

N. Medzhidova*

*Baku State University, Baku, Azerbaijan
(E-mail: nargiz516@hotmail.com)*

Worldview and personality in the context of philosophical understanding of human self-actualization

The article deals with issues related to the philosophical understanding of human transformation in the conditions of modern reality. Stating that there is a crisis in the spiritual development of mankind, the author offered his vision of what can contribute to its overcoming. Turning to the experience of philosophical anthropology, the author analyzed the correlation between individuality, personality and worldview. Obviously, these concepts are related to the social activity of the subject and are based on the dialectics of the subjective and objective. Compared to individuality, personality is distinguished by greater activity, aspiration to self-actualization, responsibility for the consequences of its activity. At the same time, the activity of a personality should have a creative character. In the context of this philosophical approach, which integrates many realities of human existence, a person appears as an ontological reality, as a personality, the creative beginning of social practice and history. The being space of a person is interpreted as a subjective-objective reality or a unique integrity of interdependent phenomena of a person's inner world, his or her worldview searches and expectations.

Keywords: worldview, man, subject, personality, self-actualization, meaning of life.

Introduction

“The enormous technical and practical successes have contributed to the “debauchery” of man’s consciousness — what no god has done for man in a millennium, man does himself. He probably hoped to see being in this activity, but, frightened, he found himself facing a void of his own making” [1; 299]. In these words, Karl Jaspers characterized the spiritual situation of his time — but at the moment, nothing has changed, at least for the better — over the last three decades the sense of imminent catastrophe, fear and confusion have only increased.

The dependence of man only on his mind has led to the fact that today we live in an information society, where the main thing is the possession of information and man’s ability to use it correctly. But how come we, possessing a huge spiritual, cultural, scientific and technical heritage, have not learnt to use it correctly for the benefit of every member of society? Why having all preconditions and conditions for creative creation of reality, we only passively perceive it, — we go with the flow, adjust to any conditions, spiritually degrade and eventually direct all technical power to the destruction of our planet as a whole. Morality is being destroyed, imagery and art are degenerating, true religious feelings are dying out. There is a substitution of the true goal — henceforth the means of its achievement are proclaimed the goal, and the consumption of such “goals” — the highest good bringing the experience of happiness. As a result, the human being becomes a hostage of technological development and the increasing production of consumer products, which gives rise only to a growing sense of general instability and insecurity. People do not have a clear knowledge of their own destiny and the destiny of their time, but in any case, although mostly unconsciously, we feel that we live at a time when the world has reached a milestone in its development that is incommensurable with the similar milestones of individual historical epochs of the past millennia. There is a realization that we are living in a spiritually incomparably richer situation of opportunities and dangers, but if we fail to cope with it, it will inevitably turn into a most insignificant time for the failed human being. Looking back at the past millennia, it may seem that man has reached the end of his development or that he, as a carrier of modern consciousness, is only at the beginning of his journey, at the beginning of his formation, but this time possessing the means and the possibility of real recollection, on a new, completely different level. Look how much the potency of life has increased recently — the limits of our possibilities have expanded incredibly. And yet, with more means, more knowledge, more technology than all previous epochs, our age behaves like the most wretched of all; it is adrift. Our age is confused in the midst of abundance — deeply confident of its

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: nargiz516@hotmail.com

creative powers, yet it does not know what to create. Master of the whole world, he is not master of himself [2; 56]. The events of the twenty-first century continue to raise more questions than they answer about the interrelationship and mutual influence between the nature of people's social activities and the world around them. On the one hand, thanks to advances in various spheres of social activity, human beings have been able to involve even outer space. On the other hand, by the frequent unpredictability of its results, especially in terms of significant mismatch of the desired with reality, it, this activity, sometimes jeopardizes the very existence of both himself and all his existing natural and social environment. Whence such a number of suicides and why mankind strives to accumulate and improve that can forever erase even the memory of us from the Universe?! Today, in our world there are no plans, no goals, no ideals; there are no higher or lower, no right or wrong, there is a levelling of wealth, rights, culture, classes, genders: humanity has started to live as if on the other side of good and evil. The spiritual sphere — culture, religion, art — has been criticized and shattered; authorities have lost their weight and norms have lost their significance. Denial of the past and complete prostration about our future are the characteristics of our time. And even what we produce today is not produced for the purpose of obtaining use value and owning, if possible, a durable product, it is produced for the purpose of its death, the acceleration of which is equal only to price inflation. This policy calls into question the “rationalist” tenets not only of economic science, but in general the reasonableness and expediency of our very existence. There is a persistent feeling that mankind throughout all centuries has been running and running, striving for something — something that can confirm its existence — to improve, secure, prolong, make more comfortable — and, in the end, came to the denial of itself. The snake bites its own tail: meaninglessness, uselessness, hopelessness...

Mankind is on the verge of crisis in all spheres of its existence — natural, social, economic, political, mental-psychological, spiritual. What led to this? All the will, all the forces aimed at improvement, in the end, led to the denial of human life itself. Life is an inherent property of the world around us. For a number of centuries, the main way of perceiving reality has been passive worldview with complete identification with the environment. We are not representatives of the animal world and we should treat the very fact of our life reasonably: to live — consciously. The concept that most clearly captures this conscious experience of life is existential — existence. Existence is a sensual experience of life, its continuous movement. It is a state in which you realize that one is condemned to be free. “Condemned because he did not create himself, and yet free because once thrown into the world he is responsible for everything he does” [3; 330]. Existence is possible only in the creative re-creation of reality, because it is at such moments that we are more conscious and reasonable in our attitude to life — we ourselves act as its creators. This demiurgic worldview is inherent in a person who seeks, first of all, to constitute himself.

Research Methods

The theoretical and methodological basis of our study is the dialectical-ontological justification of the relationship between worldview and human personality, which suggests that the qualities of a person as a subject of activity are the basis of the causality of existence, the source of activity, creative self-activity. This means that the process of formation of higher forms of personal growth includes the mechanism of self-overcoming (self-actualization), which allowed us to see the human problem from the position of preserving the subject position at different stages of the life path. In the context of this philosophical approach, which integrated many realities of human existence, a person appears as an ontological reality, as a personality, the creative beginning of social practice and history, which, in turn, allowed us to overcome the impersonal, static-structural approach to consciousness and activity, which exaggerated the role of the formative influence of social programs and social projects on the personality.

The central position of this approach implies the consideration of the individual as a subject of the process of being and co-existence, which should be supported by a certain orientated personal activity in acquiring a worldview. This means that the personality and its worldview appear as interdependent and mutually conditioning sides of the whole, and the phenomenon of “human being” is an organized hierarchy of different ways of human existence. The being space of a person is interpreted as a subjective-objective reality or a unique integrity of interdependent phenomena of a person's inner world, his or her worldview searches and expectations [4].

Results and discussion

The worldview of a person from the point of view of classical thought is impossible without the ontological aspect, which determines the system of worldview as a whole. In this regard, it is thought that the

constitutive beginning of personality is located “on the other side” of the social and natural, in the being layers of the universe. The concept of personality in Max Scheler’s anthropology is quite indicative in this sense. According to the German scientist, “what makes a human being a human being is the principle opposite to all life in general, it as such is irreducible to the “natural evolution of life,” and if it can be elevated to something, then only to the highest basis of things themselves — to that basis, a private manifestation of which is also “life” [5; 53].

In his opinion, the spirit is the supreme foundation of human life. He regards the personality as an activity centre through which the spirit manifests itself in the finite spheres of existence.

In contrast to the representatives of the animal world, man, who becomes a person, can rise above himself and the world by objectifying them in his cognitive effort. On the basis of man’s “givenness” to himself, Scheler explains the presence of ontological traits such as: 1) the presence of man’s specific categories of thing and substance, which allow him to transform the thing; 2) man’s allocation of a single space of the world, unrelated to the concreteness of the environment and activity, which creates a peculiar background of perception of the world; 3) the presence of reflexivity, the ability to realize himself as the center of his own spiritual acts [5; 55–58].

All this is possible only insofar as the spirit has no spatio-temporal characteristics and is found only in the highest foundation of being itself. Accordingly, man in his personality surpasses himself and the world [5; 57]. The personality by its spiritual act breaks down the world’s resistance to the impulse of life, “derealizes” the opposition between the world and creative power. The process of derealization consists in what, judging from Scheler’s description of it, strongly resembles the process of catharsis: What does it mean to derealize (entwirklichen) or “ideate” the world? It does not mean, as Husserl thinks, to refrain from judging existence; on the contrary, it means to attempt to remove, to annihilate the very moment of reality, the holistic, undivided, overbearing impression of reality with its affective correlate — to eliminate that “fear of the mundane” which, as Scheler insightfully observes, “goes away” only “in those spheres where forms pure live” [5; 64–65]. The elimination of affects by moving the recipient into an alternative reality is realized in artistic creation, the realm of “pure forms” that have an ontological character.

Scheler’s concept of personality clarifies the nature of worldview: in essence, worldview is an ideation, derealization of the world, its creative transformation, carried out by spiritual effort.

This raises the problem of the nature of the relationship between worldview and personality. This problem involves consideration of the question of the correlation of individuality, personality and worldview. Obviously, these concepts are related to the social activity of the subject and are based on the dialectics of the subjective and objective, if the objective is understood as social relations. If we talk about the relationship between the personal and the social, then the social organically, along with the individual, is included in the structure of personality. Compared to individuality, personality is characterized by greater activity, moral emphasis, responsibility for the consequences of its activity. It should also be noted that the activity of personality, taking into account the above characteristics, must necessarily have a creative character, while the activity of individuality can be destructive.

But personality is defined not only (and not so much) in terms of social, but also in ontological terms. Therefore, the essence of personality, in our opinion, is not any activity, but the one that generates spiritual activity of self-creation, the result of which is the formation of the worldview of the individual. Let us try to define this relation in the following way: personality is an individuality creating its own worldview. Or, in other words, it is a self-creating individuality. This definition contains several fundamental points: uniqueness, integrity, ontological rootedness, priority of the spiritual vector of development, creative approach and fundamental incompleteness of the process of self-creation.

One of the provisions of postmodernism, following from the central attitude of acentrism, is the assertion of the equivalence of all traditions, the idea of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, for all its weaknesses, presupposes a dialogue between different cultural subjects. At the level of a person’s worldview, this is realised as a person’s polylogicality. As a process of understanding interaction between equivalent subjects, polylogicality is carried out in parallel on several levels: 1) the relation of the Self to the external Other (or, if we designate the Self as a text, text to text, recipient, etc. in the context of the structuralist tradition); 2) the relation of the Self to the internal Other (or the intra-textual relation of different Selves); 3) the relation of the Self to culture (or text to context); 4) the relation of the Self to God (text to metatext).

In this connection, a different meaning of the attempt of structuralists to eliminate personality from the creative process, contained in the concept of “death of the author,” emerges. Roland Barthes argued the following: “... The author nurtures the book, that is, precedes it, thinks, suffers, lives for it; he also precedes his

work as a father precedes his son. As for the modern scriptor, he is born at the same time as the text, he has no existence before and outside of writing, he is by no means the subject in relation to which his book would be a predicate; there remains only one time, the time of the speech act, and every text is written here and now" [6; 387]. One should not see in this proclamation of the "death of the author," as opposed to Bakhtin's theory of the author, an attempt to objectify the creative process, because subject-object relations are not always applicable to creativity. It is an attempt to protect us from the unambiguity and one-dimensionality of understanding the text, from a certain final meaning, an endeavor to present the result of creativity as an unfinished process of writing and its continuous interpretation.

A seemingly paradoxical situation is created. The subject creates his or her identity through self-elimination by subordinating himself or herself to the writing process. In fact, elimination occurs only from the point of view of formal discourse, and self-development is realized through this creative self-elimination. The subject of creativity only in the hypostasis of the scriptor (in other words, at the moment of creation) is capable of spontaneous self-changing, of renewing being, of transcending his or her own self and developing a worldview.

The development of the worldview, its change, takes place as the personality grows, as the subject deepens into itself, as it becomes acquainted with the macrocosm through the microcosm, in the interval between the scriptor and the Author as hypostases of absolute subjectivity and absolute objectivity (or transcendental and transcendent, subject and other-subject, singular and universal). But this is the creative process. The formation of personality in the postmodern era is associated with the discovery of a new view of the world — with a complete restructuring of the worldview. This restructuring, or rather creation, is a constant, incomplete process, like writing a text in its poststructuralist interpretation.

It would seem that the state of a scriptor presupposes the finality of the text, because, unlike the Author, who creates a draft and then refines it to the "final" white version, the scriptor writes the text(s) once and for all, i.e., definitively. But it is not. Firstly, such a writing process is fundamentally incomplete, for putting "text" on "paper" is only a part of writing, which continues during the whole life of the scriptor, because the true process of creativity (writing) does not always coincide with the materialization of this process. And it is interrupted, perhaps, only by the spiritual death of the subject. But, since creativity in communicative terms is multidimensional, polylogical, the writing process, terminating at the first and second levels of polylogue, can be continued through other levels by other subjects.

In the hypostasis of the scriptor, the subject, as we have defined above, simultaneously "corrects" what has already been written, and what is currently being written can, in turn, be considered the basis for a new correction. And the paradoxical process whereby "the subject may be said to find himself precisely in the act of self-dismissal to which he defiantly subjects his personality" [6; 380] appears as the crumpling and discarding of a draft with the simultaneous creation of a new draft. Thus, the scrivener is the state of the draft text of the personality born in the text. Only in the hypostasis of the scriptor (in other words, at the moment of creation) is the subject of creativity capable of spontaneous self-changing, of renewing being, of transcending his or her own self and developing a worldview. Only in this hypostasis, which presupposes semantic emptiness, absolute cultural naivety, is there the possibility of creative disruption of the causal chain, of insight.

The postmodernist pathos of the struggle against onto-theo-teleo-phono-logocentrism in the personal aspect can find some — though not literal — parallels in the philosophical views of M.K. Mamardashvili, who argued that personality is "something that has no other grounds than itself, i.e., self-existence... something that is beyond a given culture, beyond given customs, beyond given tradition, beyond given social rules, mores and habits" [7; 63]. It is not difficult to notice that the difference of this definition is the denial of the cultural validity of the personal structure, but it is thought that Mamardashvili himself did not limit himself to the literal meaning of this phrase, since the groundlessness of the personality means a transcendental orientation, an aesthetic aspiration to reach a new, broader level, to cross any framework, including that of culture, and this is possible only on condition of a huge labour of reworking and overcoming cultural and other frameworks, i.e. a good acquaintance with what is discarded.

Fyodor Girenk's work advocates a concept of human asociality reminiscent in part of the postmodern nomadology and rhizomancy of Deleuze and Guattari. He believes that self-reproduction is at the heart of understanding human nature. The non-bodily experience of the imagination, which resists socialization and the social norm, immerses the human being in a purposeless flow of being that knows no distinction between subject and object, between the sensual and the rational, the eternal becoming of the self [8; 129]. Therefore, we can say that the elimination of ontocentrism in postmodernism is also relative and represents only a step

in the synthesis that follows the deconstruction of the eternally becoming structure of the individual. On this basis, we can say that the worldview of the modern personality is a polycentric, polylogical flow of becoming, a striving for the self-resonance of the personality.

Man is so never fully fulfilled, fully realized and fulfilled. As B.D. Gubin writes, “man himself as such is only an indirect product of God’s plan for himself, that he is the Great Promise, promises, but is never fully realized in any of the worlds” [9; 86]. Thus, man’s life can be presented as a series of unsuccessful attempts to express, to realize himself, to self-realize. He says: Tomorrow I will start a new life. But tomorrow comes, but nothing in his life changes. And so, it goes on without end — tomorrow, next week, next month, next year, etc. On the other hand, if a man were to achieve all his goals at once, he would probably just die of boredom, not knowing what to do next and how to live. Even the greatest people have not fully realized themselves. Maybe the difference between them and ordinary people is that they realize it and others do not. When Leonardo da Vinci was asked why he was not satisfied with his painting “Mona Lisa,” he replied that he was not dissatisfied with the painting, but with himself.

However, even in spite of these limitations, man strives with all his might to realize himself or to self-actualize. It is true that man can never be completely sure that he has realized himself. By and large, man is never fulfilled.

Nietzsche taught that man is a creature and a creator, in which the two beginnings have an irreconcilable struggle. But we are very rarely the creators of our own lives. Life is something that does not really belong to man. Life is like an expensive toy that is given to a person on his birthday to hold for a few minutes and then taken away forever. The person says, “This is my life!” But it is only a small piece of it that lasts for a very short time, maybe just a few seconds. After all, it is important to live life, not to pass it by. That is why a person lives only in brief moments of his life, maybe he lives only a few hours during his whole life, and the rest of the time he lives not his own but someone else’s life, daily reproducing, copying and repeating other people, or himself. But if a man repeats himself, he is dead. However, the main task for man is to strive to realize himself as a Man. However, it remains unclear why man has to make efforts to be a man: the natural, the essential, the necessary are given to us with the greatest difficulty! Man is one who is infinitely removed from himself. Man is only the possibility of becoming Man, but nothing more.

We are all human beings, but that does not mean that we are always human beings, being human beings by definition — homo sapiens. Moreover, our essence does not depend on us, but in most cases depends on a multitude of random factors — economic, psychological, social, political, cultural and God knows what else — which determine (or, in this case, which is the same thing, limit) the essence of man, giving him — in each historical epoch and in each segment of human life — a certain form or essence, filling his life with content and meaning.

But it should be said that man’s essence is that which, in fact, never belonged to man as his essence, which constantly slipped out of his hands, was lost by him in the course of history (the famous problem of alienation is man’s loss of his own essence or identity) in the process of self-realization. That is, the more man strives to realize himself, his essence, the more likely it is that he will lose or forfeit it in the course of its realization. A person is something that is almost never a person. Man is homo machines.

On the contrary, we observe that this essence, at every stage of man’s development, has been alienated from man, separated and isolated from him, causing him endless agony, suffering and anxiety over its loss or temporary oblivion, and making him desperately search for it. Man must always be reminded that he is a human being, that he is a rational, moral and spiritual being and that “nothing human is alien to him.” Man is someone who always forgets his own essence, who he is. We only remember it when we lose it. Therefore, we can say that man is an essence-less (we do not deny essence, but we do not believe that it belongs entirely to man, that is, that it is entirely in his power) or accidental being.

However, some philosophers believe that a person has an essence, the latter is seen either in society, social relations, as in Marxism, or in freedom, as in existentialism. However, in what (or whom) would philosophers specifically not see the essence of man — in an individual who is free by nature (is he free by nature?) or a society in which restrictions are everywhere — we can’t help but see that these concepts contradict, if not exclude each other. After all, in order to be free, a person must live in society (there is no problem of freedom outside of society!), and on the other hand, society is forced to impose restrictions on a person everywhere, depriving him of the very freedom that he has been granted since his birth. Therefore, a person is forced to rush between the two extremes of human existence — between individuality (freedom) and sociality (necessity) — trying to determine the essence of a person, to find the desired core. But human is the

third thing that happens to him. A person is everything that has happened to him in life, contrary to his will, desire or aspiration. The human is rare, unique, and exclusive.

The German-American philosopher E. Fromm, realizing the complexity and contradiction of the philosophical problem posed above (can a person be free in society, being fully or partially dependent on it?), tried to combine the two extreme points, showing that the essence of man, being inherent in him from nature, manifests itself only under certain social conditions that favour his development or, on the contrary, hinder it [10]. However, it remains unclear how these conditions are formed, if a human being participates in them, and how these conditions in turn influence a human being, shaping his essence.

Therefore, we are forced to come to the conclusion that the human essence is an ephemeral, ghostly and metaphysical concept, which, if a person possesses, it is only occasionally, accidentally and sporadically — in extremely rare moments of his life — when he can be selflessly and hopelessly in love with someone, or when he does good for someone else, who, maybe even for the first time in his life, sees or creates, creates something beautiful and unique, without understanding how it happens. Hence, in contrast to existentialism, which asserts human freedom at every step (either-or) and Marxism, which makes a person dependent on society, social relations, and society as a whole, we assert that the human essence is not given to him from birth (like a bird's ability to fly) and is not directly dependent on public. Rather, it arises in spite of them or against them, that is, sporadically, randomly and spontaneously.

Therefore, we can say that a person is not an individual and not a social being, as is commonly believed, but a random being. We do not choose our life in this world, we come to this world and leave it also not of our own free will, that is, by accident. A person is a flash, a spark and lightning.

After all, if a person owned his own essence, or to use M. Stirner's terminology, if it were "his property", then all human problems existing in the world today would be solved once and for all, and a person would achieve complete harmony with himself, other people and the world. However, the historical and individual experience of a person proves the opposite: the essence of a person is something that does not depend on a person, that does not fully belong to him and is not in his absolute power, but depends on many random factors (subjective and objective), manifests itself contrary to his will, desire or even aspiration, that is, occasionally, by accident and without reason. A person is everything that happens or happens to him in his life.

But in this case, if a person is not responsible for himself, and all manifestations of his human essence (humanity) do not depend on him, then a person bears no responsibility for the evil, misfortunes, sufferings, wars and catastrophes that occur in the world? We are not thereby depriving a person of the very responsibility that the existentialists wrote about, when a person is responsible for everyone and the fate of the whole world. By choosing ourselves, we choose the whole world.

But even if we accept this point of view, we will have to admit that a person does not always assume this responsibility, but only at certain moments in his life, and no one can really explain why and wherefore he does this, that is, again accidentally, spontaneously and casually. A person is something that will happen, slip, flash and slip (excuse the expression) between a person and a person. We've all fallen in love and we know what it's like, but we also know that you can't fall in love on your own. Love is that we are not envious, but rather we depend on it. Man, the human, is a mystery, a riddle, and a miracle.

Conclusion

From childhood we instill in children's minds the general rules of moral behaviour, teach them that they should love and respect each other, not to do evil and to help their neighbours in a difficult moment, but only a few of them are capable of this, and they cannot explain why and why they do it. Why did you help this man? — they ask him. I don't know, he answers. Of course, all this can be explained by peculiarities of upbringing, character traits or objective conditions. But all this hardly explains why a person sometimes acts in a human way. All of us are sometimes human, doing things that others do not expect from us.

Even people who are considered highly moral, morally and psychologically stable are not immune to bad deeds and immoral actions, proving once again that man is a being defined not from himself, but from outside, random conditions, which hitched together — in a certain way and in a certain place — gave rise to the actions that man commits, not quite understanding, clearly realizing their meaning and significance.

Man is not the subject of his own life, but he is subjective in certain moments of his life. We are subjective not because we are subjects, but we are subjects because we act subjectively. One student in my lecture on a question cautiously remarked that it was only his own, subjective opinion. Be glad you have a subjective opinion, "I told him," but many people don't even have one.

The human is the tension, the string and even the gulf between human and man. The human is something that sometimes slips or flashes between people, or happens like a spark, a comet or a star. The human is a blink, a moment, a lightning bolt, a flash. That's why I say: man, what is human, is an accident.

Thus, we can say that the human is that which comes true, happens between people when people do not expect it of themselves; it is that which flashes, slips between human and man when they are not even aware of it themselves. Every human being, at least once in his or her life, must become a Man, so that his or her life — even if only for a brief moment — may be illuminated with meaning.

Jaspers, in considering the spiritual state of his time, noted that situations can either be unconscious — then they have an effect in such a way that the one affected is unaware of how it happens. Or they are seen as available to the self-conscious will, which can accept, utilize and change them. A situation that has become conscious will, in one way or another, push a person towards a certain behaviour. It does not automatically make the inevitable happen; it indicates possibilities and limits of possibilities: what happens in it also depends on the person who is in it and how he or she recognizes it. Although the apprehension of the situation itself already changes the situation, because it appeals to possible action and behaviour. To see a situation means to begin to dominate it, and to look at it closely means the struggle of the will for being [1; 332]. Man fulfils his purpose and mission if he is not satisfied with the existing reality, but lives with the desire to solve the problems he sees in himself and in his society, because man exists only to the extent that he realizes himself. Hence the whole life of man should be subordinated to the supreme idea of creation of the surrounding reality. Our reality is in our activity. Philosophy today should not silence the problems of our time just because it does not feel the strength to solve them. Of course, he who does not play does not lose, but he does not succeed either. Pride is the scourge and engine of the philosopher — the fear of the shame of failure and the feeling of superiority over circumstances. And when inner freedom takes over, the development of philosophy goes on, the development of mankind goes on. Even if we do not propose the necessary way, we at least say that it is necessary. To make enquiries is already a beginning — there will be solutions, and there will be a way out, even if not suggested by us.

Список использованной литературы.

- 1 Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории / К. Ясперс. — М.: Политиздат, 1991. — 528 с.
- 2 Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Восстание масс / Х. Ортега-и-Гассет. — М.: АСТ: Ермак, 2005. — 70 с.
- 3 Сартр Ж.-П. Экзистенциализм — это гуманизм / Ж.-П. Сартр // Сумерки богов. — М.: Политиздат, 1989. — 398 с.
- 4 Рябикина З.И. Субъектно-бытийный подход в исследовании личности: методология и перспективы развития / З.И. Рябикина, Л.Н. Ожигова, А.Ш. Гусейнов, В.В. Шиповская // Южно-Российский журнал социальных наук. — 2024. — Т. 25. — № 2. — С. 6–27.
- 5 Шелер М. Положение человека в Космосе / М. Шелер // Проблема человека в западной философии. — М.: Прогресс, 1988. — 547 с.
- 6 Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Р. Барт. — М.: Прогресс-Универс, 1994. — 615 с.
- 7 Мамардашвили М. Мой опыт нетипичен / М. Мамардашвили. — СПб.: Азбука, 2000. — 400 с.
- 8 Гиренок Ф. Аутография языка и сознания / Ф. Гиренок. — М.: Проспект, 2017. — 256 с.
- 9 Губин Б.Д. Человек как косвенное существо / Б.Д. Губин // Журнал современной зарубежной философии и философской компаративистики. — 2009. — № 3-4. — С. 77–86.
- 10 Фромм Э. Человек для себя / Э. Фромм. — М.: Neoclassic, 2018. — 320 с.

Н. Меджидова

Адамның өзін-өзі тануын философиялық тұрғыдан түсіну контексіндегі дүниетаным және тұлға

Мақалада қазіргі шындық жағдайында адамның өзгеруін философиялық тұрғыдан түсінуге қатысты мәселелер қарастырылған. Адамзаттың рухани дамуындағы дағдарыстың болуын айта отырып, автор оны жеңуге не ықпал етуі мүмкін екендігі туралы өз көзқарасын ұсынады. Философиялық антропология тәжірибесіне сілтеме жасай отырып, автор даралықтың, тұлғаның және дүниетанымның арақатынасын талдайды. Бұл ұғымдар субъектінің әлеуметтік белсенділігімен байланысты және субъективті және объективті диалектикаға негізделгені анық. Тұлға жеке тұлғамен салыстырғанда үлкен белсенділікпен, өзін-өзі тануға деген ұмтылыспен, оның қызметінің салдары үшін жауапкершілікпен ерекшеленеді. Осы жағдайда жеке тұлғаның белсенділігі қажеттілікпен

шығармашылық сипатта болуы керек. Адам болмысының көптеген шындықтарын біріктірген осы философиялық тәсіл аясында адам онтологиялық шындық, жеке тұлға, әлеуметтік практика мен тарихтың шығармашылық бастамасы ретінде көрінеді. Тұлғаның күнделікті кеңістігі субъективті-объективті шындық немесе адамның ішкі әлемінің өзара байланысты құбылыстарының, оның дүниетанымдық ізденістері мен үміттерінің қайталанбас тұтастығы ретінде түсіндіріледі.

Кілт сөздер: дүниетаным, адам, субъект, тұлға, өзін-өзі тану, өмірдің мәні.

Н. Меджидова

Мировоззрение и личность в контексте философского осмысления самоактуализации человека

В статье рассматриваются вопросы имеющие отношение к философскому осмыслению трансформации человека в условиях современной действительности. Констатируя наличие кризиса в духовном развитии человечества, автор предлагает свое видение того, что может способствовать его преодолению. Обращаясь к опыту философской антропологии, автор анализирует соотношение индивидуальности, личности и мировоззрения. Очевидно, что эти понятия связаны с социальной активностью субъекта и основаны на диалектике субъективного и объективного. Личность по сравнению с индивидуальностью отличается большей активностью, стремлением к самоактуализации, ответственностью за последствия своей активности. При этом активность личности должна с необходимостью иметь творческий характер. В контексте этого философского подхода, интегрировавшего множество реальностей человеческого бытия, человек предстает как онтологическая реальность, как личность, творческое начало социальной практики и истории. Бытийное пространство личности трактуется как субъективно-объективная реальность или неповторимая целостность взаимообусловленных феноменов внутреннего мира человека, его мировоззренческих поисков и ожиданий.

Ключевые слова: мировоззрение, человек, субъект, личность, самоактуализация, смысл жизни.

References

- 1 Jaspers, K. (1991). *Smysl i naznachenie istorii [The Meaning and Purpose of History]*. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].
- 2 Ortega y Gasset, J. (2005). *Vosstanie mass [The Revolt of the Masses]*. Moscow: AST: Ermak [in Russian].
- 3 Sartre, J.-P. (1989). Ekzistentsializm — eto gumanizm [Existentialism is a Humanism]. *Sumerki bogov — Twilight of the Gods*. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].
- 4 Riabikina, Z.I., Ozhigova, L.N., Guseinov, A.Sh., & Shipovskaia, V.V. (2024). Subektno-byitiinyi podkhod v issledovanii lichnosti: metodologiya i perspektiv razvitiia [Subject-existential approach in the study of personality: methodology and development prospects]. *Yuzhno-Rossiiskii zhurnal sotsialnykh nauk — South-Russian Journal of Social Sciences*, 25, 2, 6–27 [in Russian].
- 5 Scheler, M. (1988). Polozhenie cheloveka v Kosmose [The Position of Man in the Cosmos]. *Problema cheloveka v zapadnoi filosofii — The Problem of Man in Western Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- 6 Barth, R. (1994). *Semiotika. Poetika [Semiotics. Poetics]*. Moscow: Progress-Univers [in Russian].
- 7 Mamardashvili, M. (2000). *Moi opyt netipichen [My Experience is Atypical]*. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka [in Russian].
- 8 Girenok, F. (2017). *Autografiia yazyka i soznaniia [Autography of Language and Consciousness]*. Moscow: Prospekt [in Russian].
- 9 Gubin, B.D. (2009). Chelovek kak kosvennoe sushchestvo [Man as an Indirect Being]. *Zhurnal sovremennoi zarubezhnoi filosofii i filosofskoi komparativistiki — Journal of Contemporary Foreign Philosophy and Comparative Philosophy*, 3-4, 77–86.
- 10 Fromm, E. (2018). *Chelovek dlia sebia [Man for himself]*. Moscow: Neoclassic [in Russian].

Information about the author

Medzhidova Nargiz — PhD, Lecturer of Department of Philosophy, Baku State University, Baku, Azerbaijan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3404-3493>