nature of numerous power relations, that a certain form of knowledge shows power over another and thus affirms control in society. Different groups of people (wealthy and poor, healthy and sick, etc.) speak different languages, have different levels and forms of knowledge between which there is no dialogue in the modern world. As a result, one form of knowledge begins to dominate the other, which has a specific identification in the development and establishment of social control institutions. The dynamics of knowledge leads to changes in the nature of power, institutions of social control. All these changes occur due to a change in discourse standards.

Thus, the theory of archeology knowledge gives researchers a modern, original tool for studying the dynamics of social reality. It is possible to obtain an unbiased idea of the nature of power and the specifics of the individual spheres of life of society using the principle of deconstruction of discourse and gradually forming an idea of the episteme in a specific historical period. In the conditions of the “current modernity”, when social realities are of diffusion nature, become uncertain and complexly predictable, this theoretical and methodological tools are becoming more relevant. In such circumstances, types of discursive practices are of relatively sustainable nature, which modern researchers can rely on studying postindustrial society.

K.-O. Apel made an attempt to take modern public opinion out of a crisis state in his theory of communications, relying on the constructive traditions of pragmatic and analytical philosophy, the ideas of classical transcendental philosophy and the M. Heidegger’s approaches. The peculiarity of K.-O. Apel’s theory is that it combines intersubjectivity with reflection, the philosopher abandons the theoretical-cognitive solipsism of the New Age period and introduces the concepts of “understand-

6 Foucault M. Archeology of knowledge. Kyiv: Osnovy, 2003. 326 p.

ing”, “agreement”, “communication”. Communication and understanding presuppose a subject-subject connection and recognition of a sovereign personality in a person. As we can see, the form of application of the final justification of moral norms to life practice should be the principle of responsibility of each person, as a participant in real interaction, to achieve agreement (Konvention) and harmony in solving the urgent problems of our time. The demands of all the members of the community in the communication network can be justified by a reasonable argument, and the one who makes them must explain his own demands to others with the help of justified arguments, so “on this basis, the members of the communication community (that is us, all thinking beings) obliged to take into account all possible demands of all possible members of it, in other words, all human “needs” to the extent that they can make demands on their human environment (Mitmenschen)”⁷.

The question about the criteria for the credibility of the argumentation arises. After all, as by M. Foucault noted, in society, different forms of knowledge among the participants of communication are due to higher reasons: the level of education, social status, state of health, etc., which leave the participants of the interaction in unequal conditions and contribute to the distortion of information. All this affects the process of reaching agreement, and sometimes it is impossible. A person who resorts to arguments must at the same time remember the real community in dialogic communication, they are a member of, through the process of socialization and striving for ideal interaction. They must be able to adequately assess arguments presented and discuss their objectivity in order to reach agreement.

It can be argued that the communicative discourse, freed from any external coercion, can counteract the formal rationalization of the information society, which colonizes the personal world of modern man’s life. It is the discourse that is able to ensure communication process in all spheres of social life, its rational and humanistic character. Discursive practices can contribute to overcoming the process of colonization and existing forms of alienation, including alienation between people, as well as affirming natural, authentic communication, that is, expanding a certain level of awareness, education, social activity of self-reflective agents who are participants in the discourse and take part in the formation of non-institutional opinion in public sphere.

Separately, there is the problem of cognitive appropriation of the world, commensurability with it, it should be noted that the concept of commensurability is not the same as harmony, is not equivalent to individual reactions of a certain amount of people to social influences. The peculiar informational and energetic influence of one person makes society as a whole move not due to the mechanism of cause and effect changes, but due to communication and information exchange at all levels of culture in society. People, being in a constant vortex of historical events, change the nature of their activities, face a state of social chaos, appropriate that special perception of the lifeworld of other people, which they energetically “dispersed” due to their presence in this culture. The problem of human alienation in Ukrainian sources is often associated with the spread of such a phenomenon as marginality. Since the

7 Lyakh and Pazenok. Modern foreign philosophy, 412.

end of the 20th century, as a result of unsuccessful attempts to reform all spheres of life, mass impoverishment of the population, society has faced such typical manifestations of marginality as the destruction of national consciousness, denationalization, depersonalization, worldview confusion, loss of leading personal life orientations and sense of freedom. Once again, a person is faced with the question of choosing his future destiny and the problem of building a new way of interacting with the world. As a solution to this task, there are ideas of appropriating life activity and “mastery” of the world, which was proposed by V. Tabachkovskiy. In addition, appropriation takes various forms in various spheres of life of a modern person. In particular, “in the spiritual sphere, appropriation acts as human dignity, in the ideological sphere – as fame, popularity, in the moral sphere – as authority, in the ethnic sphere – as a rite, ritual, tradition, in the linguistic sphere – as a sign, image, symbol, line, figure, in cultural studies – as an archetype, mentality, etc. In the social sphere, appropriation is reduced to power, prestige, domination”⁸.

The most significant in terms of its consequences is alienation from a person of his ancestral essence, the first prerequisite of such a process is manifested in the loss of the creative character of human work, which contradicts the essence of a person as a creative and active being. The second reason for the alienation of the ancestral essence is the loss in one’s activity of such an important component as the universal planetary worldview, which makes it impossible for a person to become a universal, multifaceted personality. The third prerequisite for alienation from a person of his ancestral essence is the alienation of an individual from culture, that is, from the accumulated human experience of social relations in his historical territory. If a person is perceived as a microcosm, then everything that is inherent in the social system, the culture of this society is reflected in it itself. A person is not determined by society, its culture, but directly grows in the culture of society, experiences himself in it. H. Skovoroda believes that it is possible to reveal such a true essence of the “invisible”, “inner” person through “relative life”. In this way, a person goes to God, trying to avoid the deceptive external world: “We are looking for happiness in regions, in ages, in states, while it is everywhere and always with us, like a fish in water, so we are in it, and it is near us looking for us. It is nowhere because it is everywhere. It is like sunshine: just open the entrance to your soul. It always knocks on your wall, looks for a passage and does not find it; and your heart is dark and unhappy, and darkness over an abyss”⁹

A person must be the creator of his own thoughts and be able to counteract the influence of universally recognized patterns. Freedom of thought should not be squeezed into a rigid scheme of logical judgments, because the habit of thinking logically kills imagination: “In fact, it is about the fact that a person is multidimensional –

8 Kotsyubynskiy V.Y. Embezzlement as a phenomenon of the formation of civil society (Social and philosophical analysis). Kyiv: Institute of Philosophy named after H.S. Skovoroda of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 1999. P. 85.

9 Skovoroda H. Discover a person within yourself, trans. M. Kashuba, V. Voynovich. Lviv: Svit, 1995. P. 231.

and if they are placed in a Procrustean bed of one dimension, even a rational-cognitive one, they will inevitably lose the ability to self-criticize and will slide into the darkness of autism and collapse of the personality,” M. Popovych claims¹⁰. The process of learning about the objective world must remain a creative process and, at the same time, be accompanied by responsibility for its existence. Otherwise, the personality loses their uniqueness, acquires the characteristics of a one-dimensional abstract “I”. Losing their identity, such an alienated person turns into a transcendent subject, becomes indifferent to others, indifferent to other people’s wishes and will. A person must consciously determine their relationship with the outside world, learn to control their instinctive drives, form a sense of responsibility for their own actions, create and constantly improve their value system, which will determine human behavior. Only in activity a person does define and create themselves. Activities should be aimed at doing good for other people, fighting for justice, and looking for the good around you. The individual responsibility of each person for their own actions to community is of special importance, which strengthens and harmonizes the functioning of society as a whole¹¹.

A person who is not rooted in their Motherland loses their deep “kinship” with their land, their people and becomes a “tumbleweed” and is not responsible for their actions. The remark of M. Popovych, who notes that the fewer independent dimensions are there in society, the closer such social organism is to pathology is becoming extremely relevant today: “it is a question of whether progress necessarily creates conditions under which its achievements perish”¹². It is impossible to overcome the destructive consequences of alienation only with the help of the achievements of scientific and technological progress, so self-improvement appears as one of the effective means from the spectrum of possible ways to solve the problem. Through personal experience, in the process of self-discovery, self-awareness, and self-understanding, a person comes to know himself as a harmonious, integral personality, capable of comprehending all aspects of their existence (physical, social, spiritual) and overcoming destructive aspects of both individual and social existence. As we can see, the conducted theoretical analysis of the phenomenon of social alienation allows us to conclude that the source base of research by domestic scientists is formed in the context of cultural, ethno-national processes, as well as intercivilizational communication under the conditions of information “transparency” of borders. The intensification of communicative relationships in modern society, the rapid development of nanotechnology shift the emphasis to meaningful informational and technological factors, the moral and ethical component of human development of the surrounding world, thereby increasing the importance of everyone’s social responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

10 Popovych M.V. Rationality and dimensions of human existence. Kyiv: Sphere, 1997. P. 77.

11 Tsymbalisty B. Earmark of statelessness. Political culture of Ukrainians. Kyiv: UVKR and the Republican Association of Ukrainian Scholars, 1994. 62 p.

12 Popovych, Rationality, 260.

Therefore, culture as a form of objectification of human activity includes Being and Non-Being, and alienation, as a consciously imposed process, ensures their movement and mutual movement. The need to counteract the total rationalization of the lifeworld of a modern person becomes possible through the acquisition of communicative competence in the process of socialization, thanks to the cultivation of internal resistance to the colonization of everyday life. Communication acquires the meaning of the universal reality of social existence. In the conditions of building a democratic state, the Ukrainian community must recognize the importance of reflexive control of everyday collective activity and achieve social harmony through the practice of communicative mutual understanding. In the period of tectonic global shifts, the Ukrainian people need to develop a project to achieve the “proportion” of life, true freedom, to form conditions for the growth of a multidimensional personality with a reflexive ethnic consciousness, which, through the trinity of mind, will and emotional sphere, is able to bring modern harmony of existence to the surrounding world.

References

- Krymsky S. B. “Principles of spirituality of the 21st century” In *Two Rus*, ed. L. Ivshyna. 4th ed. Kyiv: Ukrainian Press Group CJSC, 2005. P. 468-484.
- Lyakh V.V., Pazenok V.S., compiler. *Modern foreign philosophy. Currents and directions*. Kyiv: Wakler, 1996. 428 p.
- Habermas J. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Moscow: Ves mir, 2003. P. 326.
- Herasymova E.M. *Economic knowledge in the discourse of the formation of the globalized world*. Chernihiv: ChDIEU, 2008. 336 s.
- Foucault M. *Archeology of knowledge*. Kyiv: Osnovy, 2003. 326 p.
- Kotsyubynskyi V.Y. *Embezzlement as a phenomenon of the formation of civil society (Social and philosophical analysis)*. Kyiv: Institute of Philosophy named after H.S. Skovoroda of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 1999. 385 p.
- Skovoroda H. *Discover a person within yourself*, trans. M. Kashuba, V. Voynovich. Lviv: Svit, 1995. 528 p.
- Popovych M.V. *Rationality and dimensions of human existence*. Kyiv: Sphere, 1997. 290 p.
- Tsymbalisty B. *Earmark of statelessness. Political culture of Ukrainians*. Kyiv: UVKR and the Republican Association of Ukrainian Scholars, 1994. 62 p.