

ГУМАНІЗМ ЦИВІЛІЗАЦІЙНОГО ПРОЄКТУ УКРАЇНИ: ПОШУК СВІТОГЛЯДНИХ І МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНИХ ОСНОВ ПРОДУКТИВНИХ СОЦІАЛЬНИХ ПРАКТИК

Назип ХАМІТОВ

orcid.org/0000-0001-8193-9383

член-кореспондент Національної академії наук України,

доктор філософських наук, професор, провідний науковий співробітник Інституту філософії імені Г.С. Сковороди НАН України, президент Міжнародної асоціації філософського мистецтва України

Анотація. У статті зазначено, що кожна країна, яка є не об'єктом, а суб'єктом історії та геополітики, має свій цивілізаційний проєкт. Доведено, що змістом та метою такого проєкту у демократичному відкритому суспільстві є гідна самореалізація громадян у продуктивних соціальних практиках, що породжує цивілізаційну суб'єктність країни.

На основі методологічних стратегій метаантропології та метаантропологічного потенціалізму під гуманістичним цивілізаційним проєктом мається на увазі образ майбутнього країни, що породжує стратегію вільної та ефективної реалізації у світі завдяки гідній самореалізації своїх громадян, у процесі якої формується культурна ідентичність у поєднанні з цивілізаційним прогресом. Гуманістичний цивілізаційний проєкт – це результат продуктивного цивілізаційного вибору, який робить країну суб'єктом історії, а її громадян – захищеними, вільними і такими, що не загрожують іншим країнам.

Доведено, що гідна самореалізація особистості у будь-яку епоху та серед будь-якого народу стає основою цивілізаційних проєктів та розвитку цивілізації. Однак лише в ХХІ столітті її починають визнавати головною метою цивілізаційних проєктів, роблячи їх не лише гуманістичними, а й ефективнішими. Цивілізаційний проєкт, у якому людина, її розвиток та самореалізація є лише засобом, сьогодні не буде успішним за жодних обставин. Це необхідно враховувати під час створення та реалізації цивілізаційного проєкту України.

Зазначено, що в житті людини культурні та цивілізаційні засади перебувають у постійній взаємодії – культура є духовним змістом цивілізації, а цивілізація створює умови для розвитку культури. Цивілізація виявляє себе як спосіб розкриття соціально-економічного та культурного потенціалу країни, виведення його на світовий рівень, а культура постає як спосіб натхнення, світоглядного поглиблення й гуманізації цивілізації. Тому соціальні практики цивілізаційного проєкту України, що актуалізують її суб'єктність, мають бути гуманістичними в умовах як війни, так і миру.

Ключові слова: цивілізаційний проєкт; гуманізм; Україна; ідентичність; соціальні практики; цивілізаційний суб'єкт; людина; самореалізація; гідна самореалізація людини; світогляд; методологія; метаантропологія; метаантропологічний потенціалізм.

HUMANISM OF THE CIVILIZATION PROJECT OF UKRAINE: THE SEARCH FOR THE WORLDVIEW AND METHODOLOGICAL BASIS OF PRODUCTIVE SOCIAL PRACTICES

Nazip KHAMITOV

Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,

© Хамітов Н.

Doctor of Science in Philosophy, professor, lead research fellow of the Institute of Philosophy, National Academy of Science of Ukraine, President of the International Association of the Philosophical Art

Annotation. *The article shows that each country, which is not an object but a subject of history and geopolitics, has its own civilizational project. It has been proven that the meaning and purpose of this project in a democratic, open society is the worthy self-realization of citizens in productive social practices, which gives rise to the civilizational subjectivity of the country.*

Based on the methodological strategies of meta-anthropology and meta-anthropological potentialism, a humanistic civilizational project is understood as an image of the future of the country, generating a strategy of free, and effective implementation in the world thanks to the worthy self-realization of its citizens, in the process of which cultural identity is formed in combination with civilizational progress. A humanistic civilizational project is the result of a productive civilizational choice that makes a country a subject of history and its citizens protected, free, and not a threat to other countries.

It has been proven that the worthy self-realization of the individual in any era and among any people becomes the basis of civilizational projects and the development of civilization. However, only in the 21st century does it begin to be recognized as the main goal of civilizational projects, making these projects not only more humanistic but also more effective. A civilizational project in which man, his development, and self-realization are only a means will not be successful today under any circumstances. This should be taken into account when creating and implementing the Ukrainian civilizational project.

It is shown that in human life the cultural and civilizational principles are in constant interaction – culture is the spiritual content of civilization, and civilization creates conditions for the development of culture. Civilization takes on meaning as a means of revealing the socio-economic and cultural potential of a country, bringing it to the world level, and culture acts as a way of inspiration, worldview deepening and humanization of civilization. Therefore, the social practices of the civilizational project of Ukraine, which actualize its subjectivity, should be humanistic in conditions of both war and peace.

Key words: *civilizational project; humanism; Ukraine; identity; social practices; civilizational subject; human; self-realization; worthy self-realization of human; worldview; methodology; meta-anthropology; meta-anthropological potentialism.*

Introduction. Realising the humanism of Ukraine's civilizational project, which is leading our country to that subjectivity that will be accepted by the democratic world, we inevitably come to two questions. How can civilization and culture be combined? Maybe their mutual conditionality and integrity, which lead the country onto a world level, at least make it visible in the world, and is a long-run objective of the civilization project of Ukraine?

Answering the first question, we should recognise that culture and civilization are productively combined in a society only by members of this society. This is possible only on the condition of their dignified

self-realisation. Therefore, giving the answer to the second question, it is possible to affirm that the deep purpose of a civilization project will still be human as the personality of his development and self-realisation, not a balance of culture and civilization created by man as the end, the balance between them.

Understanding this goal of the civilizational project requires delving into the concept of civilization. In its broadest sense, civilization is the way of the presence of people in history. If this presence is humanistic, the civilization organically includes culture. Civilization is inspired by culture, culture acquires everyday life enrooted civilization.

Orientation towards humanization, to ensuring of human dignity and the self-realisation of man – is an important tendency of modern civilization. So modern civilization is presented as a combination of material and technical, economic, legal, spiritual, and cultural conditions of dignified life of the human community.

Any civilization develops the unity of the past, present, and future. Thus, civilization is its history, and a current state, and a civilizational project – orientation to the future. It is important not to focus on any of one's own civilization time measurements.

Getting stuck on the past, even very heroic, brings to life the conservatism that crosses the country from the present. Dissolution in the current state does not allow it to develop, generating endless pragmatism and populism in politics without ideology. Focusing only on the future creates the utopianism and populism of the left political forces established on it.

Let's try to go between extremes – perhaps this is one of the definitions of humanism.

The self-realisation of citizens as the basis of productive social practices for the implementation of the humanistic civilizational project of Ukraine.

It is important to realise that modern civilization is a global one that integrates different peoples and countries on the basis of certain universal values. Does this mean that in the world one single civilization, which is represented by people (peoples, political or civic nation), culture and appropriate mentality may dominate? Thus, in the modern world, there is a similar tendency, or more exactly, tendencies, because we have several global civilization projects. Superpower countries (or countries that set themselves up as superpowers) in one form

or another represent a civilizational project as "exemplary," building on this ideology through internal and external policies. As a result, a modern world is a world of the struggle of the civilizational projects of superpowers and those states that they draw into their orbit. This creates a new world order scenario in which some countries clearly define their right to be subjects and directors of geopolitics, while others play the undeniable role of objects that are used to influence subjects – competitors.

However, another tendency is opposed to this, in which a modern world is a dialogue and consensus of a diverse civilizational project. Geopolitical, military, political, and economic realities show that the tendency towards global consensus pluralism is more productive, and just on this basis, it is necessary to build a civilization project in Ukraine, which, with necessity, requires consensus pluralism within the country – that is, a plurality of projects of dignified self-realisation of its citizens.

What would be a methodology "to embed" dignified self-realisation into a civilizational project of Ukraine? The scientists of the NAS of Ukraine must answer this question. But before this, we should compare the concepts "a civilization project," "a civilization choice," and "the civilizational development" and define the concept of dignified man's self-realisation.

One can understand dignified self-realisation as disclosing vital human potential in corporeal, creative, and spiritual dimensions, making it creative and therefore useful for a modern, innovative society. This self-realisation organically combines the individual and communicative abilities of a person. Dignified self-realization means an activity that not only reveals a man's capacity, provides her goals and values, but

also gives pleasure to her needs and the needs of her family.

A dignified, self-realised man is happy – in an occupation, and in a family, in a civil and social space. Such a man enters relations and is able to create an open democratic society that does not destroy freedom in exchange for "happiness" and makes the economic, political, and spiritual freedom of an individual the condition of his development. Thus, only dignified, self-realised citizens are the key and criterion by which the civilizational project of Ukraine will not move towards authoritarianism or totalitarianism.

We should understand one very important fact here. An important component of the dignified man's realization of Ukraine is gender equality and gender partnership, which can overcome authoritarian tendencies in a family and a society. In Ukraine, a woman has always played an extremely vital social role, and strengthening her participation in a new civilizational project is required, not only to report to the international partners of Ukraine.

The will to dignified man realisation means that an individual and a society as a whole must make a Choice – a choice of civilization way that will make this self-realisation possible. Today, after a quarter of the century of the state independence of Ukraine, the crucial question of a civilization choice raises before it again. In mass consciousness, such a choice is associated with the election of a geopolitical region, bloc, or alliance of countries, which Ukraine should enter. But a country's civilization choice as a subject of world history is, first of all, a choice of lifestyle and values that are productive for the development of a country and its citizens at this or that stage of its state formation. Even on this basis, foreign

partners, alliances, blocks, and so on are elected. So a civilization choice is largely the choice not of the place in the world but of paradigms and strategies to realise own progress in the world that can be interpreted as a real national idea.

A civilizational country choice cannot be done once and for ever, it must be constantly confirmed by pragmatic action programmes and actions. A productive civilization choice of the country is a civilizational project and a civilizational development, requiring a series of elections, both in terms of periodic authority elections in a democratic society and in terms of making choice for election by the representatives of the elected government and political opposition, as well as providing a daily choice in the process of self-realisation of every conscious citizen.

One cannot deny that a civilizational choice at certain stages of the history of the country becomes the Choice with the capital letter – is crucial and provides a fundamental strategic result. One should not just assume that by making such a Choice, one is already absolved himself of responsibility, having given "powers of this world" – or superpowers or geopolitical alliances the implementation of realisation of the strategies of the Choice. The civilization choice is a constant process of selection, correction, and implementation of own, not imposed from outside development strategies – ways of implementing a civilization project.

However, we must realise that a civilization choice completely different takes place in a totalitarian, authoritarian, and open society. In a totalitarian society, its leader makes it, outlining the contours of the future, and the leader's encirclement develops strategies for mastering the future and defines the limits of human stress along the

way. In the authoritarian society, for example, in the society of oligarchic neo-feudalism of the XXI century, we have the same, taking into consideration the possibility of non-system compromises with the opposition. In an open society a civilization choice is the result of extensive public discussion and consensus among political elites and people.

What is the significance and actuality of the concept of “civilizational choice” at this stage in Ukraine? Is it possible to replace the concept of “civilizational choice” by “civilizational perspective ‘or’ civilizational by developed”? Answering these questions, one should understand that the choice of any subject (both individual and collective) is a necessary condition for its transition from potential to actual state, is the condition of its actual subjectivity. Moreover, we should realise that a country's civilizational choice combines in a civilizational project as well as the civilization development – and the future state, and the movement towards it.

How is this process combined with separate personalities at the level of a whole society? Of course, we would like a person to be included in the general process at the level of daily self-realisation. After all, personal realisation as a goal of a civilizational project of a society does not mean that this self-realisation will be “switched on” only on completion of its implementation. It should cause this embodiment. And you can speak about the methodological principle of embedding dignified man self-realisation not only in the result but in a civilizational project implementation process. In other words, dignified man self-realisation is not just the aim of a civilization project, it is not just an ideological slogan or even a methodological vector, it should be the practice of a civilizational project.

Just as at a country level we have movement from a civilization choice to a project and its implementation, and at a personal level we have movement from a life choice to a life project and fulfilment of this project – self-realisation. Sincerity, efficiency, and simultaneously, creative dynamism and openness of self-realisation towards Another person will determine its dignity.

Dignified self-realisation means that a person, having listened to himself, chooses a profession and a close, loved man creates with her a life project and further responsibly realises it with partners and co-thinkers – goes out from existing into an extreme limit, from potential into currently central. Indignity of self-realisation is focusing illusion on the permanence of a life choice, such as “search of yourself when a person changes professions, family, does not feel herself anywhere, and thus is involved in other life projects, losing responsibility. In authoritarian and totalitarian societies, such people are invested in the Procrustean bed of forced “correct” self-realisation, creating a system of repression and self-repression. Instead of it, in a democratic, open society, such a civilizational project is formed, in which non-repressive conditions of truly dignified self-realisation are actualized. The creative and cooperative atmosphere exists that makes the reality, not the illusion of civilizational development.

In this plan it is very important to show our fellow citizens that a project of happiness, which is self-centred family consumption and the accumulation of resources taken out on the “bread place” from a state budget, is deeply indignant self-realisation as it crosses the country's civilizational future. Such a project of happiness and self-realisation, based on it, creates populism that allows politicians occupy “bread places I2”

or put “their people”, as well as corruption – this project of happiness is always lack of that what you can obtain from a state budget.

Another project of happiness is a project “to be and not to have”. In this project of happiness creative and cooperative creative self-realisation, in which man makes products necessary to others and receives adequate remuneration or profits, even in today’s Ukraine crisis, is able to lead a society to a civilizational level of developed European countries. It is clear that within this project of happiness, the dignity of self-realisation is not conditioned by consumption but by creativity, as self-realisation does not become a means to own something but it becomes value itself. It is impossible to enter this project of happiness and self-realisation because of control and repressiveness, even though it is very specific and fair. Only hard work of creative intellectual elite – teachers, scientists, humanitarians, philosophers, writers, broadcasters, producers, work to change the value of emphasis in students, readers, viewers – can change the sterile patterns of behaviour of an individual and as well as of a society.

Methodological strategies for understanding the project of Ukraine as a civilizational subject: meta-anthropology and meta-anthropological potentialism.

It seems heuristically productive to use such methodologies of socio-humanitarian knowledge as potentialism and meta-anthropology, moreover, to show possibilities of their synthesis in order to understand the problems of dignified personal self-realization in the context of a civilizational choice, a civilizational project, and the civilizational development of Ukraine. First, we will outline the nature and methodological possibilities of each of them.

Potentialism means the need for analysis of a social phenomenon in categories of possibility and reality. From here comes the legality of the use of the term potential, which expresses various aspects of the self-movement of system elements from possibility to reality [3].

So, potentialism allows us to understand the development of a country and, above all, to determine its real, not illusory, utopian ambitions and capabilities. The place of meta-anthropology in socio-humanitarian knowledge can be understood in two fundamental manifestations: 1) as a metatheory of Human Sciences, its existence in culture and society, integrating the results of the simultaneous development of these areas, and 2) philosophy of human development. As a result philosophical anthropology as meta-anthropology can be understood in a broad and strict sense, expressing the specific duplicity of its tasks [8; 9].

Meta-anthropology, in a strict sense, as a direction of Ukrainian philosophy, has integral and methodological significance for contemporary socio-humanitarian knowledge as a project based on the separation of human being into ordinary, frontier, and metafrontier dimensions, which correspond to everyday personality and philosophical types of outlook. Everyday life is formed by the will to self-preservation and procreation, frontier – on one hand – will to power, on the other – the will to knowledge and creativity, metafrontier – will to love, freedom, and tolerance [7; 8].

This approach continues a philosophical search of the classic of philosophical anthropology, M. Scheler [11], and the classic of philosophy of personalism, Berdyaev [10]. In modern Ukrainian philosophy meta-anthropology is one of the tendencies

of the development of the Kyiv worldview-anthropological school, founded by academician V. Shynkaruk. It is important to realise that meta-anthropology, in its strict and broad senses, cannot be rigidly divided into two opposite realms – they determine each other. Only as a metatheory of socio-humanitarian knowledge, meta-anthropology be a philosophy of human development; only as a philosophy of human development meta-anthropology is able to an integrating function in the humanities and social sciences.

The combination of potentialism and meta-anthropology as methodological strategies enhances the possibilities of each of them. Potentialism acquires an ideologically valuable vector, and meta-anthropology overcomes detachment from the realities of the inherent processes of man and society. So we have metaanthropological potentialism as a methodology for the development of potential human life, the nation and humanity from everyday to higher frontier and metafrontier displays.

By life potential in a broad sense, one can understand the integrity of key human capabilities – and corporal, and mental, and spiritual. The aim of any open and humanistic social system is the development of the potential of human life, its self-realization as a condition of a society formation. Realisation of this makes it possible to understand metaanthropological potential not just as a methodological strategy of socio-humanity theories, but as a practical paradigm of the country development.

It is productive to use first of all, such a direction as social meta-anthropology in a methodology of metaanthropological potentialism. Within this direction a triadic methodology of meta-anthropology (ordinary, frontier, metafrontier

human being), applies not only to human as to inimitable existence and a unique personality but as to “o society and to the rights in society» [2, p. 81].

When we speak about the independent and deliberate choice of the way of development in the coordinates of metaanthropological potentialism of the triad “ordinary, frontier, metafrontier,” it is productively to replace the category “ordinary” with “existing (real)”. On this basis, we have the following principles (stages of realisation) of this methodology in understanding potential of this or that social system and man in this system:

1. Analysis of parameters of the existing (real) existence of a social system and people in this system, and understanding their potency.

2. Construction of a project of metafrontier (beyond) existence of a social system that is fundamentally beyond the existing one but reflects its potencies and thus is humanistic – dignified self-realisation—is the goal of this project, not the means.

3. Making an integrity of a strategy project achievement of metafrontier (beyond) existence of the social system and man in it through the transition of potential into actual, possible into real that foresees frontier existence of this system.

To answer the questions what potencies of the social system and man in it can be real, and what - utopian, it is possible only due to profound comparative analysis of the results of the first and second theoretical stages. This comparative analysis should be conceptually forwarded by categories of “possibility – reality”, “potential – actual”, “real – proper”.

The only pair “available – metafrontier (beyond)” makes it possible to understand worldview and valuable, man measuring

transformation potency vector into reality, having created such a draft and image of renewal of human being in society, which will allow to rub through all trials on the way towards renewal.

Thus, a new civilizational project of any society means not only changing its parameters as social, but also the transformation of human existence, first of all its self-realisation. Hence, the actuality of a methodology of metaanthropological potentialism for understanding and a civilizational choice of the country and its civilizational project and implementation of this project, understanding the logic and risks of the development at all stages. Metaanthropological potentialism opens the possibility to actualize lifestyle changes and human values, and hence its existential foundations [3; 5]. However, using this methodology makes it possible to realise that it is impossible to separate man “both from the natural and biological background... and from a kind of inner nature of the human personality, independent self-knowledge” [4, p. 67].

Social practices of the civilizational subjectivity of Ukraine: the context of international communication.

It is important to realise that without the implementation of a civilizational choice as to choose a civilizational project that favours dignified human self-realisation, there is a loss of the subjectivity of a country. This encloses it in the past and cancels from the potential leaders of civilizational progress. Another thing is that the choice of a country may be under the pressure of external geopolitical subjects; it also means the loss of the country subjectivity and hence opportunities to realise its potential.

Let us distinguish several features of a productive civilizational choice, a productivity condition of which is a civilizational

project that contributes to strengthening the subjectivity of Ukraine and dignified man realization in it.

Any country performs a civilizational choice as a subject, not an object, just by implementing its own development strategy – creates a civilizational project and implements it. The presence of development strategies that do not depend on the change of political elites makes the country a subject of geopolitics. A civilization choice as an option of the only geopolitical place in the world, with the necessity, turns a country into an object of geopolitics, resulting in the loss of real independence and sovereignty, and its civilization project turns into a project of eternal provincialism.

It is also necessary to realise that a civilizational choice, a civilizational project, and civilizational development in their productive forms are possible only if there is a real consolidation of people in the country. One can understand real consolidation only as the consolidation of self-realized citizens. And then not only the government, politicians, state and public figures, but most citizens are responsible for the civilizational choice, creation and implementation of a civilizational project. It is then the civilizational development will be not only a number of slogans and imitations of reforms, but it will become a real movement of the country, that changes the way of life based on the selected values but not some abstract way of life and the way of life at the level of a citizen.

Constructive civilizational choice, a project, and development on their basis take place on the condition of consensus, and not only compromise of political parties and groups that are actively involved in public life and represent different social groups and regions of the country. Political

parties and groups and their leaders must be in a state of mutual trust and demonstrate publicly not mutual strife, trying to acquire ratings humiliating the opponent but the ability to trust and to enter into a state of co-creation that will actualize people's trust in politicians and government in general.

Mankind experience again and again proves that a civilizational choice that unfolds into the project and its implementation, is truly productive for self-realisation and the general life of citizens only if there is interaction between the political elite and the elite intellectuals, especially with the expert community of morally and professionally reputable scientists, who are able to create and responsibly and critically analyse different modes – projects of a civilizational choice of the country, and outline strategies to achieve them.

We cannot but admit that the civilizational development of the country, which is formed by choosing a civilizational project, should not come into conflict with the archetypes of its culture and the peculiarities of its mentality. Every culture that creates its members must make their own, inherent in its underlying fundamental mission of enriching human culture.

To achieve full subjectivity in Ukraine, which generates dignified self-realisation of its citizens and at the same time it is generated by it, it is necessary to solve the problem of civilizational confrontation with modern Russia. It is important to realise that this opposition for Russia is largely a civilizational confrontation with the West.

Russian politicians and many of its electorate perceive Ukraine not as a subject that creates its own civilizational project but as a part of its «Moscow-Orthodox civilizational project», which is based on other values than Western. That is why such opposition

is perceived in Russia as not a conflict of interests but a confrontation of values. In modern Russia, it is believed that the West broke the written and unwritten agreements that emerged during the dismantling of the USSR, chief among which is an imperial right to influence on the territory of the former allied superpower. «The West has gone too far to the East», – believe in the Kremlin. This causes a fundamental irreconcilability and uncompromising of a Russian position at any negotiations on the «Ukrainian issue».

Such a circumstance makes actual the necessity for an active and, at the same time, prudent and wise position of Ukrainian scientists, diplomats, politicians, public figures and government, which considers Ukraine being at the break of Western European and Eurasian civilizations. This position should be built on the basis of an understanding of the uniqueness of the Ukrainian civilization project and the need for its implementation on the basis of real opportunities [6] in the name of human dignified development.

The civilizational project and, accordingly, the civilizational development of Ukraine should be a response to time challenges. But it is necessary to respond not only to calls inside the country and even only on calls from outside the country. The civilizational Ukraine project is to become a response to the new global challenges facing as the challenges to human nature and generate, in principle, innovative strategies of personal self-realisation. Only then will this civilizational project be supported by the world.

What new global challenges do we have in today's world? First, it is a challenge to neototalitarianism or a neo-totalitarian challenge. This challenge is primarily caused by the latest international terrorism and, therefore, means the appearance of modern

totalitarianism or neototalitarianism. It is important to realize that this challenge is generated by terrorist threats and simultaneously generates them. At the beginning of the 21st century, we had a strong problem restoring totalitarian tendencies in public life, which were hidden by their appearance as democracy.

This is due to both environmental hazards and the dangers of global terrorism, which is the result of a clash of cultures and civilizations in the conditions of economic and political globalization. Neototalitarianism is largely generated by the competition of different globalisation projects presented, for example, by the USA, Russia, China, and others.

Neototalitarianism is the totalitarianism of epoch-screen culture and screen lifestyle. This is totalitarianism of the era of social networks and informational wars. Unlike posttotalitarianism, neototalitarianism is able to use the resources of information network society, especially screen culture – television and the Internet, where the various discussions are held and are properly moderated. Neototalitarianism is a form of totalitarianism in which direct propaganda is added by techniques of ideologically biased moderations of spontaneous or provoked debates – especially in social networks on the Internet.

Second, it is the challenge of gender innovations. This challenge is by gender equality and freedom of choice of gender and sexual identity. The practice of gender equality in many countries that were centuries of patriarchal existence becomes destructive and hidden – until braking birth rate and the demographic crisis. On the other hand, we have a number of innovations in sexual life. In the Western world, especially in the Protestant world civilization,

become more ordinary gay marriages, and even raising children in such marriages, that makes them same-sex families. Various sexual perversions, which were for centuries considered immoral, begin to be perceived only as deviations that are the result of a personal choice and are not related to public morality.

Third, this is a challenge to transhumanism. This challenge is connected with the desire of modern man to gain power over social and personalised processes through information technologies and also to transform her physicality through bio- and nanotechnologies to overcome the limits of lifespan. The challenge to transhumanism is the least appreciable in today's Ukraine, but its worldview and ideological forms signal the important issue – the desire to evolve not in a moral and spiritual but in the physical and corporal plane, endlessly continuing and increasing the everyday dimension of human existence.

Under what conditions is Ukraine able to generate and implement a civilizational project that responds to these global challenges? This is possible only when an atmosphere of perception of interpreted creative and co-creative human being exists, when complexes of revenge, resentment, and inferiority have been understood and overcome.

During the process of implementing a civilizational project in Ukraine, it is necessary to not intimidate or induce but motivate people – in economic, and in political, spiritual, and cultural spheres. After all, the main subject of the realisation of a civilizational project in Ukraine in a democratic society is not an abstract state, culture, or civil society but a free, self-realised citizen that creates a new state, a new culture, and a new civil society, making

his country e subject of world history.

Taking into consideration the difficult conditions in which the Ukrainian state exists now, a creative, responsible citizen often, with the need becomes a volunteer, but later he should receive understanding and support from the state and entering into partnership with the state, goes out beyond only the limits of a volunteer status. Movement from a status of a volunteer that started a socially significant project to a status of a public servant, scientist, professional journalist, and efficient businessman – that's vector of dignified man's self-realization in today's and future Ukraine.

Thus, only dignified self-realisation is the goal of a civilizational project in Ukraine. However, dignified self-realisation is at the same time its precondition and a way of implementation – without self-realised and self-sufficient people who are typically the middle class and fundamentally integrate into economic, political, spiritual communities, this project becomes utopian [5; 6].

There is a contradiction that must be resolved dialectically – the state, which is the main subject of a civilizational project in Ukraine, must show appropriate activity to create a social atmosphere for the actualization of active and creative personalities, taking care to provide equal opportunities for getting education, training and a fair action of “social elevators” – to form and maintain common for all “rules” in a society where man is the highest value.

Conclusions. The possibility of man's self-realization in modern and future Ukraine is significantly complicated by the fact that a hybrid war, in the space of which Ukraine has existed for several years, is not just a local situation. It is an element of a new world order. It is quite possible to agree with Academician V. P. Horbulin [1].

What is the hybrid world order? In the context of the above said, it can be quite called neototalitarianism. This is a scenario of relations between countries and relations inside a country where interests dominate moral principles, tactics become the strategy, and worldview eclectic and chaos exist there under the guise of clear propaganda slogans.

The hybrid world order – is a way of doing politics with strange hands through system manipulation of the collective consciousness and collective out of consciousness first to create situations of chaos and further – a chronic state of controlled chaos of the social system.

As noted above, a hybrid world order is a world order scenario in which some countries clearly define their right to be subjects and directors of geopolitics, while others play the role of extras who are undeniably used to influence on subjects- competitors. In this case, extras are cast to be the true directors of their own destiny.

Using a metaanthropological potentialism approach, we can assume that directors of the hybrid world order try to establish their civilizational projects for each of the managed countries that must constantly oscillate between the existing and frontier being, that makes it possible to manipulate them.

Thus, the world resembles a strange play that is directed by a few directors who profess different approaches, see finals in different ways, and, by all possible means, conceal themselves as directors.

Such interaction of subjects of the hybrid world order with necessity creates unforeseen consequences, one of which is chronic international terrorism. That is why a hybrid world order can also be called a hybrid world disarrange, world disorder.

Is a hybrid world order organic for mankind, that it means its new stage, whether is it – a disease of human history, is its the curvature that has not been before? I would suggest the following metaphor: oncology of mankind, or more accurately, the oncology of humanity. After all, this world order is not only contrary to the previous world order, which was formed after World War II, but to all human morality, the whole way of human existence that has formed over the last two millennia. In this world order, something lurks that is dangerous to man at all, that leads man beyond good and evil, on the other side of humanity.

In the context of what has been said, there is a logical question: are corruption and populism, these deep internal threats to the very existence of the Ukrainian state, which has been passing through a complex evolution recently, demonstrating its vitality, logical and natural manifestations of this hybrid world order, manifestations that have not only internal reasons but also those that were stage-managed from the outside? Are they those manifestations that provoke a very dangerous political elite alienation and distrust towards citizens, destroying the possibility of dignified self-realisation?

If the state of hybrid wars and hybrid relations in the world is not spontaneous, can we even talk about the philosophy of the hybrid world order? If it is so, it should be the philosophy of overcoming the hybrid world order. And this can be a very important mission in the world of modern Ukraine. And there should be a worldview vector of dignified self-realisation of our contemporary Ukraine.

Humanitarian technology, political and diplomatic ways to overcome the hybrid world order that do not reinforce it

with symmetrical, mirror responses but transform it and its subjects – that is very necessary now for Ukraine and what must enter its civilizational project and civilizational development, creating real conditions of dignified self-realisation of its citizens.

In conditions of a full-scale war in Ukraine, it is very important not to forget about the need for worthy self-realisation of a person as the highest goal and meaning of the civilizational project of our country and its subjectivity. This is the basis of that new humanism, which, from the standpoint of meta-anthropology and meta-anthropological potentialism, is the humanism of active support and understanding of the worldview of the Other [12], which is a key condition for the support of Ukraine from the democratic international community and the real victory of our country.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Горбулін В. Хитромудра невизначеність нового світопорядку. *Дзеркало тижня*. 2016. № 30, 27 серпня.
2. Крилова С. Краса людини: особистість, сім'я, суспільство (соціально-філософський аналіз). Ніжин: Аспект-Поліграф, 2011. 344 с.
3. Пирожков С. І., Хамітов Н.В. Цивілізаційна суб'єктність України: від потенцій до нового світогляду і буття людини. Київ: Наукова думка, 2020. 250 с.
4. Пирожков С. І. Образ людини і трудовий потенціал населення. *Філософська і соціологічна думка*. 1991. № 7. С. 66–81.
5. Пирожков С. І., Хамітов Н.В. Цивілізаційний проект України: від амбіцій до реальних можливостей. *Вісник НАН України*. 2016. № 6. С. 45–52.
6. Пирожков С. І., Хамітов Н.В. Цивілізаційний вибір України в глобалізованому світі. *Дзеркало тижня*. 2016. № 28, 13 серпня. С. 4.
7. Хамитов Н. Філософія: бытие,

человек, мир. От метафизики к метаантропологии. 3-е издание, исправленное и дополненное. Киев: КНТ, 2016. 268 с.

8. Хамітов Н. Філософська антропологія як метаантропологія: метатеорія гуманітарних наук і філософія антропо-трансценденції. *Філософія людини як шлях гуманізму та гідності у граничному бутті суспільства: підхід філософської антропології як метаантропології*. Збірник наукових праць. Київ: НПУ імені М.П. Драгоманова, 2016. С. 6–30.

9. Хамітов Н.В. Філософська антропологія: актуальні проблеми. Від теоретичного до практичного повороту. 5-е видання, виправлене і доповнене. Київ: КНТ, 2022. 405 с.

10. Berdiaev N. *Dialectique existentielle du divin et de l'humain*, Paris, Janin, 1947. 247 p.

11. Scheler M. *Philosophische Weltanschauung*. Verlag von Friedrich Cohen in Bonn. 1929. S. 3–14.

12. Khamitov N. *The War in Ukraine and the New Humanism: David versus Goliath. Meta-anthropology of history of the 21st century*. Sofia: KIBEA Publishing, 2023. 123 p.

REFERENCES

1. HORBULIN, V. (2016). The Cunning Uncertainty of the New World Order. *Mirror of the Week*. No. 30, August 27. [in Ukr.]

2. KRYLOVA, S. (2011). *Human Beauty: Personality, Family, Society (Social-Philosophical Analysis)*. Nizhyn: Aspekt-Polygraph, 344 p. [in Ukr.]

3. PYROZHKOVA, S., KHAMITOV, N. (2020). *Civilizational Subjectivity of Ukraine: from Potentials to a New Worldview and Human Being*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 250 p. [in Ukr.]

4. PYROZHKOVA, S. (1991). The Image of a Person and the Labour Potential of

the Population. *Philosophical and Sociological Thought*. No. 7. pp. 66–81. [in Ukr.]

5. PYROZHKOVA, S., KHAMITOV, N. (2016). Civilization Project of Ukraine: from Ambitions to Real Possibilities. *Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*. No. 6, pp. 45–52. [in Ukr.]

6. PYROZHKOVA, S., KHAMITOV, N. (2016). Civilizational Choice of Ukraine in the Globalized World. *Mirror of the Week*, No. 28, August 13, p. 4. [in Ukr.]

7. KHAMITOV, N. (2016). *Philosophy: Existence, Man, Peace. From Metaphysics to Meta-anthropology*. 3rd ed., correct. and ext. Kyiv: KNT, 268 p. [in Rus.]

8. KHAMITOV, N. (2016). Philosophical Anthropology as Meta-Anthropology: Meta-Theory of Humanitarian Sciences and Philosophy of Anthro-Transcendence. *The Philosophy of Man as a Way of Humanism and Dignity in the Marginal Existence of Society: the Approach of Philosophical Anthropology as Meta-Anthropology*. Collection of Scientific Works. Kyiv: NPDU, pp. 6–30. [in Ukr.]

9. KHAMITOV, N. (2022). *Philosophical Anthropology: Current Problems. From Theoretical to Practical Turn*. 5th ed., correct. and ext. Kyiv: KNT, 405 p. [in Ukr.]

10. BERDIAEV, N. (1947). *Dialectique Existentielle du Divin et de L'humain*, Paris, Janin. 247 p. [in Fra.]

11. SCHELER, M. (1929). *Philosophische Weltanschauung*. Verlag von Friedrich Cohen in Bonn. pp. 3–14. [in Deu.]

12. KHAMITOV, N. (2023). *The War in Ukraine and the New Humanism: David versus Goliath. Meta-Anthropology of History of the 21st Century*. Sofia: KIBEA Publishing. 123 p. [in Eng.]