

PERSONALITY AS A SUBJECT OF RESEARCH IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY

I.V. Yarkova

*Department of Political Science, ONU them. I.I. Mechnikov,
K35. French Boulevard. 24/26., Odessa, 65058, Ukraine*

Abstract: *A theoretical analysis of the concept of "personality" is submitted, the essence of this concept is determined from the point of view of various philosophical schools. The evolution of the historical and philosophical vision of such an important direction of world philosophy for the domestic intellectual tradition is revealed. The ways and directions of the study of personality in modern political philosophy are determined.*

Keywords: *individual, personality, socialization, individuality, political philosophy, philosophical school.*

Formulation of the problem. Personality in modern scientific discourse is one of the main categories. Features of its formation and development cover the main aspects of the emergence of human behavior, including deviant. At the same time, an analysis of contemporary world philosophical thought shows that the most common and influential are problems related to personality, Marxism, existentialism, neo-Freudianism, modern religious philosophy, as well as postmodernism (a phenomenon in modern science). philosophy).

The purpose of the study is to determine the essence of the phenomenon of personality from the standpoint of modern political philosophy.

The state of the study. It is worth noting that scientific attempts to describe the problem of personality have been made. Among modern schools of philosophy, existentialism should be noted (S. Kierkegaard, G. Marcel, J.-P. Sartre, K. Jaspers, M. Heidegger). In modern world philosophy, there is N. Berdyaev, B. Bone, R. Flueling, E. Mounier, E. Brightman, J. Lacroix, P. Ricoeur. Problems associated with certain forms of interpersonal communication have devoted their scientific research. Horney, G. Sullivan, E. Fromm, who founded the philosophical school of neo-Freudianism. However, a lively interest requires a radically different logic of understanding for the assimilation of the indicated problem.

Statement of the main provisions. A man in his concrete manifestation is an original and unique being. Almost every philosopher associated the essence of man with some sign. For example, Aristotle explained a person as a political being, which is realized only in the state. Descartes connected the essence of man with his thinking: "I think - therefore, I exist." Kant emphasized the moral character of human nature, I. Fichte - the role of activity, Hegel - spirituality, L. Feuerbach - loving relationship with one's neighbor [1].

Among modern philosophical schools that pay significant attention to the problem of personality, one should note existentialism (S. Kierkegaard, G. Marcel, J.-P. Sartre, K. Jaspers, M. Heidegger). Representatives of this direction believe that the essential definition of a person is the irrational identity of his inner world, his existence [2, p. 272]. Existence is a unique personal being of a person who embodies the spiritual, psycho-emotional originality of a person. The personal nature of existence makes it inaccessible to any logical-discursive,

rationally-objective methods of cognitive comprehension: through their universality, they are fundamentally “incompatible” with the personal (uniquely unique) nature of existence. Therefore, the latter is fundamentally incompatible with the “general”, material-objective objective world, with its rational-logical structure, is interpreted as “what is not” (that is, the totality of opportunities, the future, etc., which is mainly oriented “Existence” as an object of one’s desires, intentions, plans, projects), as nothingness, nothing.

The most famous representatives of personalism as one of the leading directions of modern world philosophy are N. Berdyaev, B. Bone, R. Flueling, E. Mounier, E. Brightman, J. Lacroix, P. Ricoeur. They are united by an understanding of the personality as the primary ontological reality and the highest spiritual value, the existence of which is determined by the supreme person - God [2, p. 278].

Personalism justifies the concept of understanding reality as a set of individual spiritual existences (“persons”), connected through irrationalized communication into a harmonious whole. This harmony is the creation of the Supreme Person (God), whose function is to combine individual persons [2, p. 272]. According to the position of the representatives of personalism, a person-person is an ontological concept and manifests itself as a fundamental principle of being, in which volitional activity is combined with the continuity of existence, and provides personal existence with “personal” realizability.

That is why rational-discursive thinking is not able to comprehend the completeness of the "personal" in the world. Such an understanding is possible only in a pluralistic-plural cognitive orientation, which the abstract monosubject of traditional philosophy is not capable of. The analytical-objectivist scientific methodology traditionally considers a person as a part of nature or society (a biological being or an atom of social being), therefore this methodology cannot comprehend a person as a self-sufficient integrity, person, "spiritual creation". The personality is based on the ability to arbitrarily acquire certain states (free will), which is not an environmental impact. Therefore, positivism denies the possibility of progress of society in itself, since it is not capable of any independent actions, and therefore fruitless, and reproduces the existing one. Only an individual is a real person who carries out new actions.

The main characteristic of the personality is its freedom: the personality, according to N. Berdyaev, not only possesses freedom, it is freedom itself. The person, according to N. Berdyaev, is not a substance, but a creative act, it is resistance, rebellion, struggle, “victory over the“ burden of peace ”, freedom over slavery” [3, p. 7].

Representatives of the French school of personalism, under the influence of N. Berdyaev, disseminate a number of fundamental principles developed by existentialism. Efforts are directed to the intimacy of the person, which replaced the “external” characteristics of ownership with “internal”. It is intimacy that should protect the integrity of a person from totalitarianism, the imposition of external circumstances by force, but at the same time not to allow oneself to become isolated in oneself, to fence oneself off from other persons. “Intimacy” forms a new type of personality, which differs from what was formed in the conditions of the formal legal union of living organisms and the rational mechanical separation in the state system [2, p. 279].

Modern Neo-Freudianism (K. Horney, G. Sullivan, E. Fromm) in the definition of personality indicates the manifestation of her attitude to other people through certain forms of interpersonal communication, explains the personality based on internal processes and at the same time social being of a person [2, p. 272].

E. Fromm understands human existence as the formation of man, the improvement of his spirit [4, p. eleven]. Any conversation about morality, value orientations, conscience and duty can be formed on the basis of the

philosophical comprehension of man. By the way, the weakness of many ethical systems lies in the fact that they ignore philosophical anthropology, disregard general thoughts about human nature and try to contrast predefined shrines to the personality, which supposedly make it possible to construct a person. In this case, philosophical anthropology loses its primacy, becomes a fragment of ethical reflection. That is how P. Gurevich evaluates E. Fromm's position regarding the correlation of psychoanalysis and ethical-public opinion [5].

Describing a person, E. Fromm emphasizes: "A person is not a blank sheet of paper on which culture can write its own text; he is a creature charged with energy ... a creature that, adapting, reacts in a specific and specific way to external conditions. If a person adapted to external conditions, flexibly changing his nature, like an animal, he would be able to live only under certain conditions, to which he developed a special adaptation, he would reach the dead end of socialization, which is the lot of any animal species, that is, stop stories. If, on the other hand, a person could adapt to all requirements without resisting what is contrary to his nature, he would never have history at all"[4, p. 26].

E. Fromm attached great importance to the problem of human destructiveness. From the perspective of a comprehensively grounded anthropological concept, he criticized the well-known thesis: aggressive behavior of a person has phylogenetic roots, it is programmed in a person and is associated with an innate instinct. According to E. Fromm, the emergence of human destructiveness concerns history rather than history. "That's the point," the thinker noted, "that a person differs from an animal precisely in that he is a killer" [6, p. eight].

So, the views of representatives of modern widespread philosophical trends convince us that significant progress is being made in the study of problems of a person, of a person, wide and varied views on these problems and ways to solve them are demonstrated. At the same time, the diversity of approaches, the presence of a number of teachings about a person, their claims to self-sufficiency in solving modern problems of the individual do not lead to radical positive changes in personal social development.

A personality is a unity of the social and the individual, the essence of its existence [2, p. 273]. It is a holistic, individualized system of socially significant properties of a person (interests, needs, abilities), which are formed in the process of establishing specific historical types of activity in accordance with the conditions of society. During a person's practical activities, the social and the spiritual are combined, self-realization and self-affirmation of the personality, its socialization, which is simultaneously its individualization, an individual form of appropriation of social relations. The development of the personality, the disclosure of its individuality is the development of the universal in the individual and through him the growth of wealth and diversity of his spiritual world, the development of initiative and creative abilities. A person realizes himself only next to another person in the process of joint activity. The depth and scale of it, a measure of human self-realization, as well as how its interests coincide with those of other individuals and society, determine the level of development of the individual.

The formation of the personality is determined by the system of social relations, the culture of a certain era, which it gradually masters during public life. V. Nesterenko notes that the decisive condition for individualization of a person is "his socialization - attracting a person to the social by accepting and transforming himself into his life world, in accordance with the capabilities and requirements of individual traits, achievements of social experience in its broadest sense." Of course, in real life, social and natural-unique interact in a person from the first days of his life, and, possibly, even earlier. But, as analysis and practical life

show, individuality is not given to man by nature, it is set by the way of his being - social. It is socialization, carried out through imitation, suggestion, through the action of the whole system of upbringing and education, that creates individualization [7, p. 242].

The search for the essential characteristics of a phenomenon and its conceptual and categorical definition is, as is well known, the most important condition, a component and the goal of a scientific analysis of this phenomenon. At the same time, it is a complex component in any scientific research. Such complexity is due, in particular, to the ambiguity of almost all social phenomena and processes. And this requires the researcher to define, according to Solovyov, an "abstract beginning" in the development of a theoretical model of the object of study. As noted by one of the researchers of this phenomenon, the German philosopher G. Koch, the concept of self-realization can mean everything and nothing. Therefore, it is used in one case to denote a holistic personality, in another - to show only certain aspects of the process of his life, in the third - to highlight the personality of an individual [8, p. 1283].

Social is an important component of a person's personal being as an integral factor in social life. This means that the social does not exist outside of individuals, but between them, in themselves. C. Popper, criticizing social radicalism aimed at completely replacing the social system, notes that "the artist and those who collaborate with him, as well as those institutions that ensure their lives, their dreams and plans for a better world, the standards of their decency and morality - all these are components of a social system that needs to be washed away. If they really intend to clean the canvas, then they will have to destroy at the same time themselves and their utopian plans "[9, p. 189], because the originality of the new picture of the social system, as seen by new authors, is to a certain extent the result of the same system that they want to rebuild. The social, which exists only thanks to the individual, as a form of its being, sets the individual circle the limits of socially defined possibilities of behavior. It causes a general orientation of the development of individuals, and also determines the degree of manifestation and realization by an individual of diverse abilities, needs, knowledge, skills, etc., that is, all the essential forces of a person. This is its function in relation to the individual.

However, man as an "individual social being" selectively refers to external influences. This selectivity, a certain way of dealing with the external, is a concentrated embodiment of that unique, individual in the personality that transforms social opportunities presented from the outside. The selectivity is determined, firstly, by the individual limits of a person's being and the development of social relations, and, secondly, by the form of personal development of these relations, which are expressed by the corresponding personality traits. So, the individual and the social in personality can be understood as the unity and opposite of form and content. They are the parties to the basic inconsistency of the individual at the individual level: between the social content of the personality and the individual form of development and implementation of this content. As G. Diligensky aptly emphasizes, the analysis of the correlation of sociality and individuality inherent in modern man can serve as a key for understanding his subjective world [10, p. 39]. In our opinion, this approach has a full justification in the analysis of the process of personality formation.

As fundamental in the development of a holistic personality, the contradiction of the social and the individual is concretized due to other contradictions that reveal not only its new level, the plane in the personality, but also require the corresponding development of the phenomenon of self-realization of the personality [11, p. 31].

An irrelevant concept of “personality” cannot exist, because the essence of a person is always tied ”to a particular level of development of society, reflects the nature of production processes and relations between people, the type of political structure of the state and attitude to cultural values. It is in society that the self-identification of an individual and the identification of its inclusion in a particular social group are carried out.

The identity of a person (a sense of an individual's organic belonging to his historical era and the type of interpersonal interaction that is characteristic of her) provides for the harmony of her inherent ideas, images and actions with the socially psychological image of a person dominant in a given era, the adoption of social life as her own. Identity is, according to the American researcher E. Erickson, the central integral quality of the individual, which makes a person a "political person."

By a political person is meant any citizen whose social behavior is directly or indirectly associated with participation in politics (elections, political movements, demonstrations, etc.).

More “political man” is presented, in particular, in the concept of H. Arendt, in the works “Between the Past and the Future”, “Vita activa or about an active life”, etc. Politics and power should be a creative element, a space in which an active man’s search for himself in relation to others. According to H. Arendt, such a “space of expression” of human activity is socio-political reality: “People are organized politically, according to essential communities, from an absolute chaos of disagreement.” The phenomenon of politics is described by the philosopher as a sphere of speech and action, and therefore, every political subject, acting, talking and telling, can openly "self-present", expressing himself, while respecting and strictly observing the rights of others to self-expression [12-14].

All the considered concepts reflect, firstly, individual, psychophysiological (emotional, intellectual, etc.) features of a person, his specific habits, value orientations, behavior style, etc., on which big politics often depend (for example, the personality of a political leader) Secondly, they denote a person’s belonging to a certain group (status, professional, socio-ethnic, class, elite, masses, etc.), social community, social layer; responsible for fulfilling a specific political role: the voter, party member, parliamentarian, minister and the like. Thirdly, they indicate the degree of a person’s activity in political and public life, reflect aspects of his interaction with the authorities, fulfillment of certain political responsibilities, emphasize that a person is a subject and object, subject to the influence of politics.

There are two main approaches to the consideration of the problem of personality in politics - “object” and “subjective”.

Proponents of the first approach (T. Hobbes, G. Spencer, A. de Tocqueville, J.-Rousseau, D. Bell, S. Lipset, R. Dahl, V. Kornhauser, J. Rawls and others) understand a person as an object of politics . That is, the interests of man must be subordinate to the state, and the individual must put himself under the leadership of the general will. Personality as an object requires control and subordination on the part of transpersonal entities - socio-political structures and institutions.

Modern political science, which has a humanistic orientation, considers the main personal interest of a person, and the social and political order develops as a result of the correlation of interests of different people when coordinating the interests of free individuals (taking into account the views of A. Smith, W. Godwin, etc.). That is, the emphasis is on the subjectivity of a person [15].

The subjective expresses an active, activity beginning. "The subject of politics is the carrier of substantive and practical political activity, which causes certain changes in the political relations of society." The subject always knows, has consciousness and will, actively acts. Therefore, the carriers of purposeful political activity in a certain political space are the subjects of politics.

The understanding of the political and philosophical nature of the phenomenon, although interesting in itself, nevertheless, does not allow us to go beyond the framework of purely speculative (if not speculative) reasoning, if we did not take into account the fact that the phenomenon of self-realization always has a personal nature. It captures how a certain conditional subject - the "average" individual - becomes a person, acting within the framework of a political culture, provided that such actions make maximum use of his intellectual, moral and volitional qualities, that is, the potential that, with one on the one hand, it distinguishes one person from another, and on the other, it is a hallmark of a person as a tribal being.

One of the conditions for distinguishing a person as a political subject is his interaction with other people. Aristotle also noted that politics is a special form of communication or type of relationship between individuals. Therefore, as a subject of politics, it is the "statesman" and "political person". Later N. Machiavelli considers as subjects of the politics of "sovereign", "party" and "strata". T. Hobbes's "political body" is generally part of the total state mechanism, since it generally denies the need for any autonomous political actors outside state institutions. In the XIX century. classes (K. Marx), races, peoples, nations (L. Gumplovich) emerge as the main subjects of politics. At the beginning of the twentieth century. political phenomena begin to be analyzed in terms of the participation of groups ("interest groups" (A. Bentley) and elites ("political elites" (G. Mosca, V. Pareto)) [16].

Modern political science, in particular American, distinguishes the personality of the individual as the "primary", initial subject of politics. This tradition is reflected in the behavioristic concept of political behavior and in the theory of "rational choice". The behaviorist approach brings to the arena a political actor (an actor is an individual who rationally pursues the goals of maximum benefit), whose behavior can be observed and controlled.

Proponents of the theory of "rational choice" reduce politics to the totality of the behavior of individual actors. The communicative approach establishes a status of an equal and autonomous subject of both vertical and horizontal social and, in particular, political communication, that is, a political subject.

An ordinary person cannot be excluded from political life. Since, firstly, the very person who created the policy was the rational (homo sapiens). Secondly, it is individuals who form social communities, strata, groups, political parties and political movements, and various political institutions.

In the system of discrete coordinates of modern sociocultural reality, philosophy (in its academic, priority and perspective forms: from the history of philosophy and philosophy of science to philosophical global studies, philosophical forecasting, ethical issues of bio- and sociophilosophy) acts as a definite worldview foundation for the sciences of man, the life of man and himself appeals to Man. Moreover, during the period of recent geopolitical history, philosophical thought, philosophical reflection seems to be almost the only effort of the integrative, interactive and transboundary universe of man. A universe that "feeds" a person with the phenomena of spiritual understanding of the world: Faith, Hope, Love. It is these phenomena of human existence, as Pierre Ado successfully noted in "Spiritual exercises and ancient philosophy" that lead to

“transformation of the worldview and the transformation of personality” [17, p. 544], to the feeling of kinship with the world of Truth, Divinity, One. The process of such an understanding of the world proceeds in different planes of a person’s self-determination, from personal identification to complex systems for modeling physical and anthroposocial reality.

The politics of the 21st century is the comprehension of a civilized way of being and overcoming those destructive processes that concern all people today. The politics of the 21st century is a new type of political thinking, a new type of political and civic culture, a new way of life and lifestyle, a new way of life and social organization of society, a new type of consciousness of one’s personality. At the center of 21st century politics is man, the level and quality of his life, the civilized style of individual life.

The philosophy of politics is the science of the most general principles and possibilities of politics, the correlation in it of the objective and subjective, regular and random, rational and irrational, existing and due. The philosophy of politics is a way of studying the dynamic nature of modern society, taken in one of its relatively autonomous dimensions - the political.

The task of the philosophy of politics is to identify the deepest bioanthropological, sociocultural, traditional, psychological and other problems of political phenomena. Since the central subject of politics is man, and human activity is closely linked to choice and goal-setting, values and ideals, political ethics and culture occupy a large place in the philosophy of politics.

21st Century Politics focuses on the fact that a person is not only the “economic and political cell” of society, he is a sociocultural phenomenon that absorbs: rational, cognitive-creative, cognitive-cognitive that intertwines with elements of emotional-volitional, traditionalist, national-historical, national psychological.

21st Century Politics focuses on issues of human freedom and the price of progress, on the pragmatic components of politics, its ability to provide the common good of everyone. If technocratism presents technology as an absolute, then the humanistic worldview considers the personality, its life and freedom as an absolute. The politics of the 21st century is the comprehension of a civilized way of being and overcoming those destructive processes that concern all people today. At the center of 21st century politics is man, the level and quality of his life, the civilized style of individual being, which puts politics in direct connection with existential, and therefore existential, dimensions. The main thing in politics is the organization of human relations in such a way that everyone who is attracted to it can successfully solve personal and general issues.

The individual political activity can be considered that individual who sees in politics not so much a means as the goal of his activity: upholding rights and freedoms, making decisions aimed at improving the welfare of each member of society, ensuring the security of each individual person, provide opportunities for its development.

Despite sometimes conflicting opinions, when it comes to identifying a list of subjective qualities, almost all researchers are unanimous in their leading role in the formation and development of political subjectivity.

The objective conditions for the development of modern Ukrainian society find themselves in endless changes in political power and restructuring of the political space. As a result - a chronic distrust of political institutions, state power, politicians; human disbelief in the ability to influence socio-political processes. In conditions of constant anxiety, frequent contact with objectively or subjectively stressful situations and unrest, generated primarily by political events, information wars, internal tension between the subject and society is growing.

Conclusions. From the above, we can conclude that the differences between individuals should not be too big so that the parties can understand each other, but also not too insignificant so that they can cause admiration for what the other owns and the desire to perceive and bring it about themselves. Therefore, the individual makes a choice either in relation to an individual action, or in the aspect of choosing goals, the meaning of life. Choosing, a person realizes the most important feature of his individuality - selectivity, which is the central personality element of human freedom. In selectivity, personal freedom, the above contradiction of the social and the individual is solved. The analysis of freedom, therefore, is an important next link in revealing the essence of self-realization. Modern political science, which has a humanistic orientation, considers the main personal interest of a person, and the social and political order develops as a result of the correlation of interests of different people when coordinating the interests of free individuals.

The main landmark of the political philosophy of the 21st century is a person, self-awareness, self-knowledge, political freedom, freedom of spirit, freedom of choice, civil society, rule of law, which have a deep essence and are provided with a complex set of internal self-consciousness and beliefs of a person, the whole system of political, moral influence, as well as legal means, should ultimately guarantee and stimulate the proper behavior of all subjects of political relations.

List of references

1. Bevzenko L.D. Social self-organization. Synergetic paradigm: possibilities of social interpretations. - K. : Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, 2002. - 437 p.
2. Social philosophy: a short encyclopedic dictionary / [for zag. ed. V.P. Andrushchenko, M. I. Gorlacha that.]; [Text]. - K. ; X. : Rubikon, 1997. -- S. 272-279.
3. Berdyaev N. A. About the appointment of a person / Nikolai Alexandrovich Berdyaev. - M. : Republic, 1993. -- 383 p.
4. Fromm E. Man for himself. To have or to be? / Erich Fromm. - Minsk, 1997. -- S. 26.
5. Gurevich P. Greatness and limitations of Fromm himself / Pavel Gurevich. [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://www.infoliolib.info/psih/fromm/fromm01.html>.
6. Fromm E. Anatomy of human destructiveness / Erich Fromm. - M., 1994. -- S. 8-11.
7. Nesterenko V. G. Entry to Philosophy: ontology of people / Vladislav Grigorovich Nesterenko. - K., 1995. -- S. 242.
8. Koch H. Karl Marx und die "Selbstverwirklichung des Individuums" // Einheit. - Berlin, 1973. - No. 11. - S. 1283.
9. Popper K. Vidkrite slipiststvo that yogo vorogi / Karl Popper. - K. : Osnovy, 1994. - T. 1. - S. 189.
10. Diligensky G. G. In defense of human individuality / G. G. Diligensky // Questions of philosophy. - 1990. - No. 3. - S. 39.
11. Humboldt V. Ideas for experience that defines the boundaries of the state / V. Humboldt // Language and Philosophy of Culture. - M. : Progress, 1985. -- S. 31.
12. Arendt H. The Becoming People. - Lviv: Literature, 1999. -- 254 p.
13. Arendt H. Vita activa, or On an active life - St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 2000. - 437s.

14. Arendt H. *Mizh Minimum and Maybutnim* - K.: Spirit and Literature, 2002. - 321c.
15. Bregued A. Yu. *Fundamentals of Politology: Nav. posibnik*. - View. 2-ge, reoff. i additional - K.: KNEU, 2000.-- 312 p.
16. Yury M.F. *Politology: Pidruchnik / M.F. Yuriy*. - K.: Dakor, CST, 2006.-- 416 p.
17. Ryus Jacqueline. *Steps of common ideas: Panorama of new science*. - K.: Osnovy, 1998.-- 669 p.