

CIVIL FEELINGS AS THE CIVILIZATIONAL CAPITAL

Karas A. F.

Between the conception
And the creation
Between the emotion
And the response
Falls the Shadow
Life is very long
(*T.S. Eliot. The Hollow Men*)

Philosophy is really homesickness –
the desire to be everywhere at home.
(*Novalis*).

INTRODUCTION

It is known that our understanding of reality relates to our understanding of ourselves. However, if the Cartesian paradigm of the quality of understanding was associated with rational production of knowledge and learning, views on the nature of understanding have changed in our time. We recognize that the mind and the process of understanding are mediated by bodily nature of human, by culture and sign's systems of communication. Nevertheless, as before, today the question of the prospects and conditions for the peaceful coexistence of different people, cultures and civilizations on the planet remains relevant. Throughout all previous centuries people have never reached full agreement on how to achieve peace on the basis of "pure reason". Containment of the global war in the modern world is based not so much on the reason, as on the fear of nuclear weapons. Although we know that fear is not the best teacher, even if it is fear of God. But, as Quintus Horace Flack noted, even if the world were destroyed, it would also not teach us to be afraid of our actions and to be responsible.

It remains an open perennial question: whether our "human nature" inevitably designed to produce deadly conflicts? Do hatred and animosity have an inherently evolutionary origin and are inevitable for the fate of human, no matter what cultural context it unfolds? It seems that the uncritical perception of this idea led to the domination of the metaphysical conception of the antagonistic conflicts between different classes, cultures and civilizations. In turn, this idea leads to the assumption of some

incomprehensible perpetual ontological precondition of hostility between men, cultures and civilizations.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the schematization of violence spread, in particular, under the influence of Marxist theory of class struggle and in the simplified and distorted interpretation of Darwinism. Probably, one should agree with Milbank's idea that historically social theories are formed under the influence of ethos of the secular Enlightenment and they originate from the a priori adoption of the *ontology of violence*¹. It seems that it was on this conscious and unconscious assumption, among others, the influence of the theories of O. Spengler², A. Toynbee³ and S. Huntington⁴ etc. was substantiated.

The ideas of hostile confrontation between cultures and civilizations were spreading at a time when a new cultural anthropology was being formed (F. Boas, R. Benedict, and M. Mead) with its leading notions that: "humanity is one undivided thing despite differences of skin color, gender, ability, or custom". Interestingly, representatives of cultural anthropology, who empirically justified the biological unity of mankind, unexpectedly induced cultural relativism. Criticizing the scheme of the historical progressivism, which prevailed in philosophical doctrines of the Modern era, some scientists focused on the uniqueness of cultures and civilizations and the moral and legal norms associated with them. Some theories, like Marxism, deliberately or not consciously, taking ontology of violence, contributed to the spread of philosophical-metaphysical paradigms which ideas were attributed to social and geopolitical reality.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, *Max Weber* applied the opposite approach: Western civilization continues to evolve, although in crisis: the basis of civilizational development is value-oriented rational social actions⁵. Another influential thinker, Albert Schweitzer, writes after the First World War a series of works in which he believes that the crisis of Western culture is caused by spiritual and ethical problems and their false philosophical comprehension. Civilization can be saved by focusing on *the reverence and*

¹ John Milbank. *Beyond Secular Order: The Representation of Being and the Representation of the People*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013. 304 p.

² Шпенглер О. *Закат Европы*. Образ и действительность. Том 1-2. URL: https://www.e-reading.club/bookreader.php/97744/Shpengler-Zakat_Evropy._Obraz_i_deiistvitel%27nost%27._Tom_1.html

³ Toynbee Arnold J. *A Study of History* (2 Volumes). Laurel Editiono Dell Books, 1965. 701 p.

⁴ Huntington S. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon & Schuster.1996.368 p.

⁵ Weber Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. An introduction by Anthony Giddens. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005. 314 p.

awe for life. “The idea of reverence for life leads to the renewal of elementary thinking”⁶.

Related ideas were expressed by *E. Husserl*, who believed that the spiritual “telos” of European humanity was common to all people, cultures and nations. Overcoming the European crisis consists in substantiating the birth of the European “world” from the idea of reason or the spirit of philosophy with “one of its guiding intellectual motives: the idea of universalism”⁷.

It is about correcting the understanding of being as one that relates not only to identity but to the process of becoming, evolution, transformation and development. It should take into account considerations of *E. Levinas*. He argued that a person’s true freedom lies in his ability to liberate himself “from the ontological principle in thinking” and to assume an ethical attitude to the world⁸. We are talking about the need of recognition that “the voice of mind is the voice of peace” (“the ontology of peace”). This is concerned with the empathic and ethical dimension of human existence and refers to the fertilization of the emotional lives of people and communities through the intentions and meanings of peaceful coexistence. The central questions of our time relate to the tension between universal rights and national sovereignty and the role of interpersonal *trust* between peoples of different cultures and countries.

The problem is this: how fair is to conduct a demarcation line between the “inner world” of human and its “outside world”? Is there any reason to admit that among all the diversity of cultures on the planet, can we identify some kind of the process as a single civilization development, common to all? It is important to track the correlation between changes in social structures and changes in the nature of affective, feeling or emotional behavior of human and people. I suppose that local and global conflicts are really based on emotions and discourses, not cultures or civilizations per se.

It should be noted that these issues are aggravated by the contemporary problem of “*post-truth*”, which is particularly relevant in the light of current events in Russia and America, and so on. There is no doubt that the post-truth has already become a tool of hybrid war today. The new reality of war actually relies on it. A particularly interesting question follows from this: the creation of false “facts and events”, aimed at hostility, comes from the “nature of man”, political ideology, culture or of all these together?

⁶ Швейцер Альберт. Благоговение перед жизнью. Пер. с нем. Москва. Прогресс, 1992.

⁷ Гуссерль Э. Кризис европейского человечества и философия. *Вопросы философии*. 1986. № 3. С. 101–116.

⁸ Левинас Э. Избранное: Трудная свобода. Пер. с фр. Москва. 2014.

The purpose of this text is to show that the phenomenon of citizenship and the emergence of the discourse and reality of civil society give rise to new social sentiments and, at the same time, the citizenship themselves is conditioned by the formation of the new civil feelings. This underlies the emergence of “civilization capital” and the civilization process as a universal way of democratic interaction between human and power on the basis of the recognition of the values of individual freedom, dignity, trust, calling, recognition, authenticity, and the like.

My hypothesis is that civil feelings and social capital are formed in the context of the evolutionary development of mankind, which at the level of *semiosis*, through practical reason and a certain discursive-ethical practice becomes an emotional-empathic factor for the unfolding of a single civilizing world process.

I would like to focus on the following points of the subject: (a) to find out the closeness between the notions of social capital and civilizational capital; (b) identify the connection between the social capital of a civil society and the emotional state of trust of its members; (c) to reveal the relationship between mind, emotions and discourses and outline the *civil process* as a process of “*emotional granulation*” based on the discursive-ethical practice of freedom-authenticity;

The civil process relates to the formation of appropriate emotional standards: among which are the sense of dignity, uniqueness, vocation, hope, annoyance, shame, tolerance, benevolence, trust, empathy, civil responsibility, etc. They underlie the phenomenon of “civilization capital” and in generally are united by the notion of “civil feelings”. We associate the methodological guidelines for the interpretation of the renewed understanding of mind with communicative semiotics, discursive ethics and scientific achievements in the areas of cognitive science, bioethics and neurobiology.

1. Mind and social reality

We should remember that during a humankind history about a billion people were killed in constant conflict and wars. In the twentieth century, according to the researchers, approximately 200 million people were killed and over 600 million have suffered injury. Most of those who were destroyed or subjected to abuse of power and bullying were victims of state or political reason, guided by the spirit of collectivism and the worldview of the “common good”, based on the abolition of political and private liberties and the deprivation of the civil and human rights.

Ukraine has brought into sacrificial fire of communism and imperialism from 20 to 25 million people killed in wars, famine and repression that is, third or fourth of its inhabitants died. But if we take into account that the total

deprivation of liberty for private property and private life, according to the Marxist communist doctrine, touched virtually every family between 1918 and 1955, then the number of victims from violations of human freedom reaches the majority of that time population. The current dismal state in all spheres of Ukrainian social life – from economy to culture – is a logical consequence of the deliberate deprivation and restriction of the political and private freedoms of many generations of the population.

We have sufficient reason to assume that the socio-political systems and civilization of the modern world as a dynamic historical process are influenced by different types of mind and his metaphysical doctrines. The mind is not neutral in our lives. In order to understand the nature of mind, we must be able to look deeper – to look “under his verbal language”. I would like to point out that the mind works on several levels: (a) verbally conscious, (b) unconscious through discourse-symbolic structures, (c) on the bodily-emotional level it closely related to culture and outlook. There are certain forms of semiotic mediation between reason and reality at each of these levels.

We are talking about the difference between the minds not from the point of view of intellectual insight inherent for the representatives of all historical cultures, but about the differences caused by the symbolic spheres, the emotional involvement of a person in social design and the peculiarities of the theoretical approaches, religious and secular views.

The tragic experience of the formation of Soviet communist and national-socialist totalitarianism, despotic-theocratic regimes of Asia and Africa, leaves no doubt that they are generated by the mentally-symbolic construction. Nowadays the virtual project of the “Russian World” as a pretentious metaphysical construction has been very tragically embedding in Ukrainian society.

There is also an example of the socio-civilizational development of the Western type, which consisted of close cooperation with a certain kind of mind and, eventually, after the Second World War, the formation of a stable civil society. Civil society is not identical with the political sphere of the state. On the contrary, at the request of civil society, state power is intended to ensure the rule of law, observance of constitutional norms and equality of citizens before laws. Actually, the implementation of civil society – is the realization of individual freedom and civil rights through self-government of society and its groups. In the historical process, it becomes possible on the basis of the formation of national democratic governance. It was in this context that the status of man as a royal’s subjection was transformed into a citizen’s status.

The process of forming a civil society belongs to the phenomenon that originated, developed and reached maturity under the influence of human mental activity and the formation of appropriate *discourse-ethical practice*. Before civil society and the phenomenon of citizenship or nationality became social reality, their discursive rationale was formed in the philosophical writings of Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Ferguson, Rousseau, Payne, Kant, Hegel, Tocqueville, and many others. It is obvious that ethics, even at the level of normativity, relates to the objectification of moral conceptions through the conventional embodiment of the proper (common, public) feelings. *J.-J. Rousseau* notes in Section VIII of the first book *On Civil Status* (L'état civil) that “This transition from natural state to civilian one causes very noticeable changes in a person, giving justice to the place in the human behavior that previously belonged to the instinct, as well as giving to human actions a moral value, which they previously lacked. Only since the voice of duty replaces physical motivation, and the right replaces desire, the person who still drew attention only to himself, is forced to follow other principles and consult with *the mind*... A man in this state... receives much more – improves and develops his abilities, expands ideas, becomes more generous in feelings...”⁹ Very important in the formation of discursive-ethical practice of citizenship is its juridical and legal norms.

Citizenship discourse unfolds in at least two interrelated planes. The first concerns the moral and ethical vision of the citizen as a person of educated, enlightened, well-bred, sensual and civilized. The second is about the transformation of legality context in which the conception of political and legal identity of a person defines through the system of legal meanings and norms.

At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the process of emotional transformation began to connect with the notion of “empathy”, which the ability to overcome selfish intentions was characterized “The term “empathy” is derived from German word *Einfühlung* (*feeling into*), coined by *Robert Vischer* in 1872 and use in German aesthetics. *Wilhelm Dilthey* borrowed the term and began to use it to describe the mental process of compassion. In 1909, the American psychologist E. B. Titchener translated it into a new word “empathy”¹⁰.

This term applies in particular by philosopher *Theodor Lipps* (1851–1914), as well as *Edmund Husserl* (1859-1938). The concept outlined

⁹ Руссо Ж.-Ж. *Про суспільну угоду, або принципи політичного права.* / Пер. з фр. та ком. О. Хома. Київ: Port-Royal, 2001. С. 241.

¹⁰ Rifkin Jeremy. *The Empathic Civilization.* The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis. Penguin Group, New York. 2009, P. 12.

the highest form of positive social and cultural interaction in “the constitution of the common world – which provides the basic conditions for practical cooperation”¹¹. For E. Husserl “the problematic of empathy concerned primarily the *order of constitution* through which the other is experienced as a living being in the first place”¹².

2. Conflict between civilizations as the conflict between minds and as well as between emotions: semiotic aspect

Once the Ukrainian philosopher of the 18th century, Hrigoriy Skovoroda proposed to consider our human problems from the point of view on the three worlds in which we exist: the micro-world, or the human himself, the macro-world, or the reality that surrounds us, and the *symbolic* world lying between the first and second. He believed that the symbolic world, which mediates human and reality, is the key for understanding of ourselves in search of inner and outer world.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Charles Sanders Peirce, who also divided the world into three interdependent parts, offered a famous question: can we adequately understand reality, relying only on our senses and mind, and not taking into account the pre-accumulated knowledge about it? In other words, what role in the understanding of reality plays previously accumulated knowledge, *sign systems* and communicative communities, by which we are mediated in our minds¹³? “The origin of the notion of reality shows that it includes the concept of unlimited COMMUNITY capable for infinite growth of knowledge”¹⁴.

It seems that the symbolic sphere, by which the mathematical mind operates, relates most to “a community unlimited in time and space”. However, the interpretation of social and humanitarian processes is emotionally rich and takes place in a much wider semiotic context, which is not limited to rational or logo-centric discourses. At the same time, this communicative context has its verbal and cultural limitations that affect the interpretative intentions. Thus, the impression is that the distinction between culturally (emotionally) driven minds is inevitably confrontational.

From the semiotic point of view, the mind, as a signs system, participates in a special way that a person is at the highest evolutionary level of life in relation to distant ancestors; and it is the very mind combines all

¹¹ Miettinen Timo. *The Idea of Europe in Husserl's Phenomenology*. A Study in Generativity and Historicity. Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki. Printed in Finland at Multiprint OY, Helsinki. 2013, P. 185.

¹² *Ibid.* P. 204.

¹³ Пирс Ч.С. Избранные философские произведения. Москва: Логос, 2000. С. 19, 42–44.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* P. 89.

living beings in a single chain of interaction. The mind is inherently the main link, which serves to combine human life not only with animals and plants, but also with the whole universe. Such a link, according to the design of Pierce, is the activity of signs, or as he called it in 1883 – *semiosis*. However, not only a symbolic world or sign systems, but its emotional saturation, or the investment and embedding of emotional significance in ideas, objects, imagination, and actions play an important role in the understanding and interpretation of reality. Since the symbolic spheres of different cultures are not identical, it is important to take into account how the social imagination of a society connects with “the ontology of violence” or with “the ethic (ontology) of empathy and peace”. The same applies to emotional spheres: what is more traditional for them – to seek the pleasure of domination and humiliation of the other or, conversely, to seek satisfaction from creativity and love.

The ancient Greeks knew about this *affective* state of a person – to seek satisfaction through humiliation, mockery and mistreatment over others; they marked this with the concept of “*hubris*” (ὕβρις). Aeschylus, Aristotle and others were inclined to believe that the road to *freedom* lies in the ability of man and society to overcome hubris, to *free* himself from its captivity. This view is consistent with E. Levinas’ consideration the emancipation from obsession with being.

A. Toynbee specifically addressed the phenomenon of hubris and investigated its civilization role. Like the Greeks, he believed that large militarized states and empires (Persian, Assyrian, and Roman) came to the decline because of the excessive spread of vicious *hubris* in society.

Samuel Huntington’s article *The Clash of Civilizations?* appeared in the Summer 1993 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, where he wrote: “It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future”¹⁵. These considerations capture the tendency to recognize certain a priori hostile preconditions that allegedly underlie civilization and determine its nature. However, in my opinion, this may apply to the “semiosphere”, not to a priori being that is once

¹⁵ Huntington Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations?* in *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993, P. 3.
URL: <http://home.sogang.ac.kr/sites/jaechun/courses/Lists/b6/Attachments/9/clash%20of%20civilization.pdf>

and for all. But this theoretical masterpiece attracted a surprising amount of attention and reactions. Interestingly, Russian theorists of the doctrines of *Eurasia* and the *Russian world* have fully embraced the idea of a civilizational hostile confrontation.

Incidentally, it was during these years (1992) that the so-called “mirror neurons” were discovered in primates. A bit later they were also discovered in humans. In 2005, an Italian scientist, Marco Iacoboni, argued that mirror neurons are the basis for those human emotions that underlie empathy¹⁶.

Among others, Edward Said was the first who criticized the theory of Huntington (1993), calling it *The Clash of Ignorance*: “These are tense times, but it is better to think in terms of powerful and powerless communities, the *secular* politics of reason and ignorance, and universal principles of justice and injustice, than to wander off in search of vast abstractions that may give momentary satisfaction but little self-knowledge or informed analysis. “The Clash of Civilizations” thesis is a gimmick like “The War of the Worlds,” better for reinforcing defensive self-pride than for critical understanding of the bewildering interdependence of our time”¹⁷.

Dominique Moïsi, Professor and scientist of International Relations, in his famous book (2009), which has an unexpected title, has noted: “I’ve always had strong doubts about Huntington’s theory.” He “... has dangerously confused culture in general, along with social and religious beliefs and models of behaviors, with political culture”¹⁸. D. Moïsi assures that *emotions* can be the key to understanding global conflicts¹⁹. He calls fear, humiliation, and hope the leading emotions of a globalized world.

The causes of the collision of cultures and civilizations, of course, can be deduced from their inherent structural and narrative phenomena, which could prompt contradictions. Meanwhile, the source of confrontation lies in our habituated imagination of the nature of human, that is interpreted by the metaphor of “social animal” to which we in particular attribute some dual “dark-light essence” and certain innate emotional qualities. And then we describe these with a specific binary-opposition logic or dialectic.

However, such an imagination is reductive: a human and his anthropogenesis are interpreted within the framework of the connections between biological nature and social relations. Not surprisingly, the

¹⁶ Iacoboni Marco. Grasping the Intentions of Others with One’s Own Mirror Neuron System. PLOS Biology. 3, 2005.

¹⁷ Edward W. Said. The Clash of Ignorance, in *The Nation*. October 22, 2001 URL: <https://www.thenation.com/article/clash-ignorance/>

¹⁸ Маузі Домінік (Dominique Moïsi). *Геополітика емоцій*. Як культури страху, припущення і надії змінюють світ. Пер. з англ. О. Гординчук. Київ, 2018. С. 35.

¹⁹ Ibid, P. 38.

confrontation between cultures is a simple analogue of confrontation between social animals, whose life is supposedly a struggle for survival. So the idea of hidden social Darwinism works. In the outlined paradigm of “human nature”, a very important part of reality is lacking: the communicative sphere with its semiotic means by which the individual attaches to the community, values and culture.

In order to take into account the outlined *communicative* part of our life (Lebenswelt), several terminological replacements should be made. This refers to the substitution of the notion of “human nature” for the concept of “human being,” and the notion of “social animal” for the concept of “*semiotic animal*”. It should be emphasized that the key semiotic function in relation to a person cannot be reduced to communication, as is usually the case – it concerns *the modeling* of human existence as such. For this reason, we supplement the concept of “*anthropogenesis*” with the conception of “*anthroposemiosis*”, which allows us to look more broadly at the evolutionary process, involving signs-semiotic systems, cultures and emotions, in particular, amongst its factors.

For the first time the expression “semiotic animal” appeared in 1897 in the German language, in the text of prominent mathematician Felix Hausdorff (1868–1942)²⁰. He used it for emphasizing the role of symbolic thinking in social development. However, it has been almost a hundred years since this concept has returned to philosophy, and John Dilly has outlined its fullest rationale. In his view, the concept of “semiotic animal” best contributes to a new understanding of human being in the sense of new humanism or “post-humanism”. The term “semiotic animal” combines the features of “symbolic animal”, “linguistic animal”, “social animal” and “political animal”. But most importantly, with the help of this concept, we rethink not only the “dark nature of man”, but also the essence of the evolutionary process as one that usually boils down to biological and physical development and terminates at the level of the human species. Now we can understand evolutionary development as a process of *semiosis*, that is, the actions of signs and sign systems, beyond which there is no life itself. At the level of human development, semiosis, with its ability to model, is decisive; it underlies the ethnic, cultural, and civilizational differential adaptation of life on the planet. At the same time, the process of semiosis on the anthropological level transcends the biological and physical nature of evolution and in a certain way submits it to semiotic factors and structures. The most important role among the latter belongs to information, knowledge, communicative technologies and

²⁰ Deely John. *Semiotic Animal. A postmodern Definition of “Human Being” Transcending Patriarchy and Feminism*. University of St. Thomas, Houston. 2010, p. 29.

empathy. Thus, apart from the differential function of semiosis, its other function is integral, and they are both derived from semiotic modeling and virtual reality construction.

When asked “how does empathy work?” or how the brain connects the outside world to the inside, we find the following explanation: “The sight of another person’s state awakens within us hidden memories of similar states we’ve experienced. I don’t mean conscious memories, but an automatic reactivation of neural circuits. *Seeing someone* in pain activates pain circuits to the point that clench our jaws, close our eyes, and yell “Aw!” if we see a child...”²¹ I would like to point out that the stimulus of the empathic transmission of pain from another’s face is not the face itself, but the *syntagma* (set of signs), which indicate pain. *Empathy works as a sign system phenomenon*. “The discovery of *mirror neurons* in 1992 boosts this whole argument at the cellular level”²². This means, in particular, that human is not born as the genetic selfish. It also means that the pursuit of enjoyment through the hubris may be a curse for a person, but not her/him destiny. Hubris (or egocentrism) can determine the fate of a person when, due to adverse circumstances, she/he loses the voice of her/his own vocation.

In this regard, it is interesting to compare the views of *T. Hobbes* and *J. Locke* on the origin of hostility between people. It is known that T. Hobbes believed that hostility derives from the “nature of human” in its quest to be free. At the same time, he proceeded from the metaphysics of “materialist reductionism” as some kind of the ontology of hostility. Instead, Locke binds hostility to the social division of people into the very rich and the very poor, which causes hunger and injustice. That is, feelings of injustice, mistrust, and judgment about them are extremely important factors of hostility. Interestingly, Locke proposes to take into account the role of *semiotics* in the human mind. He wrote about the *role of signs* on the last page of *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1690)²³: “in reaction against ... the Cartesian attempt to claim for rational thought a complete separation from any dependency on sensory experience”²⁴.

It is worth noting that Darwin’s careful reading also does not confirm the widespread belief that he recognized the struggle for survival as the only driving force of evolution and natural selection. According to Darwin, no less important factor in the theory of evolution is the natural tendency of living

²¹ Waal de Frans. *The Age of Empathy. Nature’s Lessons for a Kinder Society*. Three Rivers Press, N.Y. 2009, P. 78.

²² *Ibid.*, P. 79.

²³ Lock John. *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*. The Pennsylvania State University, P. 718.

²⁴ Deely John. (1990) *Basics of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, P. 113.

beings to cooperate and combine efforts, at least within the species. “In his later works, *The Descent of Man and Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872), Darwin noted the social nature of most animals and even their emotions and moral responsibilities”²⁵.

That is, evolution is not just a struggle for survival. It is also collaboration within the groups²⁶.

However, in this work, Darwin deviated somewhat from his previous leading ideas, since he believed that emotions were transmitted through the ages as certain entities. And it is this essentialist view of emotions that has caused much confusion and misunderstanding about the interpretation of the sources of conflict. In particular, he attributes to human nature its innate primary dark corporeal essence. Although W. James suggested interpreting the emotional reaction as a specific case rather than as an essence, his views were distorted²⁷.

Our contemporary belief that cultures and civilizations are in a confrontation and struggles, has two sides. *One of them* concerns the semiotic interpretation of biological evolution as an anthroposemiosis. This means that the phenomenon and conception of semiosis (i.e. the actions of signs and sign systems) expands the traditional interpretation of evolution over the biological process, inextricably combining evolution with the processes of communication, understanding, language, narratives, culture and civilization. In this aspect, the genesis of a plurality of cultures is the same manifestation of life as the genesis of the nucleus of a creature from one cell to its systemic bodily set. That is, the sets of biological species and human cultures are a necessary condition for the spread of life in different natural environments in order to increase the potential of survival and preservation.

However, *the other side* in interpreting the plural diversity of cultures and civilizations refers to the human metaphysical reflections. Actually, only immersing the existing plurality of cultures in a certain metaphysical theory or symbolic worldview and discourse, we can find them in antagonistic oppositions or, conversely, can identify the immanent process of single civilization advancement.

The centerpiece of civilization development is the transformation of human, or the transfiguration of subjectivity, which occurs in two congruent planes of human life: the internal mental-psychological mechanism of self-

²⁵ Rifkin Jeremy. *The Empathic Civilization*. The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis. Penguin Group, New York, 2009, P. 90.

²⁶ Brooks David. *The End of Philosophy*. The New York Times, Published: April 6, 2009. URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/07/opinion/07Brooks.html?_r=1&

²⁷ Фельдман Барретт Ліза. *Як народжуються емоції*. Харків, Клуб сімейного дозвілля. 2018. С. 255-256.

control increases in accordance with the ordering of the external, cultural and aesthetic spaces of life. In the social aspect, we are talking about the dialectical inseparability of the relationship between private and public spheres of life. It also relates to the conjunction between the internal psychological and behavioral structures of subjectivity and external social and cultural special features of the organization of the public space of life. This is a combination of sensory-emotional forms of subjective response to the aesthetic-artistic arrangement of the environment and ethos.

By the concept of semiosis, we semantically deepen, increase and extend our understanding of the process of evolution in the fact that we affirm the fundamental mediation of biotic and abiotic interactions and relationships by sign systems with their mental component. The effect of semiosis increases with the evolutionary development and acquires a decisive character inherent in the history of mankind through the modeling function of the verbal sign system.

The evolutionary ethno-cultural differentiation of the “Adam-Eve family” relates precisely to the modal perspectives of semiotic diversity for survival. Thanks to additional biological semiotic factors, the process of evolution unfolds as an integral civilization development. Accordingly, the human mind is associated with the modeling function of verbal thinking. This means that understanding is influenced by semiosis and is fundamentally open to the prospects of co-existence. Understanding is not limited to the epistemological image of the world, it is not so-called “objective reflection of reality” in the rational mind; understanding is cognitively linked to the symbolic realm of life and to the modeling of semantic as well as emotional markers of the perspective of social and individual development.

The metaphysics of confrontation and animosity about the essence of civilizations stems from our discursive discord regarding definitions of “human nature”, “culture” and “civilization” and ideologically determined worldviews. For example, in the early nineteenth century religious and economic contradictions between states, and actually between their political elites, grew into a metaphysical and civilizational confrontation during the Napoleonic wars.

Due to the historical and political circumstances of the 18th and 19th centuries, juxtaposition of culture and civilization began in fragmented Germany from the politic and metaphysical opposition of the German-speaking folk “culture” to the French-speaking German aristocratic court, with its French manners. This led to the ideological antithesis of “culture-civilization” in particular in the theory of O. Spengler, and then turned into a concept of “collision or clash of civilizations”, as the inevitable condition of human existence. Thus, the confrontation between cultures and civilizations

has a metaphysical basis that could determine our understanding of reality and influence social development. In fact, confrontational metaphysics (the ontology of violence) itself becomes one of the key semiotic matrices of civilizational confrontation.

Of course, under the metaphysical doctrines lie the hidden political and economic interests of the world's elites. On the example of Russia, we can see that its political, educational and cultural elites have long been consciously concerned about the confrontation with the West, above all. The doctrine of "Moscow is the Third Rome" was put forward in opposition to the West since XVII century. In the early twentieth century, it turned into metaphysics of Russian Eurasia, and at the beginning of the XXI century – on the geopolitical doctrine of the "Russian world". Actually, on the metaphysical platform of the "Russian world" V. Putin is in confrontation with Western civilization and by the means of hot and hybrid wars opposes the aspirations of Ukraine to accept European values and its direction of social development.

Among many other factors, we should pay attention to the importance of the concept of "identity" in our thinking. This is due to the logical nature of thinking and the historical conditioning of the social imagination regarding the mental semantic and emotional connections of a person with culture, religion or civilization. There is a good reason for this: we are not very capable of understanding other people outside the cultural narratives that are determined by their emotional experience.

3. Social capital and civilizational capital

The reason for bringing the concept of "social capital" closer to the civilization process is that the origin of civil society, in the context of which this phenomenon occurs, is organically connected with the nature of the civilization process.

The vision of *social capital* arises from the characteristic of the voluntary and trusting cooperation between members of the self-governing community in the study of civil society and democracy in America, conducted by *Alexis de Tocqueville* in the 1830th. For the first time, "social capital" as an analytical concept, was articulated at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but it has got a special heuristic meaning at the end of the twentieth century.

According to the dictionary, social capital broadly refers to those elements of effectively functioning groups that include interpersonal relationships, sense of identity, common understanding, common norms, shared values, trust, cooperation and reciprocity. They generally had seen as factors that serve for public good. *Francis Fukuyama* defines social capital as generally *understood rules* that enable people to cooperate such as the norms of reciprocity. Social capital is formed by repeated interactions over time and it

is critical for development and it is difficult to generate it through public policy. “If group members expect others to behave honestly and reliably, then they start to trust each other.” However, “the commonality of values and norms does not in itself create social capital, because the values can be wrong”²⁸. First of all it is about the value of interpersonal trust regarding enabling autonomy to the moral obligation.

F. Fukuyama observes that Mafia and Ku Klux Klan were parts of the American civil society, they have their own “social capital”, but they are disastrous for society²⁹. On the contrary, the rules that shape social capital relate to virtues such as truthfulness, implementation of agreements and reciprocity. Obviously, trust cannot arise between a master and a slave or in a situation of humiliation and domination. “There is usually an inverse relationship between rules and trust: the more people depend on rules to regulate their interactions, the less they trust each other, and vice versa”³⁰. That is, the sense and meaning of freedom and voluntary actions are necessary conditions for mutual trust.

It is about building a culture of trust. Piotr Sztompka notes : “The process of the emergence of a trust culture is just an instance of a more general process through which cultures, social structures, normative systems, institutions, organizations, and all other macro-societal entities come to be shaped and crystallized”³¹. And “the culture of trust is more likely to appear in a democracy than in any other type of political system”³². It concerns the construction of a sense and status of citizenship and the creation of a common public space for the exchange of information, thoughts, and ideas. “Democracy opens opportunities for mass involvement and activism of citizens through voluntary associations, civic organizations, and local power”³³.

The philosopher *Onora O'Neill* emphasizes: “Trust requires an intelligent judgment of trustworthiness. So those who want others’ trust have to do two things. First, they have to be trustworthy, which requires competence, honesty and reliability. Second, they have to provide intelligible evidence that they are

²⁸ Фукуяма Ф. *Великий крах*. Людська природа і відновлення соціального порядку. Львів: Кальварія, 2015. С. 23-24. (Fukuyama Francis. *The Great Disruption. Human nature and the reconstruction of social order*. A Touchstone Book, New York, 2000.)

²⁹ Ibid, P. 26.

³⁰ Fukuyama F. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press, 1995, P. 224.

³¹ Sztompka P. *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge University Press.1999, P. 119.

³² Ibid, P. 139.

³³ Ibid, P. 143.

trustworthy, enabling others to judge intelligently where they should place or refuse their trust”³⁴.

This general acceptance of the concept of social capital which is based on trust, I would like to supplement with two emphases: *first*, the formation of social capital refers to the nature of beliefs and understanding; and *secondly*, common values, trust, cooperation and reciprocity relate to the nature of sensuality, feeling, or emotionality. The change in the worldview has an effect on the change of the inner world of human and on its external activity.

People are endowed with scientific knowledge that broadens our understanding of the world. T. Hobbs distinguished between the right of nature and the law of nature, taking into account the importance of *individual freedom* and the power of reason for the formation of *scientific discourse*. Since then, the status of citizenship refers to the elevation of the role of reason in the formation of legitimate grounds in the relations between the individual and the authorities and between the people themselves. If the right is to exercise freedom in one way or another, then the law defines and binds through the participation of reason³⁵. According to Hobbes, the basic law of nature (not the right of nature), dictated by the voice of mind, consists in the fact that a person among people *must seek peace* and be consistent in this claim. Law of nature is a “guideline, or a general rule discovered by reason, according to which a men is forbidden to do what is harmful to him life”³⁶.

The mental orientation to the “search for peace”, which originates from a moral source, refers to the creation of new social and political relations and leads to a proper emotional transformation in the perception of human freedom: man internally becomes a citizen of political commonwealth (J. Locke) because he feels equal in his dignity before the law with all other citizens. For example, G. Hegel also linked freedom to the recognition of human dignity and legal relations.

For this reason, “J. Milbank attacks the modern inclination to use the ‘laws’ and ‘conventions’ which govern our social, economic and political interactions, as a ‘biopolitical’ means of surveillance and control (in the sense of Michael Foucault). Rather, the use of laws should be based on the principle of ‘equity’, which resists formalization, and appeals to our faculty of judgment (...), virtues of ‘pre-legal trust’ (faith), ‘patience’ (hope) and a

³⁴ Onora O’Neill. *What we don’t understand about trust?* URL: https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill

³⁵ Гоббс Т. *Левиафан*, или материя, форма и власть государства церковного и гражданского. Сочинения в 2 т. Т. 2. Москва: Мысль. 1991. С. 98.

³⁶ *Ibid*, P. 98.

'polity of friendship' (love), and teleological oriented to the organic actualization of the common good'³⁷.

The problem of affects and upbringing feelings was considered in the works of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Spinoza, and in Great Britain and French philosophy and literature. The theme of emotionality, in particular the formation of the gentle sensitivity, courtesy, politeness and elegant manners becomes a leading in the philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment of the 18th century. F. Hutcheson, A. Ferguson, D. Hume, A. Smith, and others are turning to its coverage. For example, A. Smith in his famous *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* justifies the idea that people tend to care about others, and they do it because of their pleasure to see others happy. He draws attention to the contextual influence of emotional experience: "Intrapersonal emotions trigger at least some sympathy without the need for context whereas interpersonal emotions are dependent on context"³⁸.

Actually, it was a new social-commercial, voluntary associations and civic organization's context of civil society, which, in particular, was studied by the friend of A. Smith – Adam Ferguson in the work entitled *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767)³⁹. Ferguson is critical to the admiration of some of his contemporaries for commercial society; he prefers civic and communal values and virtues that underlie citizenship.

Civil society was created in the new context of social relations. It (the context) was formed not only under the influence of commerce and economic interests, but under the prevailing of the orientation of people to free expression, vocation and recognition of dignity. There is a significant change in value orientations and their emotional experiences and expressions. The value of citizenship is focused on the recognition of person's uniqueness and expresses the aspiration to self-realization in his earthly life. This new civil context of social relations determined the transition from traditional cultural values to emancipatory ones.

Thus, social capital, which is formed on the basis of a sense of trust within self-governing social groups with horizontal relations, extends to the state of citizenship as such, which is ensured through the formation of a civil society. In this way, social capital, through the formation of civil society and its national state, becomes a *civil-civilization' capital*. It has become the ground for the spread and development of the citizenship dignity and trust in the

³⁷ Hoff Johannes. *Beyond Secular Order: The Representation of Being and the Representation of the People* by John Milbank', *Modern Theology*, 32, no. 4 (2016), P. 6.

³⁸ Smith Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by Sálvio M. Soares. MetaLibri, 2005.

³⁹ Ferguson Adam. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, 283 p.

secular public sphere of national state and in the field of international relations and the formation of civil norms of international law.

The ripening of the citizenship feelings is carried out at least in three aspects. The first concerns citizenship' legal status, defined by civil, political and natural rights; here a citizen is a legal person. The second concerns citizens as political agents who are actively involved in the political activity of parties and institutions. The third one – refers to the sense of citizenship as political community membership that provides a new source of identity⁴⁰.

Now, the time has come to take a closer look at the role of emotional transformation of human life within the framework of the formation a civic context in terms of semiosis.

4. Knowledge, discourse and understanding in their relation to feelings and emotional granularity

The information that we perceive is processed by the brain and to know – means getting acquainted with something. While understanding works at a deeper level and the intentions of effective use of knowledge depend upon it. Knowledge is a mental process in consciousness, whereas understanding (or judgment) is also a mental process that involves the body level and relates to its feelings and culture. When you understand, you are able to distinguish, explain, interpret and summarize data. The horizons of understanding are determined by the content of culture, in which the individual grows. The basis of culture consists of values, emotions, experiences, meanings, senses, features of verbal, non-verbal and symbolic communications, which form a single semiotic representative matrix.

Expansion of the horizon of perception and understanding is associated with a change in *emotional granularity*. “Science has proven: everything we see, hear, feel, touch, smell, is, for the most part, products of modeling the world, not reactions to it. Simulation is a common mechanism of perception and understanding of language, empathy, memories, imagination, dreams, etc.”⁴¹

An example of emotional granularity is the differentiation of phonemes in the word and language, which is given through teaching perception, mainly unconscious. For example, Americans perceive six colors of rainbow, while Ukrainians are seven. The same applies to the Poles. This is due to the differences in conceptualization: if there is one blue in the English language,

⁴⁰ Citizenship in Diverse Societies. Edited by Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. Oxford University Press; 1 edition 2000. 456 p.

⁴¹ Фельдман Барретт Ліза. *Як народжуються емоції*. Харків: Клуб сімейного дозвілля, 2018. С. 59.

then in our – there are blue and sky-blue colors. Lisa Feldman Barrett believes that even “every new word is an invitation to construct our experiences in new ways”⁴².

People with high emotional granularity are able to delineate their feelings deeper and they are more flexible in regulating their emotional reactions. New words and concepts, as well as a new discourse play the key role in emotional “transformation”. Therefore, when we teach our children to differentiate emotional experience through the appropriation of new conceptions, we “create a new reality for them – social reality”⁴³. (I like this English word “*concept-ion*”, which also means “impregnation” and “design”).

Thus, the perception and understanding of reality is the process of transforming (modeling) of sensations and their external elements into objects of common experience in a certain communicative context (*Umwelt*) of the biological species existence. It is the communicative environment that is the primary base for the formation of perception. Therefore, the perception of people even in one culture will depend on the peculiarities of their local communicative environment.

Academic communicative environment plays a special role in setting the perception and understanding of the world due to the fact that it creates a special semantic and emotional communicative situation. It provides not just the production and transfer of knowledge, but more importantly, it evokes new nuances of emotional detail that relate to the ability to think critically and to be willing to accept other thoughts and beliefs. In this way, we broaden our understanding based on feelings and emotions thanks to the communicative features inherent in the public academic and educational process in accordance with the construction of civil society. In other words, it is a “*parrhesia situation*”⁴⁴: new knowledge of reality arises under such special emotional conditions of communication and dialogue, when self-interest or fear of being mistaken either being punished does not embarrass free speech and free thinking. It is about the transfiguration of subjectivity when our feelings and thoughts change.

However, universities themselves are influenced by the external factors of culture and political system. The degree of academic freedom and freedom of thought and speech can depend on them. In a closed political system, university communication becomes rigid and, accordingly, does not contribute

⁴² Ibid, p. 287.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 291.

⁴⁴ Foucault Michel. *The Practice of Parrhesia*. In *Discourse and Truth: the Problematization of Parrhesia* (six lectures), The University of California at Berkeley, edited by Joseph Pearson. Digital Archive: Foucault.info, 1999. URL: <http://foucault.info/documents/parrhesia/index.html> 1999

to the deepening of emotional granularity. Probably this explains the situation when scientists at the universities of Hitler's Germany or the communist Soviet Union could achieve high results in natural science and, at the same time, many of them could support the authoritarian and repressive regimes emotionally. Obviously, such university environments could not have a long-term heuristic perspective. As it is well known from the Soviet experience, science has reduced its creative potential. This undoubtedly led to the destruction of mutual trust and social capital.

I could use this example to find words to justify the need for study philosophy as a compulsory subject at universities and colleges. However, I want to call for caution in the light of our post-Soviet evidences. Philosophy is far from always, not in all its theoretical directions, contributes to critical thinking, to the formation of social capital and adequate understanding of reality. As we know, sometimes philosophy doctrines can be dogmatic and seek to squeeze endless and diverse reality into a monolithic unified theory.

This applies above all to Marxism and its shy surrogate variants, which are still inert and semi-legal, for example, in some Ukrainian environments, not to mention of official metaphysical doctrines in the Russian Federation or in communist regime of China. In general, modern education cannot be complete without the philosophical component, which is designed to form the competence of critical thinking and promote positive emotional granularity regarding dignity, trust and open civil outlook, realizing that false knowledge and fake news are a harmful and regressive phenomena for humanity. It is important to maintain the philosophical spirit of universalism as a prerequisite for critical thinking.

The articulation of understanding is unfolded in certain discursive-representational matrices. Conversely, the presence of a particular type of discourse or representative matrix influences the process of understanding reality. In the broadest sense of the word, discourse is a complex of signs, meanings, symbols, objects and codes organized by means of linguistic and act-speech and representation in verbal, musical and figurative texts. In the discourse, language, as a sign system, exercises its property of attributing the signs to the phenomena, interpreting them as objects of meaning and understanding. Discourse is always effective through a community, a group of people whose interpretive action is taken in events, outlining the symbolic and object skeleton of reality. The discursive certainty of the relationship between people gives them a certain color, tone, expressiveness, emotionality, leads to silence or openness. Discourse serves as the basis for choosing and prioritizing one meaning to others.

The contemporary American political philosopher Richard Anderson came to the conclusion that the origin of dictatorship and democracy is not at all

caused by political forces, or even social ones. According to his opinion, democracy and dictatorship have an exclusively discursive origin. They include, in particular, the direct influence of political discourse, which Anderson defines as “the procedure for organizing the composition and interpretation of texts that disseminated by persons who conduct political discussions”⁴⁵.

It should be noted that before civil society became a social reality in Western civilization, it was formed as a philosophical discourse in the works of Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Ferguson, Rousseau, Voltaire, Paine, Kant, Hegel, Tocqueville, and many others. The concept of modern citizenship was introduced by J.-J. Rousseau in the mentioned treatise (1762). He linked this to the needs of forming a nation-state in which sovereignty ceases to be a dynastic phenomenon but comes out of the will of the people.

Civil society is formed as legal and axiological aspects of social solidarity, based on the generation of trust or social capital and the relevant social convention. It is the sphere of mediation between an individual and a political authority. Each society has at least several discourse-ethical practices, but only discourse generated by the needs of responsible individual freedom and public truth leads to the creation of a civil status and progress. The generative factor of civil society is the discursive-ethical practice of responsible freedom-authenticity, which unfolds on the basis of the needs for emancipation and social expression of a civilian sentiments and feelings. Formation of civil feelings does not contradict the rational structure of social relations. On the contrary, the formation of rational instruments for the adoption of common laws in the ancient Agora or the shaping of the urban environment and the legal modernization of social relations of the Modern era relate to the intellectual and practical implementation of the idea of citizenship and the conception of civil rights.

Otfried Höffe believes that “the world-spread fact of the organization by a people of their common life in the form of right is the embodiment of a practical or social reason” which “obeys the ethics of right”⁴⁶. Moreover, the formation of civil feelings takes place on the basis of rationalization of everyday life in such manifestations as legislation, commerce, free market, public gatherings, professional work, shop and industrial production processes, the formation of a network of educational institutions, etc.

⁴⁵ Андерсон Р. *Дискурсивне походження диктатури і демократії*. Пер. з англ. А. Карася. Універсум, № 7–10. 2013 URL: <http://universum.lviv.ua/magazines/universum/2003/4/dem.html>

⁴⁶ Гьофе Отфрід. Розум і право. Складові інтеркультурного правового дискурсу. Пер. з нім. Київ. Альтерпрес. 2003. С. 8.

The civil feelings become possible under the new type of normative ethical behavior and the introduction of a variety of rational practices. The point is that “reason is not just a name for the alleged path to the truth or legitimization of principles; it is also a way of life. And these two aspects are tightly interconnected”⁴⁷. Consequently, the construction of civil feelings is bound with the voluntary and open social activity of citizens, which is conditioned not only by the individual aspirations for freedom, but also by the sense of responsibility for their own vocation. “Human, regardless of anything, is called to find a path to himself / herself that the time allocated to him, God’s gift, was not transmitted to others’ hands” and, according to Socratic, “to know himself” and become himself. “Who is called, is responsible”⁴⁸ (A. Sodomora).

Responsible freedom becomes a common normative (ethical) thing, without which individual success is impossible: “Civility means to be civilized, so that one can fulfill one’s duty to civilize. Not in some grand colonial way, but in a simpler and truer one. The *civitas* is the community of human belonging. It is what we are trying to bring to life with “civility” and “civilization” and all the rest of it. What binds the *civitas* together? A fundamental set of values – things which we wish all people to hold jointly, which define the common good. What are such values? I’d summarize them this way: freedom, truth, justice, and equality”⁴⁹.

But what does it mean to perceive and actively experience the values of freedom, dignity, truth, authenticity, trust, compassion, justice, equality, responsibility, calling, recognition, etc.? Civil values become constructs of social reality under the influence of proper collective intention, which is caused by the relevant discourse (concepts, words, and symbols), its semantic and sensory-emotional perception and embodiment into the ethical norms.

Lisa Feldman Barrett convinced that “we need the concept of emotion to experience or perceive the feeling that is associated with it. This is a tough requirement”⁵⁰. And “the concepts are not just a social outer layer on top of biology. They are a biological reality that is embedded in your brain by culture. *People living in cultures with more diverse concepts may be more adapted to reproduction*”⁵¹. This idea is completely in line with the semiotic approach to evolution and human development.

⁴⁷ Гелнер Е. *Розум і культура*. Історична роль раціональності і раціоналізму. Пер. з англ. С. Савченка. Київ. Актаю 2004. С. 205.

⁴⁸ Содомора А. *Бесіди н(р)одумки*. Львів. 2018. С. 19. (№ 17).

⁴⁹ Umair Haque. *What Civility Really Is? The Courage to Revoke Consent From Dehumanization and Inhumanity*. URL: <https://eand.co/what-civility-really-is-9bc51fdfea0a>

⁵⁰ Фельдман Барретт Ліза. Як народжуються емоції. С. 227.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, P. 233.

We attribute such signs-symbols to the nature of semiosis, considering it as immanent for civilization process. It is also worth agreeing with Feldman Barrett's position that "the question of responsibility now sounds like this: are you responsible for your concepts?"⁵². Therefore, our "freedom of choice" is also a choice between the key concepts by which we describe what we call reality.

Because each of us is burdened with the conceptual arsenal we inherit from previous generations, as well as from dominant discourses and narratives, we have little reason to believe that *human* and social conflicts are driven by only biological evolution. Civil feelings and emotions are constructed with the active involvement of concepts, discourses and culture. The formation of civil feelings as the *civilization capital* carries out under the influence of the *civitas* as the discursive ethical practice of freedom-authenticity with all its axiological and semantic elements.

5. Narrative of common sense, discursive self-determination and empathy

Any social changes, and especially revolutionary changes, precede the formation of appropriate discourse. The philosophical discourse of the Enlightenment led to the revolutionary anti-colonial liberation of America from the British Empire and to the Great French Revolution. The common sense narrative has played a particularly important role.

Interestingly, regarding the common sense as a critical element of civil feelings began to say no so-called "ordinary people", but educated segments of the academic community in the XVIII century. The concept of common sense was formulated in the context of the already existing discourse on the social benefits of civil society, with its leading perceptions of individual freedom based on the equality of all people before the laws and the rule of law over political power.

Brochure *Common Sense* published by Thomas Paine in 1776. Thus Common Sense challenged the authority of the British government and the royal monarchy. The plain language that T. Paine used spoke to the emotion of justice for common people of America. It was the first work to openly demand for independence from Great Britain. Emotions of national self-determination and hope construct a new socio-political reality.

This is an example from famous brochure of T. Paine: "In the following pages I offer nothing more than simple facts, plain arguments, and common sense: and have no other preliminaries to settle with the reader, than that he will divest himself of prejudice and prepossession, and suffer his reason and his feelings to determine for themselves that he will put on, or rather that he

⁵² Ibid., P. 246.

will not put off, the true character of a man, and generously enlarge his views beyond the present day”. (.....) “Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia, and Africa, have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! Receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind”⁵³.

A striking example of compassion or empathy in the context of the discourse of freedom and authenticity in American history relates to abolitionism and, in particular, the life experience of Abraham Lincoln. A. Lincoln was plagued by negative feelings, as he explained in a letter to a slave-owning friend (1841): “... there were, on board, ten or dozen slaves, shackled together with iron. This sight was a continued torment to me. ... It is a thing which has, and continually exercises, the power of making me miserable”⁵⁴. Of course, such feelings were peculiar to many others and they motivated them to fight against injustice.

In this observation is important that (1) the motivation trigger for action is a visual image that affects emotions; (2) the visual image of slavery or humiliation and suffering does not cause their automatic denial by each one and all. The visual image of slavery or humiliation and suffering does not automatically deny them. The discursive-ethical mediation (semiotic matrix) in the mind of human and society is important in order for emotional response to be given proper value, meaning and feeling.

That is why the discursive-ethical practices of “paternalism-clientelism”, colonialism, Marxist class struggle, Stalinism, Nazism and so on are able to induce people to indifferently perceive the humiliation and suffering of their neighbors and thus block the person’s innate capacity for empathy. In this way, the encouragement of people to the emotional domination of *hubris* is formed. It is to be recalled that Aristotle defined *hubris* as a state of perverse pleasure that someone want to obtain from the humiliation of a victim and the ill-treatment of a man or through shaming and disrespect of a person only for one’s own pleasure.

We are unable to understand others well beyond the discourses and cultural narratives that shape the practice of our emotional experiences. Similarly, the discourse of Marxism called communist revolution in Tsarist Russia and other countries. Its basis, in particular, lies in the “upbringing” of the feeling of class hatred for the enemies of mankind. Hatred is a feeling or

⁵³ Paine T. *Common Sense*. Addressed to the Inhabitants of America. February 14, 1776, URL: https://www.learner.org/workshops/primarysources/revolution/docs/Common_Sense.pdf

⁵⁴ Waal de Frans. *The Age of Empathy*. Nature’s Lessons for a Kinder Society. Three Rivers Press, New York. 2009. P. 224.

emotion that is known to every person in one degree or another. However, if it is conceptualized and got a discursive-symbolic organization, hatred can turn into a justifiable form of attitude towards people. If class or other hatred becomes the leading emotion of some social group through a specially organized discourse in which it finds its justification, it will work to destroy others as the enemies. Thus, the ontology of violence first finds its discursive justification, and then under its influence it becomes energy of emotional hatred. This applies to the discourses that can take on different symbolic-semiotic forms: religious, Communist, Nazi, etc.

I think the most striking case of discursive influence on a person's beliefs and emotional state of mind is the example of Pol Pot's (Saloth Sâr). He received higher education in France, where he came under the influence of the Marxist environment and became a member of the Communist Party of France. He served as the Secretary General of the Communist Party of Kampuchea. Pol Pot organized the physical extermination of his "class enemies" to which the cruelest methods of punishment, humiliation and murder were applied. The enemies of the revolution were destroyed in very painful ways. "They buried people up to the neck in the ground, leaving them to a slow death from hunger and thirst. In the jungle, torment was aggravated by insects. The heads of the executed were cut off and put up on stakes around the camps with the signs "I am a traitor to the revolution." "People were beaten to death with hoes and sticks. Knives cut the throat, ripped up the body. People were crushed with bulldozers, blown up with explosives, locked in rooms and set on fire, thrown into ponds with crocodiles. Cutting of skin and meat from living people was practiced". As of 1975, about 25% of Cambodia's population had been exterminated.

The opposite discourse refers to the universal values of the individual freedom and corresponding emotions. It should be emphasized that social emotions do not exist in a "pure" innate forms; in both cases they are the result of a semiosis (the actions of signs) and the consequence of their construction through discourses, narratives and metaphysical doctrines. Therefore, people tend to have certain emotional qualities and we can recognize them by observing where they prefer to be, where to go, from what they rejoice publicly: which museums are visiting, what performances are watching, to whom the monuments are erected and express their respect. It's about the fact that our human emotions are constructed along with our public space and socio-political stories. This means that human emotions always correspond to certain external cultural artifacts. Changing artifacts, even such simple ones as street's names, corresponds to changes in the emotional setting of a particular environment. We are talking about the relationship between the semiosphere and the emotional life of community.

Thus the discourse of the dissidents' intellectual resistance against totalitarianism and the support of civil society has led to the collapse of communist totalitarianism, primarily in Poland, then in the Soviet Union. It was not just intellectual discourse, but also ethical behavior according to the guidance of liberty, truth and compassion. Trust is what citizens value most in their society. It is a kind of the freedom-authenticity discourse-ethical practice.

As noted earlier, in the contemporary psychology has been experimentally proved that emotions of a person depend on the perception of situation on the basis of judgments and concepts about it. The judgments and meanings change – emotions and perceptions change. That is, our emotions depend on our understanding of reality and vice versa: a radical change in understanding – radically changes emotions (David Rock)⁵⁵. (Liza Feldman-Barrett has the same opinion). This also applies to the human capacity to show *compassion*, which often depends on participation in a particular community, especially when communities are divided on the basis of hostility.

Actually, the connection between language, speech, symbols, discourses, narratives, communication, feelings and emotions – unfolds as a process of semiosis, which is a creative manifestation of social life and modeling of a social reality. Accordingly, the rules and practices that guide the language in public life affect the material and ideal interests of people with different linguistic repertoire in different ways. This also works in the context of the economy, where labor is increasingly “semantic and communicative, not physical,” and involves manipulating the senses, meanings and objects, not the things. Therefore, in modern linguistically heterogeneous societies, the language is constantly politicized (E. Gellner). V. Rechyzyky notes: “Modern civil society is a system of “complex equality”, whose emotional atmosphere not only deeply penetrated into social progress, but largely determines its results”⁵⁶.

The feeling that one human being cannot be indifferent to another is at the heart of social capital and is also the basis of civilization capital. “We can't just scatter in all direction. Every individual is connected to something larger than itself. ... Measured by volunteer community services, Western societies

⁵⁵ Dr. David Rock coined the term ‘Neuroleadership’; he is the Director of the NeuroLeadership Institute, a global initiative bringing neuroscientists and leadership experts together to build a new science for leadership development. With operations in 24 countries, the Institute also helps large organizations operationalize brain research in order to develop better leaders and managers. See: Khalil Smith, Chris Weller, and David Rock. *Create a workplace where everyone feels comfortable speaking up*. URL: <https://www.strategy-business.com/article/Create-a-workplace-where-everyone-feels-comfortable-speaking-up>

⁵⁶ Речичкий В. *Символическая реальность и право*. Львов: Классика, 2007. С. 245.

seem to be in great shape indeed, and have plenty of compassion to go around”⁵⁷. These words were spoken 10 years ago. Today, the situation has changed, Western civilization is undergoing new test that relates, above all, to the possible decline of trust and social capital. In fact, the test is about our shared emotional life and the meaning of our hope. The XXI century is a time of self-determination and self-expression, so emotions here become overwhelming because it is about the desire for individual creative self-realization and recognition.

Thus, relying on experimental psychology, cognitive research and neurobiology, we must take into account that emotions are not congenital; they are modeled and constructed in the process of common life by means of the symbolic and, more broadly, the semiotic sphere of culture and discourses. The principal role in their manifestation is played by cultural contexts, such as sign-symbolic and conceptual semiosphere and discourse.

This is a substantially new look at the human nature that arises in the neurobiological and cognitive sciences. Recent discoveries make it necessary to rethink the old beliefs that human beings are, by nature, aggressive, materialistic, utilitarian, and selfish. The realization that we are fundamentally *empathetic* is extremely important for social development. If at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the idea of empathy was implicitly contained in the theory of evolution and emerged from analytical philosophical studies of human nature and society, then at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries it became a valid fact thanks to the research in neurosciences. “Mirror neurons are the cells in our brain that make our experience, mostly made of interactions with other people, deeply meaningful. ... Mirror neurons are brain cells that seem specialized in understanding our existential condition and our involvement with others. They show that we are not alone, but are biologically wired and evolutionary designed to be deeply interconnected with one another”⁵⁸.

So where does inter-cultural, inter-national and inter-civilizational animosity come from? Of course, Pol Pot, like any other mammal, was endowed with evolution by mirror neurons and his “mirror neurons were the basis for those human emotions that underlie empathy”. Consequently, he had an innate capacity for empathy. But he blocked it with discursive beliefs that gave specific meaning to the emotions of fear, hatred, humiliation and hope. This transfiguration applies to anyone who voluntarily and knowingly participated in genocides or took part in crimes against humanity.

⁵⁷ Waal de Frans. *The Age of Empathy. Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society*, P. 223.

⁵⁸ Iacoboni Marco. *Mirroring People. The Science of Empathy and How We Connect with Others*. Picador. New York. N. Y., 2009. P. 267.

The revolution in neuroscience that has been going on for two decades has made us take a closer look at the essence of the problem of freedom. Man is neither “doomed to freedom” and associated hedonistic loneliness, nor a collective or herd creature. A person gains his/her freedom and exercising it by showing zeal among others. It seems that for each of us, the path to responsible freedom begins with the discursive fixation of the *gubris* point and the mastery in overcoming it emotionally. This liberates us of dependence on artificial, unnatural forms of socialization and frees from alienation of our own inclinations and abilities. No one will feel free in a society where no one can trust anyone. Freedom-from has its other side as freedom-for. The discourse of freedom is changing. Nowadays we cannot reduce freedom to the state of “self-possessed” and “self-sufficient” individuals. *Jeremy Rifkin*: “The embodied approach to freedom is based on the opposite premise. One is free to the extent that one has been nurtured and raised in a society that allows for empathetic opportunities. ... The very bases of freedom are trust and openness among people. Freedom is never solitary affair, as the rationalists contend ... but a deeply communal experience. We are only really free when we come to trust one another ... Trust, in turn, opens up the possibility of extending empathetic consciousness into new more intimate domains”⁵⁹.

This allows us to speak not only of social capital as an ethical network of trusting relationships within specific social groups or national communities, but also of civilization capital (or emotions of international citizenship), which unite humanity in its common civilizational empathetic development. Every person in his practical life is the bearer of many forms of identity: from gender, ethnic, religious – to the national and civil. The national identity of Modern’s era is shaped as a political response to the existential challenges of a civil society whose members seek to see and feel themselves as citizens equal in their rights and freedoms.

However, the phenomenon of citizenship or civil identity is not reduced to its legal national content; it is rather societal and ethical entity. Since its inception, until nowadays, the nature of citizenship is valuable, sensual and fragile. “Citizenship is gradually losing its territorial “attachment” to a particular state, as well as a real and effective political and legal link between the state and the individual”⁶⁰. Existence of citizenship is shaped in the space of international law with its key principle of the rule of law and the protection of human rights for freedom, security, privacy and happiness.

⁵⁹ Rifkin Jeremy. *The Empatic Civilization*, P. 156–158.

⁶⁰ Софінська Ірина. Філософсько-правова візія доктрини громадянства. Монографія. Львів. Каменярь. С. 105.

CONCLUSIONS

The phenomenon of civil identity, that is legitimized within the framework of the national political sovereignty, in its intention to liberty and free development of person, exceeds national boundaries and other kind of symbolic and practical barriers. Civil identity, based on legal national identity, is not identical with it. It transcends beyond any institutional boundaries of socialization in the pursuit of personal self-fulfillment, which is common to each person in the sense of recognition of her/his, free creative nature. Civil compassion and civil feelings transform civil identity into an ethical self-determination that is constructed around the values of individual human freedom, dignity, trust, calling and recognition⁶¹.

Civil identity is the conception and factor of semiotic design. Its genesis concerns the function of creative freedom in the emotional transformation of human and belongs to the legal, ethical and aesthetic spheres of human' life. Citizenship and civil identity carry the transcendental spirit of *Poesis*, aimed at overcoming artificially created boundaries and barriers that exist in the path of common civilizational development.

Formation of public discourse of citizenship can only be effective because of its close connection with the corresponding ethics, or with the common public behavior, based on the recognition of the values of responsible freedom, human rights, trust and authenticity. This is about the prevalence in the formation of the discursive ethical "freedom-authenticity" practice as opposed to the practices of "paternalism-clientism" and "nihilism-cynicism".

Thereby this also encourages us to admit that, among all the diversity of cultures on the planet, we can identify the process of empathetic construction the common civilizational development for all. The civilization process is defined by the modern conversion of all the inhabitants of the planet to the adoption of the phenomenon of citizenship and the creation of social capital through stages from a national sovereignty and the formation of a political nation to the ethical self-expression of human.

Thus, let us take into account that the word *civilization* was used in the 16th century through the French notion of *civilisé* which has the Latin basis of *civilis*. Its English equivalent is translated both as "*civic*" and as "*civil*". At the same time, the Latin "*civilis*" refers to the concepts "*civis*" or "*citizen*" (English) and "*civitas*" or "*city*" (English). Then, taking into account the common semantic basis for the notions of "*civilization*" and "*civil society*", my idea is to recognize that there is a single (united) civilization process

⁶¹ Карась А. Громадянська ідентичність як етичне самовизначення людини. *Интеллектуалисти і молода інтелігенція будowniczymi społeczeństw obywatelskich*. Pod redakcją Andrzeja Goralskiego i Jana Laszczyka. Warszawa, 2015. S. 103-112.

taking place in the world that has variable cultural forms. The various cultural types of social life on the planet can be called civilizations in the figurative or conditional meaning of this concept.

We are talking, on the one hand, about the validity of the universal civil and civilizational-cultural form of the semiosis that is unfolding as a creation of the common civilization trust (capital) on the basis of mutually recognized civil feelings and shared values of citizenship. On the other hand, we are talking about particular cultural forms of communication that unfold in different paradigms of emotional granularity and mind, based on distinct axiological ideas and discourses. The civilization process of constructing a civil ethics of mutual understanding coincides with the rethinking of the nature of mind and the idea of human.

We are in no way claiming the restoration of one-sided and unilateral expansionism. It is, in fact, universalism, which from the very beginning of the birth of philosophy has remained its leading discursive idea, or a generalized sign with the highest reflexive-critical intellectual and historical potential. Under its influence, anthroposemiosis unfolds as a single civilization process with inherent phenomena of human freedom and civil rights in the pluralistic system of historical cultures.

The civilizational process of the symbolic, ethical and legal construction of civil society coincides with the rethinking of the nature of reason, emotions, culture and man. The pluralistic urban life, with its traditional forms of restraining aggression and intolerance, needs to be renewed with a symbolic sphere and public communication that is capable of supporting the motivation for empathy. It is about the semiosis of the global tendency to create an international political community in which a person claims to enjoy the rights of a citizen of the world⁶². I would like to point out here that the outlined global tendency of a single civilizational-civic development in no way contradicts the formation of national democratic republics. As the political and social experience of the last century shows, the phenomenon of citizenship in the sense of equality of human rights is established only in the context of the independent states' national sovereignty.

SUMMARY

This text deals with the analysis of the prospects of civilizational development of mankind in terms of revaluation and re-awareness of widespread beliefs about the inevitability of conflicts between cultures and civilizations. To substantiate the main points of the study, author turns to discursive analysis, methodological potential of semiotics and neuroscience.

⁶² Гьофе Отфрід. Розум і право. С. 107–109.

This made it possible to view the civilization process as a discursive and ethical deployment of civil society reality and to clarify the concept of citizenship not simply in the traditional legal aspect, but above all as a phenomenon of values and ethics. This means that civil development is influenced by the transformation of emotional life standards in the sphere of culture, which, in turn, are conditioned by leading philosophical (metaphysical) ideas, discourses, narratives and artistic styles.

The ethical-legal discourse of citizenship engenders such public and private attitudes, feelings and interests that determine the new socio-cultural reality of civil society. For its part, the civil sphere is formed as an open communicative structure under the influence of the social orientation on the values of individual freedom, sense of dignity, calling, recognition, authenticity, and the like.

There is no rigid barrier between the “inner world” of people in a particular society and their “outside world”. We can trace the subtle correlation between changes in some social structures and changes in the nature of people’s affective, sensual and emotional behavior. The inner and outer worlds of human have a complex relationships that is effected and conditioned by semiotic mediation, which includes signs and symbols, representational and verbal systems, discourses, narratives, stories, musical texts, artistic artifacts and like that.

The confrontation between cultures and civilizations has a metaphysical, ideological and emotional basis that determines our understanding of reality. Actually, confrontational metaphysics “originate from the a priori adoption of the *ontology of violence*” and itself becomes one of the key semiotic factors that aggravate civilizational hostility.

The relationships between practical reason, emotions and discourses outline the civil development as a process of human “emotional granulation” that based on the discursive-ethical practice of freedom-authenticity. The civil process relates to the formation of appropriate emotional standards among which are feelings of: dignity, uniqueness, vocation, hope, annoyance, transgression, shame, tolerance, benevolence, trust, compassion, civil responsibility, etc. They underlie the phenomenon of “*civilization capital*”, which is conditioned by “civil feelings” that generate the need and opportunity to create the *social capital*.

Civil feelings and social capital are formed in the context of the evolutionary development of mankind, which at the level of *semiosis*, through practical reason and appropriate discursive-ethical practice, becomes an *emotionally-empathic* factor for the unfolding of a single civilizing world process. This allows us to speak not only of social capital as an ethical network of trusting relationships within specific social groups or national

communities, but also of civilization capital (or emotions of international citizenship), which unite humanity in its common civilizational empathetic development.

REFERENCES

1. Brooks David. *The End of Philosophy* // The New York Times, Published: April 6, 2009.
2. Citizenship in Diverse Societies. Edited by Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. Oxford University Press; 1 edition. 2000. 456 p.
3. Deely John. *Basics of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, 2000.
4. Deely John. *Semiotic Animal. A Postmodern Definition of "Human Being" Transcending Patriarchy and Feminism*. University of St. Thomas, Houston. 2010.
5. Ferguson A. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Cambridge University Press. 1995. 283 p.
6. Foucault Michel. *The Practice of Parrhesia*. In Discourse and Truth: the Problematization of Parrhesia (Six lectures), The University of California at Berkeley, edited by Joseph Pearson. Digital Archive: Foucault.info, 1999. URL: <http://foucault.info/documents/parrhesia/index.html>1999
7. Fukuyama F. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press. 1995.
8. Iaconi Marco. *Grasping the Intentions of Others with One's Own Mirror Neuron System*. PLOS Biology. 3, 2005.
9. Iaconi Marco. *Mirroring People. The Science of Empathy and How We Connect with Others*. Picador. New York. N. Y. 2009. 316 p.
10. Hoff Johannes, 'Beyond Secular Order: The Representation of Being and the Representation of the People by John Milbank', *Modern Theology*, 32, no. 4 (2016) URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/07/opinion/07Brooks.html?_r=1&
11. Huntington Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon & Schuster, 1996. 368 p.
12. Lock John. *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*. The Pennsylvania State University. 718 p.
13. Miettinen Timo. *The Idea of Europe in Husserl's Phenomenology. A Study in Generativity and Historicity*. Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki. Printed in Finland at Multiprint OY, Helsinki. 2013. 448 p.
14. Milbank John. *Beyond Secular Order: The Representation of Being and the Representation of the People*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013. 304 p.
15. Onora O'Neill. *What we don't understand about trust?* URL: https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill

16. Paine T. *Common Sense*. Addressed to the Inhabitants of America. February 14, 1776. URL: https://www.learner.org/workshops/primarysources/revolution/docs/Common_Sense.pdf

17. Rifkin Jeremy. *The Empathic Civilization*. The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis. Penguin Group, New York. 2009. 765 p.

18. Said Edward W. *The Clash of Ignorance*. The Nation. October 22, 2001. URL: <https://www.thenation.com/article/clash-ignorance/>

19. Smith Khalil, Weller Chris, and Rock David. *Create a workplace where everyone feels comfortable speaking up*. URL: <https://www.strategy-business.com/article/Create-a-workplace-where-everyone-feels-comfortable-speaking-up>

20. Smith Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by Sálvio M. Soares. MetaLibri, 2005.

21. Sztompka Peter. *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

22. Toynbee Arnold J. *A Study of History* (2 Volumes). Laurel Edition, Dell Books, 1965. 701 p.

23. Umair Haque. *What Civility Really Is?* The Courage to Revoke Consent From Dehumanization and Inhumanity, in <https://eand.co/what-civility-really-is-9bc51fdca0a>

24. Waal de Frans. *The Age of Empathy*. Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society. Three Rivers Press, New York, 2009. 291 p.

25. Weber Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. An introduction by Anthony Giddens. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005. 314 p.

26. Андерсон Р. *Дискурсивне походження диктатури і демократії*. Пер. з англ. // Універсум, № 7–10, 2013. URL:

<http://universum.lviv.ua/magazines/universum/2003/4/dem.html>

27. Гоббс Т. *Левіафан, или материя, форма и власть государства церковного и гражданского*. Сочинения в 2 т. Т. 2. Москва: Мысль, 1991.

28. Гуссерль Э. *Кризис европейского человечества и философия*. *Вопросы философии*. 1986. № 3. С. 101–116.

29. Гюффе Отфрід. Розум і право. Складові інтеркультурного правового дискурсу. Пер. з нім. Київ: Альтерпрес. 2003. 264 с.

30. Гелнер Е. *Розум і культура*. Історична роль раціональності і раціоналізму. Пер. з англ. С. Савченка. Київ: Акта, 2004. 296 с.

31. Карась А. *Громадянська ідентичність як етичне самовизначення людини*. *Intelektualisci i mloda inteligencja budowniczymi spoleczenstw obywatelskich*. Pod redakcja Andrzeja Goralskiego i Jana Laszczyka. Warszawa, 2015. S. 103–112.

32. Левинас Э. *Избранное: Трудная свобода*. Пер. с фр. М.: РОССПЭН. 2014.

33. Маузі Домінік. *Геополітика емоцій*. Як культури страху, приниження і надії змінюють світ. Пер. з англ. О. Гординчук. Київ, 2018. 184 с. (Dominique Moisi. *The Geopolitics of Emotion*. Penguin Random House. 2009.)

34. Пирс Ч.С. *Избранные философские произведения*. Москва. Логос. 2000. 448 с.

35. Речицкий В. *Символическая реальность и право*. Львов.Классика.2007.732 с.

36. Руссо Ж.-Ж. *Про суспільну угоду, або принципи політичного права*. Пер. з фр. і коментарі О. Хома. Київ: Port-Royal, 2001.

37. Содомора А. *Бесіди п(р)одумки*. Львів, 2018. 156 с.

38. Софінська Ірина. *Філософсько-правова візія доктрини громадянства*. Монографія. Львів. Каменяр. 346 с.

39. Фельдман Барретт Л. *Як народжуються емоції*. Харків: Клуб сімейного дозвілля. 2018. 480 с. (Lisa Feldman Barrett. *How Emotions are Made: The Secret Life of the Brain*. Boston. 2017. 448 p.)

40. Фукуяма Ф. *Великий крах*. Людська природа і відновлення соціального порядку. Львів: Кальварія, 2015. 380 с. (Fukuyama Francis. *The Great Disruption. Human nature and the reconstruction of social order*. A Touchstone Book, New York, 2000.)

41. Швейцер А. *Благоговение перед жизнью*. Пер. с нем. Москва. Прогресс, 1992. 574 с.

42. Шпенглер О. *Закат Европы*. Образ и действительность. Том 1-2. URL: https://www.e-reading.club/bookreader.php/97744/Shpengler_-_Zakat_Evropy._Obraz_i_deiistvitel%27nost%27._Tom_1.html

Information about the authors:

Karas A. F.,

PhD, Professor of Philosophy,

Chairperson of Philosophy Department,

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

1, Universytetska str., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine