

Specificity of Being and “Different Modernities” of a Person in the Contextual Range of Anthropological Conflict of Postmodernism

Sergey Kostyuchkov — PhD, Associate Professor
Kherson State University
(Kherson, Ukraine)

E-mail: kosser.63@ukr.net

Specificity studies of human nature in the context of postmodern anthropological impacts on the necessity for use as philosophical and sociocultural approaches. By focusing on the fact that since the status of a person is the basis of modern system of social ideas and values of cultural space, there is a need to constantly update philosophical approaches to consideration of a person, adequate modern socio-cultural reality. The history of civilization is definitely proved, at least for Homo sapiens, the truth about what philosophy is a great teacher, giving invaluable lessons to the thinking of the individual life. It should be emphasized that the formation of new philosophical ideas in the study of a person is determined not only by local problems and contradictions, but also in a wider meaning by scale transformations in the cultural life of society, changes of its intellectual status, upgrading of social interaction models with regard to new civilizations requests. The author turns to the origins, nature and interpretation of the term “postmodern”, gives the classic definition of postmodern proposes results of one’s own thoughts. The author sees the output in developing models of social adaptation as the most constructive and effective means of application is being implicitly provides specificity of modern humans in the changing conditions of the world. Said specificity is that the subject of modern civilization is the history of much of the world’s population as solidarity, integrated and activated in the political, economic, spiritual, cultural and informational interaction subject.

Key Words: philosophical paradigm, a person, an individual, worldview, consciousness, biosocial system, social adaptation, postmodern, antropoculture process, globalization, social and cultural crisis

In terms of the third millennium, awareness of constant social changes actualizes the search, production, and use of new philosophical paradigms traditionally aimed at cultivating wisdom, its practical application to improve the quality of life of the society. Since the status of a person is the basis of modern system of social ideas and values of cultural space, there is a need to constantly update philosophical approaches to consideration of a person, adequate modern socio-cultural reality.

International community faces fundamentally new tasks and challenges, which force it to adequately respond to its own complexity and unpredictability. As Ukrainian scholar Marja Nesterova noted: “The structure of our society needs to change. Around the world, people are creating revolutionary movement against their governments. They do not want to live under

© Kostyuchkov, Sergey, 2017

the rules of government’s dysfunction and corruption. People are trying to create a new world in which individual capabilities and the implementation is not detrimental to collective action” [Nesterova, 2017: 106].

It appears quite natural that different images of a person have become components of the foundation of certain ideas about the person and the basis for the formation of socio-cultural concepts in the research field of various sciences. The philosophical interpretation of a person as a unique natural creature gives an idea about it as an embodied trinity of the natural, social and spiritual. However, neither philosophy nor science, nor art has created a universal cognitive tool, whose use would enable to consider a person in all its multidimensionality.

It is necessary to take into account the assessment of the situation, whereby the 21st century is characterized by rapidity, stochasticity and variability of social, political and economic processes of social life. A contemporary person, being limited by a rigid “Procrustean bed” of the real and virtual, aims, according to modern researchers, “to realize the virtual or virtualize the real in various ways. Both the first and second are the results of the inability of humans to adapt rather than the consequences of disadaptation. It seems that the reason should be sought in certain socio-biological contamination of human nature. As a result, socially significant ideas focused on adaptation of a person as a biosocial system — a product of mental activity of individuals — passively overcome barriers of alienation in the individual consciousness” [Kostyuchkov et al, 2014: 14-15].

There are reasonable grounds to say that in different periods of human civilization development there were made variously successful attempts to find answers to questions about the role and place of a person in the world, its origin, historical purpose, planetary mission, the meaning of existence and the way the past, present and future determine characteristics of human existence, the extent of its relationship with the outside world and the limits of individual choice. Diversity, multidimensionality and polyaspect nature of human phenomenon determines the interdisciplinary status of research of the Homo sapiens, which is in the scope of studies of philosophy, anthropology, cultural studies, and other social and natural sciences. Individual, personality, individuality are essentially different characteristics of the study of a person, fixed in biogenetic, socio-cultural and personality approaches.

In our opinion, modernized world view is characterized by understanding of the subject of cognition considering its natural background. The spotlight falls on achievement of human interests through the preservation of natural environment of its existence. Accordingly, the mode of human existence in environmental and social space with its extreme points in consensus and conflict changes. “The process of the human being in the world is characterized by ambiguity, stochasticity and eventuality; being defines the essence of a human, its nature as a universal and at the same time particular substance. The said process is also defined as the one, where concrete empirical experience is acquired in the cognition of human nature: subjectivity of the lifeworld is transformed into the personal sphere of society through the internalization of social values and mechanisms of subjection and subjectivization” [Kostyuchkov, 2016: 55].

We cannot but agree with the conclusion of the national philosopher Galina Berehova that “... all phenomena and processes ... are subject to the same laws. Therefore, the action of the mechanism for formation of a new, modern, planetary and space outlook of a personality is based on common laws of the universe, among which we particularly note movement, energy exchange, cooperation, unity and logic of nature, critical mass, unrepeatedness and uncertainty. At the same time, the matrix of philosophical knowledge for the success of the mechanism for formation of the consciousness of future specialists for the purpose of guiding humanity on the

path of conscious survival is based on a three-pronged foundation of life: energy exchange, consciousness, spirituality... Understanding of this law of the Universe makes it possible to develop strategies and tactics of formation of a new-type outlook of an individual by means of philosophy on the basis of the interdependence of all other laws” [Beregova, 2016: 38].

There is a seriously funded scientific position, whereby an extremely wide range of characteristics and definitions of a person, formed during 20th — early 21st centuries, including “One-Dimensional Man”, “Homo-consumers”, “Homo-bankrupts”, “Homo-players”, “Homo digitalis”, “Homo-resting”, “Homo-running”, “Posthuman” etc., is a reflection of the real anthropological and cultural process of formation of new features of a modern person. These new formations are considered as a response to fundamental changes in the economic, political and social life and modern culture in general; while life scenarios, strategies and tactics of individual and social behavior, religious norms, values, programs of political parties, doctrines government officials, economic preferences, ways and means of interpersonal communication are being modernized and transformed [Barthes, 1989].

We believe that a quality socio-cultural analysis specificity is manifested in the nature of cognition of various phenomena and processes in human life, in particular — actualization of “higher” human generic forces as a source of publicness of social actors (general anthropological perspective). Broadly speaking, any biological or social system involves varying degrees of inequality of individuals, resulting in their ranking, which is defined as hierarchy. The above-mentioned “... new formations in the structures of individuals of different ranks, being usually differentiated by the level of access to other vital resources, representatives of higher ranks have prevailing capabilities compared to others; they do not coordinate their actions with partners and are defined as dominant individuals or dominants” [Kostyuchkov, 2014: 314].

It should be emphasized that the formation of new philosophical ideas in the study of a person is determined not only by local problems and contradictions, but also in a wider meaning by scale transformations in the cultural life of society, changes of its intellectual status, upgrading of social interaction models with regard to new civilizations requests. Changes brought by new millennium actualize the process of active search for an adequate response to historic challenges, production of new values, which reflect the continuity of civilization development. These circumstances necessitate philosophical reflection and substantiation of the following tasks:

- Definition of the content and ways of realization of socially significant goals able to combine part and whole, universal and individual, public and private;
- Development and substantiation of a constructive model of humane society and civic person, united by initially convergent interests, objectives, priorities;
- Reorientation of public intentions from idealization of the real to realization of the ideal;
- Scientific search by every society of the own path of development in a globalized world, with a focus on the principles, trends, and counter-trends of the process of global development;
- Analysis of philosophical and scientific approaches to research of a postmodern person;
- Search for the optimal way out of social and cultural crisis, based on moral human development, growth of its identity in the postmodern world conditions.

Depicting the image of the person of the future, Ukrainian philosopher Oleg Bazaluk states that “... the person of the future is a harmony of mind, body, and soul, focus on the implementation of internal creative capabilities across Earth and space. Achieving these criteria by each representative of civilization is the main task of the educational system and the near surroundings: parents, relatives, friends, family, etc. Only then, it can be guaranteed that

the trend of priority transition from corporate (collective) work to the individual (personal) one, which is being observed in society, will benefit civilization” [Bazaluk, 2011: 90].

Within the topic, it is necessary to appeal to the origins, nature and interpretation of the term “postmodern”. According to the French philosopher Jean Lyotard, the word appeared in journalistic, then — in a scientific sphere on the American continent among sociologists and critics. It means “the state of our culture following the transformations which, since the end of the nineteenth century, have altered the game rule for science, literature, and the arts” [Lyotard, 1998: 9]. As indicated by the philosopher, science seeks to know the truth, so it should develop its own methods or, as expressed by Jean Lyotard, “game rules”.

“Entry” of the culture in the postmodern era began at least from the late fifties. In Europe, it marked the end of its recovery, as emphasized by the French researcher Alain Touraine in the book “The Post-Industrial Society” in the late 1960s. The above entry and subsequent transit were more or less dynamic depending on the level of development of the country, and inside of it — on the sector of activity; hence general discoordination, which complicates perception and reflection of “the whole” [Touraine, 1970].

It should be noted that according to a British historian, sociologist and political scientist Perry Anderson, the idea of postmodernism first emerged in the Hispanic world in the 30-ies of 20th century, i.e. earlier than in England or America. The term “postmodernismo” was introduced in wide use by a literary scholar Federico de Onis to describe the conservative movement as a part of modernism. Only in the 1950s, the term appeared in English-language scientific space, but in a fundamentally different context — as a characteristic of this era instead of the aesthetic category.

It should be noted that Arnold Joseph Toynbee in his book “A Study of History”, published in 1934, justified the position that the new history of the West was determined by the union of two powerful forces: industrialism and nationalism. However, since the 1870s, they came into irreconcilable contradiction; the reason for this was the rapid growth of international industry, which resulted in active “break” of national borders and that the nationalist trends have affected small and obviously non-viable ethnic groups. The First World War was the result of the implication of these two factors and clearly demonstrated the coming of the era when nation states can no longer be self-sufficient [Toynbee, 2001].

According to the English sociologist Anthony Giddens, postmodernism is the era in human development, characterized by qualitative growth of uncertainty of a large part of social realities. The signs of stochasticity, chaos, eventuality, multivariance and alternativeness become obvious. Anthony Giddens distinguishes the following features of postmodern:

1. Changes of human being occur in space and in terms of gaps in cognition of the world and of itself;
2. Social transformations gain mass, centered and sporadic nature;
3. The identity of the person is exposed to rupture, dissection, which results in fragmentation of life experience;
4. The truth as a phenomenon of spiritual life finds definite and strictly contextual nature;
5. Postmodern society experiences “theoretical helplessness” in front of real globalization trends;
6. There arises “desolation in everyday life” as a result of intervention of purely abstract systems;
7. Coordination of political efforts is devoid of opportunities and prospects through increasing the role of local factor and dispersion (scattering) [Giddens, 1990].

As seen from the twenty-first century, the term “postmodernism” suggested by Jean Francois Lyotard, was quite successful, at least because it contains a reference to the chronological sequence of the modernism, and yet captures the fact of the end of the previous era. As we believe, postmodernism is the time, which can be confidently defined as a period of history full of conflicts, bifurcation (even polyfurcation) points, states of uncertainty, lack of clear guidelines that would indicate the general direction of future development. Postmodernists proclaim radical value pluralism as the only normal social and cultural life, since it provides the possibility of free self-fulfilment of all its members.

In modern intelligent community there dominates an approach that views postmodernism not as a highly specialized form, but as a certain, specific state of modern society, a new kind of socio-cultural reality, which corresponds to the society of the human. Of all the various and ambiguous assessments of postmodernism, we can specify those that most clearly express its content and, accordingly, have been widely adopted. These are the provisions that reveal the key sense of postmodernism — the priority is given to superficialism, plasticity, continuous transformation, and critical revision of reality.

In this context, the statement that anthropological conflict of postmodernism is triggered by progressive imbalance between a person, whose capabilities as a representative of Homo sapiens species are limited both biologically and by human community, which sees no limits in its information and technological expansion becomes particularly relevant. This circumstance leads to a postmodern “sensitivity”, which causes some kind of indifference, “extinguishing” successiveness in relation to the events of the surrounding world. The postmodern person is open to everything but sees everything as a symbolic space having no desire to key into the sense of things, essence of phenomena, meaning of signs, etiologically choosing an “planning” kind of being.

Considering transformation processes of the world philosophical resources in a globalized informational world, there is a need for philosophical consideration of various aspects of life of a modern person, and the role of philosophy in the process of constructive and productive understanding of trends and prospects of its development. This is determined not only by factors of political, economic, cultural or social content, but also by the needs of philosophy itself. The history of civilization has definitely proved, at least for Homo sapiens, the truth that philosophy is a great teacher, which gives invaluable lessons of life for a conscious individual.

It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that philosophy in modern terms, according to Delia Guzman, “is not associated with something practical and useful in life: people began to avoid philosophy, as well as someone who has not found the meaning of life, avoids staying alone with himself. Today, heart emptiness and insecurity are problems of many people. Thus, we should not be surprised about omnipresent corruption, disorder, natural disasters. Therefore, when a person finds inner core in himself or herself, he / she loses the opportunity to move forward” [Guzman, 1997].

There is a quite reasonable scientific position, whereby the postmodern person, seeking improvement, self-fulfillment, self-development, undergoes many difficulties primarily associated with the fact that identity of a person appears to be questionable resulting in a crisis of collective identities. This is primarily caused by human involvement in a large number of information flows that affect the manner of his / her performance of many social roles. Individual identity becomes a more complex entity than it was before. It becomes the unity of diversity, a kind of polyidentity. Accordingly, the task of rescue of a person, assistance to a

person in maintaining his / her personal uniqueness, physicality, and, therewith, the salvation of culture is a quite realistic and pragmatic task [Lectorskiy, 2004].

A realistic approach to the problems of postmodern human being makes it necessary to consider the following: a postmodern person is distinguished by its outlook and consciousness with as unpredictably combinatorial nature as a cultural environment where these media of consciousness exist. Such a person is always in “different modernities”, though being in a single chronological flow with the outside world. A person tries to detect nodal points in these “modernities”, find and manifest its own identity. Identification of the postmodern person is carried out both under the influence of global and local factors, and under the influence of personal qualities. Such a person becomes an active subject of globalization, the main “structural block” and a tool to create a new civilization at the same time.

Modern domestic researchers Oleg Bazaluk and Tamara Blazhevych suggest developing an educational technology aimed at the formation of planetary and space personality on the basis of the analysis of existing global educational systems. In their theoretical research, the authors develop a model of planetary and space personality and technologies aimed at the formation of such a personality. The authors call the technology of formation of planetary and space personality as “space education“. This is in reference to “... creation of a universal educational system that reliably provides quality complication of structures and functions of the I-psyche (individual psyche) and its adaptation to the specific socio-cultural environments” [Bazaluk & Blazhevych, 2015: 97].

The foregoing suggests that in postmodern conditions starts the actualization of an entirely new factor — the possibility of anthropogenic elimination of a human as a species. The solution of the problem is seen in the development of models of social adaptation as the most constructive and effective means, whose application implicitly assumes specificity of the existence of modern person in terms of the constantly changing world. This specificity is manifested in the fact that the subject of modern civilization history is much of the population of the Earth as a subject, which is aligned, integrated and activated in the political, economic, spiritual, cultural, and informational interaction.

In this context, the idea of the new society, proposed by Italian philosopher Maurizio Lazzarato seems relevant. He says: “We ... imagine a general idea or program of such a society, which will optimize and diversify the systems and will give the freedom to flashing processes; there, tolerance towards individuals and minority practices will be firmly established; there, the subject of impact will be not individual players but the game rules; there, finally, the invasion of the state in society will be expressed not in internal enslavement of individuals, but in their influence on the world around us” [Lazzarato, 2005].

Conclusions

Thus, based on the work of predecessors and summarizing their thoughts, we reached the following conclusions:

1. In the most general terms, the processes of interdisciplinary study of a postmodern person, strategic directions and basic research methods are similar to those used in any other areas of scientific knowledge. There arises a need to find the causes of the phenomena studied, their most accurate, thorough and comprehensive interpretation. Polyaspect philosophical analysis of human cognition, of course, involves the study of epistemological and methodological assumptions based on this analysis.

2. Specific interpretations of human capacity for creation and self-creation, their genesis, meaning, manifestations — have always been differentiated by a very broad range — depending on historically determined world view trends, ideological and socio-political position in the general field of philosophical research.

3. Crisis is a necessary condition for the formation of a new (in this aspect — postmodern) culture, in the center of which appears another person, respectively — other characteristics of his/her personality — behavior, internal experiences (needs) and external attributes.

4. The starting and key consideration point of philosophical and scientific approaches to the study of postmodern person should consider the idea that his study, by means of both natural and human sciences, is a complex, diverse, and stochastic process. Therefore, there will inevitably appear factors complicating the cognition and opening new research perspectives at the same time.

References

- Barthes, Roland. *Select works: Semiotics. Poetics. Division of languages*. Moscow: Progress, 1989.
- Bazaluk, Oleg. Philosophy of education. Formation of a Planetary and Cosmic Type of Personality. In *Future Human Image*. Volume 1, 2011: 61-93.
- Bazaluk, Oleg, and Tamara Blazhevych. Modern Basics Philosophy of Education. In *Future Human Image*. Volume 2 (5), 2015: 93-100.
- Beregova, Galina. Philosophy of education: pragmatism-instrumentalism concept of forming the future human in higher education. In *Future Human Image*. Volume 3 (6), 2016: 31-45.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- Guzman, Delia. Philosophy as an Education for Life. In *New Acropolis*. №1, 1997: 43-48.
- Kostyuchkov, Sergei. Human nature in the context of biopolitics: ethological and sociological aspects. In *Gileya*. Volume 88 (9), 2014: 312-316.
- Kostyuchkov, Sergiy. Place and role modern man in planetary existence: biopolitical interpretation. In *Future Human Image*. Volume 3 (6), 2016: 53-66.
- Kostyuchkov, Sergei, Edward Pronin, and Ilya Lepnitsky. Formation mechanism of human adaptation, as biosocial systems: educational and philosophical interpretation. In *Socio-Humanitarian Research and Technology*. № 3 (8), 2014: 12-18.
- Lazzarato, Maurizio. Biopolitique / Bioéconomie, article publié initialement dans la revue. In *Multitudes*. №22, 2005. <http://left.by/archives/2745>.
- Lectorskiy, Vladislav. Has the man died? In *Human*. №4, 2004: 10-16.
- Lyotard, Jean Francois. *The Postmodern Condition*. Moscow: Institute of experimental sociology, St. Petersburg: Aletya, 1998.
- Nesterova, Marja. Educational Cognitive Technologies as Human Adaptation Strategies. In *Future Human Image*. Volume 7, 2017: 102-112.
- Touraine, Alain. La société post-industrielle. Naissance d’une société. *Population Année*. Volume. 25, №3, 1970: 684-685.
- Toynbee, Arnold Joseph. *The Study of History*. Moscow: Rolf, 2001.