

KHAMITOV Nazip,
doctor of science in philosophy, professor
Leading Researcher of Institute of philosophy,
National Academy of Science of Ukraine,
President of the Association of the Philosophical Art

SELF-REALIZATION OF PERSONALITY AS A GOAL OF A CIVILIZATIONAL PROJECT OF UKRAINE

Each country that is not an object but a subject of history and geopolitics, has its civilizational project. It seems self-evident to assume that a deep purpose of this project under the condition of a democratic open society is man and his development – worthy self-realization of personality.

Before we determine essential features of dignified man self-realization and obstacles on her way it is necessary to put the question: what is a civilizational project?

The working definition might be: a **civilizational project – is an image of the future of a country, that generates strategy for its free, dignified and effective implementation of the world through dignified self-realization of its citizens during the process of which cultural identity is combined with the progress of civilization.** In other words, a civilizational project – is the result of a productive civilization choice, which makes the country a subject of history, and its citizens – secure and free.

This definition leads to highlight two important and problematic sections.

First, it is namely worthy self-realization of personality in any era and in any peoples becomes *foundation* of civilization projects and the civilization development. However, only in the XXI century, it begins to be realized as a main *purpose* of civilizational projects, making these projects not only more human but also more *effective*. In other words a civilizational project, in which man, his development and self-realization is only a *means* today will not be successful under any circumstances. This should be considered when creating and implementing a civilizational project of Ukraine.

Secondly, putting the question of cultural identity and civilizational progress, we touch the question of interaction of civilization and culture. Leaving aside concepts that oppose civilization and culture as material-technical and spiritual – creative origins, let us address to the approach that unites them. This unity is due to the fact that in life of man cultural and civilizational origins are in constant interaction – culture is spiritual content of civilization, civilization – creating conditions for the development of culture. Civilization gets sense as a means of opening a socio-economic and cultural potential of the state, bringing it to the world level, while culture takes itself as a means of inspiration and humanization of civilization. Only the certain level of civilization development gives a person *the freedom* to implementation of life potential – dignified self-realization, including cultural-humanist development, but it is the freedom of self-realization does not destroy civilization itself.

The abovesaid raises new important issues. 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 recognize that culture and civilization are productively combined in a society only by persons of this society. This is possible only on condition of their *dignified self-realization*. Therefore, giving the answer to the second question, it is possible to affirm that a deep purpose of a civilization project will still be human as personality of his development and self-realization, not a balance of culture and civilization created by man as the end, the balance between them.

Understanding this goal of civilizational project needs to delve into the concept of civilization.

In the 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 to humanization, to ensurance of human dignity and self-realization 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 own civilization time measurements.

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

It is important to realize that modern civilization is global one, that integrates different peoples and countries on the basis of certain universal values. Does this mean that in the world one single civilisation 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 a superpower) in one form or another represent a civilizational project as «exemplary», building on this ideology, internal and external policies. As a result, a modern world is a world of the struggle of 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 which are used to influence on 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 and political, and economic realities show that the tendency of global *consensus*

pluralism is more productive and just on this basis it is necessary to build a civilization project of Ukraine, which with necessity requires consensus pluralism within the country – that is, plurality of projects of dignified self-realization of its citizens.

What would be a methodology «to embed» dignified self-realization into a civilizational project of Ukraine? The scientists of 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 self-realization.

* * *

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

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

We should understand one very important fact here. An important component of dignified man realization of Ukraine is gender equality and gender partnership that can overcome authoritarian tendencies in a family and a society. In Ukraine a woman has always played an extremely vital social role and strengthening of her

participation in a new civilizational project is required not only to report to the international partners of Ukraine.

The will to dignified man realization means that an individual and a society as a whole must make a Choice – a choice of civilization way that will make this self-realization 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 choice is associated with the election of a geopolitical region, bloc or alliance of countries, which Ukraine should enter. But a country civilization choice as a subject of world history is first of all the is 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 *paradigm and strategies to realize own progress* in the world that can be interpreted as a real national idea.

A civilizational country choice can not be done once and for ever, it must *be* constantly *confirmed* by pragmatic action programs and actions. A productive civilization choice of the country – is a civilizational project and the civilizational development, requiring a series of *elections* – both in terms of periodic authority election 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-realization of every conscious citizen.

One can not deny that a civilizational choice at certain stages of 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 from responsibility, having given "powers of this world " – or superpowers or geopolitical alliances the implement of realization of 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 implementation of a civilization project.

However, we must realize 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 of 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 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 of political elites and people.

What is the significance and actuality of the concept of «civilizational choice» at this stage of 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 realize that a country civilizational choice combines in itself a civilization *project*, as well as the civilization development – and the future state, and movement towards it.

How is this process combined with separate personality 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-realization. After all, personal realization as a goal of a civilization project of a society does not mean that this self-realization 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-realization not only in the *result* but in a civilizational project implementation *process***. In other words, dignified man self-realization is not just an aim of a civilization project, its an ideological slogan or even methodological vector, it should be 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-realization. Sincerity, efficiency, and simultaneously, creative dynamism and openness of self-realization to Another person will determine its *dignity*.

Dignified self-realization means that a person having listened to himself, chooses a profession and close, loved man creates with her a life project and further *responsibly* realizes it with partners and co-thinkers – goes out from existing into over extreme limit, from potential – into currently central. Indignity of self-realization – is focusing illusion on permanence of a life choice, such «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-realization, 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-realization are actualized. The creative and cooperative atmosphere exists that makes the reality, not illusion of the civilizational development.

In this plan it is very important to show our fellow citizens that a project of happiness, which is self-centered family consumption and the accumulation of resources taken out on the "bread place" from a state budget is deeply indignant self-realization – as it crosses country civilizational future. Such project of happiness and self-realization, 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-realization, 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 dignity of self-realization is not conditioned by consumption but by creativity, as self-realization does not become a means to own something but it becomes value itself. It is impossible to enter this project of happiness and self-realization because of control and repressiveness, even 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.

It seems heuristically productive to use such methodologies of socio-humanitarian knowledge as *potentializm* 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 nature and methodological possibilities each of them.

Potentialism in this context is understood as a direction of the modern science development, the main principle of which is, by Academician SI PyrozHKov definition «assessment of diverse opportunities which are inherent in this or that system, and those under appropriate conditions can be realized» [4, 9]. Potentialism «Unlike *kaleydoskopism*, which based on analysis of opportunities that have occurred... involves the study of wider range of preconditions that determine the development of a concrete process or a system» [4, 9].

Potentialism means the need for analysis of a social phenomenon in categories of *possibility* and *reality*. From here legality of the use of the term «potential which reflects different aspects of self-motion of inside elements of a particular system from possibility to reality» [4, 9].

So, potentialism allows us to understand the development of a country in dynamics and above all is 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 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 metaanthropology can be understood in a broad and strict sense, expressing her specific duplicity of its tasks» [9, 6].

Meta-anthropology in a strict sense as a direction of Ukrainian philosophy has integral and methodological significance for the 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 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» [8, 125-271; 10, 207-212].

This approach continues a philosophical search of classic of philosophical anthropology M. Scheler [11] and the classic of philosophy of personalism Berdyaev [2]. In modern Ukrainian philosophy meta-anthropology is one of tendencies of the development of Kyiv worldview-anthropological school, founded by academician V. Shynkaruk.

It is important to realize that meta-anthropology in a strict and broad senses can not be rigidly divided into two opposite realms – they determine each other. Only as a metatheory of socio-humanitarian knowledge meta-anthropology can be philosophy of the human development; only as philosophy of the human development meta-anthropology is able to an integrating function in 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 inherent processes of man and society.

So we have *metaanthropological potentializm* – as a methodology of 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 *development of potential of human life*, its self-realization as a condition of a society formation. Realization 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 productively to use first of all such a direction as *social meta-anthropology* in a methodology of metaanthropological potentialism. Within this direction a triadic methodology 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» [3, 81].

When we speak about the independent and deliberate choice of the way of development in coordinates of metaanthropological potentialism of the triad "ordinary, frontier, metafrontier" it is productively to replace the category "ordinary" into "existing (real)". On this basis, we have the following principles (stages of realization) 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-realization is the goal of this project, not 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 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-realization*. Hence – actuality of a methodology of metaanthropological potentialism for understanding and a civilizational choice of the country and its a 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. However, using this methodology makes it possible to realize 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» [5, 67].

Man is not a toy in the hands of politicians, political technologists and "social engineers", any productive civilizational changes in social dimension are possible now only under conditions of free and creative person self-realization. It is quite clear that the «new horizons are opened before those countries whose social system are able to provide to the maximum degree, on the one hand, realization of creative potential of its citizens, on the other – to meet their needs» [5, 67].

* * *

It is important to realize that without implementation of a civilizational choice as to choose a civilizational project that favours dignified human self-realization, there is a loss of *country subjectivity*; it encloses it in the past and cancels from the potential leaders of the civilizational progress. Another thing is that a choice of a country may be under pressure of external geopolitical subjects; it also means the loss of the country subjectivity, and hence opportunities to realize 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 only geopolitical place in the world, with the necessity turns a country into an object of geopolitics, resulting in the loss of the real independence and sovereignty, and its civilization project turns into a project of eternal provincialism.

It is also necessary to realize that a civilizational choice, a civilizational project and civilizational development in its productive forms are possible only if there is real consolidation of people in the country. One can understand real consolidation only as consolidation of *self-realized citizens*. And then not only the government, politicians, state and public figures but most citizens are responsible for a civilizational choice, creation and implementation of a civilizational project. It is then the civilizational development will be not only a number of slogans and imitation 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*.

The 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-realization and the general life of citizens only if *there is interaction between the political elite and the elite intellectual* – especially with the expert community morally and professionally reputable scientists, who are able to create and responsibly and critically analyze different mode – projects of a civilizational choice of the country, and outline strategies to achieve them.

We can not 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 peculiarities of its mentality*. Every culture in creature of its members must make their own, inherent in its underlying fundamentals mission of enriching human culture.

To become full subjectivity Ukraine which generates dignified self-realization 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 realize that this opposition for Russia is largely civilizational confrontation with the West.

Russian politicians and many of its electorate perceives 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 the Western.

That is why such opposition is perceived in Russia as not a conflict of interests but a confrontation of values. In modern Russia believe 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 question».

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 understanding of the uniqueness of the Ukrainian civilization project and the need for its implementation on the basis of real opportunities [7] 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 new *global challenges* facing as the challenges to human nature and generate in principle innovative strategies of personal self-realization. Only then this civilizational project will 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 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 XXI century we have a strong problem of restoring totalitarian tendencies in public life, which are hidden by their appearance

democracy. This is due to both environmental hazards and 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 competition of different globalization projects presented, for example, by the USA, Russia, China and others.

Neototalitarianism – is 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 resources of information network society, especially screen culture – television and the Internet, where the various discussions are held and which are properly moderated. Neototalitarianism – this totalitarianism, in which the 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 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 for centuries considered immoral, begin to be perceived only as deviations that is the result of *a personal choice* and they 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 personalized processes through information technologies and also to transform her physicality by bio- and nano-technologies – up to overcome the limits of lifespan. The challenge to transhumanism is the least appreciable in today's Ukraine, but it in its worldview and ideological forms signals the important issue – the desire to evolve not in a

moral and spiritual but in physical and corporal plane, endlessly continuing and increasing 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 implementation of a civilizational project in Ukraine it is necessary not intimidate or induce but *motivate* people – in economic, and in political, and in spiritual and cultural spheres.

After all, the main subject of realization of a civilizational project Ukraine in a democratic society is not an abstract state, culture or a civil society but a free self-realized citizen that creates a new state, new culture and a new civil society, making his country subject of world history.

Taking into consideration 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, efficient businessman – that's vector of dignified man self-realization in today's and future Ukraine.**

Thus, only dignified self-realization is the goal of a civilizational project in Ukraine. However, dignified self-realization «is at the same time its precondition and a way of implementation – without self-realized and self-sufficient people who are typically the middle class and fundamentally integrate into economic, political, spiritual communities, this project becomes utopian» [7].

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.

* * *

The possibility of man 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 abovesaid, it can be quite called neototalitarianism. This is a scenario of relations between countries and relations inside a country where interests dominate moral principles, the tactics becomes 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, 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 potentialsism 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 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 of the 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 the mankind, that it means its new stage, whether is it – *a disease of human history*, is its the curvature, which has not been before? I would suggest the following metaphor: *oncology of the mankind*, or more accurately, *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 a complex evolution recently, demonstrating its vitality, logical and natural manifestations of this hybrid world order, manifestations which have not only internal reasons, but also those which were stage-managed from the outside? Are they those manifestations that provoke a very dangerous political elite alienation and distrust to citizens, destroying the possibility of dignified self-realization?

If the state of hybrid wars and hybrid relations in the world is not spontaneous, can even talk about *philosophy of the hybrid world order*? If it is so, it should be 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 worldview vector of dignified self-realization of our contemporary Ukraine.

Humanitarian technology, political and diplomatic ways to overcome the hybrid world order which 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-realization of its citizens.

* * *

The task of creating of a civilization project in Ukraine at the present stage newly actualizes the value of the National Academy of Sciences, including the Sections of Social Sciences and Humanities, basing on a systematic analysis of modern global threats and challenges to our country is able to create paradigms of civilizational reforms and to assess the humanitarian hazards and risks along the way, making creative synthesis of strategies and futures scenarios of the future development of Ukraine.

Only thanks to such a role of the National Academy of Sciences the civilizational project in Ukraine will be not the project of *a civilization buffer* between West and East and it will be a project of civilization of *humanistic innovations* – **a project of civilization of dignified man self-realization**. His motto should be «dignified man self-realization – is a strong country». The implementation of this project into life in a scientifically based form – is a fundamental condition of national security and the very existence of Ukraine as an independent state.

His implies the need to reform organizations of scientific and scientific and educational activity that involves four important principles:

Principle 1. The balanced development and creative interaction of natural and technical and socio-humanitarian knowledge – in order to prevent the development of technocracism in which man is only a means to achieve a variety of indicators and turning humanitaristics into a tool of ideological manipulations and confrontation. The latter is extremely important, because it is known that the higher the level of conflicts in the country it is more likely to use a hybrid war against it.

Principle 2. Flexible awarding of creative scientists irrespective of ages and religion, carried on according clear and transparent criteria – both for the originality of ideas and approaches, and on their conformity with resonant problems and human society. This means the actual combination of theory with practice.

Principle 3. New connection science and education with a focus not on memorization of existing theories and approaches but on the ability to use them, create new ones, think critically and creatively and solve problems in a dialogue, that will promote dignified man self-realization in all dimensions of personal and social life.

Principle 4. Productive interaction of academic and civic (volunteer) science, which allows to provide flexibility of self-realization of a scientist and response efficiency to the challenges of the world of hybrid aggressions.

List of sources used:

1. Горбулін В. Хитромудра невизначеність нового світопорядку // Дзеркало тижня. № 30, 27 серпня 2016.
2. Бердяев Н.А. О назначении человека. – М.: Республика, 1993. – 383 с.
3. Крилова С. Краса людини: особистість, сім'я, суспільство (соціально-філософський аналіз). – Ніжин: Аспект-Поліграф, 2011. – 344 с.
4. Пирожков С.И. Трудовой потенциал в демографическом измерении. – К.: Наукова думка, 1992. – 180 с.
5. Пирожков С.И. Образ людини і трудовий потенціал населення // Філософська і соціологічна думка, 1991, № 7. – С. 66 – 81.
6. Пирожков С.І., Хамітов Н.В. Цивілізаційний проект України: від амбіцій до реальних можливостей // Вісник НАН України, 2016, № 6. – С. 45 – 52.
7. Пирожков С.І., Хамітов Н.В. Цивілізаційний вибір України в глобалізованому світі // Дзеркало тижня, № 28, 13 серпня 2016.– С. 4.
8. Хамитов Н. Философия: бытие, человек, мир. От метафизики к метаантропологии. – 3-е издание, исправленное и дополненное. – К.: КНТ, 2016. – 268 с.
9. Хамітов Н. Філософська антропологія як метаантропологія: метатеорія гуманітарних наук і філософія антропо-трансценденції // Збірник наукових праць. Філософія людини як шлях гуманізму та гідності у граничному бутті

суспільства: підхід філософської антропології як метаантропології.
– К.: НПУ імені М.П. Драгоманова, 2016. – С. 6 – 30.

10. Хамитов Н. Метаантропология // Хамитов Н., Крылова С., Розова Т. и др. Философская антропология: словарь. 3-е издание, исправленное и дополненное. – К.: КНТ, 2016. – С. 207 – 212.

11. Шелер М. Философское мировоззрение // Избранные произведения. – М.: Гнозис, 1994. – 480 с.