

2. Burovskij A. M. Posle cheloveka / T. Ju. Chesnokova // Post-chelovek. Ot neandertal'ca do kiborga: sb. st. – M.: Algoritm, 2008. – S.175–224.

3. Gorohov V. G. Ponjatie «tehnologija» v filosofii tehniki i osobennost' social'no-gumanitarnyh tehnologij / V. G. Gorohov // Jepistemologija & Filosofija nauki. – 2011. – T. XXVIII. – №2. – S.110–123.

4. Kass L. R. Nestarejushhie tela, schastlivye dushi: biotehnologii v pogone za sovershenstvom [Elektron. resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: <http://ecdejavu.ru/b-2/Biotechnologies-2.html>

5. Paris K. Tehnika i filosofija [Elektron. resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: <http://philosophy.mitth.ru/paris.htm>

6. Jaspers K. Smysl i naznachenie istorii / K. Jaspers; Per. s nem. – M.: Politizdat, 1991. – 527 s.

Kultenko V. P., candidate of philosophical sciences, Associate Professor of Philosophy, NUBiPUkraine (Ukraine, Kyiv), kultenko@ukr.net

Medved U., Master Faculty of Plant Protection, Ecology and Biotechnology, NUBiP Ukraine (Ukraine, Kyiv)

Kharuk V., Master Faculty of Plant Protection, Ecology and Biotechnology, NUBiP Ukraine (Ukraine, Kyiv)

Problems of biotechnology in the structure and philosophy of science

The article investigates the opportunities and potential risks of biotechnology in terms of issues of bioethics, biodiversity, scientist's moral responsibility for the consequences of their actions on security biotechnological progress. Modern human, mastering biotechnology offers potential to free themselves from the dictates of nature, but at the same time is in danger to bring itself to the role of God, realizing all the potential dangers associated with the use of biotechnology to interference in the human genome and so on. While even a superficial analysis reveals the dangers of such threats to human restriction on his freedom, change its nature, to create a biological weapon, removing people «of different varieties» and so on. Interference with the natural process of life can lead to overpopulation of the Earth, and therefore to commercialization rights to life, the birth of offspring and others. Genetic engineering irrevocably blurs the boundaries between the artificial and the natural world and this requires the formation of human conscious and responsible attitude to it initiated experiments on themselves and the world.

Keywords: biotechnology, bioethics, bio security, biotechnology advances, the responsibility of the scientist.

* * *

УДК 316.422:124.5

Meteleva T. O.,
Philosophy doctor, associate professor.
Deputy Director for Science, Leading researcher.
State institution "Institute of the World History
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine"
(Kyiv, Ukraine), TyapaLyuka@yandex.ua

SYSTEM OF VALUES AS A FACTOR OF SOCIETY TRANSFORMATION: FUNDAMENTAL VALUES AND EXISTENTIAL VALUES

The article considers a link between the dominating system of values and the transformational capacities of communities. An overview of the evolution of teachings about the fundamental values and a comparison of the basic provisions of concepts by V. Lefebvre and F. A. von Hayek have allowed to give a definition and to theoretically substantiate the notion of the «fundamental values» underlying the adversarial types of moral and ethical systems. A review of the methodologies of research of the systems of values by G. Hofstede, H. Triandis, F. Trompenaars and S. Schwarz has enabled to reveal the differences of the fundamental values from other types (existential, political etc.) and the methodological incorrectness of equalling them. An analysis of materials of the European sociological research of values has revealed the fundamental systems of values appropriate to established democracies, post-socialist and post-Soviet countries. It is shown that with all their variability, in all European countries there is a common core of the fundamental values inherent in the First System dominating for open societies, which gives rise to a significant transformational potential of these countries.

Keywords: fundamental and existential values, moral and ethical system, sociological studies of values, society open and closed, transformational potential.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

The fact that human communities – ethnic groups, nations or countries can differ and really differ from each other by their cultural characteristics is evident. The fact

that they differ in the systems of values prevailing at certain cultural and historical periods is less evident because such distinctions are inherent rather to larger formations, such as geo-cultural regions, than to separate groups or countries. Examples can include such a well-established term as «European values» which is applied to the core values common to European countries and different from the systems of values of non-European countries. Though, whichever the list of characteristic features included into this term may be, all the researchers agree that a certain set of values common to Europe exists and influences the development of European countries and peoples. But such influence or such a connection of the current for the community system of values with transformational possibilities of separate countries or regions has scarcely been investigated, and is mainly postulated, i.e. being a priori the foundation for many researches it has not been supported by substantial analysis of explicit factual data.

At the same time, the prognostic potential for uncovering such a connection, in case its determining features are investigated, can be groundbreaking.

So, the aim of this paper is to exposure and ground theoretically the connection between the dominating system of values and transformational possibilities of communities. Such an aim requires determining and theoretical grounding for the notion «basic values», identifying their difference from other types of values; reviewing factual data bases of sociological surveys of values to determine their capability in discovering the prevailing basic values for a certain community; researching the connection between basic systems of values and transformational possibilities of societies.

For the first time, the attention to existence of basic systems of values was attracted, though indirectly, by Vladimir Lefebvre when he was investigating psychological mechanisms of people's behavior, reconstructing and simulating their motivation constituents by mathematical methods [4]. He established, exclusively empirically, that in similar situations of choosing the form of conduct, the behavioral orientations of representatives of the so-called «western world» (countries of Western Europe and North America) and «eastern world» (countries of Asia, countries with totalitarian regimes) are entirely opposite. V. Lefebvre called the type of behavior inherent to the representatives of «western world» (or using the terms of K. Popper, open societies) «The First Moral and Ethical System»; and, correspondingly, the opposite type, inherent to the representatives of «eastern societies» (or closed societies) was named «The Second Moral and Ethical System».

The First System is characterized by the impossibility to unite good aim and bad means, and by behavioral orientation for search of compromise and understanding. The Second System is characterized by the predominance of the principle «the aim justifies the means» and by confrontational behavior. The action, aimed at support and establishment of hierarchy of values, which the individual has, is experienced by this individual as a proper and positive one, and entails the increase of ego boost. The action, though aimed at obtaining of desideratum but not proper from the point of view of values, leads to decrease of self-estimation and psychological discomfort. So, the structure of experiencing certain facts, phenomena, actions, proper or not, by the individual is the basis for the self-

establishment and self-reproduction of the system of values on the personal level. Experiencing the right and acting in rapport with it differs greatly from experiencing the desired which not always becomes the trail marker to the action but the right and the desired can be mutually exclusive which makes the moral choice difficult.

Deconstruction of the behavioral models given in the works of V. Lefebvre and their semantic analysis as well as of numerous examples of typical behavioral reactions of the representatives of the open and closed societies make it possible to educe a certain axiological basis for the two moral and ethical systems and their further reconstruction, for establishment of basic values directing the person to achieve what is right, what «it should be» and not what is desired personally. In accordance with V. Lefebvre's terminology the basic systems of values are proposed to be called the First System (the one inherent to the open societies) and the Second System (the one inherent to the closed societies).

As it was shown in our previous works [5], the original, constitutive value of the First System is a single (an individual) from whom his/her community (any, whether it is a state, a society, a nation or ethnos, or even any other formation based on any grounds) is a derivative. Consequently, the individual (the single) also has the highest level of legitimacy. Legitimacy of any single legitimates the otherness (diversity, distinctiveness) itself and the Otherness as ontological phenomenon. This basic principle, this experiencing of the single as a value, the experience that woke up as far as the times of antiquity (in Ancient oriental civilization the single is perceived as negative and inappropriate, as disvalue, and this idea left its imprint on cultural artifacts of the Ancient East and its religious and philosophical systems) was saved in the Christian world of the Middle Ages. The final legitimacy and validity was given to it in the times of Art Nouveau. It forms, so to say, the above outlined «applied» or behavioral manifestations of the First Moral and Ethical System; the founder of the German classical philosophy Immanuel Kant wrote in the 18th century: a person cannot be the means but only the aim; one cannot achieve the splendiferous ambition if it is required to sacrifice other values and people as values in order to achieve it.

At the beginning of the 20th century this respectful attitude to a person, to his/her inalienable rights was radically developed in Albert Schweitzer's concept: life is sacred, and «reverence for the infinity of life is the removal of the alienation, it is empathy and compassion» [2; 8]. The universe and one's own life can be built on moral basis only by acknowledging the fact that a single life is valuable. «We are ethical if we overcome selfishness and do not look at other living beings as something alien for us, if we empathize and sympathize to everyone surrounding us. Only then we transform into human beings in the true meaning of this word and possess ethics which will never lose its essence, which is constantly changing and independently determines the purpose of its development» is A. Schweitzer's conclusion [8].

Respectful attitude towards the Other, acceptance of the Other's right to be itself entails the necessity in practical display and fixation of this acceptance i.e. search of mutual understanding and compromise. If the other is a value, my personal position on any matter, even if it represents the

position of a certain group to which I belong and which is larger than me, is only one of many possible positions. That is why, another position (the other's position) also has the right to exist, not more but at the same time not less than mine or anybody other's. So, the principle of value of the single compels to search compromise and mutually beneficial, mutually satisfying and mutually responsible solutions of each particular issue. The First System of Values, cultivated in the European society, is incompatible with political and cultural messianism and correlates with the general adoption of the right (in which the single, particular and general are the equal parties) over the law (which puts the general over the singular and specific) and is embodied in the development of the law-bound state, political, religious, worldview pluralism, formation of the civil society and extension of humanistic principles to the larger set of the Others including the environment. At the same time, the openness to the Other translates into the openness to the exchange of information with it, to the acceptance of novelties (innovational orientation), and, as a result, intensive technical and technological development of the society in the whole, its increased transformational potential.

The societies of closed type inhering the Second System of Values include the already mentioned Ancient Oriental civilizations, in many aspects the medieval societies, even European, to a certain extent the modern Asian states and completely the totalitarian states. In this case the top of the hierarchy of values is occupied by a society, for which each its representative is derivative and secondary. Society is above all. It means that for the society's sake all the other and all the others can be and must be sacrificed. Sacrificing the single in order to save the society inviolable, including physical self-abnegation, and, which is much more frightening, sacrifice the other individuals, is the sacred duty of each of its representatives.

Totalitarian systems give spectacular examples of the effect of such a value orientation. This set includes not only GULAG and the all-out repressive system but also such every-day life facts from the life of the ordinary citizen as disrespect for him/her displayed in any sphere. We refer not even to the characteristics of his/her communication with the authorities of any level, but to a formal, caused by the everyday needs act of communication of two equal in their social standing employees of two different professions when one of them is at his/her workplace during this act of communication and the other is in the role of a private person. The very fact of one communicator being private and the other being «public» brings a «domineering constituent» into communication, disrupts the communicative balance in favor of the one representing the «state interests».

The Single when it claims for peculiarity, for peculiar needs and aspiration to something special, not completely dissolved in common existence, is perceived and experienced well in advance as something evil within the framework of the Second System of Values. Hence, any seedlings of singularity and peculiarity must be removed pitilessly as they contradict the principle that the society is above value and threaten it by the very fact of its existence. The consequence of this is the disposition of the bearer of such a system to confront the bearers of the other worldview, other values, and any otherness as such. From

the point of view of the one who is not self-constituted and not self-worth, any claim for lawlessness, even for private necessity, is subject to punishment which is carried out into effect by a society representative at his/her workplace towards another representative of the same society when the latter is in the status of a private person. In such a situation the highest value is the one that belongs to his/her community and whose bearer, advocate and implementer he/she is. There cannot be two verities and, consequently, the bearer of the other worldview, other thought, other features, even the bearer of the other – private – necessities, must be overcome, destroyed or incorporated into the society-value. Should there happen a dialogue between the representatives of the polar value systems a respectful attitude of the representative of the First System of values towards the interlocutor will be understood by the latter as cunning, and the arguments in favor of his/her essential position will be perceived as confrontation. In return, the representative of the First System of Values will be surprised and indignant by the fact that the opponents had agreed to the proposals and had been disposed affirmatively during the negotiations, but after the negotiations had been over, they neglected the agreement. This is because within the framework of the Second System of Values the achievement of the goal (the preservation of the over-value) requires application of any remedies («you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs»), which is inadmissible and condemned from the point of view of the First System of Values.

In the sense of transformational potential it is clear that illegitimacy of the Other is another side of the uniformity and invariability, hence, of the passivity and conservatism in the functioning of the society. So, the societies where the Second System of Values rules, where the values of the community dominate over the value of the individual, have low transformational potential.

The legitimacy of the other and of the diversity for the First System of Values and their illegitimacy with the over-value of the totality for the Second System of Values are the «axiological cores», invariants of the systems of values, the practical embodiment of which can be rather varied as it is connected with their transcribing through the cultural patterns typical for certain communities (nation, ethnos, local group, etc.). Variability of political practice of European countries, as well as the difference of their cultures, taking into consideration all the commonness of the value core, are determined by the vast field of variability and nonidentity of sign-symbolic rows with the help of which the common value core can be manifested and manifests itself.

These polar basic systems of values, on which the corresponding political and economic systems feed, appear under different names in different «systems of worldview coordinates» of different researchers: «individualism» and «socialism», «individualism» and «collectivism» (S. Bruner), «democracy» and «totalitarianism», values of the open or of the closed society (K. Popper), «mechanical or organic solidarity» (E. Durkheim), community (gemeinschaftliche) or public (gesellschaftliche) relations (F. Tönnies). The critical consideration of the transformation of notions which cover the polar systems of basic values was given by F. A. von Hayek as far back as in 1948 in his work «Individualism: True and False». The true individualism, based on European System of Values, as

F. A. von Hayek argues, is not limited by economic or political explications and represents a certain system of values according to which the individual opts for freedom, including the freedom of associations and the freedom to choose certain rules and observing them, or compulsory submission. The theoretical grounding of such an individualism dates back to J. Locke via B. Mandeville and D. Home, B. Tucker, A. Ferguson, A. Smith and E. Burke. Value individualism is based on a fundamental thesis: admission of the fact and at the same time of the inherence as well as legitimacy of «boundless variety of people's talents and skills». «This thesis, – points out F. A. Hayek, – does not presume that all people are equal in their inborn talents and aptitudes, it only means that nobody is authorized to provide a final judgment about aptitudes another person possesses, neither can he/she give a permission for these aptitudes application», and here is «all the difference between the equal attitude towards all the people and the attempts to make them equal». Whereas the first is the requirement of the free society, the second means, according to Tocqueville, «a new formula of slavery» [7, p. 4]. At the same time this individualism does not confront collectivism, but it accepts cooperation only as voluntary: «in any case unless it degenerates into violence against other people and leads to assumption of exclusive power» [7, p. 5].

Thus, the fundamental contrast between the value principles of what F. A. Hayek calls «true individualism» and the other system of values is in the fact that in the first case the original value is the Individual having the right to establish a community (Society) voluntarily, and the function of the State is to «inform the individual what his/her sphere of responsibility is» [7, p. 5], while the contrary system of values acknowledges boundless right of the whole (Community) to rule the single and make him/her act with the help of orders. The similarity of the value system of democratic societies described by F. A. Hayek to the First System of Values derived from V. Lefebvre's concept is obvious.

How well do the modern sociological surveys of values, which are systematically carried out within the territory of Europe and all over the world, allow eliciting the dominating basic system of values and its transformations? Let us make a short review of such surveys.

The first global and the best-known survey of transformation of the systems of values in the countries of the world was the World Values Survey (WVS) which was held systematically over three decades since 1970s. Their results were summarized in 1997 by R. Inglehart in his famous work: «Modernization and Post-modernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies» [10]. The scientist demonstrates the existence of relationship between the level of the welfare in the society and the life strategies of an individual in a well-argued manner. According to his conclusion, having achieved certain sustainable level of wellbeing, the society and the individual begin to function not in the survival mode with its values of material welfare but in the mode of self-actualization. «Dematerialization of values» takes place: values of spiritual and cultural kind substitute the «earthbound values of wellbeing» [10].

But R. Inglehart's research, as well as the empirical surveys themselves which he used as a basis, did not

mean to establish any connection and correlation between the values shared by the citizens of a certain country or interrelation between concrete sociopolitical models, the possibilities of their development and the ruling system of values. It was aimed at the revealing of the tendencies of changing of the values themselves in the modern world. So, it is not possible to use either the WVS surveys or R. Inglehart's conclusions for our purpose.

There are also several long-term European monitoring social surveys aimed at identifying the value orientation of the population and its change as well, namely, the project European Values Survey – EVS, Eurobarometer – EB, and its analogue in the former Soviet states named Eurasian Monitor (EM), the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), and, at last, the newest of the European projects European Social Survey (ESS). The results of all the waves of surveys carried out by EVS were summed up in a unique document – Atlas of European Values [12]. Even a quick overview of the Atlas gives us an opportunity to observe the existence of a certain value zoning, segregation of separate «value regions», the differences between which correlate with the extent of the democratic development in these countries. The data analysis proves that there exist certain value divergences between the countries with consolidated democracy, countries with socialist past and post-Soviet countries. At the same time the countries with consolidated democracy (West-European) have «internal» division which can be conventionally drawn along the line North-South.

We shall give only one example, and for this purpose we shall use the consolidated data about the public activeness and evaluation of democracy as political system. The idea of the level of social activeness is represented by the detected proportion of those who expressed readiness to participate in the allowed protests. According to this index the highest activeness (at the level of 60 per cent and higher) is traditionally displayed by the countries of Western Europe, among which the highest indices are shown in the North of Europe. During the first survey in 1991, the leader of social activeness was Iceland with its index of 78%. The next waves of surveying show the growth of social activeness in the European countries as a whole: the survey in 1999 showed much higher indices in the countries which were included into the first survey, the indices in the new countries, mainly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, are also rather high. At that, the countries which were the members of the socialist block, including the republics of the USSR, displayed the highest activeness (at the level of 75–85%, the first group) or close to it (64–74%, the second group) typical to the countries in the north of Western Europe. It should be mentioned that such a high activeness of post-socialist countries and of those which were the members of the USSR can be explained by the heady events of the 90s of the last century: breakup of the socialist system and the USSR, and by some kind of revolutionary inspiration and great expectations, belief in the possibility of the changes for the better shared by the peoples of those countries.

In 2008, the level of activeness began to decrease on the whole. For illustration purpose, let us arrange the differences between countries not into four (as it was done by the authors of the survey) but into three groups: the first one with the activeness from 80% and more, it included the countries of European North: Iceland, Sweden (84% each)

and Norway (80%). Let us place the countries with the level of activeness from 50% to 79% into the second group. Its leaders were France (78%) and Macedonia (76%). Poland and Austria (52% each) and Montenegro (51%) completed the list. The third group of the lowest activeness comprised post-socialist and post-Soviet countries: Moldova (47%), Ukraine and Estonia (43% each), Slovakia (37%), Bulgaria, Russia, Belarus, Azerbaijan (34% each), Romania (33%), Armenia (32%), Hungary (25%); they were joined by Great Britain (48%), Northern Ireland (46%) and Turkey (34%).

Such a division of the countries according to the index of their social activeness shows rather the dependence of the index itself upon the current social and political situation in these countries than the affinity of the value factors of these or those countries (though there exists such an issue to a certain extent). Similar dependence is illustrated by other data: for example, the results of estimating democracy as a good political system (having a democratic political system would be a very or fairly good idea). Let us arrange the countries into the above groups again. According to the results of the survey in 1998, the first group included all the countries of Western Europe and a significant part of post-socialist and even post-Soviet countries, basing upon this index. Its leaders were Iceland and Denmark (98% each), and it was closed by Ukraine and Armenia (85% each) and Poland and Slovakia (84% each). The second group consisted only of two countries: Moldova (75%) and Russia with the lowest level of democracy estimating – 63%.

The survey in 2008 illustrated some changes in the positions which can be explained on the basis of analysis of the current political situation in each separate country. The strongest support of democracy was inherent to Denmark (99%), Italy, Greece, Switzerland (97% each), Austria, Iceland, Norway, Spain and Georgia (96% each), Sweden (94%); Slovakia, Croatia, Albania, Montenegro and Belarus (88% each), Poland, Great Britain, Ireland (86% each), Estonia and Romania (84% each) closed the rear. Russia (78%), Latvia (77%), Ukraine (72%) and Azerbaijan (66%) made the second list.

As it can be seen the change of both the level of social activeness and the level of support (estimation) of democracy in all the groups of countries depends, to a great extent, upon the current domestic political issues in those countries. But one can notice that the «democratic indices» in the majority of countries of consolidated democracy (countries of Western Europe) are higher on the average than the indices in post-socialist countries (countries of CEE). They are the lowest (at the average) in the post-Soviet countries. The Balkan countries boast very high indices of social activeness and democracy support among the CEE countries. The other indices manifest similar trends.

Unfortunately, the given projects of the monitoring social researches did not take into consideration the fact that, first of all, it was necessary to investigate the basic system of values in this or that country but were aimed at identification of the people's systems of values and at determination of existential values (attitude towards family, job, friends, hobby, satisfaction with life, etc.) into which to a large extent we can also include the «political» values, the results of estimating which are given above. Existential values as «important elements of the individual's inner structure are fixed by the individual's life experience and by all his/her rueful feelings» which «separate important for a

certain person issues from the unimportant ones» [1, p. 202–203], reflect something desired by a certain person, whose wishes are, to a large extent, determined by the peculiarities of the current economic, political, etc. situation and that is why are alterable depending on it. On the contrary, the basic values target at the right but not at the desired.

In order to find out how «individualistic values» and «individualistic worldview» (which correspond to basic values of the First System of Values) spread in the modern societies G. Triandis offered a special term «idiocentric» which denotes the people, for whom their own beliefs, feelings and emotions mean more than relations with other people, the persons concentrated on their own satisfaction, on the effectiveness of their own efforts and acknowledgement of their results. The technique of determining the level of spreading of «individualistic values» and measuring of «culturological indices» developed by G. Hofstede has widely spread within the European and post-Soviet territories. G. Hofstede is very close to G. Triandis in his understanding of «values of individualism»: in his concept, individualism is also displayed in the priority of self-caring and caring about his/her family and inclination to form such associations where this care is given to the society in exchange for ... subordination of the person to the group values. As we can understand such a psychological individualism can be inherent to the representatives of both the First and the Second basic values systems and its quantitative measurement does not add anything to understanding of the basic system of values underlying the public life. The same approach is inherent to F. Trompenaars whose research is based on the opposition «individualism – communitarianism»: when individualism prevails, the interests of the individual are placed ahead of the interests of the group, when communitarianism dominates, it is vice versa.

Though such an approach is false from the point of view of methodology the employment of G. Hofstede's, F. Trompenaars' or Schwartz's methods confirmed the idea of difference between the «individualistic» West and the «collectivist» East. According to G. Hofstede, the indices of individualism are the highest in the countries of Western Europe (Anglo-Saxon civilization: the USA and Great Britain, in particular) and they are the lowest in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America [12]. According to F. Trompenaars the countries with the high level of individual independence (over 50%) are mostly European (the exceptions are Nigeria and Venezuela), and the countries having the opposite orientation – collectivism are mainly the countries of the East (the exception is France) [6].

The major part of the proposed methods displays the approach basing on detecting existential values and ignoring the basic ones. The method developed by S. Schwarz and used in the ESS project is not an exception. In order to characterize the relationship between the individual and the group he uses the value items «inclusiveness» and «autonomy», where the first denotes harmonious relationship of the individual and the society, and the second one denotes the opposition of the individual and communal interests [3]. According to S. Schwartz's methodology the respondent is offered to choose between several typological value items, and the respondent chooses the one which

is the closest to him/her. We can give the phrasing of the orientation which is to reveal the craving for power as an example. The answer which the respondent can choose consists of two parts: «It is important for him/her that he/she is respected. He/she wants people to do as he/she says». That is, two parts of the description which according to S. Schwartz belong to one and the same type of values according to the system of basic values which underlie them, obviously contradict each other. The need to be respected by the others is inherent to the First System of Values while the need to dominate the others is inherent to the Second System. The majority of S. Schwartz's items are phrased in this way, according to our calculations they are 12 types from the offered 21 types. Therefore, S. Schwartz's methodology makes it impossible to determine the basic value systems because of the methodological incorrectness contained in it, and the answer, which the respondent chooses, contains the value parts which cancel each other.

Altogether, the question formulated in the project EVS is much more correct in the given sense though it obviously tends to find out the political values. One of the parameters which was investigated in the surveys in 1999 and 2008 determined the percentage of people who agree that equality and freedom are equally important. But if they were to choose between them both they would prefer equality. According to the data in 1999 when choosing between equality and freedom people would prefer the first one: Turkey (58%), Italy (55%), Hungary (55%), and Iceland (54%). Belgium (51%) rounds out the list of those who evaluated equality more than freedom. The second group, where freedom as a value dominates over the equality, is headed by France (46% supported equality), Finland and Spain (45% each), Ukraine (44%) and Germany, Belarus (32% each) and Denmark and Slovakia (28% each) close the rear. The Balkan countries, Romania, Moldova and the countries of Trans-Caucasia were not included into the survey. In the survey in 2008, the first group adhering to equality versus freedom was headed by France and Portugal (58% each). The last on the list were Switzerland, Turkey (51% both), and Croatia (50%). The group of freedom supporters consisted of Russia, Latvia (49% both), and Ukraine (48%). Bulgaria, Serbia, Denmark, Lithuania (36% of respondents supported equality), and Macedonia with Monte Negro (30% of respondents preferred to support equality versus freedom) turned out to be the most freedom-loving.

What turned out to be indicative in determining the basic values was the division of countries in accordance with the prevalence of paternalistic attitude. The assertion stating that people should take more responsibility for their own provision (0), or the state should take more responsibility for guaranteeing the provision of everything (100) was proposed for evaluation. During the survey in 1999 Macedonia (76), Armenia (72) and Georgia turned out to be most paternalistically disposed. The citizens of Austria (33), France (33) and Switzerland (25) turned out to be most responsible. Azerbaijan, Serbia, Monte Negro, Bosnia and Herzegovina did not participate in the survey. In its turn, the survey in 2008 showed a somewhat changed picture: the general level of paternalistic attitude significantly decreased on the whole. At that time, the highest level of paternalism was characteristic of Georgia (63) and Azerbaijan (62), though in Georgia it decreased for 8 points. Germany (32),

Great Britain (31), Northern Ireland (28) displayed the lowest level of paternalism.

As it can be seen from both surveys of the level of paternalism its prevalence is more characteristic of post-socialist countries. If we divide the countries into two groups: with the level of more than 40 points and the level of less than 40 points, the countries of Western Europe (mainly northern countries) will form the group of the «most responsible countries» according to the survey in 1999. The second group will consist of all the countries of CEE (including the post-Soviet countries), the countries of European South (Mediterranean) together with Turkey, and Norway, the Netherlands and Belgium. We can observe the same regularity in the survey in 2008 but there are great changes in it: the group with low level of paternalism (and, consequently, with prevailing of the value of the individual over the value of the state-community) included Slovakia, Moldova and Romania, which were followed by the Czech Republic, Belarus, and the Baltic countries.

At the same time, the transformational processes, taking place in the countries of CEE, demonstrate the rapprochement of these countries and the countries of consolidated democracy. But, though the countries of CEE lived in conditions of domination of the Second System of Values for a long period of time, they did not lose the basic value resource of the First System and use it more and more productively nowadays.

The methodological conclusion which can be drawn from this research is the necessity of including into the monitoring projects not only social psychologists but also, first of all, the experts in the field of philosophy, cultural and political sciences who can concentrate on the exposure of basic value systems.

Список використаних джерел

1. Здравомыслов А. Г. Потребности. Интересы. Ценности. – М.: Политиздат, 1986. – 223 с.
2. Калягин А. Н., Блохина Н. Н. «Благоговение перед жизнью» доктора Швейцера (к 130-летию со дня рождения) // Сибирский медицинский журнал. – Иркутск, 2004. – Т.49. – №8. – С.92–95.
3. Карандашев В. Н. Методика Шварца для изучения ценностей личности: концепция и методическое руководство. – СПб.: Речь, 2004. – 70 с.
4. Лёфевр В. Смолян Г. Алгебра конфликта. – М.: Либроком, 2011. – 70 с.; Лёфевр В. Алгебра совести. – М.: Когнито-Центр, 2003. – 426 с.; Лёфевр В. А. Стратегические решения и мораль // Рефлексивные процессы и управление. – 2002. – Т.2. – №1. – С.24–26.
5. Метельова Т. О. Культура глобализованого світу: на шляхах збереження плюралізму / Т. О. Метельова; Передм. до монографії; [З. О. Босик «Родина обрядовість: трансформація та архетипові мотиви весільної обрядовості Середньої Наддніпрянщини». – К.: НАКККІМ, 2010. – 344 с.; Метельова Т. О. Конфліктогенний потенціал політики мультикультуралізму: ідеології і реальність / Актуальні проблеми всесвітньої історії: конфлікти як складова міжнародних відносин. Збірник наукових праць / За редакцією доктора історичних наук, професора А. І. Кудряченка; Державна установа «Інститут всесвітньої історії НАН України». – К.: Фенікс, 2014. – 310 с.; Метельова Т. О. Світоглядно-антропологічні основи західноєвропейської філософії: від архаїки до модерну / Т. О. Метельова. – К.: Укр. кн., 2003. – 280 с. та інші.
6. Тромпенаарса Ф., Хемпден-Тернер Ч. Національно-культурні розлики в контексті глобального бізнесу / Пер. с англ. Е. П. Самсонов. – Мн.: ООО «Попурри», 2004. – 528 с.
7. Хайек Ф. А. Індивідуалізм і економічний порядок / Пер. с англ. О. А. Дмитрієвої; под ред. Р. І. Капелюшнікова. – Челябінск: Социум, 2011. – XXVIII+394 с.
8. Швейцер А. Етика сострадания [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://marsex.ru/tolstoy/schweitzer-propoved.html>

9. Atlas European values [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.atlasofeuropeanvalues.eu/new/home.php>.

10. Inglehart R. Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. – N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997. – 453 p.

11. Oxford Dictionaries [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/society>.

12. The Hovstede Center [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>.

References

1. Zdravomyslov A. G. Potrebnosti. Interesy. Cennosti. – M.: Politizdat, 1986. – 223 s.
2. Kaljagin A. N., Blohina N. N. «Blagovoenie pered zhizn'ju» doktora Shvejcera (k 130-letiju so dnja rozhdenija) // Sibirskij medicinskij zhurnal. – Irkutsk, 2004. – T.49. – №8. – S.92–95.
3. Karandashev V. N. Metodika Shvarca dlja izuchenija cennostej lichnosti: koncepcija i metodicheskoe rukovodstvo. – SPb.: Rech', 2004. – 70 s.
4. Lefevr V. Smoljan G. Algebra konflikta. – M.: Librokom, 2011. – 70 s.; Lefevr V. Algebra sovesti. – M.: Kognito-Centr, 2003. – 426 s.; Lefevr V. A. Strategicheskie reshenija i moral' // Refleksivnye processy i upravlenie. – 2002. – T.2. – №1. – S.24–26.
5. Metel'ova T. O. Kul'tura globalizovanogo svitu: na shljahah zberezhennja pljuralizmu / T. O. Metel'ova; Peredm. do monografii'; [Z. O. Bosyk «Rodynna obrjadovist': transformacija ta arhetypovi motyvy vesil'noi' obrjadovosti Seredn'oi' Nadn'iprjansh'hynnyj. – K.: NAKKKiM, 2010. – 344 s.; Metel'ova T. O. Konfliktogennyj potencial polityky mul'tykul'turalizmu: ideologemy i real'nist' / Aktual'ni problemy vsesvitn'oi' istorii': konflikty jak skladova mizhnarodnyh vidnosyn. Zbirnyk naukovyh prac' / Za redakcijeju doktora istorychnyh nauk, profesora A. I. Kudrjachenka; Derzhavna ustanova «Institut vsesvitn'oi' istorii' NAN Ukra'ny». – K.: Feniks, 2014. – 310 s.; Metel'ova T. O. Svitogljadno-antropologichni osnovy zahidnojevropejs'koj filozofii': vid arhai'ky do modernu / T. O. Metel'ova. – K.: Ukr. kn., 2003. – 280 s. ta inshi.
6. Trompenaarsa F., Hjempen-Terner Ch. Nacional'no-kul'turnye razlichija v kontekste global'nogo biznesa / Per. s angl. E. P. Samsonov. – Mn.: ООО «Popurri», 2004. – 528 s.
7. Hajek F. A. Individualizm i jekonomicheskij porjadok / Per. s angl. O. A. Dmitrievoj; pod red. R. I. Kapeljušnikova. – Cheljabinsk: Socium, 2011. – XXVIII+394 s.
8. Shvejcer A. Jetika sostradanija [Elektronnyj resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://marsex.ru/tolstoy/schweitzer-propoved.html>
9. Atlas European values [Elektronnyj resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.atlasofeuropeanvalues.eu/new/home.php>.
10. Inglehart R. Modernization and Rostmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. – N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997. – 453 p.
11. Oxford Dictionaries [Elektronnyj resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/society>.
12. The Hovstede Center [Elektronnyj resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>.

Метельова Т. О., кандидат філософських наук, доцент, заступник директора з наукової роботи, провідний науковий співробітник. Державна установа «Інститут всесвітньої історії Національної академії наук України» (Київ, Україна), TyaraLyuka@yandex.ua

Система цінностей як чинник суспільної трансформації: цінності базові та екзистенційні

Розглянуто зв'язок між панівною системою цінностей та трансформаційними можливостями спільнот. Огляд еволюції вчень про базові цінності та зіставлення основних положень концепцій В. Лёфєвра й Ф. А. фон Гаска дозволили надати визначення й теоретично обґрунтувати поняття «базові цінності», що лежать в основі контрадикторних типів морально-етичних систем. Розгляд методологій досліджень ціннісних систем Г. Гофстеда, Г. Тріандіса, Ф. Тромпенаарса та Ш. Шварца уможливив виявлення відмінностей базових цінностей від інших типів (екзистенційних, політичних тощо) та методологічної некоректності їх отождолення. Аналіз матеріалів європейських соціологічних досліджень цінностей виявив базові системи цінностей, властивих країнам з уславленою демократією, постсоціалістичним та пострадянським країнам. Показано, що за всієї їх варіативності в усіх європейських країнах існує спільне ядро базових цінностей, притаманних північній для відкритих суспільств Першої системи, яка зумовлює значний трансформаційний потенціал цих країн.

Ключові слова: базові та екзистенційні цінності, морально-етична система, соціологічні дослідження цінностей, суспільства відкриті і замкнені, трансформаційний потенціал.

* * *