

AESTHETOSPHERE OF UKRAINIAN AND EUROPEAN CULTURE OF THE XXI CENTURY

Summary. *The aesthetic sphere of culture appears as a complex, multi-layered phenomenon that synergistically combines linear and nonlinear descriptors of social status in the cultural-historical space. At the same time, stylistic forms and modifications that exist in society are positioned as a basis for further development of culturological thought, which is characterized by a comprehensive and systematic approach to the study of a wide range of problems and areas that go far beyond purely culturological research-political and cultural existence of man as a creative person, which determines the further development of domestic fundamental culturology as a science with an anthropological basis. The European vector inherent in the Ukrainian aesthetic sphere is much deeper than the external unity in the formation of common values. The aesthetic sphere of Europe and Ukraine is considered from the standpoint of the potential entelechy of culture, as well as the immanent contamination of such phenomena as individual freedom in the context of social self-organization, which determines the awareness of their cultural basis.*

Key words: *aesthetic sphere, entelechy, synergetic, 'I-Other', 'principle of compassion'.*

ЕСТЕТОСФЕРА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ТА ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ХХІ СТ.

Анотація. *Естетосфера культури постає як складне, багатопланове явище, що синергетично поєднує у культурно-історичному просторі лінійні та нелінійні дескриптори соціального стану. При цьому стиліові форми та модифікації, які існують у суспільстві, позиціонуються як підґрунтя для подальшого розвитку культурологічної думки, для якої характерний комплексно-системний підхід як до дослідження широкого кола проблем і напрямів, що виходять далеко за межі суто культурологічних пошуків і проектується в різні сфери суспільно-політичного та культурного буття людини як творчої особистості, що й визначає подальший розвиток вітчизняної*

¹ **Каблова Тетяна**, кандидат мистецтвознавства, професор, Київська муніципальна академія естрадного та циркового мистецтв, t.kablova@kmaesm.edu.ua

фундаментальної культурології як науки з антропологічним базисом. Європейський вектор, що притаманний українській естетосфері, є набагато глибшим, ніж зовнішня єдність у формуванні спільних цінностей. Естетосфера Європи та України розглядається з позицій потенційної ентелехії культури, а також як іманентна контамінація таких явищ, як свобода особистості в контексті соціальної самоорганізації, що й власне визначає усвідомлення власної культурної основи, залежності/взаємозалежності від Іншого, від історичного та морально-етичного досвіду суспільства.

Ключові слова: естетосфера, ентелехія, синергетичність, «Я-Інший», «концепція співчуття».

Historical experience shows that in the conditions of transitional epochs or acute crisis phenomena, cultural creativity is able to play an integrating, consolidating role. It's gives the opportunity is learned about the problems of society, and find and outline their own ways to solve complex worldviews, moral and aesthetic, and psychological problems. The consideration of any cultural processes should be based on the use of traditional understanding of culture as a characteristic of a particular historical epoch or a particular people. That is, there is a process of entelechy of culture, which, according to R. Meyer, is the absorption of a certain time the content, character, spirit, and style of the past cultural era².

That is, the level of perception of cultural heritage is the quintessence of both inocultural influences and resources of native culture.

Reviving the content of the discussions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it is worth highlighting as one of the important scientific problems, namely the 'novelty' of national contribution to the cultural history of mankind by the level of national mentality and Europe. As an evaluation category, 'novelty' has become almost a staple in scientific research on Ukrainian history. This applies both to the publication of works banned by the Soviet authorities and to materials covering the Ukrainian dissident movement, the life of the Ukrainian diaspora, and the activities of certain members of the Ukrainian elite — political, scientific, and artistic. Stylistic forms of modification in the transitional periods of Ukrainian history in the

² Meyer R.. Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe. Meiner, Hamburg 2005: Entelechie.

context of European development became the basis for further development of culturological thought, which is characterized by a comprehensive and systematic approach to the study of a wide range of problems and areas that go far beyond purely culturological research.

The political and cultural existence of man as a creative person determines the further development of Ukrainian fundamental culturology as a science with an anthropological basis. It should be emphasized that this, in turn, laid the foundations for theoretical and practical research on the historical dynamics of Ukrainian culture in the context of European values: culturology of systemic phenomena; research of national-ethnic, cultural-historical, stylistic characteristics of economic content; analysis of intellectual achievements of the late XIX – early XX centuries; culturology of established phenomena (in particular, mentality, spirituality, traditions, etc.), artifacts, creative activities, etc.

Modern paradigmatic understanding of culture requires a holistic, nonlinear, synergistic thinking of a person who has overcome an ethical breakthrough and is able to respond to continuous changes in the world. Understanding the cultural process using the conceptual apparatus of synergetic (study of chaos and self-organization in complex and complex systems) demonstrates the effectiveness of synergetic methodology for dialectical perception and interpretation of social self-organization of Ukrainian society as a multicultural space and, we can say more: self-organization of person in this multicultural space

This process has its own feature – the actual establishment of order in the system solely through the interaction of its components (from within) outside the ordering influences of external factors. Self-organization in itself does not provide an exclusively positive path of system development. In order for a self-organizing system to have a progressive direction of development, it must meet at least the following requirements: openness, exchange of concerted actions between its components: corporatism, exchange of information with the external environment, dynamism and in balance. It is the imbalance, the cyclicity, that is correctly defined as the state of an open system in which action is possible – a change in its composition, structure, behavior. That is, the negative entropy sent by the external environment, which must constantly neutralize the production of

internal entropy in order to preserve the conditions of its existence, It is the imbalance, the cyclicity, that is correctly defined as the state of an open system in which action is possible – a change in its composition, structure, and behavior. That is, the negative entropy sent by the external environment, which must constantly neutralize the production of internal entropy in order to preserve the conditions of its existence and maintain the imbalance of the open system.

It is the reaction to the external entropy that increases the internal orderliness, organization of the system and improves the quality of the manifestation of the effect of extreme sensitivity to external influences, which makes it impossible to apply rigid causal relationships (identical, proportional). The rectilinear extrapolation of tendencies that were the basis of populist projects of social restructuring is removed by synergetic methodology, introducing constructive models, the main feature of which is the view of the future as a palliative space of possibilities and the present as a tense choice process. The tasks of anticipation and preparation for neutralization of negative consequences bring to new scientific level discussions on understanding the traditional problems of philosophy, anthropology, history, culturology, ethics, revealing little-studied causes of culture as a system undergoing adaptive and destructive (jump, catastrophe) stage.

The evolutionary process unfolds in the slow accumulation of quantitative and qualitative changes in the parameters of the culture system and its components until reaching the bifurcation point, where the system chooses one of the possible attractors – a qualitative leap and the system forms a new dissipative structure. A negative characteristic of the evolutionary stage of development of the cultural system are the mechanisms that return it to a stable state, ignoring the strong fluctuations of the system. However, the gradual increase in the entropy of the culture system reduces its ability to adapt and increases instability.

The contradiction that arises between steady-state and entropy pushes the system to bifurcation values, at which instability becomes maximal and catastrophe occurs – a qualitative leap, leading to a new dissipative structure of the system, which slowly changes again and begins a new leap. Thus, the development of real systems is non-monotonic and contains progressive and destructive attractors. This fact characterizes the dialectic

of the aesthetic sphere, which ensures sustainability and development in the context of semantic changes.

In general, the aesthetic sphere appears as a universal manifestation of human characteristics in the context of social space, which became an integrated field of culture, through the study of which paved the way for the consolidation of everything around the individual in a particular historical period. Emphasis on strengthening aesthetic projections in the study of cultural phenomena ensured the application of new methodological principles of the theory of civilization-innovation cycles and synergetic paradigm of socio-cultural orientation, which prevents a new catastrophe – global alienation of Man from Nature, Man from Man, Man from Himself.

Awareness of the nonlinearity of any socio-cultural process poses to society as an immanent component of the aesthetic sphere, a fundamentally new task: to learn in the socio-cultural sphere to distinguish between systems capable of self-organization and self-development based on joint effective monological and dialogical responsibility of individuals for integrity, creation and constant reproduction of a single semantic field of culture.

As the events of the first quarter of the XXI century show, Ukraine highlights a number of values that are inherent in the European values of culture and society. It is about the level of education and the degree of inclusion of moral and ethical principles of the individual in the praxeological aspect of the activities of its social subject – «Kulturträger» (cultural leaders)³. The activity of such cultural leaders («Kulturträger») under the conditions of modern cultural paradigm, determined by the crisis of postmodern relativization of values and human-creating nature of their social role, realized exclusively in the form of communication is a moral and ethical activity that regulates axiological determinations of the cultural and historical process.

That is, there is a process of actualization of subject-oriented approach to the formation of society through a common cultural and philosophical basis, which has its principles of priority freedom of opportunity through self-development and continuous personal growth and equal access to quality education.

³ Rizhkova S. A., Kuznetsova I. V., Shevchenko I. O. Creation, translation, interpretation and development of culture: Monograph. Kyiv, 2010. 476 p. 177–197.

Moral priorities of professional activity of cultural leaders in the context of social responsibility for the consequences of cultural texts disseminated in society (selection – interpretation – translation) are creation and constant reproduction of a single semantic field of culture, ensuring the integrity of society, its historical perspective, dimensions of future generations. Adaptation of cultural phenomena in space and time, which is based on ensuring the longevity of the system of cultural phenomena, contributes to the emergence, production, ‘folding’ (turning into a sign of culture, loss of relevance), ‘deployment’ of signs of culture and to personal perception. Personal moral responsibility to the past, present and future for the interpretation of cultural signs justifies the importance of understanding the limits of their competence and freedom of their self, determined by the freedom of others through an understanding of their moral, ethical and cultural and educational system.

Understanding the feelings of the Other, the desire to hear the Other illustrates a responsible attitude to the consequences of their activities, which has a lasting social significance in the implementation of the value-oriented overarching task – the formation of ethical experience of the individual. It is the ability to co-feel the point of view of your partner/opponent allows a person to accomplish a double task: to feel the image of the world of the Other (created intellectually, intuitively, sensually) and at the same time maintain independence in assessing this image. Critical reflection and evaluation of one's own and other images of the world leads to qualitative changes – revision of one's own views, and finally – to a change in the system as such (the emergence of new concepts, new directions of development).

This process of performing an ethical task – showing a willingness to feel the point of view of the Other – is defined in the ‘principle of compassion’ (according to S. Mayen), which was proposed for scientific discussions. This principle encourages a specific assessment of one's own actions from the point of view of the partner / opponent. The principle of compassion contributes to the effectiveness of the praxeological activity, so the level of interaction at which the destructiveness of conflict is removed (methodological component) and the main vision is the human dignity of the Other, who thinks and feels differently (ethical component).

However, the question of the interconnectedness of ethical norms and practical actions always remains open to each individual in each case. That is why Kant considered ethical requirements as a ‘categorical imperative’, ie as an unconditional requirement to behave in accordance with the moral law, regardless of the conditions of the moment and the immediate practical consequences of the act committed by the person⁴. The absolutism of ethical requirements is, in essence, a recognition of the absolute value of humanity and humanity. Ethical laws protect everyone, the action of the categorical imperative is deprived of the possibility of human intervention as such, even if the latter violates these laws. Kant emphasized the absolutism of ethical laws in comparing man with the starry sky: ‘There are two things that fill the soul with greatness – the moral law within us and the starry sky above us’⁵. The principle of compassion inspires the subject of Kant's morality to look at the world through the eyes of the Other and to take into account his personal image, which gives his own action additional value, depending on how the action changes the world – either as a model of moral choice or as a precedent. This testifies in favor of the cooperation of the principle of compassion and the principle of responsibility for others, known as the requirement to act so that your action has the opportunity to become a model (according to I. Kant).

Violations of the ethical system ‘Man – Other – Society’ are mostly not localized, but on the contrary change for the worse the general moral climate of society. However, the presence in society of even a small number of individuals who have the willingness and need to reach the heights of ethical culture contributes to maintaining the moral priorities of society as a whole. The principle of compassion proclaims spiritual freedom and denies the hypothesis of historical necessity, the absolutism of naturalistic ideas about the natural-historical process of development of society.

The problem of the possibility and impossibility of exercising the freedom of a self-organized person in a self-organizing world is new enough for philosophical understanding. It is about the ability to act in a self-organizing space and achieve the goal – ideally a goal that conforms

⁴ Kant I. Critique of Pure Reason Kyiv: Universe, 2000.

⁵ Ibidem

to moral laws. Under the worldview in the prism of linear laws, the realization of the goal takes place according to the scheme of the causal series: the creation of appropriate initial and boundary conditions as the basis of necessity, working for the producer of the goal. In contrast, the synergetic picture of the world appeals to necessity, which includes chance, and therefore nonlinearity creates the conditions for an unexpected answer, an answer that tends to balance born of anarchy (A. Camus).

The search for transparency, clarity, and coherence in a chaotic, open, self-organizing world regulates human space in micro and macrostructures. The synergetic approach allows the analysis of transitions from one type of self-regulation to another as a transition through dynamic chaos (unbalancing of the system) to the creation of new levels of the organization. Thus, the synergetic discourse of the XXI century is characterized by the approach of humanity to the next technical revolution, which is meaningfully the technique of self-developing systems. That is, we are talking about the problem of the possibility of combining genomic technologies (certainty, specific task) with human freedom (thinking, acting, cognition of one's choice).

This significantly changes the emphasis in the philosophical understanding of the problem Man – World at the present stage, and even more requires understanding at the technical level of intervention in the biological component of man to answer the question of what awaits Man as such in the future: engineering at the molecular level with predetermined basics of life, which will allow the replication of man as a text in the 'posthuman future', or become a subject of scientific knowledge, whose role in science is dictated by the creative power and energy of the individual person.

The paradox of the situation – human freedom (time, activity, self-development) due to modern technological capabilities combined with dependence on the latter – formulates one of the main tasks of the modern scientific picture of the world: to place complex systems capable of self-development in a nonlinear dynamic the transition from one type of self-regulation to another through dynamic chaos, taking into account the essential role of chance. The study of such systems reveals in them active principles (attractors), which in the terminological apparatus of philosophy are determined by the concepts of will, self-sufficiency, and independence. Due to self-sufficiency, the system is able to block or even neutralize the external growth of entropy.

Thus, complex systems capable of self-organization are able to counteract external influences due to their own independence, which is manifested in the internal degrees of freedom of the system. The autonomy of a self-organizing system is accompanied by a state of uncertainty. The latter creates a multivariate future of the system, based on the understanding of freedom as a personal choice, a decision related to the subjective world of the individual, ie the poly variant of future choice in the behavior of a complex self-organizing system is a guarantor of unlimited freedom (synergetic). The representation of freedom in the synergetic picture of the world demonstrates the ability of the system to behave despite external influences, manipulations, and coercion. Such a system (with internal degrees of freedom) is much easier to destroy than to adjust to external choice.

The system, making a choice (intellectually, emotionally, intuitively) in the coordinates of its law, rather than responsibility, loses the delicate balance of interaction between the principles of freedom and responsibility in synergy. However, taking responsibility as such (even for the unpredictable) brings the system closer to freedom, openness to the values of the nonlinear world and combines natural science thinking with value ethics. In the context of this, the axiological component of the formation of nonlinear thinking as a willingness and ability to perceive the new deserves attention. In the situation of self-organization, the principle of freedom is a priori present in the characterization of post-classical human behavior, when it becomes necessary to be free in the process of cognition. Therefore, the search for a new ontological system of education, which will overcome social injustice and control of power (as a system of institutions) over human consciousness, will free the individual from any humiliation, including 'Culture of silence' (P. Freire)⁶. Under such conditions, the education system acquires praxeological principles of freedom – not as an abstraction, but as an immanent condition of human development.

It is also important to understand freedom not as brought from outside and given (a spiritual slave does not need freedom), not as chosen only for himself (there is a risk of becoming a dictator), but as a common critical

⁶ Freire P. *Cultural Action for Freedom*. Cambridge : Harvard Educational Review, 1970. p. 77.

understanding of the real world through dialogue, openness and constant interaction with the world of knowledge. Social resistance (revolution, national liberation movements) to external dictatorship is not enough to truly achieve freedom, it is necessary to understand the causes of tyranny and overcome the internal conflict between the desire and fear of freedom. However, this conflict is the bifurcation point in the process of changing the internal identification determinants of the active personality, striving for self-education, self-organization, self-establishment. Education under these conditions plays an attractive role, which has received a conceptual definition in the system of views of G. Fat – the categories of ‘border’ and ‘transgression’. The author of the concept described the category of ‘border’ in the literal and metaphorical sense of the government's direction to establish restrictions through the education system, designed to impede freedom of self-determination. At the same time, the ‘border’ serves as an impetus for cultural criticism of its problem field, which leads to a rethinking of cultural resources and the formation of new identities, ie outdated boundaries of knowledge give way to new in the way that provides the acquisition of knowledge (discovery in science, the discovery of new cultural texts for the system of self-education of the individual)⁷.

Transgressive breakthrough (the boundary between possible and impossible) in the process of cognition is really a new phenomenon, because the new horizon of knowledge is not linearly related to the previous state, but is constantly looking for ways to further development that promotes self-creation in freedom and openness.

There is a risk of replacing the concept of self-organization with the concept of manipulation disguised as social self-organization (advertising, fashion, genetic or neuro-linguistic programs, etc.) or self-manipulation (adaptation to the existing organization of society, rejection of cultural and personal development, self-consciousness, etc.), – the process of exercising freedom from consciousness and culture in favor of the alienated ‘attractor’. This is the discourse of non-existence in which they compete.

Overcoming the existing risk is possible only if people are aware of the relationships and interdependence of each other, and the historical and valuable experience of society. It is in the conscious, full of meaning,

⁷ *Lychkovakh V.* Non-classical aesthetics in the cultural space of the early 20th century. XXI centuries: monograph. Kyiv, 2011.

struggle of natural forces in the context of synergetic knowledge that the post-ecclesiastical paradigm of philosophy lies. The effect of synergetic is announced under the condition of the interaction of the components of the system on the basis of mutual conformity, mutual coordination, mutual coordination and, of course, in accordance with the objectives of moral law. The situation of dynamic chaos creates conditions for the competition of different attractors, the result of which is not known in advance, but it is a competition based on cultural and moral values (refusal to destroy the competitor's attractor) that leads to unexpected and lasting results.

The freedom of the individual in the conditions of social self-organization is determined by the awareness of one's own cultural basis, dependence / interdependence on the Other, on the historical, moral and ethical experience of society. At the same time, the value system of an individual who has gained his own experience of freedom and responsibility, in fact, faces the inertia and amorphousness of the value system of man-mass. Thus, the aesthetic sphere of Ukraine and Europe is aimed at philosophical understanding of human freedom in the synergetic paradigm of culture, as an analysis of transitions from the existing type of self-regulation to a new level of self-organization and definition of the individual in the context of vertical-horizontal perception of cultural-historical continuum.

References

- Baudrillard J. In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities. Moscow : IL, 1993.
- Freire P. Cultural Action for Freedom. Cambridge : Harvard Educational Review, 1970.
- Kant I. Critique of Pure Reason. Kyiv : Universe, 2000.
- Kostenko, N. Relationship with culture in the state of 'emergency'. *Ukrainian society: monitoring of social changes: Sob. sciences works*, 2015. 2(16). P. 390–405.
- Lychkovakh V. Non-classical aesthetics in the cultural space of the early 20th century. XXI centuries : monograph. Kyiv, 2011.
- Meyer. R. Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe. Meiner, Hamburg 2005.
- Ryzhkova S. A., Kuznetsova I. V., Shevchenko I. O. Creation, translation, interpretation and development of culture : Monograph. Kyiv, 2010.
- Shulga, M. Aberrant state of social consciousness of Ukrainian society. *Ukrainian society: monitoring social changes*. 2014. 1(15). 512–545.
- Trosbi D. Cultural capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*. 1999. 23. P. 3–12.