UDC 316.3:330.131.7]:32-027.21

O. M. Ishchenko
PhD, Associate Professor,
Department of Philosophy of the Humanities
Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University

V. G. Puhach
PhD, Associate Professor,
Department of Philosophy and Political Science
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management

IDEOLOGICAL ISSUES IN A SOCIETY OF RISK

Formulation of the problem. The increase in the intensity of manifestations of risks in modern society necessitates the development of an appropriate way of thinking and lifestyle, new strategies and specific forms of existence in a risk-generating environment. As one of the determining factors of existence, the result of socio-cultural and political processes, the risk has a contradictory and multidimensional impact on society, increases the instability and uncertainty in development both at the individual and individual, and at the social level. Consequently, the value of value orientations, norms and ideals that determine human behavior, restraining social disorganization processes that can generate risks increases. A society of risk, which is in a state of constant instability and uncertainty, value disorientation, is experiencing a lack of solid recipes of dignified life, concretely formulated and reliable landmarks, clearly defined goal of life's way. "Traveling" without any idea of "the destination that could be guided" society of risk, thus, actualizes the theme of determining the ranges of social behavior, which, obviously, correlates with ideological issues. After all, ideology as a "critical perspective", designed to change the existing social reality. Ideology, being an idea of a desirable society or criticizing a real one, is "an essential element of any society that seeks to motivate people to act or to stimulate discussion of alternative ways of its organization" [8, p. 54]. This feature of ideology is extremely important for a modern society of risk.

Analysis of recent research and publications. A special theoretical achievement of the subject of a society of risk acquires in foreign scientific literature, where risk is considered in its various aspects, such as the state of unpredictability, uncertainty, and danger. These are the ideas of such scientists as U. Beck, N. Luhmann, G. Bechmann, M. Douglas, A. Wildavsky, K. Dake, B. Turner, M. Wallah and others. Ideological issues in the context of a society of risk are researched in the works of European and national scholars in various fields of knowledge: philosophical anthropology, social philosophy, axiology, political philosophy, risk-taking, in particular O.N. Yanitsky, Ch.L. Barkova, V.I. Veremchuk, I.Yu. Puchkina, L.V. Smorgunova, A.I. Sokolova, M.S. Kovaleva, A.B. Kaczynski, D.V. Demchuk, O.I. Gorbniak, S.V. Kononenko.

The purpose of this **article** is a thorough, substantive analysis of the ideological component of the risk society in the political and philosophical plane.

Presentation of the main research material. Uncertainty, the risks and the associated threats in the post-modern society tend to grow steadily. The danger that permeates all without exception spheres of human existence, is legitimized by its course - disasters, violence, conflicts, various crises became the norm of everyday life of man and society. In addition, the process of fundamental structural changes, which is currently observed, is also a major factor in the growth of risk. The influence of the latter on the existence of a modern person becomes decisive, and, consequently, human life becomes increasingly unpredictable and dangerous. Against this backdrop, an appeal to an ideology that inherently maintains a critical attitude to existing reality contains ideas and practical projects that set the beginnings of "political strategies and tactics, models of political activity designed to transform the real world" [8, p. 49] seems very relevant and important.

Reactualization of ideological issues in a society of risk has objective reasons. First, in a society of risk, all leading spheres of public life undergo a radical transformation. In the spiritual and cultural sphere, which is particularly influenced by risks, the radicalism of transformations is associated with a revision of the basic normative model of society. It should be noted that there is a change in the normative ideal of the past, namely equality, the normative ideal of the present-security. In this circumstance, in particular, the authoritative German researcher U. Beck, who believes that the social project of society acquires a pronounced negative and protective character, emphasizes. It deals with a risk society when the production of risks begins to dominate the production of goods. When an industrial society is structured around the production of goods, then society of risk-around security. In such society, the main driving force is risk, and the ideal is security [3, p. 38]. Well-known British philosopher Z. Baumanis in solidarity with such a view and emphasizes that "life in danger is life at risk (Risikoleben)". Adhering to the ideals of the humanist tradition, the British philosopher subjected to a crushing critique a modern society that lost its ability to self-regulate, whose members not only do not have an idea of their own long-term goals, but also try to avoid such design in every possible way. Moreover, by losing control of processes and phenomena that are important to society, uncertainty "is reflected in the change in the system of values, and people, striving to adapt to changing conditions, begin themselves to deny stability and duration as important conditions of normal existence" [2, p. 11]. In other words, the threat, uncertainty and fear appear as the leading social risk of society. Thus, in conditions of risk society defined as "the society of individuals included in economic relations and covered by fear and uncertainty", as a community of "frightened citizens" [7, p. 40], the concept of "security" acquires a value-normative, ideological context.

Secondly, constant risk-taking gradually deprives man of the main property of his life-the ability to purposeful action. Being in a state of constant risk, a person loses the meaning of being. The environment of risk provokes "the threat of a sense of pointlessness, senselessness of human existence". And in this context sublimation of the meanings of life, which appears as a function of ideology is particularly important. Thirdly, the rejection of ideology, the blocking of ideas about its valuable content, apparently, is associated with a change in the positive logic of social development negative as the main condition for the formation of a "society of universal risk". However, the denial of any ideal leads to a decrease in the role and significance of idiosyncratic meaning, thereby increasing the risk and violation of social unity, the loss of social ties that threaten disintegration. In addition, "deideologization" is undesirable, as it leads to social stagnation and "paralysis", and under such conditions the social morals are degrading and social institutions, through which it is incorporated into social life, are becoming ineffective.

Most researchers in the field of risk are united in the fact that the risk is directly related to the situation of uncertainty. The specificity of a situation of uncertainty lies in the complete or partial lack of information, that is, ignorance produces it. Therefore, the lack of knowledge, falsehood, the falsity of his spit, misinform the subject of the surrounding reality and make his activities risky.

Since human activity is not the same type, the stencil situation of uncertainty appears as a social consequence of the infinite variety of human actions. In order to minimize the destructive nature of these actions, reduce their contradictions, in their activities people must rely on strong moral and value foundations.

In addition, uncertainty is a "powerful individualizing force" that separates and not unites. In a situation of uncertainty, the idea of a community of interests, generated by "excessive need", is becoming increasingly numb, and eventually becomes immensely large. Therefore, "fears, anxieties and sorrows" people have to endure alone, they "are not added to others, do not accumulate in the "common cause, do not have a "natural address". This, as British philosopher Bauman emphasizes, deprives the idea of solidarity of the former content as "rational tactics" [2, p. 47].

It is clear that ideology does not serve as a direct source of personality values and human priorities. However, it attaches to their selection, approving of one's personal goals, orientations and aspirations of the person and "forbidding" or indifferent to others. Being a natural and social being, a person does not necessarily follow the "signals" of ideology steadily, but in any case takes them into account, correlating his inner motives with socially sanctioned norms and values. After all, the latter serve as a kind of map, according to which people, almost geographically, determine the "location of themselves, their desires and needs, their relationships with other people, etc., and determine how all these things are connected and may be the consequence of the choice Direction of action" [1, p. 283]. Having lost standards and values, as the famous Dutch researcher F. Ankersmit observes, people are deprived of the ability to act: "norms and values … create an internalized map, according to which we can model our actions and their consequences. Thus, they make our actions meaningful, coherent and predictable to a certain extent" [1, p. 283]. Affirming the need for norms and values Ankersmit is skeptical of the thesis of "as if" their loss. Referring to the analysis of the past, he emphasizes: "what is always considered a loss of values, usually turns out to be nothing more than a replacement of old values with new ones that simply are disliked by *laudatores temporis acti* (praises of the past-author), so that the latter do not want or not capable of recognizing their norms" [1, p. 282–283]. Instead, norms and values play the role of not so many indications that outline what is allowed and what is not allowed in real human action, "how much an instrument that authorizes to maintain disparate or even conflicting needs at a reasonable distance from one another" [1, p. 283]. The present world demonstrates the mixing of various moral maps. And although without such a blend there would be no democracy that exists today, yet this mix is seen as a threat. "From a purely political point of view", notes the Dutch researcher, "the most dangerous consequence of mixing cards is loss of orientation, growing uncertainty in the political sphere. After all, without a reliable moral card, we will lose confidence in the wisdom of our goals; we will stop understanding how others will react to us and what the "fabric" of the whole society which holds everything" [1, p. 285]. It is noteworthy that Ankersmit does not believe that such disorientation can be treated by social sciences. The latter, in his opinion, can only offer an additional card that only deepens the confusion of people.

It is worth noting that ideology, in addition to morality, has a value-regulating moment. A person is not only contemplative, but also an active being, which in the course of his activity relies on the perceived goals, projects, norms, ideals, and so on. In other words, in the process of its activity, man and society reproduce themselves, guided by the notions of good, ideal. The latter carries out a targeted determination regarding the "collective consciousness", influences the reality of the future and thus has a regulatory effect. Ideology builds individual and social life according to a definite plan, fixes their direction. Acting as a basis for a holistic image, it thereby opposes the social entropy of the diversity of human actions. It is worth noting that a person is not simply adhered to ideology, he introduces something of his own, which is correlated with his own life, needs and interests. Man "passes" an ideology through his own subjective world and already in this form, it interiorize it. Consequently, combined with the unique motivational-value world of a person, ideology "acquires the right" to be a reality that man experiences it. Such a combination of General and individual in ideology allows it to direct people to certain actions, to inspire and motivate them to achieve certain goals.

Ideology determines human life not only from the standpoint of their activity, but also in meaningfulness. And in this regard, it is appropriate to recall the opinion of the prominent German sociologist, M. Weber, who emphasized that every human action becomes meaningful only in those cases when it correlates with the values significant for a given person. Thus, the goals and ideals that translate the ideology are included not only in the system of the most important values, but also in the life sense of man. It is precisely this circumstance that acquires an exceptional importance in a society of risk in view of the fact that a postmodern person faced a threat to the loss of the meaning of being. Ideology informs human existence of the highest sense, value-semantic orientation, under its influence; the activity of people gets a characteristic orientation. In ideas that make up the "core" of ideology, one sees what should and should be embodied in reality. Ideas are induced to improve human life, due to human transformations, far-reaching development.

Ideas serve as a peculiar criterion, according to which the assessment of the degree of imperfection of socio-cultural reality. Thus, ideology as an imaginary model of the future, on the one hand, captures the necessary, desirable, that is, what should become real, and, on the other hand, there is a differentiation of priorities and goals that contribute to the process of changing the reality, respectively, correlated with the necessary, desirable. In this the temporal specificity of ideology manifests itself − the focus on the future from the present, on the historical perspective of optimally organized social relations that meet the criteria of the "higher", because, as emphasized by the famous German philosopher F. Nietzsche, "above" is the only real object of human love, around which communities arise themselves [4, p. 49].

The importance of ideas, as the basis of ideology, lies in their consensual nature. The consesuality of ideas legitimizes ideology as an orientation towards a concrete system of values. People agree to consider something valuable as a result of communicative practices, that is, the agreement reached on the subject of discussion. In the process of communication, they exchange ideas and form common knowledge as the basis of the agreement reached on the valuable. Ideas become consesual when actors begin to believe in their value and reasonableness. In this regard, the latter are constitutive for social reality. Consequently, the condition of consesuality ideas is communicative processes [6, p. 118].

Ideological consensus is not just an agreement; it is based on competition and rivalry, which ultimately aims at constructing a logically grounded project of the future that has the features of the ideal. Ideology, accordingly, is able to ensure the interaction of individual subjects in such a way as to promote the strengthening of the whole part of which they are. After all, in fact, a person loses his faith in his value, if an infinitely valuable whole does not operate through it: in other words, "she has created such a whole in order to be able to believe in their own value" [5, p. 12]. The orderliness of the whole provides an opportunity for individual self-affirmation, personal self-realization. Such interdependence is of value because it generates a generalized view of society as an "order" in which everyone has his own identity, his meaning of being. In addition, this interdependence mitigates compulsion of unanimity and dogmatism inherent ideology, because behind them a person sees the desired future and favorable opportunities for their own individual manifestations.

One cannot ignore the fact that the idea of "ideology" is tightly linked to the idea of power and subordination. "It is", says the English philosopher Bauman, "an integral part of the concept according to which ideology corresponds to someone's interests; Rulers (the ruling class, elites) − that's who provides his rule by means of ideological hegemony" [2, p. 40]. A similar notion of ideology is classical, but rather

contradictory. Indeed, such a position is not able to explain "why some ideas or ideological configurations of ideas can actually motivate a significant number of people to engage in political activity … It remains unclear how and why some ideological programs easily cause political sympathies, while others lose their power over people" [8, p. 53]. However, in any case, the establishment of "ideological hegemony" requires social communication ("cultural" Crusades"), which involves the mutual participation of "warring parties". However, in a postmodern society, communication is no longer a guarantee of subordination, but a "sense of risk" is such thing. The ruling class refuses to commit itself to realizing a long-term perspective; it no longer translates "transforming ideas", aimed at the future. Instead, against the background of the general risk, the thesis "alternative does not exist" is cultivated in every possible way; the principle of "short-term" becomes fundamental. Therefore, the "long-term plans" are losing demand, and the preference is given to the "somewhat changed" today rather than the "best" future, that is, in a society at risk few people are disturbed by a distant prospect. Modern politicians are ready to respond to all kinds of random impulses and refuse long-term policy for the sake of immediate political goals. They demonstrate that "stupid and disorderly behavior … which is as dangerous as the transfer of control over a large international airport to the hands of a schoolboy" [1, p. 408]. If well-known politicians, nevertheless, dare to express "ideas", to offer "grandiose pictures of the future", they immediately "feel the need to apologize to the public for saying something that cannot be achieved in a few days" [2, p. 32]. This is due to the fact that the indecisiveness and uncertainty of the state, the readiness of politicians to respond quickly to what captures public attention is perceived by the people as their consideration of thinking, that is, the fulfillment of the requirements of direct democracy. In fact, this is only a simple implementation of changing, chaotic and rather vague political representations of citizens [1, p. 409]. The fact that "the exhaustion of ideological energies" is characteristic of the political mood of the present, a violation of faith in the possibility of long-term large-scale transformations, in no way denies the importance of ideology. On the contrary, in modern conditions, its significance is only increasing. Especially important is the role of ideology in overcoming political apathy, which society of risk demonstrates, giving people (citizens) the ability to comprehend socio-political problems that they lose in situations of uncertainty, insecurity and fear.

Conclusions. Reducing interest in common and general affairs, indifferent attitudes towards the universal good, "the decline of a social man", which is observed in a modern society of risk, is obviously due to the lack of ideological constructions aimed at "desirable, better future". This situation leads to a constant need for more and more objects of hatred and aggression. After all, as a result of the absence of a "common cause", the "stalled" people accumulate untapped energy. For its release, the "yellow press" is involved, which "deliberately traps or invents" such objects. However, as Bauman noted, all even the thinning efforts of tabloid media amounted have nothing, if "deep and almost universal anxiety and concern was aimed at eliminating its real causes, but not desperatelysearchfor alternative exit of aggression" [2, p. 32]. In fact, there made the fight against "drive weakness", which is irrational because it does not reach the goal, do not have any relation to the real causes of human anxiety, fear, anxiety and uncertainty. As a result, a postmodern society is infested with anti-humanism, and people become more disoriented, limited and helpless. Instead, ideology, being, for expressing Bauman, the "acute angle", which puts pressure on the existing reality, is the possibility of using schematic patterns of public order, fundamental set of regulatory elements of human existence to minimize the level of vulnerability of human existence to give it meaning and meaningfulness. Otherwise, society, facing uncontrollable changes, unpredictable events in the absence of ideal and future goals becomes "plankton like" creature that drifts rather than moving intent.

References

1. Ankersmit F. Aesthetic policy. Political philosophy on the other side of fact and value / transl. by I. Borisova. Moscow: Publishing House of the Higher School of Economics, 2014. 432 p.
2. Bauman Z. Individualized society. URL: socioline.ru> files> bauman_zigmunt_individualized_society-2005. Pdf.
3. Beck U. Society of Risk. On the way to another modern / transl. by V. Sedelnik, N.Fedorova. Moscow: Progres-Traditsiia, 2000. 384 p.
4. Murberg I.I. F. Nietzsche about the modern man in the political space. Voprosy filosofii. 2009. № 5. P. 47–60.
5. Nietzsche F. Volition to power. Experience in reassessing all values: unfinished treatise / transl. by E.Gertsyk. Moscow: Kulturnaia revolutsiia, 2005. 880 p.
6. Smorgunov L.V. Comparative Political Science in Search of New Methodological Orientations: Does Any IdeasMatter For Policy Explanation. Polis. 2009. № 1. P. 118–129.
7. Sokolov A. Political risk from theory to practice. Moscow: Pokoleniie, 2009. 144 p.
8. Schwarzmanntel D. Ideology and Politics / transl. by E. Pysina. Kh.: Publishing House Humanitarian center, 2009. 355 p.
9. Yanitsky O.N. Risk Sociology. Moscow: Publishing House LVS, 2003. 214 p.

Summary

***Ishchenko O. M., Puhach V. G.* Ideological issues in a society of risk.** – Article.

The subject field of the proposed article is the consideration, a detailed analysis of the society of risk in terms of its instability, uncertainty, value disorientation, the absence of specifically formulated landmarks, clearly defined goal of life. In turn, ideology, based on which ideas are based, can change social reality, encourage people to act, stimulate the directions of human activity while reducing the concern, anxiety, fear, uncertainty in society of risk. The rejection of ideology, its underestimation in the socio-political plane leads to the disappearance of a complex of long-term collective social representations that serve to explain and assess the conditions of human existence and create a sense of confidence in the future and make sense to human existence. The neglect of this condition, the marginalization of an ideology that can minimize risks, in the aspect of adequate perception of reality leads to life, which "compresses to the eternal present". As a result, society loses solid and reliable foundations of its existence, frightened members of which, without a well-defined route of their own lives, follow only their instincts.

Key words: risk, society of risk, uncertainty, danger, ideology.

Анотація

***Іщенко О. М., Пугач В. Г.* Ідеологічна проблематика в умовах суспільства ризику.** – Стаття.

Предметним полем пропонованої статті є розгляд, детальний аналіз суспільства ризику в аспекті його нестійкості, невизначеності, ціннісної дезорієнтації, відсутності конкретно сформульованих орієнтирів, чітко визначеної мети життєвого шляху. У свою чергу, ідеологія, в основу якої покладені ідеї, здатна змінити соціальну реальність, спонукати людей до дії, стимулювати напрями людської життєдіяльності, при цьому применшуючи стурбованість, тривоги, острахи, невизначеність у суспільстві ризику. Відмова від ідеології, її недооцінка в соціально-політичній площині призводять до зникнення комплексу довгострокових колективних суспільних уявлень, що слугують поясненням та оцінкою умов людського існування і створюють відчуття впевненості в завтрашньому дні й надають сенс людському буттю. Нехтування цією умовою, маргіналізація ідеології, здатної мінімізувати ризики, в аспекті адекватного сприйняття дійсності призводять до життя, яке «стискається до вічного теперішнього». У підсумку суспільство втрачає міцні та надійні підвалини свого існування, налякані члени якого, не маючи чітко визначеного маршруту власного життя, прямують, керуючись лише своїми інстинктами.

Ключові слова: ризик, суспільство ризику, невизначеність, небезпека, ідеологія.

Аннотация

***Ищенко Е. Н., Пугач В. Г.* Идеологическая проблематика в условиях общества риска.** – Статья.

Предметным полем предложенной статьи являются рассмотрение, детальный анализ общества риска в аспекте его неустойчивости, неопределенности, ценностной дезориентации, отсутствия конкретно сформулированных ориентиров, четко определенной цели жизненного пути. В свою очередь идеология, в основу которой положены идеи, способна изменить социальную реальность, побуждать людей к действию, стимулировать направления человеческой жизнедеятельности, при этом приуменьшая обеспокоенность, тревоги, страхи, неопределенность в обществе риска. Отказ от идеологии, ее недооценка в социально-политической плоскости приводят к исчезновению комплекса долгосрочных коллективных общественных представлений, которые служат объяснением и оценкой условий человеческого существования и создают ощущение уверенности в завтрашнем дне и предоставляют смысл человеческому бытию. Пренебрежение этим условием, маргинализация идеологии, способной минимизировать риски, в аспекте адекватного восприятия действительности приводят к жизни, которая «сжимается к вечному настоящему». В итоге общество теряет крепкие и надежные фундаменты своего существования, напуганные члены которого, не имея четко определенного маршрута собственной жизни, следуют, руководствуясь лишь своими инстинктами.

Ключевые слова: риск, общество риска, неопределенность, опасность, идеология.