

досягає статусу російської політичної нації – це ті метафізичні питання, які розкривають сутнісне буття руських. Як писав М. Хайдеггер «...наука історії може лише або спотворити, неправильно витлумачити відношення до історії, котре і само завжди є чимось історичним, відтіснивши його до простого антикварного знання, або підготувати сутнісне поле зору вже обґрунтованому відношенню до історії в усій зв'язності» [11, с. 127]. Таким сутнісним поглядом на історію є лише філософський, оскільки «...лише в філософії – на відміну від будь-якої науки – розкривається істотне відношення до існуючого» [там само], зокрема й до історії конституювання руської національної ідентичності. Але це справа наступного дослідження

Бібліографічні посилання:

1. Введенский А. И. Судьбы философии в России / А. И. Введенский // Очерки истории русской философии. – Свердловск. 1991. – С. 26–66.
2. Власенко К. И. О национальном характере русской философии / К. И. Власенко // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 7. Философия. 1990, № 4. – С. 40–52.
3. Зеньковский В. В. История русской философии. В 2 т. / В. В. Зеньковский. – Париж, 1989. – Т. I. – 469 с.
4. Зеньковский В. В. История русской философии. В 2 т. / В. В. Зеньковский. – Париж, 1989. – Т. II. – 477 с.
5. Лосев А. Ф. Русская философия / А. Ф. Лосев. // Философия. Мифология. Культура. – М. : Политиздат, 1991. – 525 с. – (Мыслители XX века). – С. 209–236.
6. Лосский Н. О. Идея конкретности в русской философии / Н. О. Лосский // Вопросы философии, 1991, № 2. – С. 127–134.
7. Лосский Н. О. История русской философии // Н. О. Лосский. – М. : Высш. шк., 1991. – 559 с. (Б-ка философа).
8. Никон иеромонах Век крещения // Вопросы истории, 1990, № 12. – С. 47–59.
9. Радлов Э. Очерк истории русской философии. 2-е доп. изд. / Э. Радлов. – Пг. : Наука и школа, 1920. – 99 с.
10. Україна: етнопатриархальна палітра суспільного розвитку: Слов.- довід. / УВДУ при Президентові України; Відп. ред. Ю. І. Римаренко. – К. : Вид-во УАДУ, 1997. – 272 с. – Бібліогр. с. 259–263 (78 назв).
11. Хайдеггер М. Введение в метафизику. Курс лекций летнего семестра 1935 года / Мартин Хайдеггер // Новый круг. – 1993. – № 1.
12. Шамбаров В. Е. Русь: дорога из глубины тысячелетий. Когда оживают легенды / В. Е. Шамбаров. – М. : Алетея, 1999. – 448 с. : ил. – (Vita memoriae).

Китов Н. Г. «Философия в России», «росийская философия», «русская национальная философия»: экспликация понятий.

Проделан исторический анализ различения терминов «философия в России», «росийская философия», «русская национальная философия» в работах российских философов. Обосновывается тезис, что термин «русская национальная философия» отражает, как исторические особенности формирования русского человека, так и специфические особенности его философствования. Среди них много инородцев, которые, однако идентифицируют себя русскими.

Ключевые слова: варяги, русы, консорция, философия, философия в России, национальная философия, русская национальная философия.

Kitov N. «Philosophy in Russia», «Russian philosophy», «Rus national philosophy»: explication of concepts.

The historical analysis of difference between the terms «philosophy in Russia», «Russian philosophy», «Rus national philosophy» in the works of Russian philosophers are examined. The idea according to which the term «Rus national philosophy» reflects both historical features of the formation of Rus population and specific features of their philosophizing is proved.

Keywords: Vikings, The Rus, consortium, philosophy, philosophy in Russia, the national philosophy, Rus national philosophy.

Надійшла до редколегії 01.03.2013 р.

УДК 111. 82

М. Kovalets

Dnipropetrovsk national university named after Oles Honchar

THE PHENOMENON OF HYPER-CHAOS IN SPECULATIVE REALISM ACCORDING TO QUENTIN MEILLASSOUX

In the article «The phenomenon of hyper-chaos in speculative realism according to Quentin Meillassoux» we deal with the phenomenon of absolute outside the limits of theological discourse, the rejection of ontological and advancement of logical proof of its existence.

Keywords: ancestry, contingency, correlation, hyper-chaos, principle of Factuality

The subject-matter of speculative realism in modern world is in the fact that it is a new developing movement in contemporary philosophy. The core of speculative realism is correlationism criticizing the basic principles of post-Kantian philosophy. Thus the human reason takes the privileged place

in comprehension of the map of the world. Decarte's teaching is placed on the foreground. The core of this work is examination of the phenomenon of hyper-chaos in Quentin Meillassoux's work 'After Finitude'. The purpose of investigation of hyper-chaos is in the attempt to explain the birth of our Universe. It is the accident which appears to be a necessity. Meillassoux gives up the idea of ontological explanation of hyper-chaos. He uses the logical proof to determine this phenomenon. Chaos is structured logically with the help of the principle of autolimitation. As contingency is a basis of this principle we face the unexistent nonmetaphysical absolute. Irrasion – the principle of sufficient basis – which lies in the core of the principle of factuality — rejects the idea of existence of necessity but takes into consideration the principle of contingency – unnecessary of unexistence.

The main representatives of speculative realism are Quentin Meillassoux, Graham Harman, Iain Hamilton Grant and Ray Brassier. Harman main works are 'Tool-Being: Heidegger and the Metaphysics of Objects' and 'Prince of Networks: Bruno Latour and Metaphysics'. Grant's book is 'Philosophies of Nature After Schelling'. Brassier is the author of 'Nihil Unbound: Enlightenment and Extinction' and the translator of Alain Badiou's 'Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism and Theoretical Writings', and Quentin Meillassoux's 'After Finitude: An Essay on the Necessity of Contingency'. These contemporary philosophers are interested in reorganization of post-Kantian critical idealism, phenomenology, post-modernism, deconstruction, in other words, in correlationism — the relation between Being and Thinking. Earlier the problemacy of order and chaos was studied by such philosophers as: Deleuze and Guattari's work 'What is Philosophy?', Baudrillard's 'Simulacre and simulation', Deleuze's 'Logic of sense', Prigogine and Stengers 'Order out of chaos'.

The object of the work is hyper-chaos. The objectives: 1. Criticizing of Kant's "transcendental subject" and foregrounding Descartes' teaching about "primary" and "secondary" qualities. 2. Comparison of speculative realism with ontological realism and anti-realism. 3. Assessment of the two principles of correlationism: the Principle of Correlation and the Principle of Factuality. 4. Investigation of the connection between Baudrillard's hyper-reality and Deleuze's chaos. 5. The understanding of contingency. 6. Definition of hyper-chaos as the 'Creator' of the Universe.

Speculative or metaphysical realism is a developing movement in the modern philosophical thought. Even according to Kant, metaphysics is 'the mother of chaos and night in the scientific world, but at the same time the source of, or at least the prelude to, the re-creation and reinstallation of a science, when it has fallen into confusion, obscurity, and disuse from ill directed effort'. (Kant 1998, p. 6). Kant thinks that it's impossible to cognize a thing-in-itself. But even he writes that 'we can prove the existence of God and the existence of God and the immortality of them objects lying beyond the soul – both of them of possible experience– with the same force of demonstration as any mathematical proposition'. (Kant 1998, p. 371). Kant formulated two statements: 1. The thing-in-itself is non-contradictory; 2. There is a thing-in-itself. Absolute contingency of speculative realism rejects the ideas of Kantianism. Meillassoux is for reactualization of Descartes' teaching. 'Kant's response, as we know, grants to Hume that everything we know comes from experience. Yet Kant constituting "the transcendental subject"'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 5). Thus we are talking about primary and secondary qualities. 'These terms come from Locke, but the basis can already be found in Descartes... In short, nothing sensible – whether it be an affective or perceptual quality – can exist in the way it is given to me in the thing by itself, when it is not related to me or to any other living creature.. Remove the observer, and the world becomes devoid of these sonorous, visual, olfactory, etc., qualities'. [Meillassoux 2008, pp. 7-8) and 'if there were no real fire, there would be no sensation of burning.. the sensible only exists as a relation: a relation between the world and the living creature I am.. These sensible qualities, which are not in the things themselves but in my subjective relation to the latter – these qualities correspond to what were traditionally called secondary qualities'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 8). Kant insists on limitation of human cognition of Absolute and reality in general. But Descartes thinks that such cognition is possible owing to human perception. We come now to metaphysics, a purely speculative science, teaching of experience only one possible. Speculative philosophy privileges the human being. Nevertheless, talking about importance of metaphysics Kant writes: 'For the same reason, metaphysics forms likewise the completion of the culture of human reason... That, as a purely speculative science, it is more useful in preventing error than in the extension of knowledge, does not detract from its value; on the contrary, the supreme office of censor which it occupies assures to it the highest authority and importance. This office it administers for the purpose of securing order, harmony, and well-being to science, and of directing its noble and fruitful labours to the highest possible aim– the happiness of all mankind'. (Kant 1998, p. 369).

I would like to mention the representative of ontological realism – Theodore Sider and the representative of ontological anti-realism – David J. Chalmers as philosophers contradicting with speculative realism. Sider writes about the deflationists who in some case are opposite to metaphysics and 'according to which the world is the way it is independent of human conceptualization'. (Chalmers 2009, p. 387). We used to believe in the objective structure of the reality. He insists

that the world has a structure – an order. Sider writes: ‘The world has an objective structure; truth-seekers must discern that structure; they must carve at the joints; communities that choose the wrong groupings may get at the truth, but they nevertheless fail badly in their attempt to understand the world. If we must admit that, although the electrons go together because they’re all electrons, the electron-or-building-or-dinner-jacket-or-dogs also go together because they’re all electron-or-building-or-dinner-jacket-or-dogs, and that there’s nothing objectively better about the first grouping than the second, ... then the world would, really, be just a structureless blob’. (Chalmers 2009, p. 399). And what about Chalmers’ anti-realism? He begins from the hardest — the fundamental philosophical questions: ‘The basic question of ontology is What exists?. The basic question of metaontology is: ‘are there objective answers to the basic question of ontology? Here ontological realists say yes, and ontological anti-realists say no’. (Chalmers 2009, p. 77). On the one hand, he pays our attention to ontological realist — Quine, ‘who held that we can determine what exists by seeing which entities are endorsed by our best scientific theory of the world’ and, on the other hand, to the ontological anti-realist — Carnap, ‘who held that there are many different ontological frameworks, holding that different sorts of entities exist, and that while some frameworks may be more useful than others for some purposes, there is no fact of the matter as to which framework is correct’. He writes about two Carnap’s sorts of existence questions: internal and external ones. The examples of internal questions are ‘Are there any odd perfect numbers?’ asked by a mathematician, and ‘Is there an apple on the table?’ asked by a child. On Carnap’s view, internal claims are typically true or false. The examples of external questions are ‘Do numbers exist?’ or ‘Do ordinary physical objects exist?’ asked from a purported neutral perspective. External questions are those posed outside a given framework, concern the existence of the framework’s system of entities as a whole’. (Chalmers 2009, p. 93). Chalmers comes to such conclusion: ‘It will be obvious that the picture I have outlined is closely parallel to Carnap’s. Ordinary and ontological existence assertions correspond to internal and external questions. Ordinary existence assertion, like internal questions, have truth-conditions that are determined by an associated framework (a furnishing function), and have truth-values that are determined trivially by the framework and the underlying state of the world... Ontological discourse is thereby often defective, but ordinary discourse about existence is not defective at all’. (Chalmers 2009, p. 127).

In *After Finitude*, Meillassoux says about the correlation between Thinking and Being. He actualizes the problem of correlationism. He finds two principles: the Principle of Correlation and the Principle of Factuality. Author writes about first principle: ‘By correlation we mean the idea according to which we only ever have access to the correlation between thinking and being, and never to either term considered apart from the other. We will henceforth call correlationism any current of thought which maintains the unsurpassable character of the correlation so defined. Consequently, it becomes possible to say that every philosophy which disavows naive realism has become a variant of correlationism’. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 13). And about second: ‘Thus factuality must be understood as the non-facticity of facticity’ and we should mind that ‘the principle of factuality does not claim that contingency is necessary; its precise claim is that contingency alone is necessary — and only this prevents it from being metaphysical’. (Meillassoux 2008, pp. 129-130). According to the first principle everything that lies outside of the correlation of thought and being is unknowable (Kant’s transcendental subject, Husserl’s intentionality). According to the second one things could be otherwise than what they are (the problem of consciousness in Heidegger’s philosophy and phenomenon of language — Wittgenstein). And Meillassoux came to conclusion that on the one hand, there are “weak” correlationism and on the other — ‘strong’ correlationism. Correlationism is in opposition to realism: there are no objects, laws, beings, events which have not been explained from the subjective point of view. Every person stating the possibility of access to reality which exists independently from the subject, culture, language is a naïve realist or metaphysician. Correlationism is based on the statement: there is no X without any entity of X, and there is no theory about X without thinking of X. This statement is called correlationist circle. There are two main versions of correlationism: a transcendental one proclaims universal forms of subjective cognition of things, and a postmodernist version rejects the very existence of subjective universality. Both cases deny the absolute cognition, thinking of the things-in-itself which don’t depend on our subjectivity. Thus correlationism insists on impossibility to imagine the absolute X independent from the subject. And we can’t know the reality in itself. In this case correlationism is similar to anti-realism: ‘The ontological argument is capable of uncovering, since the latter secures the existence of an X through the determination of this X alone, rather than through the determination of some entity other than X – X must be because it is perfect, and hence *causa sui*, or sole cause of itself’. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 58). The meaning of the dia-chronic statement is: ‘event X occurred at such and such time prior to the existence of thought’ – and not, let us emphasize it: ‘event X occurred prior to the existence of thought for thought. The first statement does not claim that event X occurred prior to thought for thought – what it says is that thought can think that event X can actually have occurred prior to all thought, and indifferently to it. But no variety of correlationism,

no matter how vehemently it insists that it should not be confused with subjective idealism a la Berkeley, can admit that this statement's literal meaning is also its deepest meaning'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 196). The object is to show: 1. The rejection of correlationism. 2. To show that human thinking can burst out to reality in itself which does not depend on subjectivity. In other words absolute reality can be thought about by the subject. It seems to be naive realism but Meillassoux challenge is to show it in speculative explanation. Correlationism has a serious problem which is called the problem of archi-fossil or the problem of ancestry. Fossil is a material carrying the traces of life existed before mankind. But archi-fossil is a material which existed before the very appearance of life on the Earth. For example: '1. the date of the origin of the universe (13. 5 billion years ago), 2. the date of the accretion of the earth (4. 56 billion years ago), 3. the date of origin of life on earth (3. 5 billion years ago), 4. the date of the origin of humankind (Homo habilis, 2 million years ago)'. (Meillassoux 2009, p. 20). Correlationism is not able to explain the meaning of these statements because it is impossible to cognize the world itself without presence of a human being. Thus we can see the correlation between Thought and Being, but in this case Being is independent from Thought. So, our task is to find a new interpretation of reality to reject the correlationism. But a new reality is different from present reality. That's why Meillassoux prefers to call his teaching the speculative materialism but not realism. The speculative materialism is based on the principle of factuality. Factuality is the absence of reason for any reality. The necessity of factuality lies in facticity. I can think independently from any thinking of X. The principle of factuality criticizes the ontological truth: to be means to be a fact, but not a correlator. So, he supposes that there is something outside of thought and being. It is hyper-chaos: 'Everything could actually collapse: from trees to stars, from stars to laws, from physical laws to logical laws; and this not by virtue of some superior law whereby everything is destined to perish, but by virtue of the absence of any superior law capable of preserving anything, no matter what, from perishing'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 90). Hyper-chaos is a new substitute reality which is irrational. It has a certain stability, which includes both freaks and geniuses, good and evil.

We are involved in the notion of 'hyper' which describes the map of the world. Hyper is the main power giving the stimulus for transformation of hyper-reality into hyper-chaos. This transformation began from the distinction between empirical receptivity and transcendental constitution. The notion of hyper is studied by Mikhail Epstein in his work 'Postmodern in Russia'. According to Epstein, hyper is a phenomenon of revolutionary transformation from modern to postmodern, from pure-reality to pseudo-reality. Actually the word hyper means 'extreme', 'enforced'. In 1967 the notion of hyper-reality was introduced by Umberto Eco and Jean Baudrillard, 'who referred it to disappearance of reality under the influence of mass media'. (Epstein 2000, p. 16). Hyper-reality is illusion created by mass media and represented as more exact, 'real' reality than the one existing in life. Jean Baudrillard describes it: 'It is all of metaphysics that is lost. No more mirror of being and appearances, of the real and its concept. No more imaginary coextensivity: it is genetic miniaturization that is the dimension of simulation... It no longer needs to be rational, because it no longer measures itself against either an ideal or negative instance. It is no longer anything but operational. In fact, it is no longer really the real, because no imaginary envelops it anymore. It is a hyperreal, produced from a radiating synthesis of combinatory models in a hyperspace without atmosphere'. (Baudrillard 2009, p. 3). So, Epstein proclaims: 'excessiveness is such abundance of quality when it becomes opposite to itself'. (Epstein 2000, p. 31). Deleuze and Guattari's work "What is Philosophy?" involves us into the notion of chaos. Deleuze describes the phenomenon of chaos with the help of logic. Authors speak about concepts as some spatial image which has its limits, consistency and bill of quantities. The concept is an incident of its own creation. Plan is the receptacle of concepts. The plan is an absolute horizon of incidents. Concept is the act of thought. Plan is the image of thought which consists of endless motion. Thus concepts and the plan create the order. Deleuze shows the difference between a man of wisdom and a philosopher. The order is transcendental for a philosopher but for a man of wisdom the order is immanent. A wise man thinks that chaos is ordered by God, but a philosopher himself makes order out of chaos putting a grid with wrinkles on it and thus concept appears. The order must include the fragment of chaos. The order transforms the chaos into chaos-cosmos. Only with the help of the chaos in the order the individuality and freedom are possible. And in 'Logic of sense' Deleuze describes this phenomenon in a such way: 'Multiple interconnected series surround selections and, when considered as a complete set, these constitute an undetermined chaos. This explains the necessity of individuating selection in providing a relative order over a grounding chaos. The event, understood as a selection in series, is therefore also two-sided in terms of determinacy and chaos: it highlights a zone, but it also spreads what happens at that zone along all other series and back again, granting a form of determinacy against an accompanying chaotic background. (This explains Deleuze's frequent references to chaos and to a chaotic cosmos, a 'chaosmos', for example, with Felix Guattari in What Is Philosophy?)'. (Deleuze 2009, p. 5). And with the help of excessiveness we can talk about transformation of order in chaos. In that case we should mention the notion of contingency as an

accident, it is opposite to necessity. Hyper-reality and hyper-chaos are self-organising systems. Their inner structures have a complicated building. They have relations of complementarity, in some case chaos is like order and order is disorder. We never know exactly in what direction this or that system will be developing: in the direction of negentropy (order is negative) or entropy. 'Even chaos has its determination' — such suggestion we can meet in the work by Ilya Prigogine and Izabella Stengers 'Order out of chaos'. (Prigogine 1986, p. 9).

Quentin Meillassoux says about the necessity of contingency. It is a random a-priori construction studying the objects. Instead of a priori necessity of Kant, contingent a priori is introduced by Meillassoux. Contingency means an arbitrariness and randomness. For example, Kurt Hubner, in his work 'Critique of scientific reason', contrasts the notion 'contingent a priori' to the Kantian transcendental notion 'essential a priori'. And he underlines 'the limitation of Kant's a priori as the principle of causation'. (Hubner 1983, p. 87). Particularly, Werner Karl Heisenberg, criticizing the statement 'If we know the present exactly we can foresee the future', claims that it is impossible to know all details about the present. Bohm and Vigier disagree with this point of view. They formulate the unlimited principle of causation which says that there is a causative explanation of each event. Meillassoux replaces the notion of absolute by 'extreme form of chaos' — a hyper-chaos which guarantees 'only the possible destruction of every order'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 105). He uses the principle of a necessary entity: 'Everything is possible, anything can happen — except something that is necessary, because it is the contingency of the entity that is necessary, not the entity. Here we have a decisive difference between the principle of unreason and correlational facticity, for we now know that a metaphysical statement can never be true. We could certainly envisage the emergence of an entity which, as a matter of fact, would be indiscernible from a necessary entity, viz., an everlasting entity, which would go on existing, just like a necessary entity. Yet this entity would not be necessary, and we would not be able to say of it that it will actually last forever, only that, as a matter of fact, and up until now, it has never ceased to be'. (Meillassoux 2008, p. 107).

The conclusion. Nevertheless Meillassoux insists on the fact that hyper-chaos is a guarantee of destruction of all relations overall. According to Meillassoux time is the absolute connected with factuality. But this time is special, it is called hyper-chaos. It is neither physical time nor usual chaos. The contingency of hyper-chaos means that disorder and accident can be destroyed by order and determinism. We talk about the equal contingency of order and disorder. Hyper-chaos can not go past or wrong, as it happens in the systems of order, from which we learn about accidents and errors. Einstein metaphorically said: 'God does not play with dice'. But in speculative realism Meillassoux proclaims in his work that God rolled the dice, at least at the moment of creation. Talking about chaos we should mention the phenomenon of disabsolutization but not absolutization. This play with dice isn't determined by law as it was understood in the classical map of the world. It's not a mechanism, it's not working, it's happening accidentally. But He always gets the target. The very idea of irrational appearance of hyper-chaos makes the existence of God rational. We are involved into the field of irrational faith. If there is no God now there are no reasons for His emergence in future. Nietzsche said 'God is dead' and he writes that 'You must have chaos within you to give birth to a dancing star'. (Nietzsche 1999). But I don't want the society to move in the way of nihilism I want to give it some hope. So, I proclaim 'God will be revived'. Thus investigating the hyper-chaos or contingency absolute we touch upon theological problems. Thus hyper-chaos needs a new discourse which has not been worked out by Meillassoux. The development of the new discourse is the perspective of further investigation of hyper-chaos.

References:

1. Baudrillard, J 2009, 'Simulacre and simulation', Michigan, p. 108.
2. Chalmers, D 2009, 'Metametaphysics new essays on the foundation of ontology', Oxford, Clarendon press, p. 540.
3. Deleuze, G 2009, 'Logic of sense: A Critical Introduction and Guide', Edinburgh, p. 232.
4. Epstein, M 2000, 'Postmodern in Russia', Moscow, p. 367.
5. Hubner, K 1983, 'Critique of scientific reason', Chicago, p. 283.
6. Kant, I 1998, 'The critique of pure reason', p. 372.
7. Meillassoux, Q 2008, 'After Finitude: An Essay on the Necessity of Contingency', p. 212.
8. Nietzsche, F 1999, 'Thus Spoke Zarathustra', Pennsylvania, p. 334.
9. Prigogine, I Stengers, I 1986, 'Order out of chaos', Moscow, p. 213.

Ковалець М. С. Феномен гіпер-хаосу в спекулятивному реалізмі в інтерпретації Квентіна Мейясу
В статті «Феномен гіпер-хаосу в спекулятивному реалізмі в інтерпретації Квентіна Мейясу»
розглядається феномен абсолюту поза межами традицій теологічного дискурсу, відторгнення
онтологічного та висування логічного доказу в його існуванні.

Ключові слова: стародавність, контингентність, кореляція, гіпер-хаос, закон фактуальності

Ковалец М. С. Феномен гипер-хаоса в спекулятивном реализме в интерпретации Квентина Мейясу
В статье «Феномен гипер-хаоса в спекулятивном реализме в интерпретации Квентина Мейясу»
рассматривается феномен абсолюта за пределами традиций теологического дискурса, отвержение

онтологического и выдвижение логического доказательства его существования.*Ключевые слова:* древность, контингентность, корреляция, гипер-хаос, закон фактуальности

Надійшла до редколегії 01. 03. 2013 р.

УДК 130. 123**В. І. Кондратьєва***Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України***САМОАКТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ЛЮДИНИ: ГУМАНІСТИЧНА ПСИХОЛОГІЯ І РЕЛІГІЙНІ ПРАКТИКИ****Стаття присвячена компаративному аналізу положень представника гуманістичної психології (А. Маслоу), логотерапії (Ф. Франкла) і змісту та мети релігійних практик.***Ключові слова:* актуалізація, людина, само актуалізація, релігійні практики, молитва, психологія, гуманізм, віра.

Актуальність теми. Особливість духовних процесів ХХІ ст.- це прагнення до реалізації гуманізму як у філософії, психології, релігієзнавстві, так і у всіх галузях людської життєдіяльності. Ми наголошуємо на тому, що йдеться саме про прагнення, а не про реалізацію. Принцип гуманізму – це любов не до далекої людини, а любов до ближнього свого, до Батьківщини, до всього навколишнього середовища. Людина як духовна істота вміє співчувати та допомагати іншим людям, але вона повинна реалізовувати співчуття та допомогу в конкретному житті. Таке ставлення до людей, до всього існуючого в світі є близьким до релігійних положень, але воно притаманне як віруючим людям, так і невіруючим. Гуманізм реалізується не заради Бога, а заради людини, вона є вершиною творіння. Гуманізм – це не тільки певні справи, але й допомога словом, тим словом, що заспокоює, а не принижує та наказує.

Слід наголосити, що зіштовхуючись з сучасною несправедливістю, з сучасним злом, що панують у світі, страждає саме гуманізм як принцип ставлення однієї людини до іншої, як принцип ставлення до всього живого і неживого. Тільки в такому розуміння людина може стати щасливою, коли осмисленим постане її життя. Нажаль, багато філософських напрямів і психологічних шкіл фіксують той факт, що все ХХ століття та початок ХХІ ст. характеризують людину як таку, яка втратила сенс власного життя. Так, наприклад, філософія постмодернізму зафіксувала це в особливому баченні, що проголошує смерть суб'єкта, розпад раціонального в людині, втрату сенсу власного життя як норми сучасного світу, як закономірний етап в житті людини і людства, коли нікого не цікавлять цінності, прояви духовності, культурне середовище, а наступає доба людської деструктивності. Людина стає іграшкою неусвідомлених сил і текстів «потоків свідомості», вона втрачає власне обличчя, тобто власну екзистенцію, сутність, унікальність власного змісту. ХХІ століття ставить перед нами питання: як надати людині сенс її існування на цій Землі, як показати, що людина може бути щасливою?

В зв'язку з цим особливо важливою постає самоактуалізація. Самоактуалізація – це життя в смислі, у пов'язаності з осмисленням самого смислу і, в такий спосіб, самоактуалізація теж виступає комунікативним процесом. Але, в цьому випадку потрібна інформація особливого роду, яка розрахована на задоволення мета-потреб людини, на осмислення дійсних обставин у світлі вищих цілей та цінностей буття. Фундаментальні точки відліку відомі завдяки резонансу в культурі спеціальних каналів – релігії, певних релігійних практик та моралі. Але ґрунтом будь-якого вибору є екзистенція людини. Спрямувати такий вибір, за певною мірою, можливо завдяки представленню тих текстів, що прояснюють буттєвий смисл актуальних подій.

Отже, за мірою вичерпності або переродження можливостей духовної консолідації на ґрунті парадигм раціоналізму, позитивізму, міфологічного мислення та ін., сучасне суспільство все гостріше потребує трансцендуючої масової комунікації. Гуманістична парадигма мислення, що визначає принципово нові форми колективної обробки та засвоєння інформації, закладає і ґрунт для принципово нової інтегруючої одиниці спілкування. Все можна пізнати у порівнянні.

Комунікативна сила міфема визначається категоричністю імпульсів табу, які зміцнюються завдяки строгим обрядам. Ідеологема має своїм ґрунтом вчення, положення якого апріорно вважаються істинними положеннями. Вплив конструкту тримається на довірі до експерта і суспільній думці. За тією або іншою мірою, все це елементи спрямованого комунікативного впливу. Всі ці елементи в релігії, мистецтві, в тій або іншій мірі, впливають на несвідомі механізми психіки людини. Окрім того, всі вони спираються на ті або інші системи регулювання масової поведінки людей.