

YURII MIELKOV (Kiev)

**HUMAN PERSONALITY IN THE COMPLEX WORLD:
PLURALISM OF IDENTITIES AND THE PROBLEM OF WORLD-
ATTITUDE**

Interregional Academy of Personnel Management <uka7777@gmail.com>

The article is dedicated to the philosophical consideration of the problem of constituting the world-attitude in the situation of the complex world that serves as one of the key factors of the Weltanschauung disorientation that in turn leads to the decline in global health. Using post-non-classical methodologies and referring to the cases of social and political life in a nation state, the author focuses his attention on the analysis of plurality of human identities as a problem that could not be solved by classical methods of the Modernity but requires the development of each personality as the subject of one's own life. The shortcomings of the proposed approach could be defined as a lack of analysis of empirical data that should form the subject of separate study. Practical and social meaning of the paper lies in the attempt to manifest the philosophical and Weltanschauung base of the process and structure of human identity in the present-day world.

Key words: human personality, identity, complexity, philosophy of health, philosophy of democracy.

Introduction. The issue of the global human health in the 21st century is certainly not only that of medical science. It is quite evident that the major health problems are determined by a broad quantity of social and political factors that describe the living condition of the people of the world. More so, mental health problems, like the growing number of suicides among young people, as well as cases of depression, alcoholism, or dementia, could be well evaluated in the broad scope of culture and Weltanschauung (world-outlook and world-attitude) instead of being considered from the medical point of view only. As argued by China Mills in her recent book on global mental health [12], the tendency to apply psychology and psychiatry to the everyday life of different countries in the today's world could be presented as a form of violent Westernization and even 'colonialism' that reconfigures socio-economic crises of countries in general as individual crises of the people in particular – and as their personal 'mental illnesses'. And it is philosophy and social and cultural studies that have achieving the due comprehension of the crises in question as their inherent task, even if the application of those humanitarian disciplines to the issues of global health could sound as something rather untraditional.

Purpose (aim) of the article – to outline the major problems of the contemporary Weltanschauung situation that directly result in some or other forms of mental disorders.

Theoretical part. First of all, it should be denoted that one of the reasons, if not the major reason, for such disorders and for the aforementioned suicidal and depression tendencies is the general disorientation of human personality as the illness of our times that corresponds to the growing complexity of the world already noted by psychologists [5]. The concept of *complexity* in one of the most provoking in the contemporary philosophy in general and philosophy of science in particular. That's mostly due to this concept providing the manifestation of the interconnection between the world and the human person: the latter is not just 'an observer' of some complexity having emerged out of nowhere in the process of human cognition of the surrounding world, – the complexity in question is but a reflection and even a construction of the human him- or herself, as demonstrated by the representatives of Kiev philosophical school of the 20th and 21st century [1, 10].

In other words, 'complexity' of the contemporary world, i.e. the world as it is comprehended by the cognizing human being, is not just an absence of simplicity, a

form of unpredictability and disorienting plurality – like the non-classical understanding of the world in science (where a butterfly flapping its wings in one part of the world could cause natural disasters in the other end of the planet) opposes the classical view of the world as a simply winded clock mechanism. Complexity here also means the inability of classical general rationality to comprehend the world as a whole, as any complexity is but an evaluation of that complexity that, as any value notion, possesses an irreversible subjectivity. That is, the simplicity of the world is directly proportional to the level of the ‘lightness’ of human being, which is so familiar to us by its representation in post-modern culture and the arts, and the acknowledgement of existential complexity of human being, peculiar to the philosophical thought already since the middle of the 20th century, turns out to be an acknowledgment of the complexity of the whole world that surrounds us.

Methodology. Taking those theoretical and philosophical ideas as a background, let us turn now to more practical aspects of the said complexity, applying the synergetic and post-non-classical methodology [4, 14] to analyzing the current situation of human personality and its identity. The reason for focusing our attention on this very subject is that one of the most important consequences of the crisis of the classical *Weltanschauung* is indeed the *personalization* of the human world-attitude as both a trend and a challenge. That is, the noted disorientation comes from the inaptitude of classical mechanisms of, so to say, mass production of senses and identities. Previously, senses, values, and identities were something pre-described to humans from the very birth by their social status, their religion, class, or nation, – while now only person him- or herself could be the subject of goal-setting and the source of values and identities, even if being such a source means not actually producing new values and identities, but accepting the already existing ones as one’s own, immanent and assimilated.

Results and discussion. As it could be shown in the field of social and political practices, more and more persons find themselves reluctant to obey the will of the national unity, as the very right of ‘the people’ to self-determination and to creation of their own state supposes, so to say, unidimensionality of their identity – the thing that in the 20th century ceases to be real and sufficient for a contemporary human person even taken in his or her sole identity as a citizen. Such unidimensional abstraction is actually a product of the remote age when the will of the nation could be embodied *in one single person*. “L’etat, c’est moi” (“The state, it’s me”), – that was simple and clear way to formulate this idea that Louis XIV was famously said to confess. And now, no single person, be it president or prime minister, has the right to state it that way; a state could be no longer reduced to one single ethnical group, culture, language or dialect, either. In other words, the common will can be neither personified nor represented: each human personality could represent its own interests *by itself only*, as such unique combination of them – composition of interests, identities, cultural and biological traits – could be possessed by nobody else, even if that other somebody could be found more able in competent in any *one* of those spheres of activity and fields of identification.

The processes of the development of human personality lead it to obtaining new plural forms, ways, and levels of identification – and that’s why such processes are incompatible with unification of culture, with imposing one correct ‘self-consciousness’. Just in the same way, feminism, racism, nationalism, chauvinism, Zionism / anti-Semitism and many other similar phenomena of ‘-isms’ present but artificial cultivation of one and only human identity – and that’s why such identity appears as abstract and artificial, even if originally, amongst other alternative identities it really was natural and organic. Thinking in obsolete binary oppositions, such ideological movements strictly discriminate people of different race, sex, ethnos etc. not allowing interspersing political discourse with any other human qualities.

That feature of any abstract identity and a self-contained system could be well demonstrated on the example of *nationalism* that is rather history now in Western countries but still present a threat to social consistency in Eastern Europe. Croatian

writer Slavenka Drakulić (who lives in Sweden today) describes how it all was felt in 1990s in the following way:

“Being Croat has become my destiny... I am defined by my nationality, and by it alone... Along with millions of other Croats, I was pinned to the wall of nationhood... That is what the war is doing to us, reducing us to one dimension: the Nation.

The trouble with this nationhood, however, is that whereas before, I was defined by my education, my job, my ideas, my character – and, yes, my nationality too – now I feel stripped of all that. I am nobody because I am not a person any more. I am one of 4.5 million Croats... I am not in a position to choose any longer. Nor, I think, is anyone else...

...One doesn't have to succumb voluntarily to this ideology of the nation – one is sucked into it. So right now, in the new state of Croatia, no one is allowed not to be a Croat” [7, p. 50–52].

By providing the ‘freedom’ of ethnic nationality, abstract ideology turns to be a totalitarianism of a kind, as a “silencing or marginalization of alternative, non-nationalist political languages” [6, p. 20], – and there is no exit up to higher levels of values, to the ideals common to any social system. Literally every human community is multiethnic and plural now, as the concept of multiculturalism proves [8], and their plurality, as well as proliferation of identities manifested by personalities they consist of, still increases as they follow the course of their cultural and civilization development.

Here is but another example of the complex nature of human identity leading to conflicts and mental disorientation. In 2010, the Nobel Prize in physics was awarded to Andre Geim, who is an ethnic German, born and spent most of his life in the USSR and Russia, and currently a citizen of Netherlands who lives and works in the United Kingdom. According to the old linear logic – it is completely impossible to determine, which one of those several countries should actually count that Nobel Prize as ‘its own’? The scientist himself answers this question with full intelligibility and in a philosophical way:

“When I was a little boy, I was a fan of my neighborhood soccer team. Then I was a fan of my street team, then – the town team, and after that – of the national team of my country. We introduced that artificial division into neighborhoods, towns, and countries. Indeed, we all are just humans. We have one common science. But, of course, I am still proud of my education I got at PhysTech [Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology]” [3].

With all respect for the opinion of the Nobel Laureate*, it would be better to make a small correction: the division into communities is not necessarily *artificial*. Actually, one of the tasks of contemporary philosophical thought lies in differentiation of natural and artificial in such kinds of identification. I think that the division “into neighborhoods and towns” is actually quite an organic division: Andre Geim really counts himself as Sochian (that is, as one who belongs to his native town of Sochi), and at that not necessarily Russian, – and he says that in his other interviews. Nobody can deprive him of the title of the graduate of the famous Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, and many Russian citizens have full right to be proud of the success of their compatriot – the success achieved in many respects *thanks to Soviet education and scientific schools* but at that – *in spite of the present-day Russian state!* It is the latter that due to various factors – be it deficiency in financing for fundamental scientific investigations or banal everyday despondency and life atmosphere of 1990s that was uncomfortable for a conscientious person, – that forced many prominent scientists including future Nobel Laureates to emigrate changing their citizenship – but not their culture, not the education they had received, not their natural identity, in the long run.

However, in the age of the EU, one could think that one and only state identity is being just replaced by other identities, also artificial. Thus, Anthony Smith who favors nationalism argues that ‘European identity’ that is being so popular since recent

* Which is completely justifiable within the frames of the classical science proper. Since its emergence in the Modern times, it does not really acknowledge any borders at all. All efforts to create ‘a national science’ turned out to be phenomena similar to Lysenkoism in Soviet biology, leading but to the lag in development. It is another case of other spheres of human culture – including philosophy and humanities – being somewhat different from classical scientific activity in this respect.

times, could not substitute national identities, which are the only real ground for human social life [13]. However, we could state that ‘European identity’ is in no way less artificial than ‘French’ or ‘German’ identity – those national identities were in turn created in more or less violent way at the expense of eliminating more natural identities of the Burgundians and the Languedociens, or by subordinating the Franconians and the Bavarians to one Prussian dialect and Prussian police-state organization. It is understood of course, that in the beginning of the 21st century, European identity is not being created by such means – it is just found to be more suitable *on global level*, where more natural identities of neighborhood and township are just irrelevant, as they are too remote from the problems discussed. And that means that European identity does not deny French or German identity – on the contrary, it is possible on their ground only, manifesting itself and becoming actual in other contexts and in other times. That’s what Habermas means when he states:

“European identity this way already could not mean anything else but unity in national diversity; by the way, German federalism after the defeat of Prussia and reconciliation between confessions proposes not the worst model for that” [2, p. 228].

In my opinion, Europe as single organic formation is an example of what is formed in social space succeeding the depleted nation state. *National* is but one out of many levels and contexts for constituting identity and social space; an important level it is, but not an exclusive one, even in pure political matters. The notion of the people is always more broad than the notion of the nations, and not only because it includes representatives of different nations and ethnic groups, cultures and races, but because identity of each person could not be reduced to national identity, although it is augmented with the latter. The new stage of identification paradigm in full correspondence with dialectics means the return on the new level to classical unity while preserving non-classical plurality. Identity of representative of that or other sex, race, ethnicity could not be lost once it had been obtained and acknowledged, – and the same job task would be done by a person with full correspondence to his or her ‘complementary’ identities, but that does hinder evaluating the results of that job task by objective and universal criteria and scale.

In philosophy of science, that methodological approach reflects the ideas of the concept of post-non-classical science proposed by Vyacheslav Stepin [14], as a replacement for classical unity and non-classical radical plurality while dialectically combining unity in plurality and developing non-linear thinking. And in philosophy proper, that approach could be considered as the form of dialectics of the one and the many that finds its resolution in the transition to philosophy of the concrete: a singularity that contains the universality. The universal as the concrete (and not abstract schematic general) does not oppose the singular, – on the contrary, it could exist in the form of the singular only. In contemporary science, similar approach is defined by the term ‘fractal’: fractals are self-similar objects that tend to reproduce their structure (appear as identical) at different scales – in different context of consideration.

Human identity could be indeed considered as an entity similar in its nature to fractal (or, a monad, using more traditional philosophical term). Thus, if we would observe our planet from a rather remote position, say, from space, we will then see one and the only humankind culture on the Earth, all differences inside that single culture remaining unnoticed or at least irrelevant for the position of the said extraterrestrial observer. In the space-planetary context, human being is identified as an earthman. With closer observation (from a lower orbit) one can notice that single humanity breaks up into several more or less different meta-cultural entities: European, American, African, Asian, and Slavic cultures. Upon consideration, for example, of the latter culture with yet closer distance, an investigator can separate out of it Western Slavic culture, Southern Slavic culture, and Eastern Slavic culture. Then one observes that there are Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian cultures and identities present in the Eastern Slavic culture – and so on and so forth, up to features of different cultures present in one person, including even elements of cultures that no longer exist in the global world, like Ancient Greek, Ancient Jewish, or Byzantine. And here we do not

take into account other different forms of identity – social, political, linguistic, gender... The order out of chaos, as well as the exit out of the maze of plural abstract identities, is obtained due to setting an ordered system of considering an event in its proper context [11, p. 201–203].

And not just in context at that – but in its becoming and development as well. Cultural identity itself, and the culture as a whole, is a living entity organically unfit for existence within abstract limits preset by a scheme, be it a stamp in passport or a set of laws regulating the usage of a language. For example, the language spoken by population of a nation state (even if limiting the population by the number of people belonging to one ethnicity only) could neither be reduced to one system of given rules nor separated by strict ‘state borders’ from languages of neighbor countries.

At the same time, the nation itself is sure to display no signs of being an absolute and motionless entity when considered from the point of view of dialectical, non-linear and fractal approach. Nation is a self-organizing system as well, and the very term ‘nation’ in philosophy (at least, in Eastern European philosophy) is usually described as the level of ethnos’ development that corresponds to the industrial age. If we turn to the history of the becoming of Ukrainian and Russian ethnos, we would find out that there were different Eastern Slavic tribes existing in the times of the birth of ancient Rus’ state, which is true for any ethnic history. And it is completely of no sense to try to represent the history of Kievan Rus’ as exclusively history of ‘Russian’ or ‘Ukrainian’ nation only, according to today’s abstract state situation.

In fact, tribes uniting themselves into a nation and gaining a new identity – that is a prolonged historical process. Here is an avid example: in historical drama “The Pretenders” by Henrik Ibsen, the hero, Norwegian king of the 13th century Håkon Håkonsson, envisions his life goal in realizing that national ‘unity in plurality’ – the idea perceived by his contemporaries as a strange and grandiose, one actually fit for a king:

“Norway was a kingdom, it shall become a nation. The men of Trondelag fought the men from Viken. The men of Agde fought the men of Hordaland, the men of Haagoland the men of Sogn; now all must be united and know themselves and realize that they are one!” [9, p. 284].

Mentioned strange-sounding names of ancient Norwegian tribes do not tell much to the present-day reader – Norway tribes did unite themselves, as well as Russian, English, French and other ethnic groups. And the problem is not in the fact that there is a perspective of a new united identity and united culture arising today, so that the Jewish and the Americans, the Russians and the Ukrainians would relate to that one culture as the Polans and the Drevlyans relate to Rus’, or men of Haagoland and men of Viken relate to Norway. The problem is that the becoming of one united identity no longer requires forgetting all other cultural, ethnic, social, gender and other identities; that becoming does not oppose preserving the existing cultural diversity. Classical dilemma: ‘either – or’, is no longer dominant. As a ‘unity in plurality’, contemporary cultural identity could appear not as an abstract and uniform phenomenon, but as a complex, multidimensional and fractal entity. Non-linear thinking considers different identities and different traditions being complementary, and not opposite to each other.

Another matter is that the noun ‘human’ is itself abstract and empty without being concretized in qualities of the German, the Ukrainian, the Jew, man, woman and so on ad libitum et ad infinitum. That’s the difference between post-non-classical concrete unity of plurality [4] – and abstract uniformity. That’s the difference between the proposed approach to consideration of humankind unity – and humankind unification by dogmas of cosmopolitanism that supposes turning all the people into similar westernized culturally one-sided individuals having no national and local cultural dimension. Thus, it is further *proliferation* of identities that could serve as an adequate orientation for the further development of humankind, with the broader and intensified cultural education enabling each person to truly become a subject of one’s own life.

To summarize all the aforementioned arguments and statements, it would be sufficient to state that, in my opinion, the major problem of the today’s world-attitude is that now only human persons can serve as potent subjects of setting values, goals, and identities

for themselves – and not social institutes or systems in general, like nation states of the Modern age. The situation of the plurality of identities, where each person could not be subjugated to any single identity, be it of ethnicity, nationality, race, or profession, does correspond to the philosophical ideas of the development of human personalities, but is indeed hindered both by subjective and objective factors, with people themselves lacking the due level of cultural education to perform the task of being actual subjects of their life and activity, and with old nation states and other bodies readily putting obstacles on the road of that education and development while trying to impose artificial and strict one-way identities and values. All those difficulties indeed result in the disorientation of the world-attitude and in the decline in personal and global health, and finding the solution to the problems in question constitutes quite an important task for future studies in social and political philosophy as well as psychological science.

References

1. *Богатая Л. Н.* Ценностно-смысловой и символический универсум в фокусе современных образовательных стратегий // Гилея: Науч. вест. – 2015. – Вып. 103. – С. 286–292.
2. *Габермас Ю.* Залучення іншого: Студії з політичної теорії / Пер. з нім. – Львів: Астролябія, 2006. – 416 с.
3. *Гейм А.* «Мы не знаем, к чему приведёт это открытие»: Интервью телерадиокомпании БиБиСи. – [Электронный ресурс.] – Режим доступа: http://www.bbc.co.uk/russian/international/2010/10/101005_andre_geim_iv.shtml.
4. *Мелков Ю. А.* Человекомерность постнеклассической науки. – К.: ПАРАПАН, 2014. – 154 с.
5. *Bonds-Raacke J. N.* Psychology in a Complex World. – Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co, 2014. – 412 p.
6. *Brubaker R.* Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 216 p.
7. *Drakulić S.* The Balkan Express: Fragments from the Other Side of War. – New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1993. – 166 p.
8. *Holovatyj M. F.* Multiculturalism as a means of nations and countries interethnic unity achieving // Economic Annals-XXI. – 2014. – Iss. 11–12. – P. 15–18.
9. *Ibsen H.* The pretenders // The Oxford Ibsen / Ed. and transl. by J. W. McFarlane and G. Orton: In 8 vol. – London: Oxford University Press, 1962. – Vol. 2. – P. 217–365.
10. *Mielkov Iu.* Human-commensurable Systems: from Complexity to Harmony // Systems: Connecting Matter, Life, Culture and Technology. – 2013. – Iss. 1 (1). – P. 79–94.
11. *Mielkov Iu., Tolstoukhov A., Parapan I.* The Many-Faced Democracy. – Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2016. – 282 p.
12. *Mills Ch.* Decolonizing Global Mental Health: The Psychiatrization of the Majority World. – London & New York: Routledge, 2014. – 192 p.
13. *Smith A.* Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995. – 216 p.
14. *Stepin V. S.* Theoretical knowledge. – Dordrecht: Springer Verlag, 2005. – XVI. – 412 p.

ЛЮДСЬКА ОСОБИСТІТЬ У СКЛАДНОМУ СВІТІ: ПЛЮРАЛІЗМ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТЕЙ І ПРОБЛЕМА СВІТОСВІДНОШЕННЯ

Ю. О. Мелков (Київ)

Статтю присвячено філософському розгляду тих труднощів, з якими пов'язана розробка людського світовідношення у ситуації складності світу. Особливу увагу приділено проблемі множинності людських ідентичностей як фактору, що впливає на дезорієнтацію у світостворенні та занепад особистого та глобального здоров'я мірою того, як люди з усього світу стикаються з ситуацією багатоманіття цілей, цінностей та ідентичностей, що більш не можуть ефективно нав'язуватися національною державою чи іншим соціальним інститутом, але вимагають від кожного здатності бути справжнім суб'єктом своєї життєдіяльності та цілепокладання. Складність світу, що виникла, як зазначається у статті, є лише відображенням зростаючої складності особистостей, проявляючи необхідність подальшої проліферації ідентичностей та посилення культурної освіти для людей світу, аби мати змогу подолати поточну кризу ідентичності та всі психічні негаразди, що з неї витікають.

Ключові слова: людська особистість, ідентичність, складність, філософія здоров'я, філософія демократії.

ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ В СЛОЖНОМ МИРЕ: ПЛЮРАЛИЗМ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЕЙ И ПРОБЛЕМА МИРООТНОШЕНИЯ

Ю. А. Мелков (Киев)

Статья посвящена философскому осмыслению трудностей, с которыми связано установление человеческого мироотношения в ситуации сложности мира. Особое внимание уделено проблеме множественности человеческих идентичностей как фактору, влияющему на дезориентацию в мироотношении и упадок личностного и глобального здоровья по мере того, как люди всего мира сталкиваются с ситуацией многообразия целей, ценностей и идентичностей, которые не могут более эффективно навязываться национальным государством или иным социальным институтом, а требуют от каждого способности быть настоящим субъектом своей жизнедеятельности и целеполагания. Возникшая сложность мира, как отмечается в статье, является всего лишь отражением возрастающей сложности личностей, проявляя необходимость дальнейшей пролиферации идентичностей и интенсификации культурного образования для людей мира, чтобы иметь возможность преодолеть настоящий кризис идентичности и все психические расстройства, выступающие следствием такового.

Ключевые слова: человеческая личность, идентичность, сложность, философия здоровья, философия демократии.

УДК 316.6–044.332:355.29

Надійшла 11.08.2017

Л. М. ОМЕЛЬЧЕНКО¹, В. І. ВУС² (Київ)

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ АДАПТИВНОГО ПОТЕНЦІАЛУ ДРУЖИН ПОСТРАЖДАЛИХ ВІЙСЬКОВОСЛУЖБОВЦІВ

¹Національний університет біоресурсів та природокористування України; ²Міжрегіональна академія управління персоналом <omelchenko@ukr.net> <viktorvus@ukr.net>

Дослідження присвячене актуальній проблемі соціально-психологічної адаптації дружин постраждалих у бойових діях військовослужбовців, що не здобула належної уваги наукового загалу. Стаття висвітлює результати емпіричного дослідження особливостей адаптивного потенціалу дружин, чоловіки яких постраждали в бойових діях. Методологічне підґрунтя – системний підхід до трактування поняття «адаптація особистості» та концептуальне положення про взаємозумовленість адаптивного потенціалу людини та її самопочуття. Критерії дослідження – когнітивний, афективний та конативний компоненти соціально-психологічної адаптації жінок. У результаті аналізу виявлено: проблемна ситуація характеризується актуалізацією у свідомості жінок родинних труднощів, зумовлює зміни у сімейній самоідентифікації, підвищує стресостійкість; адаптація здійснюється за девіантним типом (неконформістським), що зумовлює фрустрацію потреби в самоактуалізації, спричинює психофізіологічне виснаження; чинниками, що спричиняють погіршення самопочуття жінок, є когнітивний дисонанс в системі «я – інші», розбіжність ціннісних орієнтацій особистості та соціуму. Емпіричним шляхом визначено основний комплекс адаптивних механізмів. Визначені основні напрями психологічного супроводу сімей постраждалих військовослужбовців.

Ключові слова: сім'я військовослужбовців, соціально-психологічна адаптація, адаптивний потенціал, психофізіологічний стан жінок.

Вступ. Соціально-політичні зміни в Україні вимагають нового підходу до проблеми соціалізації, що відбувається в умовах невизначеності. Уваги науковців потребують провідні інститути соціалізації, зокрема сім'я, що нині переживає кризовий період. Дестабілізаційний соціальний вплив особливо гостро позначився на родинах військовослужбовців, потерпілих у зоні АТО. Сімейна криза, зумовлена наявністю потерпілого чоловіка, спричинює зміну структури сім'ї: її внутрішній шар складається з особи, яка бере на себе роль опікуна, – дружини. Саме