

critics as a fundamental methodological requirement, that grants not only a variety of rival scientific theories, but also multiple gnoseological systems. Given gnoseological situation is closely related to major postmodern epistemological principles: defundalism (criticism of fundamental knowledge essentials), contextuality of the truth, fragmentarily of knowledge, constructivism (knowledge consists of constructions built on the basis of non-interpretable schemes).

References

1. Касавин И.Т. Поль Фейерабенд в поисках «свободной теории познания» // Историко-философский ежегодник '86. М., 1986. – С.207-226.
2. Полани М. Личностное знание. На пути к посткритической философии. Пер. с англ. – Благовещенск: Изд-во БГК им. И.А. Бодуэна де Куртене, 1998. – 344 с.
3. Фейерабенд П. Против метода. Очерк анархистской теории познания / Пер. с англ. А. Л. Никифорова. – М.: АСТ; Хранитель, 2007. – 413 с.

*Scientific supervisor: Abysova M.A.,
PhD, Associate Professor*

UDC 14:111.852 (043.2)

Monastyrova D.V.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

PROBLEM OF BEAUTY IN POSTMODERN CONDITIONS OF UGLINESS AESTHETIZATION

Aesthetics exists not by itself, but in aesthetical properties of objects in the form of reflection of aesthetic categories. Aesthetical category of beauty is the central concept of any aesthetic system. In European philosophy, originated in Antique philosophy, the concept of beauty has been analyzed through the prism of dialectical pairs: “measurability – immeasurability”, “utility – idleness”, “absoluteness – relativity”.

The discussions on quantitative (general) or qualitative (individual) nature of beauty were extremely long. In the first case one supposed that the beauty formula is the accurately computed relation of computable measures, proportions, symmetry, and so on. Only one standard of the beauty of any object became an inevitable consequence of such an attitude. In the second case, beauty was considered as something individual, incognizable and invariable. Naming objects and phenomena “beautiful”, one should presuppose that they have nothing in common, except the fact of their existence. So, if the beauty is only something individual, it does not exist. The solution has been found not in absolutization of one of the extremes, but in the ability to see measurability and

immeasurability as two sides of the same object. Perceiving beauty one “does not allow to separate a single object from the general concept of the beauty”, – as G. Hegel said. “General” doesn’t exist beyond the individual: cognition of the beauty and its manifestations (such as symmetry, color and measure) is impossible without cognition of concrete beautiful objects.

In the light of discussions of utility and idleness of beauty the solution of the problem has been found since Antiquity: beauty is grounded on utility but it’s not limited by it. One can distinguish two aspects in it: intrinsic value and utility for us. Thus, the beauty denies (in the Hegelian sense) utility, but isn’t opposed to it.

Solving the question of absoluteness (supra-sensuality) and relativity (sensuality) of beauty, it is necessary to refer to the saying of Heraclitus: “*The most beautiful ape is ugly when compared to a human. The wisest human will seem like an ape when compared to a god with respect to wisdom, beauty, and everything else.*” The dialectic solution is: absolute beauty exists through the relative one.

Hereby, classical aesthetical thought represents the nature of the beauty as something that objectively exists, as something which has its social-human value, which is formed on the grounds of the concepts of symmetry, harmony and measure. But the beauty’s evaluation has subjective nature and can be both true and false depending on its compliance with the beauty as an objective value. Aesthetical estimation appears as a dialectic unity of beauty and utility.

Among the philosophical and theoretical origins of the artistic culture of postmodernism widespread in the last third of the XX century, are post-structuralism, post-Freudian theories, deconstruction theory, cultural and philosophical views of Nietzsche. Such features as “fragmentation”, “accident”, absence of the clearly defined conceptual and categorial apparatus were adopted from post-structuralism. However, if the post-structuralism originated in an attempt to overcome structuralism, the postmodern culture should be considered an attempt of overcoming the whole modern culture. Ideas of post-Freudian theories were absolutized in the postmodern art practices where the role of unconscious motives and instincts turn to be the basis of the creative process. The means of Post-Freudism became a target for postmodernism. Another source of postmodern culture, embodied in the art practices is philosophical and cultural views of Nietzsche. Postmodernists accepted the Nietzschean idea of nihilism, infinite interpretation, the presence of both Apollonian and the Dionysian origins in art. In addition, the ideas of the German philosopher influenced the study of the theory of the simulacrum. Nietzsche’s ideas in postmodern culture have been radicalized. But in the context of extreme relativism (“anything is good” and “everything is allowed”), one can’t guarantee that constructive forces would seem preferable if they are equal to destructive ones. Postmodern aesthetics acquires such features as irony and self-parody, game dodge (which essence lies in guessing and finding a plurality of meanings), styles’ merging, inter-textuality and infinite number of interpretations.

Thus, Postmodern aesthetics decanonizes the aesthetic values of the beauty, rejecting the dialectical study of its objective nature through correlation of “quantity – quality”, “utility – futility”, “supra-sensibility – sensibility”. The category of beauty has no longer any objective criterion, which allows ugliness to become sensually acceptable and romantically attractive.

*Scientific supervisor: Abysova M.A.,
PhD, Associate Professor*

UDC 159.923.2:316.3 (043.2)

Pihura I.Yu.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

SELF-DETERMINATION OF PERSONALITY IN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Self-determination is understood as determination of the meaning of human existence, as well as active protection, preservation of personal ethical values in everyday interactions with other people. For some philosophers, this term is the ultimate factor of the existence of the personality. Sometimes, the term “self-determination” is interpreted not only as an option, but also as a moral creation of oneself. The term “personality” derived from the Greek word “persona” that means a “mask”.

In philosophy “personality” is connected with social and psychological aspects, of human. Among them are the sense of dignity, values, beliefs, self-determination, principles of person's life individual characteristic, moral, sociopolitical and other positions.

Self-determination theory was developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan in the mid-1980s. Self-determination theory is about human motivation, it indicates two basic types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic.

In ancient times the problem of self-determination attracted attention beginning from Socrates. In medieval times self-determination was identified with soul. Beginning with the Renaissance man was defined as a universe. It was the time of individuality triumph.

In modern socio-philosophical D. Bell`s and E. Toffler`s works the main conceptions in which cultural transformations of the last century are analyzed. Information society has generated a number of cultural, social and political reforms, which have an influence on human.

In accordance with M. Heidegger's thoughts the need for self – determination stems from person's loneliness – “abandonment”. Self-determination is a self-conscious ethical choice of man, its active work outside and responsibility for the