

Бічікашвілі І. Б.,
асоційований проф. ф-ту соціально-політичних наук
Тбіліського державного університету
імені Івана Джавахішвілі (Грузія)

Bichikashvili Iryna,
Associate Professor of the Department of Social
and Political Sciences at Ivane Javakhishvili
Tbilisi State University (Georgia)

УДК 007: 304: 316.6.000.141 (479.22)

СВІТОГЛЯДНІ ОРІЄНТИРИ СУЧАСНОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА: ПОГЛЯД ІЗ ГРУЗІЇ

THE WORLDVIEW MILESTONES OF MODERN SOCIETY: THE OPINION FROM GEORGIA

Анотація. Актуальність запропонованої для обговорення теми зумовлена науковою дискусією, що виникла до-вкола поняття світоглядних орієнтирів сучасності. Теоретики різних наукових галузей пропонують тлумачення цього поняття, механізмів його формування та критеріїв визначення. Авторка статті у своїх міркуваннях стосовно світоглядних орієнтирів сучасного суспільства опирається, насамперед, на праці сучасного норвезького філософа Е. Гамлунда, який своєю чергою орієнтується на філософські тенденції Заходу, та пропонує не використовувати поняття «світогляд» в контексті суспільної свідомості, оскільки сам термін мало застосовується в сучасній американській та англійській філософії, а якщо й застосовується, то як «цілісний підхід до існування: місце людини в Космосі, її ставлення до інших істот, до Бога, до світу загалом». На противагу цьому тлумаченню авторка наводить визначення, яке свого часу запропонувала радянська наука: «світогляд – це система поглядів на світ (природу, суспільство, мислення), що впливають на ціннісну орієнтацію людини і на її діяльність».

У статті автор аналізує місце світогляду людини в сучасному суспільстві й у журналістиці. Зокрема розглядає причини виникнення безвихідних суспільно-політичних ситуацій. У контексті міркувань дослідниця звертається до досвіду грузинського суспільства. На думку авторки причина більшості безвихідних соціально-політичних ситуацій у світі – погане засвоєння людиною специфіки ведення діалогу, в необачності політиків, в легковажності журналістських трактувань поточних і минулих проблем світової спільноти. Вирішення проблеми автор бачить у веденні діалогів, тобто формуванні логічної послідовності «висловлено-почуто-поступки-консенсус». Позиція підкріплена прикладами з сучасного грузинського соціально-політичного життя.

Ключові слова: світогляд, світоглядні орієнтири, світосприйняття, діалог, консенсус.

Анотація. The urgency of the research is stipulated by the scientific discussion that arose around the notion of worldview orientations of the present time. The theorists of various scientific fields offer interpretation of this concept, mechanisms of its formation and criteria for determination.

As to the modern society's worldview orientations the author of the study relies primarily in her arguments on the works of the modern Norwegian philosopher E. Gamlund, who focuses on the west philosophical tendencies and suggests not using the notion "worldview" in the context of social consciousness, since this term is little used in contemporary American and English philosophy, and if it is applied then it is used as "a holistic approach to existence: a place of a man in the cosmos, a man's attitude to other beings, to the God, to the world in general". In contrast to this interpretation, the author gives a definition that was suggested once in the Soviet science: "a worldview is a system of views on the world (nature, society, way of thinking), that affect the value orientation of a human and his/her activities".

In the article the author analyzes the place of human's worldview in the modern society and in journalism. In particular, she considers the reasons of hopeless socio-political situations. In the context of considerations, the researcher refers to the experience of the Georgian society. It is the author's opinion that the reason of most hopeless socio-political situations in the world is poor communication skills of an individual, as well as carelessness of politicians and irresponsibility of journalistic interpretations of the current and past problems of the world community.

The author considers that conducting the dialogues is solution of these problems that is in formation of the logical sequence of “expressed-heard-actions-consensus”. This position of the author is reinforced by the examples from the contemporary Georgian socio-political life.

Keywords: *worldview, worldview orientations, world perception, dialogue, consensus.*

Introduction. Concerning to the concept “worldview milestones”. Why do we use the worldview? Because, in our understanding, the worldview is something stable and affirmed. The word “milestones” gives the hope for variability, the right to choose, which is more compliant with the modern trends. The idea of the article arose due to communication with a young Norwegian philosopher Espen Gamlund, a lecturer at the University of Bergen. He is a tireless popularizer of the subject of his scientific studies being well acquainted with the local society.

The Norwegian scientist pays attention to the essence of the key concept – “world view” and what it means in the West. E. Gamlund is sure that one should not use this term, which, in his opinion, is rarely used in Anglo-American philosophy. But if one makes an attempt to interpret, it is “a holistic approach to existence that includes a vision of a person’s place in the Cosmos, in relationships to other beings, perhaps to God and the world as a whole”.

The Soviet high school and its teaching of fundamental philosophy highlights immediately “the interpretation” of this notion in our minds: “A worldview is a system of views on the world (nature, society, thinking) that affects the person’s value orientation and consequently on his/her activities” [1, p. 916]. You should admit that the difference in interpretations, in fact, is insignificant. And if we add one more opinion to these two similar definitions: “The worldview is determined, ultimately, by the level of social development, the state of science, awareness” [2, p. 177], then the difference in our and Bergen’s wordings is even more imperceptible.

Without arguing with the interlocutor about the similarity of two formulations which belong to the Norwegian and a group of Soviet authors from the encyclopedia, we turned to the following problem: “In what approaches is the difference between continental and Anglo-American philosophies noticeable particularly?” E. Gamlund’s answer sounded as follows: “Analytical (Anglo-American) philosophy benefits the society by making it clearer in definition and clarification of terms, it is oriented toward empirical sciences. Continental philosophy is mostly immersed in phenomenology and existential philosophy. It is most interested in making intraphilosophic discussions without orientation to other sciences”.

As we have already mentioned above, the conversation with E. Gamlund pushed us to some parallels between the philosophical concept “world

view” and empirical science – journalism, which also became a part of the scientific analysis of this material. But before proceeding to determine the position of the Norwegian philosopher on this issue, it is necessary to identify the trends that are contrary to the worldview preferences of generations who live at the breaking point of two eras.

The results and discussions. The modern technological reality has shaken the intrascientific boundaries so much that it can be a question of general, depressing problems that have confronted all sciences. As to journalism, it has always included all spheres of life in the area of its analysis. Earlier one could hear the opinion that amateurism (an amateur level of serious science) harms journalism, but as a form of popularization it is still present in our profession. However now dilettantism has taken such deep roots in the sphere of journalism, which leads to scrapping of the established criteria of professionalism. In addition, the unsubstantiated, unbridled judgments have become the norm. There is a breakdown of established norms of decency. The free use of definitions and characteristics that are degrading for a criticized object (it can be a person, a group of people or an entire state) leads to erosion of seemingly persistent norms of interpersonal and interstate contacts. Dilettantism and its “facilitated” interpretation of facts are causally justified.

Due to formation of “information society” many people believe in existence of a single emotional space, in the world without borders. Anonymous bloggers gave rise to a situation when there is no one to ask. Do not you need to ask? It means the need when we have to prove the truth of “hot” facts. Nobody needs this. Do they shoot at your usual values? Take aim and shoot using a larger caliber weapon. And it does not matter that the people around are deaf from this someone’s shooting, when being deaf, it is already impossible to hear reasonable suggestions. Is it not absurd to say that there is a “world without borders” and, as we have already said, a single global emotional space. If you mean the ability of a person anywhere in the world to empathize, then it has long been proven by masterpieces in the form of books, paintings, movies. There is an Internet reaction to everyday calculations in social networks of touching or frightening pictures, there is a calculation of their views, but this creativity is another kind of work. There is no concern with reality. Only superficiality, easiness without hesitation. Such a superficial style of living of negligible years,

given to a person for the main life stages (the period of accumulation of knowledge, their implementation and, finally, the reaping of fruits) leads to a number of deadlock situations. To solve them, you need a response, only not superficial, but qualitative. And here journalism could play its social and educational role, but so far we have not seen it.

Meanwhile, the stalemates, in many cases spread all over the world and concerning the future of the whole world, require urgent resolution. Not by the order of someone, but by agreement of everyone. Today this is unattainable. *In our opinion, the basis for all problems and the impossibility of their solution lies in poor human learning in the issues of dialogue building, in imprudence of politicians who represent their understanding of the problem, irresponsibility in journalistic interpretations of the current and past painful problems of the world community.*

I would like to repeat: the humanity will change for the better and will be able to achieve a certain unification in the worldview guidelines only when it learns to conduct dialogues. It is in the process of conducting dialogues that there is an opportunity to disagree with someone or with something. The stated thought should be heard and, in case of disagreement with the position of the participant in the dialogue, discussed again, and not immediately discarded. And then the people will learn to find the way to consensus, i.e. will learn to make concessions. Such a consensus - a concession will be a demonstration of awareness by the participants of dialogue that someone's position in the current situation is more acceptable.

The desire to "speak through" the problems, to fix the deadlocks and unresolved misunderstandings from a reasonable part of mankind has long been practiced. As early as the beginning of the twentieth century, an American Andrew Carnegie wrote a check of \$ 1.5 million to build "a centre of arrangements" - "Palace of Peace". Thus the Carnegie Foundation was formed one hundred and seven years ago with headquarters in New York. In the premises of the Foundation there are meetings of the Bilderberg Club (founded in 1954). 128 Americans and 255 Europeans and Asians in a closed format negotiate global problems and trends. Probably they have chemistry. But we do not know anything about their arguments and arrangements, the journalists are not allowed there. Of course, for the positive dynamics of world development, the meetings of such overworlds are useful. But do they give anything to the majority of unprivileged citizens? Of course, they do not. After all, secrecy can not generate consensus. And according to the problems accumulated in the world today, such clubs are focused on economic priorities, and political problems, cultural disunity of people - are not yet in the focus of their attention.

To turn back to resolving and defusing political problems, it is necessary to take into account the cultural and moral values of nations inhabiting the globe. Let's suppose that a certain club has been created to discuss the accumulated differences. Among other things, the representatives of the neighboring countries also want to participate in it with their "weak spots". Do the neighbors know each other? On a simple everyday example I would like to demonstrate my own ignorance about the problems of our city. For still not fully clarified reasons, the VI Corps of the State University, where the Department of Journalism is located, was blocked. We were offered to conduct lectures in the high-rise building of the University, which was open for physicists, mathematicians, geologists, biologists and other specialties more than a quarter of a century ago.

During the transition period from a planned economy to a market economy, the building fell into decay. The first 5-6 floors (altogether there are 12 ones) are more or less suitable for conducting lectures, heating from the boiler room can somehow heat up the audience, and in the other upper-level auditoriums there is a chaos. It happened so that our humanities have never been in this high-rise building for a long time, so the difference in basic conditions was more dramatic. Over the years since independence, a beautiful educational building has become an abandoned, untidy building. Absolutely outrageous against the background of the ruin are half-meter gilded tables with the inscriptions "Professor ...". Not the name of the faculty or laboratory, namely a certain "professor" who does not think about the thing how students perceive this outrageous sign of conceit, who do not even have an elementary snack bar. Evening lectures end and a crowd of frozen, hungry students goes to "wild field", to the unsettled space where the city buses drive at random. If it's raining, there's no way to hide. How should they reach a consensus within one institution, is there any dialogue between the administration and students who maintain this administration? In the format of our disciplines ("Newspaper", "Magazine") and in the format of our educational newspapers and magazines we raised the issue of food accessibility in the campus, the issue of absence of student hostels, the issue of classrooms' lack. But there was no case when the authors of publications were invited to administration for giving the clear information on its intentions.

Is it possible to be sure that students studying in such "field conditions" will remain patriots of their alma mater and accordingly of their country?

Why does disorderliness of students's everyday life catch the eye? Because it concerns the worldview of that generation, which in 5-7 years must be the most popular and professional. Most importantly they should

be effective, clearly knowing every next move of its civil way. But if today these young people are pressed with discomfort, disregard, being not including into the discussion of problems, what will we get tomorrow?

If we return to the position of the Norwegian philosopher and his views on “the ability to be geared towards”, obsession of the Georgian media on political topics, Georgia’s accession to NATO and the EU, and no publications on the needs of population, covering no word on the problems of unemployment among youth, then, according to his opinion, the described state of the media looks like features of immature democracy. Not many years have passed since separation of Georgia from the Soviet Union, and the building of democracy and civil society looks like to take the years. The state itself should be interested in this.

Conclusions. Officially, Georgia is not a clerical state, the church is separated from the state. But there are all signs of the opposite, when not only those who find it difficult to live (old people, disabled people) try to be attached to the church, but also quite able-bodied people, to whom the state cannot offer a job, a program for retraining, or volunteering. To impose consciously clericalism today, when the whole world is enthusiastically learning, striving to be at the forefront of scientific and technological achievements, is it not an indicator of the lack of moral values in power, or is it a sign of obscurantism?”

According to the philosopher’s opinion, the church should be separated from the state. This is a great advantage for development of the society. And religion should have less power. It is important to share politics and religion, and not put religious beliefs at the basis of political decisions.

The dozens of millions of lari (the Georgian currency) are allocated to the church by the Georgian government. Many people talk about this in social networks. But there is no discussion of programs to eradicate unemployment, free education programs, and support for young families. There are not any discussions, because there are no such programs. As the youth say, “there is no moving”. The standing swamp and therefore fuzzy worldview and unformed milestones.

Список літератури

1. Философия: Энциклопедический словарь / под ред. А. А. Ивина. – Москва : Гардарики, 2004. – 1072 с.
2. Краткий словарь по философии / под ред. И. В. Блауберг, П. В. Копнин. – 2-е изд. – Москва : Политиздат, 1970. – 398 с.

References

1. Ivin, A. A. (Ed.) (2004), *Philosophy: A Encyclopedic Dictionary*, Gardariki, Moscow, 1072 p.
2. Blauberger, I. V. & Kopnin, P. V. (Eds.) (1970), *The Concise Dictionary on Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Politizdat, Moscow, 398 p.

Подано до редакції 21. 05. 2018 р.

Бичикашвили И. Б.,

ассоциированный проф. ф-та социально-политических наук
Тбилисского государственного университета имени Ивана Джавахишвили
(Тбилиси, Грузия)

МИРОВОЗЗРЕНЧЕСКИЕ ОРИЕНТИРЫ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ОБЩЕСТВА: ВЗГЛЯД ИЗ ГРУЗИИ

Аннотация. В статье автор размышляет о месте мировоззрения человека в современном обществе и в журналистике. Приводится сравнение двух философских подходов англо-американского и пост-советского на основе работ норвежского философа Эспена Гамлунда. По мнению автора, причина большинства тупиковых социально-политических ситуаций в мире – плохая обучаемость человека в вопросах ведения диалога, в неосмотрительности политиков, в легковесности журналистских трактовок текущих и прошлых проблем мирового сообщества. Решение проблемы автор видит в ведении диалогов, т. е. формировании логической последовательности «высказано-услышано-уступки-консенсус». Позиция подкреплена примерами из современной грузинской социально-политической жизни.

Ключевые слова: мировоззрение, мировоззренческие ориентиры, мировосприятие, диалог, консенсус.