

O.T. Arinova^{1*}, E.L. Bumagina²¹ Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;² Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia

(Email: arinova.kargu@gmail.com, senior.bumagin@yandex.ru)

From Sigmund Freud's "dissatisfaction (discontent) with culture" to a reassessment of values in the 21st century.

The article gives a socio-philosophical analysis of the axiological choice and focuses on the difference between the value attitude and the cognitive attitude. The authors of the article relies on the point of view, according to which the philosophical science of the XXI century, when studying culture, proposes to proceed from an axiological understanding of the global processes taking place in the modern world. The article concludes about the historical originality of the current stage and the historical need to build a new axiological system. The authors did not set themselves a part of a detailed analysis of the ideas of Z. Freud, which he outlined in his work "Dissatisfaction with Culture". The aim of the authors was to take from Freud's reflections the controversy "culture is the source of human disaster" and the proposals of trade with the positions of modern cultural studies. A paradox arises: it is culture that owns the means of suffering, which culture both generates. The decisive step of culture is to replace the power of the individual with the power of society and, consequently, with restrictions. The authors, starting from the Freudian idea of dissatisfaction with culture in the psychological and religious sense, prove the relevance of applying the axiological approach in various fields of knowledge of the modern world, modern society. In conclusion, the authors concludes that the global problems of modern civilization are closely related to the values of mankind, their reassessment and rethinking, the search for new content in their inconsistency.

Keywords: culture, axiology, values, modern problems of philosophy, ethical foundations of culture, crisis of culture, fundamental values, human existence.

Introduction

The contradiction of a person, which manifests itself in the limitations of culture, has a correlate in the inner world of a person. And therefore, it is very interesting for the author to turn to the understanding of culture by Sigmund Freud and try in this article to analyze the contradictions of modern culture in the context of the value approach. Even the title of the work "Dissatisfaction (dissatisfaction) with culture" (or "Das Unbehagen in der Kultur", which he wrote because of a controversy with a friend, a French writer, Nobel Prize winner Romain Rolland, is indicative. The author's choice of Sigmund Freud is understandable, since it was Freud, Freudianism, who had and still has a huge influence on the culture and interpretation of the inner world of man. While working on this article, the author again read this work of Freud, which consists of 8 parts. And immediately the main question arose: "why and to what does Freud object? First, Freud objects to Romain Rolland, who believed that the most creative individuals are subject to suffering and feel this world more subtly, let through all the suffering of all people" [1]. And here Freud, objecting to the writer Rolland, believes that all people suffer, and not just creative individuals, and that there are "three sources of suffering: the omnipotence of nature, the frailty of our body and the shortcomings of the institutions that regulate the relationship of people in the family, state and society". "Freud writes that "the social source of suffering is not so inevitable as our mortal body or the external world" and that "our so-called culture bears most of the blame for our misfortunes; we would be incomparably happier if we left her behind and returned to primitiveness". And the author was again struck by Freud's phrase: "The task of making a person happy was not part of the plan for the creation of the world" [1; 25]. So should a person follow values and what did these values give him?

When determining the interrelationships of a person's values that are characteristic of a certain form of his relationship with reality, it must be taken into account that the main types of activity "in their pure form exist only in a theoretical description. In reality, all these elementary activities "act in various forms of cou-

* Corresponding author's e-mail: arinova.kargu@gmail.com

pling, crossing, interaction, like chemical elements that flaunt in their purity and mutual isolation only in the periodic table” [2].

It is believed that the fundamental formulation of the problem of the relationship between knowledge and value belongs to I. Kant, who contrasted the sphere of morality (freedom) with the sphere of nature (necessity). Kant opened a new sphere of being — the “world of due” in contrast to the “world of being”, where the moral law, absolute freedom, striving for good prevails. The “world of due” is the realm of practical reason. Kant assigned practical reason (moral consciousness) a leading role in human activity.

The type of rationality that is emerging in post-non-classical science is characterized by the correlation of knowledge not only with the means of cognition, but also with the value-target structures of activity.

The definition of a possible way and forms of overcoming negative phenomena in the crisis space of the modern global world order is characterized by an actual orientation. The possibility of the movement of world civilization towards stability, in addition to the achievements of technology, may be due to the axiological choice of such a model of social development that will contribute to the survival of society in the worsening conditions of reality. The prerequisites for this ability should be sought in metaphysical foundations at the essential level of social development, designated as social being. Today, the task of social philosophy is to trace the history of the formation of certain values, to identify the most important values of modern life, to indicate the most likely and preferred trends of their evolution in the future, etc. The realities of the modern world have received philosophical and theoretical reflection in the teachings of globalization and the new world order [3]. According to the author, globalism in the modern world turns out in practice to be the ultimate extension of the Western model of life and other peoples should obey this model and its values.

In the axiosphere of modern society, social and personal-individual levels are closely intertwined, as a result of which a new model of axiological choice is formed in society every time, which is aimed at bringing society into line with new global challenges. We remember well that philosophical science clearly defines value as the basis for the subject's choice of goals, means, results and conditions of activity. The orientation of the subject in his activity to a certain value gives rise to what we call value orientation. It is the value characteristics of a certain phenomenon that play the role of a strategic guideline on the path of movement from what is to what is due [3; 63].

Axiological problems have always been problems of social, moral, aesthetic and cultural value orientation. In essence, this is a set of “classical” axiological problems, among which the following are currently being discussed: the role of values in the structure of consciousness; the formation of a planetary worldview; the definition of fundamental values of human existence. The author speaks about the axiological understanding of what constitutes modern civilization, since we are talking about the globalization of the initial attitudes of the world system. Meanwhile, according to the fair remark of Lester K. Turow: “Values, or preferences, are the black hole of capitalism. The system exists to serve us, but there is no theory of good and bad preferences, no modern theory of how to change values and manage them” [4]. In socio-philosophical terms, the core of the modern process of globalization is the modern man, his value world, his attitude to himself, nature and the world around him. Ultimately, the choice that modern civilization has to make to determine the subsequent development not only in Europe, but also throughout the world for several centuries to come depends on the beginning of globalization. In this regard, it can be assumed that the nature and content of globalization will become the main determining factors in the construction of a new world order.

The problem of axiological understanding of globalization has not yet been deeply investigated in philosophical science, trends, nature and factors influencing this process have not been identified. They are increasingly demanding solutions, because global processes cannot but touch value systems. At the stage of globalization, the insufficiency of the value and rational forms of life of human civilization is revealed, moreover, it is believed that civilization is experiencing a crisis of basic values. Therefore, in the most general form, the problem of axiological choice of the modern model of social development is considered, on the one hand, as a change in values under the influence of globalization processes, and on the other, in their reverse influence on the prospects of globalization.

Experimental

To analyze the complex, ambiguous and multidimensional worldview situation in the modern world in connection with solving the problem of axiological choice, the author of this scientific work attracted and took into account a fairly extensive array of information from the history of philosophy, history, literature, cultural studies, ethics, a systematic approach was applied to the consideration of various socio-philosophical concepts and scientific judgments related to issues of intercultural interaction, the modern historical process

and the contradictions associated with them. A small methodological comment: the concept of "morality" is used as a synonym for morality, sometimes as a synonym for the concept of "ethics". Morality is the subject of ethics as a branch of philosophy. Unlike morality, morality presupposes that a person has some kind of internal moral regulator. Morality acts as personal morality, as self-esteem, good, and therefore value. In this regard, as I. Kant wrote, "wisdom, in fact, consists more in a way of action than in knowledge" [5] and the highest goals of the human mind are connected with moral values. Kant proclaimed man, human happiness (good) as the highest goal, and it is impossible without a person's awareness of moral duty. And his categorical imperative is about this, that "a person should act in such a way that the maxim of his act would have the force of a universal law" [5; 102]. And the separation of morality (despite the fact that most dictionaries and encyclopedias indicate their synonymy) was shown by another great philosopher, Georg Hegel, according to whom, morality in the axiological understanding is the area of practical freedom of each individual, his will, which can raise the personality above the subjective desire, and morality at the same time, it manifests itself in the family, civil society and the state. And as for the very concept of "morality", then morality is the moral quality of a person, the rules that guide a person in his choice.

Discussion

It should be remembered that in general, value is what matters to a person (it is the significance of a thing, spiritual or material). Many values of man-made civilization, which are an important condition for progress and improvement of the quality of life, are currently being questioned. And already in the XXI century, an important axiological question appears: "What will the XXI century refuse?". For example, the famous historian Yuval Noah Harari says about the reassessment of the meaning of work, his need and employment: "The best advice I could give is to invest in your own adaptability. All your investments — learning a particular skill, for example, programming is a lottery. You don't know for sure if this or that skill will be useful to you, but in times of chaos you will definitely need emotional stability, the ability to survive all these changes. I don't know a single university where they would teach this" [6].

The author would like to turn to the analysis of a number of values and analyze their relevance in the modern world. So, let's take the value of "The glorification of reason, the assertion of the boundlessness of human knowledge as a guarantee of progress and the realization of humanistic ideals". Overestimation and loss of the former meaning: Reason, the idea of "Knowledge is power!" with the achievements of science is being realized more and more as the creation of new ideas and ways to deceive a person, as well as the creation of something that does not help a person to become better, more humane, closer to each other, but only increases the alienation between people, and enslaves a person with technology and deprives a person of individuality. Marcuse's "one-dimensional man", who has lost his individuality and does not live by his own rules, but obeys general imposed rules that are averagely general and mass, the rapid development of technology has made the world universal, we are surrounded by the same things, we live in the same houses, we are told and shown the same things, etc. And that's why, among other things, the philosophy of existentialism will appear and its founder Seren Kierkegaard will draw attention to a person, his actual feelings, moods, experiences, sympathy for him, an attempt to restore integrity to a person, to destroy alienation and will talk about the "hopeless tragedy of human existence" in this absurd world. Today we see an increase in the absurdity of this world that surrounds us: the simultaneity of the events of war and peace ("feast during the plague"), a global pandemic, etc. And here it is necessary to recall Karl Marx's concept of a "professional cretin", that work, professional activity is the loss of a person's identity, the "separation (alienation) of a person and the business" that he is engaged in, as a result of which "the value of labor itself is lost" and the value of "selling one's labor" comes out in the first place. And then the question arises about work as a value: is there any sense in work and professional activity? And does a person create what can be called creation? After all, is there any creation in military factories, concerns, holdings, and in the name of what is it being done?

If we turn to another value, "Understanding science as the key to progress", the author believes that the revaluation and loss of the former meaning of the idea "Knowledge is power!" with the achievements of science is increasingly realized as something that contributes to the accumulation of technologies for the destruction of nature and man himself. After all, the main question is, and for what and where will this or that discovery of sciences be applied? For the good or for the harm of a person? Is the great writer L.N. Tolstoy right, who wrote as follows: "Of all the sciences that a person should know, the main science is about how to live, doing as little evil as possible and as much good as possible". Recently, I came across an interesting thought of the Czech Scientist who headed the National Academy of his country, Josef Rzyman: "For the ma-

majority of people, science becomes something intangible and therefore not too necessary” [5; 85]. But the famous French virologist Pierre Grabar believes that “Unfortunately, the spirit of Pasteur is gradually disappearing. Young people, of whom there are so many at the institute, do not think about preserving old traditions. I am talking about the traditions of academic, in-depth research, about the work aimed at the search for high scientific truth. The rhythm of life has accelerated, young people are in a hurry, they think very practically. They are assertive, strictly business people” [5; 91]. There is a well-known phrase of Ernst Rutherford: “A scientist should not serve science and mammon at the same time” [5, 106]. And as an example, the German scientist Haber, who was one of the largest physical chemists of the early twentieth century. The method of fixing atmospheric nitrogen was found by him on the eve of the First World War. Thanks to this discovery, Germany could continue the war, since it was able to produce saltpeter from ammonia, which it had previously imported from Chile. Haber was also the inventor of poison gas, which was used in the First World War. And he is responsible for the use of toxic substances in the war. And he is a Nobel Prize winner — a paradox. Although there is a point of view that science is neither good nor evil, that ordinary values and moral norms do not apply to it, it depends on who is engaged in science, i.e., on a person.

Let's turn to such a seemingly imperishable “eternal” value — “family”. The reassessment and loss of the former significance occurred here, because by the XXI century, the institution of the family, as a social institution, has undergone drastic changes, which is associated with the equation in the rights of men and women, civil and other forms of “marriage”, loyal attitude to single mothers, the legalization of same-sex marriage, surrogacy, IVF, the emergence of a whole childfree subcultures, the increase of non-binary personalities, the expansion of gender. Show business has its own subculture, in which other values prevail and these new values are imposed on the masses. Obviously, if the family is absent, then family values automatically lose their meaning. There is increasing support for the opinion that for the normal growth and upbringing of a child, it is not necessary to have both parents, the desire of women to raise a child without a father becomes the norm (voluntary, not forced).

With such a value as “trust in information and the authority of information sources”, there has also been a reassessment and loss of its former meaning. The author gives a quote in order to define the concepts: “reliability is something that shows the quality of information, reflects its completeness and accuracy, has such signs as legibility of written and oral speech, the absence of false or in any way distorted information, a small possibility of erroneous use of information units, including letters, symbols, bits, numbers” [7]. Thus, reliability is characterized by the non-distortion of information, i.e., the authenticity of information and the adequacy of the ways in which it was obtained. And now we live in a world of unreliability of information and its conscious, deliberate distortion. Why is this extremely important and why does it have a value whose meaning has been revised in the 21st century? Yes, because decisions are made based on information! It is philosophy that draws our attention to the factor of information sources, their credibility and, therefore, perception as a value. I will name these sources: individuals who thanks to their powers or position, have access to such information that interests various kinds of mass media; documents; real environment; virtual environment; printed publications (textbooks, books, encyclopedias, etc.); Internet sites, portals, pages, etc. How else has the assessment of information sources changed today, in the 21st century? There was a division of sources into competent and incompetent. For example, authorized representatives of official management structures and state institutions here should be competent sources of objective and accurate information for us, complete information, i.e., reliable. However, they may be falsified, unreliable. Therefore, getting information today does not mean trusting it completely or at least with a high degree of probability. That is what we are fully observing in world politics today. And the importance of authorities has been lost, including in the person of the authors of the 19th and 20th century, both politicians and great figures of Culture, Philosophy, Science. And this, in my opinion, was largely facilitated by the modern information space, which plunges us into some kind of bottomless ocean of TickTockers, Instadives (slang), etc. Reading and thinking about the thoughts and works of Tolstoy, Chekhov, Dostoevsky, Gogol, Pushkin is work, time, and you open an iPhone, Smartphone, Internet and everything is ready, they do not burden themselves and me, somehow they sing, teach something, broadcast something. And most importantly, they fill all the information space.

And such an important value for the modern world is “democracy as the best form of government, freedom, equality and fraternity as the main principles of democracy”. Overestimation and loss of former significance: the modern world challenges democracy through the “degeneration” and formal existence of democratic institutions and values. Modern societies are disappointed in democratic forms and methods of governance (local conflicts are the most convincing confirmation of this), the convergence of the “market” and politics, politics and show business, the impossibility of equal partner relations between the state and civil socie-

ty, the inevitability and indestructibility of bureaucracy, corruption, lobbying interests. The concepts of authoritarian capitalism appeared (and these are elite political "clubs" in the form of the "Big 8", "Big 7", "Big 20" and "dictatorship of development", and religious fundamentalism, and the "crisis of democratic legitimacy", which Habermas warned about. Even my generation has already witnessed "color revolutions", double standards in relation to different countries on the part of the world's recognized centers of democracy, and my generation has a persistent apathy to participate in elections and an understanding of the institution of electability as a "non-value" of democracy, etc. Concentration of mass media and Internet sources in the hands of the democratic elite and manipulation, management of society and people through them.

And, finally, an extremely popular and newly relevant value is "Religion". Here, too, we are convinced that religion, as a value, is being overestimated and losing its former meaning: perhaps I will focus on two examples in this matter: American Professor Phil Zuckerman and American writer Dan Brown, whose novel "Angels and Demons" became a bestseller and a very illustrative example of the existence of religion in the modern world, the world of the XXI century. Professor of Sociology and Secular Studies at the University of Pitzer Zuckerman states that "there are obviously more atheists now than ever before, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the total number of people on the planet" [8]. According to the Gallup International Research Center/American Institute of Public Opinion (a survey of more than 50,000 people from 57 countries), the number of people who consider themselves followers of a religion decreased by 10 % between 2005 and 2011, and this trend continues, as does the steady growth of atheists. Although, it is obvious that the higher the level of security and sense of security in society, the lower the level of religiosity. According to the Gallup Center, in countries such as Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, South Korea, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, France and Uruguay, where a hundred years ago religion played a large social and spiritual role, now the proportion of believers has decreased to the lowest in the world. And religion is always associated with values and with the loss and weakening of the traditional role of religion, there is a decline, reassessment and loss of the value of values.

Conclusion

"The highest values are an integral part of human nature and man has an innate ability to strive for the ideal", Abraham Maslow believed [9]. The author considers it is important to state that global and personal problems should be separated; because the former is global, vital for all mankind and personal problems (for all the humanistic and ethical importance of each person) are, nevertheless, "local". At the same time, the author supports the understanding that already at the end of the 20th century a separate direction within philosophy appeared: the philosophy of global problems and it is here that the consideration of world problems puts the present and future of man at the center of these global problems themselves. Global problems are the consequence of contradictions of social development: these are the problems of war and peace, health and disease, environmental disasters, etc. The global coronavirus pandemic has become perhaps the most illustrative example for all mankind of what is called the global problem of human survival. Thus, if we consider culture as a world/system of values, i.e. from the point of view of the axiological approach, the central place in it is occupied by ideals, which are the quintessence of the generally significant value meanings inherent in culture, on the basis of which the beginnings, principles and goals of cultural life activity of people are determined. Being the focus of a person's value orientation, ideals optimize his being in the world, and initiate a higher — creative plan for its implementation. History as a universal cultural and historical process of human development is characterized by a change or "reassessment" (F. Nietzsche) [10] of those ideals whose generally significant ideological influence determined the historical epochs of cultural life of human communities. If we talk about the historical prospects of a person's cultural existence, then there is always a need for a high level of his value requests with an equally high level of their humanistic content and practical implementation. Only then will the mission of culture as the cultivation of man and his being in an optimal state and perspective of development be properly realized. And for a person as a culturogenic subject, it is always necessary to have a proper awareness of the generalizing role of ideals in culture and cultural creation. Paraphrasing the Nietzschean concept of the "will to power", we should talk about a reasonable will to higher values, about the "will to culture". This is precisely what the higher understanding of culture, to which F. Nietzsche actively and tirelessly called, orients the axiological approach. The history of culture can and should be understood precisely as the process of realizing the human need for values and ideals, as well as the process of approaching the ideal of full and comprehensive actualization of the creative potential of the essential forces of human nature. The orientation towards the ideal, which is integral to the genuine philosophical wisdom of seeing a possible approach to "due perfection", is connected with the practical humanization of human exist-

ence in the world, which is its purpose. The ideals that unfold the axiological potential of human existence in the world are extremely important for a person, largely determining his life vocation. The choice, recognition and cultivation of a particular system of values and ideals are the essence of the culture of society and the individual. The identification of values and ideals in culture and its phenomena radically distinguishes culture from destructive nihilism as a denial of unconditional values. And culture as a representation of values and ideals is not limited to individual segments of the life of an individual and society, but covers all aspects of human existence, giving them a pronounced value-worldview character. At the same time, the accentuation of ideals in connection with the value-based attitude of a person to reality that constitutes culture is a synonym for humanitarianism, which considers man and the human, not only from the position of a given, but also from the position of duty, i.e. from the position of “what a person should be”. It should be noted that the content of human history, marked by the embodiment of values and ideals in the reality of human existence, is also characterized by a constant struggle for ideals. The ideal can be considered the highest axiological reference point in a person's assessment of reality, in accordance with which the entire system of his relations to the world is adjusted and organized, in accordance with which the meaning-of-life purposefulness of human existence is verified. This harmonized coherence of the worldview, formed on the basis of ideals, is the key to optimizing human life. Perhaps, the impossibility of their exhaustive objectification in the conditions of empirical reality, connected with the very specifics of ideals, contains its innermost meaning, because an ideal is a reference value that has an unconditional, moreover, super-utilitarian significance, which encourages a person to improve himself and his life. Therefore, the cultural significance of the ideal, if we understand culture as a creative sphere of human existence, is obvious and beyond doubt. Developing the idea of the categorical imperative of I. Kant, I. Fichte emphasized the special importance for a person of possible approximation to the ideal. Kant seems to have removed this pragmatic interest; morality exists in its “pure form”, in its essence. Kant raises the inner ethical impulse to the greatest height when I act this way, and not otherwise, precisely at the call of the moral law in me, when every act of every person will have the force of a universal moral law and then people will become truly moral. Russian scientists Bormotov and Zhuravlev concluded that “that in society each time a new model of axiological choice, which is determined by the specifics of thinking and global challenges of the social organism” [11].

And in conclusion, the author turns to Konrad Lorenz's concept of evil and aggression as the driving forces of human history, which Lorenz calls the processes-problems and “mortal sins” of our civilization and believes that there are eight of them: overpopulation of the earth; devastation of natural living space; accelerating development of technology; effeminacy of man, the disappearance of strong feelings and affects, increasing human intolerance to everything that causes the slightest displeasure and neutralization (technically or pharmacologically) of suffering; genetic degradation of a person; a break with traditions; the increasing indoctrination of mankind (a sharp increase in the scale of the impact of technical means on public opinion, unification of people's views); nuclear weapons. It is these globalization processes, according to the author of the article, that contribute to the spread of such a phenomenon in the axiosphere of the XXI century as value relativism.

Список литературы

- 1 Фрейд З. Недовольство культурой / З. Фрейд. — Электронный ресурс. — Режим доступа: <https://www.litres.ru/zigmund-frejd/nedovolstvo-kulturoy/>.
- 2 Каган М.С. Философская теория ценности / М.С. Каган. — СПб.: ТОО ТК «Петрополис», 1997. — 205 с.
- 3 Бормотов И.В. Аксиологический выбор России современной модели социального развития / И.В. Бормотов, М.С. Журавлев. — Тула: Изд-во ТулГУ, 2015. — 107 с. — Электронный ресурс. — Режим доступа: <http://www.fa.ru/fil/tula/science/Document.pdf>.
- 4 Квятковский Г.Ю. Современные проблемы аксиологии: наследие классической, неклассической и постнеклассической философской мысли / Наука Южно-Урал. гос. ун-та: материалы 68-й науч. конф. секц. соц.-гуманит. наук (апрель 2016 г.). — Челябинск: Изд. центр Южно-Урал. гос. ун-та, 2016. — С. 487–491. — Электронный ресурс. — Режим доступа: <https://dspace.susu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/0001.74/32054/36.pdf?sequence=1>.
- 5 Ильин В.В. Аксиология / В.В. Ильин. — М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2005. — 216 с.
- 6 Юваль Ной Харари. Sapiens. Краткая история человечества / Харари Юваль Ной. — М.: Синдбад, 2016. — 520 с. — Электронный ресурс. — Режим доступа: https://librebook.me/sapiens_kratkaia_istoriia_chelovechestva/vol2/2/.
- 7 Философский словарь. — Электронный ресурс. — Режим доступа: <http://filosof.historic.ru/>.

8 Зинченко В.П. Ценности в структуре сознания [Электронный ресурс] / В.П. Зинченко // Вопросы философии. — 2011. — № 8. — С. 85–97. — Режим доступа: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=363&Itemid=52.

9 Маслоу Абрахам Харольд. Мотивация и личность / Абрахам Харольд Маслоу; пер. Т. Гутман, Н. Мухина. — СПб.: Питер, 2019. — 400 с.

10 Ницше Ф. Воля к власти: опыт переоценки всех ценностей / Ф. Ницше. — М.: Эксмо; Харьков: Фолио, 2003. — С. 365–714.

11 Хомич Н.В. Отношения рационального и чувственного в механизме формирования аксиосистемы [Электронный ресурс] / Н.В. Хомич // Контекст и рефлексия: философия о мире и человеке. — 2021. — Т. 10, № 5А. — С. 119–124. — Режим доступа: <http://publishing-vak.ru/file/archive-philosophy-2021-5/c9-khomich.pdf>.

О.Т. Аринова, Е.Л. Бумагина

Зигмунд Фрейдтің «мәдениетке қанағаттанбау (наразылық)» ұстанымынан ХХІ ғасырдағы құндылықтарды қайта бағалауға дейін

Мақалада аксиологиялық таңдаудың әлеуметтік-философиялық талдауы келтірілген және құндылық пен когнитивті көзқарастардың айырмашылығына назар аударылған. Мақала авторлары ХХІ ғасырдың философиялық ғылымы мәдениетті зерттеу кезінде қазіргі әлемде болып жатқан жаһандық процестерді аксиологиялық түсінуден бастауды ұсынады деген көзқарасқа сүйенген. Мақалада қазіргі кезеңнің тарихи ерекшелігі және жаңа аксиологиялық жүйені құрудың тарихи қажеттілігі туралы қорытынды жасалған. Авторлар білімнің әртүрлі салаларында аксиологиялық тәсілді қолданудың өзектілігін, сондай-ақ қазіргі қоғамды қамтудың әртүрлілігін көрсетеді. Қорытындылай келе, олар қазіргі өркениеттің жаһандық мәселелері адамзаттың құндылықтарымен, оларды қайта бағалау және қайта қарау, олардың қайшылықтарынан жаңа мазмұн іздеумен тығыз байланысты деген қорытындыға келген.

Кілт сөздер: мәдениет, аксиология, құндылықтар, философияның қазіргі мәселелері, мәдениеттің этикалық негіздері, мәдениет дағдарысы, іргелі құндылықтар, адам болу.

О.Т. Аринова, Е.Л. Бумагина

От «неудовлетворенности (недовольства) культурой» Зигмунда Фрейда до переоценки ценностей в ХХІ веке

В статье дан социально-философский анализ аксиологического выбора и акцентировано внимание на различии между ценностной и когнитивной установками. Авторы статьи опирались на точку зрения, согласно которой философская наука ХХІ века при изучении культуры предлагает исходить из аксиологического понимания глобальных процессов, происходящих в современном мире. В статье сделан вывод об историческом своеобразии нынешнего этапа и исторической необходимости построения новой аксиологической системы. Авторы показали актуальность применения аксиологического подхода в различных областях знания, а также многообразие охвата современного общества. В заключение они приходят к выводу, что глобальные проблемы современной цивилизации тесно связаны с ценностями человечества, их переоценкой и переосмыслением, поиском нового содержания в их противоречивости.

Ключевые слова: культура, аксиология, ценности, современные проблемы философии, этические основы культуры, кризис культуры, фундаментальные ценности, человеческое бытие.

References

1 Freud, Z. Nedovolstvo kulturoi [Dissatisfaction with culture]. Retrieved from: <https://www.litres.ru/zigmund-freyd/nedovolstvo-kulturoy/> [in Russian].

2 Kagan, M.S. (1997). Filosofskaiia teoriia tsennosti [Philosophical theory of value]. Saint Petersburg: TOO TK «Petropolis» [in Russian].

3 Bormotov, I.V. & Zhuravlev, M.S. (2015). Aksiologicheskii vybor Rossii sovremennoi modeli sotsialnogo razvitiia [Russia's axiological choice of a modern model of social development]. Tula: Izdatelstvo Tulsogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Retrieved from: <http://www.fa.ru/fil/tula/science/Document.pdf> [in Russian].

4 Kviatkovskii, G.Yu. (2016). Sovremennye problemy aksiologii: nasledie klassicheskoi, neklassicheskoi i postneklassicheskoi filosofskoi mysli [Modern problems of axiology: heritage of classical, non-classical and post-non-classical philosophical thought]. Proceedings from Nauka i Yuzhno-Uralskii gosudarstvennyi universitet: 68-ia nauchnaia konferentsiia sektsiia sotsialno-

gumanitarnykh nauk (aprel 2016 goda) — 68th Scientific Conference Section of Social Sciences and Humanities (April 2016). Cheliabinsk: Izdatelskii tsentr Yuzhno-Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Retrieved from: <https://dspace.susu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/0001.74/32054/36.pdf?sequence=1> 487–491 [in Russian].

5 Ilin, V.V. (2005). Aksiologiya [Axiology]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [in Russian].

6 Harari, Yuval Noah. (2016). Sapiens. Kratkaia istoriia chelovechestva [Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind]. Moscow: Sindbad [in Russian].

7 Filosofskii slovar [Philosophical Dictionary]. Retrieved from: <http://filosof.historic.ru/> [in Russian].

8 Zinchenko, V.P. (2011). Tsennosti v strukture soznaniia [Values in the structure of consciousness]. Voprosy filosofii — Questions of Philosophy, 8, 85-97. Retrieved from: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=363&Itemid=52 [in Russian].

9 Maslow, Abraham Harold. (2019). Motivatsiia i lichnost [Motivation and personality]. (T. Gutman, N. Mukhina Transl.). Saint Petersburg: Piter [in Russian].

10 Nietzsche, F. (2003). Volia k vlasti: opyt pereotsenki vseh tsennostei [The Will to Power: Attempt at a Revaluation of All Values]. Moscow: Eksmo; Kharkov: Folio [in Russian].

11 Khomich, N.V. (2021). Otnosheniia ratsionalnogo i chuvstvennogo v mekhanizme formirovaniia aksiosistemy [Rational and sensual relations in the mechanism of axiosystem formation]. *Kontekst i refleksii: filosofii o mire i cheloveke — Context and reflection: philosophy about the world and man*, 10, 5A, 119–124. Retrieved from: <http://publishing-vak.ru/file/archive-philosophy-2021-5/c9-khomich.pdf> [in Russian].