

# THEORY, HISTORY, CULTURE AND ART OF MANAGEMENT

BULLETIN OF KYIV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF CULTURE AND ARTS  
Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity: Scientific Journal,  
Volume 2 (2019), Number 2, pp. 3-31  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.2.2019.190553>  
ISSN 2616-7573 (Print), ISSN 2617-1104 (Online)

ORIGINAL ARTICLE  
© Ye. Kovalenko,  
O. Khlystun, &  
Ya. Martynyshyn,  
2019

**UDC:** 165.742:[316.3:005]

**JEL Classification:** B15, F69, Y8, Z13

**Received:** 28/09/2019

**Yelena Kovalenko<sup>1\*</sup>, Olena Khlystun<sup>2</sup>, & Yaroslav Martynyshyn<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, PhD, National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: [elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com](mailto:elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com); orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2253-5762>

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, D.Sc., Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: [with\\_joy@ukr.net](mailto:with_joy@ukr.net); orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1764-6559>

<sup>3</sup> Professor, D.Sc., Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: [martinishin.ya@gmail.com](mailto:martinishin.ya@gmail.com); orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8599-7206>

\* Corresponding author: Yelena Kovalenko, National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, 9, Lavrska st., 01015 Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: [elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com](mailto:elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com); orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2253-5762>; tel.: +380 98 1168335

## **Humanism as a Philosophical Category and Socio-Cultural Phenomenon in the Society's Life Management**

**Abstract:** *Introduction.* The urgency of the humanism problem is conditioned by its great influence on the evolution of cultural and historical reality, a significant place in the society's management, and the urgent need to create favorable conditions for self-preservation of human essence, a stable balance between man and nature, man and society. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is a theoretical analysis of humanism as a philosophical category and socio-cultural phenomenon in the society's management, which will provide an opportunity to create a reliable methodological base for the construction of a humane society. The methodological basis of the study is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, historical, cultural approaches to the study of socio-cultural phenomena and processes in society. *Results.* The essence of humanism

as a philosophical category, ideological paradigm and the management phenomenon has been revealed; the anthropological and sociocultural conditions of the humanistic ideas evolution have been investigated and the mental features of the cultural epochs that determine the originality of humanism forms and humanistic management have been revealed; the cultural-historical types of humanism, humanistic management and the potential of their synthesis in the modern world have been determined. *Conclusions and discussions.* Scientific novelty of the research results is to deepen the understanding of the humanism essence as a philosophical category and sociocultural phenomenon in the management of society's life, as contradictory unity and mutual struggle of various humanistic opposites in the context of changing civilizational cycles, cultural and civilized differences. The practical significance of the obtained results is manifested in the possibility of their use in the management activity of society, as well as in the addition of scientific theory and philosophy of humanistic management with new provisions on humanism as the basis of modern management system.

**Keywords:** human, humanism, humanistic management, society.

## 1. Introduction

*The problem formulation.* The modern era has posed to humanity a number of acute social problems. This is due primarily to the fact that technological power has reached a scale that causes profound negative social and cultural transformations in all spheres of human activity. Under the influence of scientific and technological progress, not only is the threat of man-made disasters increasing, environmental problems are deepening, but also technology itself becomes that powerful force that changes a person, his physicality, mental, mental and spiritual nature. The rhythm of modern life often leaves man no time to comprehend the deep, ontological foundations of his human existence, which experts classify as an anthropological catastrophe. Therefore, the problems of self-preservation of human essence, stable equilibrium between man and nature, man and society are actualized. They are reaching global proportions today and growing into a problem for the survival of humanity as a whole.

In the sphere of social life management the crisis situation is manifested in the growth of intercultural, inter-confessional and national conflicts. In terms of the conflict's causes, there are three types of conflicts: 1) conflict of goals, when people differently see the desired state of the management object in the future; 2) conflict of views, when people disagree on ideas and ideas about ways to solve the problem; 3) sensual conflict that arises in situations where people from the outset have different feelings and emotions that underlie their relationships with each other as individuals. Unresolved conflicts can lead to devastating consequences in the life of society and its structures. In this regard, modern science offers all kinds of methods for resolving conflicts. However, as practice shows, neither of these methods is capable of completely eliminating human life conflicts.

In our opinion, the solution to this problem is possible only if we take into account the humanistic component of the process of governance, which actualizes the appeal to the theme of humanism as a system of ideas about the essence of man, his being, and humanity as a characteristic of the human essence, which is peculiar only to man.

The sociocultural relevance of such conceptualization is complemented by the philosophical and multidisciplinary relevance of understanding the place and role of humanistic governance in the modern world and the reproduction of the relevant scientific picture of its functioning and development.

First, the existing philosophical approaches to substantiating the reasonableness of man as his essential, existential characteristic, humanity, is insufficient due to the expansion of the field of inhumane social practices.

Second, the formation of postclassical rationality, with its inherent inclusion of axiological factors in the ideals of science, increases the need for a humanistic expertise in management.

Third, awareness of the need to address the problem of humanism in modern management gives rise to a series of projects and discourses aimed at restoring humanity to its essence, harmonizing the social environment as a condition for growth in humanity. The dispersion of methodological approaches exacerbates the problem of their coherence, the identification of cultural and historical conditions of the diversity of these approaches, their relevance to the modern era, necessitates the appeal to the philosophical understanding of humanism and humanistic concepts of management.

Thus, the problem of constructing a synthesizing humanistic approach to the management of society's life, which is able to solve the problems posed by modern philosophy and sociocultural practice and become a methodological basis for the development of significant decisions necessary for modern humanity for survival, to acquire its ontological right, is actualized.

***State study of the problem.*** Philosophical analysis of humanism and its interpretations is devoted to many researches. The main emphasis is placed on the study of humanism as a system of conceptualizations of free human existence, which historically begins from the Renaissance. The further evolution of the humanist idea is connected with the formation of the activity aspect, that is, the shift of the emphasis from the understanding of humanism to the justification of the conditions, methods, mechanisms of its implementation in life practice. The initial stage in the development of Western European humanist thought can be traced in philosophy of Aurelius Augustinus (398; 2015), Ancius Boethius (524; 1999), Thomas Aquinas (1273; 2010).

The next stage in the evolution of humanistic ideas is conditioned by the socio-cultural conditions of the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance and Modern Times. This phase is associated with the names

Nicolas Cusa (1440; 2016), Leonardo da Vinci (Atalay, 2014), Thomas More (1516; 2005), Tommaso Campanella (1602; 2006), Thomas Hobbes (1651; 2014), Rene Descartes (1641; 1999), Benedict de Spinoza (1662; 2003), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1750; 2019), Immanuel Kant (1785; 2008). They are characterized by the study of humanism as a doctrine of the true existence of man and the conditions for the realization of this originality. At the same time, the ways and conditions they set out are conditioned by the appropriate cultural and historical background of philosophizing and are contemplative, largely utopian.

Recent studies of the phenomenon of humanism and humanistic approaches include works Friedrich Nietzsche (1888; 2017), Albert Camus (1935; 2008), Erich Fromm (1968; 2010), Martin Heidegger (1956; 1996). In recent times, that is, from the mid-twentieth century humanism is considered as a holistic worldview in the works Corliss Lamont (1991), Julian Huxley (1986), Paul Kurtz (2007).

The peculiarity of the humanist idea development and the relevant humanistic concepts formation in the Russian Empire is determined both by the specificity of its historical development and by its closeness to European civilization and Christian, Orthodox culture. The humanistic tradition is traced from the eighteenth to the early twentieth centuries in the works of most national thinkers: Mikhail Lomonosov (1765; 2011), Aleksandr Radishchev (1809; 2001), Petr Chaadaev (1831; 2011), Grigorii Skovoroda (1837), Panteleimon Kulish (1879), Vladimir Solovyov (1883; 2011), Semen Frank (1930; 1992), Nikolai Berdiaev (1952). These and many other thinkers of this period emphasized the high value and man's dignity, the exceptional importance of respecting his particular ontological status.

Domestic specialized studies in the field of humanism are a relatively young direction in the field of humanitarian knowledge. It began to form in the second half of the XX century after the publication in the USSR of the Karl Marx's works, in which he positioned himself as a humanist.

Among the modern domestic studies highlight the works of such scientists as Valerii Finogentov (2009), Givi Givishvili (2009), Pavel Gurevich (2018), Anna Kudishina (2005), Valerii Kuvakin (2003), Vladislav Lektorskii (2018), Volodymyr Lytvynov (2000), Nikita Moiseev (1999), Vadim Rabinovich (2008), Valentyna Voronkova (2010), Vladimir Zhukotskii (2006). These works are characterized by the humanism comprehension as a system of ideas about the purpose of man in his aspiration to the acquisition of his essence and the necessity of creating the conditions for such acquisition is substantiated.

A great deal of literature is devoted to the study of the relationship between humanism and religion: is humanism a product of religious spirituality, or did it arise in the process of conflict between man and the church, which occur-

red in an era of Renaissance thought and has not been completed to nowadays. Research in this area is characteristic of Karl Christ (1990), Bengt Hägglund (2007), Paul Kurtz (2007), Valerii Kuvakin (2003) and a number of other philosophers. They all find elements of confronting the religious and secular principles of humanism, and also consider modern secular humanism a nascent phenomenon, defined by theologian Karl Christ as “an alternative to theological despair” (1990, p. 73). The opposite view is held by Nikolai Berdiaev (1952), Semen Frank (1930; 1992), Alexander Men (2018) and many others who argue for the contribution of religion, especially Christianity, to the formation of the humanism idea.

The technology influence on the transformation of relations between man and nature, the noospheric formation and evolutionary humanism, as well as transhumanism are considered in the works of Albert Schweitzer (1923; 1987), Vladimir Vernadsky (1926; 2013), Jean-Paul Sartre (1953; 2007), Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1956), Nick Bostrom (2010) and others.

The formation of a pragmatic aspect in humanistic constructions can be seen in the education sphere, which poses and solves the specific problems of forming the conditions, means and ways of realizing the human in the human being by humanizing education. So the nature and status of humanistic educational approach, the role of humanization of education in the humanistic potential development of society have been analyzed in the works of Vasiliï Sukhomlinskii (1969; 2016), Shalva Amonashvili (2018), Vasyl' Kremen' (2018), Vladislav Lektorskii (2018), Yaroslav Martynshyn, Olena Khlystun and Yelena Kovalenko (2019).

Orientation to practice is peculiar to contemporary globalist constructions that have been influenced by the sentiment in modern society. They focus on the global humanistic programs formation aimed at curbing catastrophes that threaten modern man. This aspect is represented by researches of Talcott Parsons (1964; 2007), Andrei Sakharov (1990), Nikita Moiseev (1999), Mikhail Deliagin (2003), Vladimir Dergachev (2005), Thomas Friedman (2005), Paul Kurtz (2007), Mark Juergensmeyer (2013), Steven Pinker (2018), Michael O'Sullivan (2019), Adam Sneyd (2019).

Turn to the humanism practice, the search for the implementation of humanistic principles in politics, business, psychology, management, as well as other social practices of society is traced in the works of Fritz Roethlisberger (1941; 2014), Mary Follett (1942; 2014), Elton Mayo (1945; 2008), Viktor Frankl (1947; 2006), Josph Cangemi (1980), David Baldwin and Robert Migneault (1996), Jürgen Habermas (2003), Francis Fukuyama (2004), Jean Baudrillard (2010), Michael Pirson (2017), Ana Honnacker (2018), Jennifer Hancock (2019) and other human scientists.

**Unresolved issues.** Today, there are a number of major international and national humanitarian organizations in the world: the International Humanist and Ethical Union, the European Humanist Federation, the American Humanist Association, the British Humanist Union and others. Their activities are aimed at developing strategies for the humanistic development of the world community and finding ways of interaction between people, cultures and states. These organizations collaborate with the most influential international institutions: UN, UNESCO, PACE, UNICEF, WHO and others.

Such cooperation actualizes the new programs formation and humanism paradigms, which serve as a theoretical and methodological basis for the development and adoption of adequate concrete decisions not only in certain spheres of socio-cultural activity, but in all spheres of social practice. This is connected with a certain duality of contemporary world situation. On the one hand, humanism is a planetary project that humanity is striving for. On the other hand, there is a certain contradiction between humanism as an ideal and the absence of coherent, effective international mechanisms for its implementation in human life, the absence of a comprehensive humanistic expertise of social projects (Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2016).

At the same time, the issues of the essence of humanism as a philosophical category, and especially of the sociocultural phenomenon in management, the social and anthropological factors of the evolution of humanistic ideas, the mental peculiarities of civilization cycles, which determine the specificity of humanism and their humanistic management, remain insufficiently solved. Philosophical understanding of these issues will solve the problems that are actualized and substantiate the need to move to humanistic management, as a general paradigm of the present, which sets the methodological guidelines for the survival and mankind development.

## **2. Purpose and research methods**

*The purpose of the article* is to carry out a theoretical analysis of humanism as a philosophical category and socio-cultural phenomenon in the management of society, which will provide an opportunity to create a reliable methodological basis for the construction of a humane society. The latter will be a condition for solving various ontological, axiological and pragmatic problems of human life.

Achieving this goal involves solving these problems:

- to reveal the essence of humanism as a philosophical category, ideological paradigm and the phenomenon of management;
- to explore the anthropological and socio-cultural conditions of the evolution of humanistic ideas and to identify the mental features of cultural eras that determine the identity of forms of humanism and humanistic management;
- to identify cultural and historical types of humanism and humanistic management and potential opportunities for their synthesis in the modern world.

**The methodological basis of the study** is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, historical, cultural approaches to the study of socio-cultural phenomena and processes in society. The study is based on the ideas of philosophy on the unity of matter, motion, space and time. Based on the dialectical principle of cognition, humanism and humanistic management are considered in the process of continuous development, transformation, transformation, as well as in relation to the material objects and spiritual entities of society. At the same time, special attention is paid to the fact that today humanism as a unique phenomenon and socio-cultural phenomenon in the management of society is a contradictory unity of various opposites: rational and irrational, formal and informal, authoritarian and democratic, elitist. All these and other polar opposites of the phenomenon under study are interpenetrating, passing into each other, being simultaneously in a state of unity and struggle. Their unity means that they are mutually supportive, and struggle means that they are not only mutually conditioned but also mutually exclusive. Consequently, the collision of opposites, their mutual struggle, is the internal source of any change, development and self-development of humanism. The struggle of the polar forces ultimately leads to the contradictions resolution, which is the transition to a qualitatively new state of humanism and humanistic management.

Humanism and humanistic management are explored from the standpoint of a systematic approach, according to which they represent a complex, open, dynamic system consisting of a set of interconnected and interacting subsystems and elements, united by a common purpose, aimed at ensuring the harmonious of humanity existence.

Concepts, forms and types of humanism are studied in chronological order and viewed through the prism of culture, cultural values, meanings, intercultural differences, which allows to understand more deeply the essence of humanism as the basis of modern management, its nature and to predict possible features in the future.

**Research methods.** In the course of the research the following general scientific and special methods have been used: contextual-analytical is to study existing scientific provisions on the problem of research; terminological is in clarifying the content and scope of the philosophical category “humanism”; phenomenological is for revealing the essence of humanism as a phenomenon in the management of society; structural and functional are in the analysis of forms and types of humanism and organizational mechanisms of its practical implementation; semiotic is to clarify the meanings embedded in various types of humanism; modeling is to predict possible scenarios for the humanism development and humanistic management in the future; comparative is when comparing different forms and types of humanism, establishing their similarities and differences; observation is when collecting empirical

data about a research object; abstraction is in order to highlight the essential properties of humanism and distract from the minor; analysis and synthesis are in-depth study of the humanism nature and humanistic structures of government; theoretical generalization is to summarize.

**Research information base.** The information base of the research is the scientific works of the most famous domestic and foreign scientists on the theory, history and humanism philosophy and humanistic management, psychology, anthropology, sociology, religious studies and cultural studies. The empirical substantiation of the basic conceptual provisions of the humanism phenomenon also uses the results of the authors' own studies, which are obtained on the basis of socio-cultural reality observations. The chronological boundaries of the study cover all cultural and historical cycles of civilization, and territorial covers the whole world.

### 3. Research results

In the discourse of modern philosophy there is no unambiguous definition of humanism as a system of ideas about the person's essence, human being, the characteristic of the human in human, humanity. Perceptions of humanism, humanistic management and their interpretations, determined by different social, cultural and philosophical contexts of understanding the concepts of man, the good of man, the interpretation of his humanity, freedom and nature. Accordingly, there are many definitions of humanism as a sociocultural phenomenon in the management of society. It should agree with *Nikita Moiseev* (1999), which warns of the dangers of simplistic idea of humanity, to transfer it into everyday perspective (p. 31). Humanism orientation to achieve the good of the person, to ensure the individual development, his individual freedom is often perceived as a need of the individual, but not as his duty, and in the minds of many is not associated with the fate of society, the organization of his humane life.

A common point in explaining the concepts of "humanism" and "humanistic management" is their study in the system of philosophical and anthropological issues, i.e. in terms of essential gifts manifestation and human needs. The variability of the idea of humanity of the individual consistently leads to a change in the content of the humanism image, thereby defining its historicity.

Applying to the mental basis of different cultural and historical types, cultural epochs allows to distinguish not only the individual nature of the humanistic worldview, but also the cultural and historical background of this phenomenon as a system of value orientations, immersed in a particular culture and historical epoch.



Thus, ancient culture with its specific mental principle of intellectualism, according to which the mind is considered one of the highest instances and the most important ontological characteristics of man, is inherent in understanding humanity as reasonableness. An example of this understanding is the presentation of the ancient Greek philosopher *Aristotle* (4th cent. BC; 2004) it is about the priority of reason and the common good.

The Christian rethinking of the essence and purpose of man led to a change in the humanistic idea, which was closely connected with the ideas of the ascetic nature of human essence, of human purpose as a moral improvement, as the growth of mercy, compassion. *Aurelius Augustinus* (398; 2015), a philosopher and theologian, a saint of the Catholic, Orthodox, and Lutheran churches, who stood at the intersection of ancient and Christian culture, defines a person according to Platonic imagination as a body-possessing soul (pp. 97-98). At the same time, his soul is not only a reasonable entity, but a hierarchy of forces, the highest of which is the power of Love, which allows one to see God, to know one's self in the involvement of God. The good of man seems inextricably linked to the good of mankind.

The Renaissance is characterized by a radical transformation of anthropological principles. Man as the center of the universe becomes independent, autonomous. He exists as individuality. The last means that each person is unique and of the highest value, and together with other people, and even with God. Therefore, the basic meaning and purpose of her life is the talents development and abilities received from God, as well as the growth in humanity, that is, the realization of each of its essential foundations. Since the Renaissance, the main trend in Western European culture has been the emphasis on the individual-personal aspect of human being.

The selection of the individualizing component correlates with the idea of the person of the Renaissance as the center of the world, as a carrier only to her inherent creative and cognitive abilities, a creation that is endowed with limitless freedom. Accordingly, anything that limits these possibilities is considered to be antihuman in nature because it reduces the self-worth of a person to be correlated with the value of God (God-like). The individualizing background, defined by the mentality of the Renaissance, shapes the significance of individualism and the principle of the value of any individuality (Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2017).

In this way, the idea of humanism of this era includes the justification and exaltation of earthly, individual human needs, forms the principle of the right to fulfill these needs. This era also focuses attention on the conditions of realization of humanistic essence of man, on the ways and means of realization of this humanism system. An example of this sociocultural expression

of Renaissance humanism is the models of social order described by the English philosopher and saint Roman Catholic Church *Thomas More* in the work “Utopia” (1516; 2005) and the Italian philosopher and theologian *Tommaso Campanella* in the work “The City of the Sun” (1602; 2006).

For humanism of Modern Times as an epoch, determined by the avant-garde position in the science of mathematics, physics, astronomy and mechanics, it was natural revival of the cult of the ancient mind as a fundamental characteristic of man, its highest value associated with the good and therefore with humanity. It is no accident, according to the English philosopher, representative of empiricism *John Locke* (1690; 2014), that the mind as an immanent feature of human essence is the unity of intellectual ability and common sense (p. 231). Common sense is some practical principle from which all virtues derive.

The emphasis on self-determination of the individual through the mind, on the free development of subjectivity, on the assertion of true existence characterizes the further evolution of the Western European humanist idea. From the creators of German classical philosophy *Immanuel Kant* (1785; 2008) and *Georg Hegel* (1837; 2004), it takes the form of theoretical ideas. For G. Hegel, humanism means the possibility of individuality free being. The latter involves the correlation of self with substance and the assertion of self as general (p. 259). Such growth in the community is a condition of self-discovery and self-assertion of individuality. In this way, humanism becomes a program of free self-existence with the help and in the name of the mind. Famous appeal I. Kant “Sapere aude!”. The latter means having the courage to use your own mind (Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2018b).

German philosopher-irrationalists, representative of the life philosophy *Friedrich Nietzsche* (1888; 2017) exacerbated the humanism problem. He created the ideal of a self-made personality capable of self-shaping and transcending beyond humanism. Such a personality is characterized by a constant struggle between its creative and creative personalities, between creation (all lazy, weak, seeking compassion) and the creator, the superhuman (desire for self-determination, crystallization of power, assertion of will to power, above all, over his own creative side). A person appointment is understood as the acquisition of authenticity, identity, and return to their ontological foundations. But by doing so, man was put on the brink of existence and disruption. In his writings the later developed in existentialism tradition of awareness of the constant problem of human existence, since the essence of man is not a primary data, but is a process of self-determination. Life becomes a constant desire for its own super humanity. Growing up in super humanism as superhuman it means the acquisition of freedom, in fact a human free essence, but essentially torn out of society and communication. The human personality is not just individualized, but also involves itself in loneliness, loses its like.

In more balanced forms, humanism is represented in the writings of the founder of philosophical anthropology *Max Scheler* (1928; 2009) and one of the creators of existentialism, *Karl Jaspers* (1949; 2016). Preserving the idea of human dynamism, its procedural and internal mobility, M. Scheler searches for the peculiarity of the human essence. He sees this peculiarity in the ability of the spirit to transcend beyond the limits of life (p. 82). K. Jaspers shows that the essence of the person implies the achievement of self-identity through the disclosure of the uniqueness and identity of the person himself (p. 145). Accordingly, the conceptual features of humanism and humanistic management are defined by the concepts of “self-creation”, “self-formation” and “the acquisition of authenticity”. Authenticity means the way of human existence in socio-cultural reality and presupposes the essential existence of life.

It should be noted that within the framework of national culture, with its collectivism, value of mercy and compassion in absolute (most often religious) values, European norms seem averaged. Humanism is unthinkable without humanity as compassion in its utmost expression, as a compassion for everything, for every person, for the fate of the people and the country. The acquisition of its essence becomes inalienable without the acquisition of God. The latter agrees with the humanism of M. Scheler, who showed that self-consciousness, the consciousness of the world and the consciousness of God are indissoluble unity and coincide with the person’s property of his essence.

The Russian religious philosopher of Ukrainian descent, the existentialist *Nikolai Berdiaev* (1952), who fully fits into the intentions of a new phase of the humanism historical evolution, wrote that it is the Russian culture that is most acutely aware of the contradiction between humanism as a theory and practice. He noted that although there was no Western Renaissance humanism in Russia, the humanism crisis was particularly acute.

For the hermeneutic philosophical tradition of ascending to humanity, as the main goal of human being, means going beyond the ordinary situation, striving for transcendence, to freely constructing consciousness. Considering the leading humanistic concepts such as “education”, “judgment”, “common sense”, “liking”; the German philosopher, the founder of philosophical hermeneutics *Hans-Georg Gadamer* (1976; 2008) came to the conclusion of cultural and historical conditionality of understanding, knowledge human (p. 94). This approach shapes other anthropological grounds; a person is understood here as conditioned by a traditionally changing. Accordingly, humanism is defined through a system of such principles relating to man, as: self-realization, self-existence, self-expression, and self-creation, self-determination, which have a cultural and historical character.

The notion of humanism as self-determination and creation is inherent in existentialism as a humanism form. These principles are borne out by the

French philosopher, Nobel Prize winner *Jean-Paul Sartre* (1953; 2007), that man is responsible not only for his personality. He is responsible for all people (p. 21). The existential approach to the human being is to treat the person as they are, rather than as being brought to them from the outside. The idea of recognizing man as the highest value and self-worth was also developed by existentialism.

The Soviet-Russian philosopher of philosophy *Valerii Kuvakin* (2003) notes that in the modern world there is a point of view that humanism is inherently a part of the philosophical elite, of people with a high level of self-awareness, of the carriers of noble democrats (p. 114). The modern understanding of humanism is characterized by a high degree of recognition of another person's self-worth. According to the definition of the philosopher of culture *Vladimir Zhukotskii* (2006), humanism is an exceptional sense of measure, an ingenious point of absolute equilibrium between thought and the object of thought, between an idea and its embodiment. This is the point where one person meets another person and the two I form the perfect and, oddly enough, completely real moment of harmonious unity (p. 38). The memory of such a moment and the ability to reproduce it over and over again form the true beginning and path of humanistic humanity and humanistic management.

The idea of becoming an ontological human personality is inherent in the synergistic paradigm. However, a person in a synergistic paradigm is an open system that interacts with other dissipative systems in the evolutionary process. Hence the focus is on solving the problems of all human systems, the focus on the good of humanity. Thus, the synergistic understanding of man leads to the dominance in the humanism system of the good of humanity as concern and participation (Fuller, 1982, pp. 721-722). In addition, people should look at their activities from the human point of view, from the standpoint of the relationship between society and nature. Synergetic generates the principle of equivalence and equivalence of all components of the evolutionary process: human, society and nature, which enriches the conceptual framework of modern humanism and humanistic management.

Recognizing as humanistic values the principles of self-fulfillment, self-realization, and acquisition of one's own existence is peculiar to anthropological thought. The modern European philosophical and anthropological paradigm gives the idea that the preservation of human life, the creation of conditions for self-realization, for the assertion of dignity of the person are the main principles of humanism. An example of such a humanistic paradigm is the concept of human potential, which is based on the following postulates: the goal of sociocultural development is a person, expanding the field of its possibilities in free self-determination, in creativity (Fowler, 1999). At the

same time, the criterion of socio-cultural development is not the development of science and technology, but the person, the level and the extent of its capabilities in creative self-realization, in the management of social relations.

The humanistic concept of human potential is oriented towards the realization of humanistic principles in all kinds of human activity, including in management. Accordingly, we can talk about the formation of this kind of humanism, which sees its purpose not so much in the justification of humanity of man, the justification of his desire for his existence, but in the explication of the conditions of the person's purpose, its essence. We should agree with the English scientist *Julian Huxley* (1986), who believes that today humanism can be called a special scientific worldview, and everyday human activity and management, which correlate with it (p. 167).

Another aspect of the comprehension of humanism is given by its juxtaposition with the concept of humanity. There are a number of points of view regarding the relation between the concepts of “humanism” and “humanity”. Usually, one group of scientists puts a sign of equality between the concepts of humanism and humanity (Finogentov, 2009; Gurevich, 2018; Givishvili, 2009; Voronkova, 2010; et al.). For the other group, a characteristic understanding of humanity as an inherent positive trait of doing good, responsive, and caring towards people, etc. (Kudishina, 2005; Kuvakin, 2003; Lytvynov, 2000; Zhukotskii, 2006; et al.). Whereas humanism is understood as enhancing this natural ability to the level of human consciousness, and transforming it into a reasonable humanity. Thus, as shown, the essential features of humanism as a philosophical category and sociocultural phenomenon of management are historical in nature, suggesting an analysis of specific historical forms of humanism and humanistic paradigms.

The diversity of humanistic ideas creates certain difficulties for their analysis and identification of the socio-cultural conditionality of this or that type of humanism and humanistic management. In modern historical-philosophical and scientific studies there is a tradition of isolation of different types, forms of manifestation of the humanistic idea. Different approaches to solving this problem we find in the works of Martin Heidegger (1956; 1996), Julian Huxley (1986), Corliss Lamont (1991), Valerii Kuvakin (2003), Anna Kudishina (2005), Paul Kurtz (2007) and others. However, these approaches are so different that it is difficult to bring them together to solve the problem of systematic construction of types of humanism and humanistic management. Most likely, a rigid formalization of such a typology is impossible, but it seems possible to distinguish common formative types: Western and Eastern.

The Eastern type of humanism and humanistic management is the humanism of Eastern religious-philosophical conceptualizations. The Eastern humanism is characterized by the following features: appeal to a person's idea

of his nature; subordination to God, system, or ritual; the inability to understand man as the “center of the universe”; a certain shift of reference points from humanism to humanity as a socio-cultural category, non-violence; the absence of the possibility of individualization and personalization in the team, the presence of features of impersonal unity.

American researchers *Leslie Stevenson* and *David Haberman* in their monumental work “Ten Theories of Human Nature Third Edition” (1974; 2004) describe in detail the features of Eastern humanism. First of all, it is the subordination of the Fate, which cannot be changed or subordinated to itself, and the Heavenly Commandment, which, though difficult, but can still be conceived by man (p. 23). This is very important, because if one realizes that the material goods of life depend on Destiny, then they will realize the futility of pursuing them and will direct all their efforts to the attainment of heavenly morality.

The contemplative humanism of the East is a set of principles that is the embodiment of the oriental mindset inherent in the unity of man and nature. Man and nature in the Eastern Indo-Buddhist, Taoist worldview are the embodiment of a single spiritual entity. This conception of man is the cornerstone of the Oriental worldview, including Oriental humanism and Oriental humanistic management, when systems of principles about the human essence, the conditions for the realization of this essence are formed through the prism of unity of man and nature, human involvement in the natural and, moreover, in the social world.

If we consider humanistic worldviews related to Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism, despite the significant differences, a feature that unites them is the lack of emphasis on personalization, isolation or opposition to society and nature. Primary harmony between man and nature, between man and society is disturbed when people think of personal gain, not the good of the motherland, break the connection between word and deed, and become unfriendly to other people.

Another prerequisite for the formation of humanism and humanistic management within the Eastern world is the value of the ritual and its strict submission to it. Ritual is something of value, cementing a standard norm, passed down from generation to generation and striving for the overriding goal of replacing the personal interests of man with the interests of public, state or even space.

In ancient Chinese philosophy, humanistic principles were formed in accordance with the principles of the Confucian Code, which stated: let a father be a father, son is son, subject is subject, and statesman is statesman. At the same time, reverence for the elders, dedication to the homeland combined with law-abidingness and ideas about the need to accept the traditions of society with an “open heart”.

Given that by their nature all people are equal and their differences are inherent in their habits and characters, the ancient Chinese philosopher *Confucius* (5th cent. BC; 1997) associates humanism with the principle of “ren”. “Ren” is a moral law that is the pinnacle of human dignity, human in human. The thinker is convinced that people can quite conquer it. “The teacher said: is humanity so inaccessible? All you have to do just want it and it is right there” (p. 49). The very essence of a perfect person is thus a benevolent heart. Confucius regretfully notes that this virtue is a rarity in the world: “I have never met a person who would find humanity attractive” (p. 86). Therefore, potential social harmony is replaced in reality by discord.

In addition, the definition of “ren” has another meaning: “To restrain oneself in order to meet the requirements of ritual in all things is humanity” (ibid, p. 87). Researchers at the fundamental principles of Confucianism, *Leslie Stevenson* and *David Haberman* (1974; 2004) note the achievement of humanity as the main goal of human life: “Humanity is the only worthy goal of life. Confucius argued for the comprehension of the essence of both Heavenly Commandment and Destiny, but for various reasons. The commandment of Heaven is the true object of the highest interest, while the Fate must be courageously accepted” (p. 28). The same is the purpose of a moral person who lives by the laws of social morality. Although Confucius did not give any detailed definition of human nature, he insisted that humans are essentially the same. All differences between people, according to the ideas of Eastern thinkers, come from a different lifestyle.

Confucius's thesis about the human (natural) basis of man as his kindness, about the innate humanity of man is developed by his disciple *Mencius* (4th cent. BC; 2016), who is called the “second sage”. In his treatise on kindness, he writes: “Wherever water flows, it always flows down. So is a man – he always strives for good” (p. 62). The idea of Mencius is that a person’s innate desire for good is manifested in compassion, a sense of shame and indignation over evil, a sense of rightness or wrongness in his actions, and a desire for justice.

This conception of the person’s essence is supplemented by the evil conception as the immanent person’s essence and the neutrality of human nature. *Gao Tzu* (5th cent. BC) writes: “Nature (human) is like a thundering stream of water: you will open it the way to the east and it will flow to the east, it will flow to the west. Human nature is not divided into good and bad, just as water does not distinguish between east and west in its current” (Fung, 2017, p. 54). *Sun Tzu* (5th cent. BC) claims that man is inherently evil. It is natural for man to strive for the “desire for profit and lust” (ibid, p. 69), with which he is born.

Thus, one can speak about a specific form of humanism and the humanism of Eastern religious-philosophical teachings, which, as well as the Western

philosophical tradition, is characterized by the formation of ideas about the person's essence as a combination or the presence in it of three qualities: positive, negative and neutral.

The principle of collective responsibility for what is happening, the departure from the cult of one's individuality towards collective well-being is characteristic of the Shinto mentality of the Japanese management culture. An example of the embodiment of the value of collectivism in this culture is the following mechanism: the selection of candidates for work in a Japanese firm is considered not the individual talent, not the ability to original thinking, but the opportunity to adapt to the climate of the collective of the firm, to adopt its traditions, its principles of work. The human individual is a brick in the wall of the nation – such a characteristic feature of the Japanese consciousness, which is a conglomerate of ideas about the unity of the nation in order to achieve the goal.

One of the most prominent physicists of the twentieth century, the Nobel Prize winner *Albert Einstein* (1940; 2012) said: “The religion of the future will be the cosmic religion. It will have to overcome the concept of God as a person, as well as avoid dogmas and theologies. Embracing both nature and spirit, it will be based on the religious feeling that arises from the experience of the meaningful unity of all things, they are natural and spiritual. If there is a religion that can meet modern scientific needs, it is Buddhism” (p. 89). Buddhism proposes that the individual find freedom in the inner, not the outer world, to attain enlightenment by acquiring nirvana. Orientalist *Otton Rosenberg* (1991) writes: “The truth is one, but different people have to say it in different words, the path to truth is not the same for everyone. And Buddhism does not insist on the path, only to achieve the goal” (p. 184).

One of the essential components of Buddhism is the conception of the predominance of spiritual riches over the material, the liberation from lust, slander, unnecessary fuss and other flaws. In this way, spiritual liberation becomes the humanistic norm and manifestation of the person's essence. In Buddhism, with its contemplative perception of the world, the main conceptual feature is the principle of getting out of the chain of suffering by attaining nirvana as the pinnacle of spiritual perfection. A person in Buddhism should be free from psychological experiences, suffering and perceive everything calmly, with a pure heart. In Buddhist philosophy, like Confucianism, human qualities such as charity, kindness, and tolerance occupy the first place, and there is absolutely no room for personification of man, for raising him above himself to be similar to that of Western consciousness. Warrior, conqueror, conqueror of nature, Europeans and observers, patient and peaceful Buddhist there are two completely different attitudes to the world.



The active nature of Western humanism is at odds with Buddhism, and at the same time sees Buddhism as a source of escape from the spiritual crisis. But Buddhism has rice and is incompatible with the active aspect of humanism – humility in the face of suffering that a person must patiently endure in this life, without changing anything in it, which does not allow calling Eastern humanism active. Thus, a sense of impending doom fate and the inability to change things in this life that is typical of the Buddhist mentality manifests itself in humility regarding death as the end of the next cycle of rebirth. This is all the drama of Eastern humanism. One elaborate and contradictory tangle blended the beautiful Buddhist theory of Ahimsa (not to the detriment of all living things) and complete submission to its karma as the law of rebirth.

A humble attitude towards life and taking power over yourself is also characteristic of the Indian culture based on the Vedas with their inability to get out of their social state. But one should not accept the oriental perception of human nature as something “anti-individual”, suppressed by the public interest. An ancient Indian poet and philosopher *Kalidasa* (4th cent. BC; 2006) noted that “a person stands up to full height when she or he realizes the virtues and value of life” (p. 381).

Multicultural interaction with the world community has somewhat changed the traditional perception of the East about the place of suffering and compassion in human life. Thus, the idea that emerges from the idea of the need for social compassion, which means a departure from the traditional contemplation of Eastern humanism. An understanding is formed that compassion is above the law of karma.

The concept of Oriental humanism shapes the principles of maximum nonviolence and unity as the determining conditions for the realization of man's essence, as the principles of relation to man and the world. It was it what became the methodological basis of a policy of “silent” rebellion, suggesting non-violent counteraction. Today, such principles of Eastern humanism as tolerance, humanity, charity, tolerance are especially relevant for the multicultural world, for cultural communication, for managing the life of society.

In addition, Oriental contemplation, as a principle of harmony with the world, became the basis for other humanistic concepts, which stood out in independent directions of humanistic thought in various cultural and historical forms of philosophizing and managing the people's life. The contemplative component of humanism aims not at conquering and changing the world, but at the wise use of the space around it.

Contemplative humanism can be seen as a component of modern humanistic concepts, contributing to a certain harmonization of man, in one

way or another, weakening the sense of existential discontent and alienation characteristic of the European culture.

Western humanism begins to take shape in ancient culture with its inherent cult of beautiful human physicality and intellectualism, which means a cult of intellectual pursuit unrelated to practical benefit, a cult of individual improvement and, at the same time, service to the Fatherland. Ancient humanism is formed as the embodiment of the mental foundations of ancient culture, which determine the high position of man as a free citizen, preferring to engage in science, philosophy, gymnastics, and military affairs. According to the opinion of the Russian researcher of ancient socio-cultural reality *Aleksej Losev* (1989) and a number of other scholars, the original ideas of humanism (which later found a place in the European humanist tradition) were formed under the influence of the ideas of the Sophists and Socrates, which changed the course of anti-centric thought the side of anthropocentrism.

The ancient Greek philosopher *Plato* (4th cent. BC; 2018) observed that the Protagoras sophist, substantiating the thesis of man as “the measure of all things”, that is, the measure of truth, morality, utility, good, emphasizes the centrality of man in the system of ancient values, which causes the appeal to a more detailed study of the human essence (p. 234). Realizing this anthropological turn, the teacher *Plato Socrates* sees the purpose of man in self-knowledge, in the affirmation of reason, virtue (p. 47), as an ontological characteristic of man, his humanity.

The humanism principles are clearly traced in the culture of the Greek polis. Here, a person deprived of virtue was considered wicked and savage. Therefore, *Paideia*'s education has been central to this culture. It is, according to ancient thinkers, distinguished man from an animal free from slaves, a philosopher from the mob. Education was associated with all sides of the policy's life, with the formation of social traits and, according to the views of the ancient Greek philosopher-encyclopedic *Aristotle* (4th cent. BC; 2004), is one of the most important conditions of happiness for all members of society (p. 58). *Plato* (4th cent. BC; 2018), however, regarded “*Paideia*” as a revelation of the ontological essence of man, making it a way of discovering true being, a way of philosophizing.

A similar understanding of the humanistic consciousness of antiquity is expressed in the judgment of the ancient Greek writer *Lucian* (2th cent. AD; 2016) that the state should strive “for citizens to be beautiful in soul and strong in body: for it is these people who live well together in peacetime and during the war they save the state and protect its freedom and happiness” (p. 97).

Humanism, in the aspect of its functioning as a system of regulators in the management of human activity, remains a necessary and essential aspect

of Roman consciousness. At the same time, if the Greek philosophical tradition substantiated the ideal of “Paideia”, then Roman culture emphasizes the need to reconcile individual and social values, which was conditioned by such a mental basic principle of Roman cultural and historical consciousness as practical’s.

It should be noted that the Roman socio-cultural reality is characterized by the formation of an individualizing background. For the first time the Roman philosopher *Seneca* (64; 2017) focuses on the person’s inner world, the service of the mind. It is in reflection that a person comes to the need for reasonable mercy, responsibility to himself (p. 388). These principles were formed both spontaneously and as a result of philosophical understanding of society by ancient consciousness.

The practice of implementing the principles of humanism presupposes the need for education as a basis for the formation of appropriate humanistic principles. Humanistic ideas inherent in the social morals and ethics of ancient thinkers were later used by humanists and enlighteners of later eras – the Renaissance and Modern Times.

The affirmation of a new socio-cultural context, of the Christian worldview, leads to a new anthropological shift and, accordingly, a new modification of humanism, which becomes another typological cultural-historical form of Western humanism.

Today, the problem of identifying the role of religion in shaping the humanistic ideas of the West remains relevant. Philosophical reflections on the place of religion can be distributed on a scale from religious (Christian) humanism, which assumes the deterministic role of religious consciousness in the formation of humanistic principles to the complete denial of such a role, which is represented in various directions of philosophical thought.

Christianity defines man as the image and likeness of God. God is the focus of all spiritual perfection, so the idea of man as an image of God sets the desire for Truth, Beauty and Good as transcendental absolutes. God represents eternal perfection; man is the likeness of perfection. Love, goodness, mercy are as the basis of human relation to other people become the basis of Christian humanism.

The principles of philanthropy, compassion, charity, which are embedded in Christianity, they are intrinsically linked to the concept of humanity that is included in our conception of humanism itself. American philosopher, one of the few globally recognized theorists of humanism, *Paul Kurtz* (2007), finds in Christianity a particular sphere of grand, figurative, emotional perception, the embodiment of poetry of good and aesthetic inspiration, the dramatic expression of our existential hopes and faith (p. 52).

Christianity embodies the morality principles and morality, which are transmitted through concepts such as humanity and mercy, tolerance and courage, love and gratitude, honesty and justice, and other signs of human humanity. Man in essence is the embodiment of the desire for transcendence. The soul of man is the design of God about man, so it is inherently inherent in the desire for God, the knowledge of God, the knowledge of one's soul through God. In particular, this understanding of the relationship between God and man is peculiar to *Nikolai Berdiaev* (1952): “Higher humanity is laid down in Christianity because it relies on godliness and Christian personalist, on the recognition of the highest value of every human personality” (p. 137). Contemporary Russian philosopher and cultural researcher *Pavel Gurevich* (2018) is convinced that the true homeland of humanism is Christianity, since it is “Christianity that has established a personal tradition in European culture, focusing on a vibrant, sensitive, sensitive, thinking personality. Christianity created the will of her thoughts, her feelings, and then we can talk about a humanistic worldview” (p. 351).

Christianity plays a decisive role in shaping strategies for the realization of man's essence. “Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Matthew, 5:48) i “So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets” (Matthew, 7:12) – fundamental theories of Christian morality, outlined in *Gospel of Matthew* (1st cent. AD; 2011). The Christian model of humanism is based on the understanding of man as the unity of two principles: carnal and spiritual. The soul is that which God breathed into man and gave him a share of himself. Thus, in every person there is a part of the Creator. Considering the purpose of human life's conscious desire to follow the laws of high morality, identifying them with the moral teachings of Jesus Christ, one's personal ideals and actions must conform to the moral laws of the common good, which eliminates the selfish narrowness of personal or group interests.

A new vision of humanistic principles contrary to Christianity was formed in the Age of Enlightenment under the influence of socio-cultural reality with its inherent recognition of the rule of human reason and natural human rights, the equality of all not before the law of God, but before the human.

In the XVIII century there was a rethinking of the Christianity basic concepts. French Enlightenment philosophers Diderot (1746; 2013), Rousseau (1750; 2019), d'Holbach (1756; 2008), Voltaire (1765; 2017) clearly linked humanism to materialism and atheism, proving the failure of Christianity, which, in their view, served as a church and state power instrument of domination over the ignorant people. Humanity, humanity of man is, according to humanists of the Enlightenment, in a natural way to the kind of suffering of his own kind and in natural benevolence.

*Denis Diderot* (1746; 2013) believed in the possibility of human knowledge that would help him “spread his wings” as soon as he could get rid of the armor that shackles him – religion and fear that eats into his soul before being punished in the form of a terrible judgment. “Take away the fear of hell from the Christian, and you will take away his faith!” (p. 683), – radically tuned Diderot.

According to *Paul-Henri d'Holbach* (1756; 2008), “Christianity became a religion of the poor because it proclaimed a poor God; the poor have preached this religion to the poor and ignorant, which is in keeping with the spirit of these miserable and unhappy people” (p. 239). The Enlightenment maintained that man would never be free until God expelled him from his thinking and mind. They believed that as long as one believes in mysticism, he can neither know the world nor master it. Instead of science and happiness, it will only become slavery, poverty and ignorance.

The ideas of liberation from religion were embodied in the social practice of the era of the French Revolution by attempting to replace the Christian religion with the cult of Reason. At the same time, social practices were accompanied by carnivals, parades, coercion of priests to renounce the dignity, churches looting. This is how the contradiction between the theory and practice of humanism turned out to be a precedent for militant atheism.

Further development of the tradition of radical free thinking is made by the German philosopher *Ludwig Feuerbach* (1841; 2018), in accordance with his anthropological concept of the materialistic origin of religious consciousness. According to this conception, the gods give rise to the fear of man against the forces of nature, the social forces on which his existence depends. In its turn, fear is caused by human needs of well-being, happiness. Recognizing the great importance of religion, it identifies true (anthropological) and false (theological) religions.

The humanist conception of the Enlightenment has been sharply challenged by representatives of Christianity. Orthodox theologian *Alexander Men* (2018) writes that “Rousseau has developed his concept of the perfection of human nature, which is distorted by the growth of urban civilization. The “natural man” was declared a martyr in need of release. As soon as he or she removes the burden of conditioning, his or her life will blossom in all its splendor and grandeur. The French Revolution (the brainchild of Rousseau) proclaimed its religion a brotherhood of people and hoped for a change in the social order to give the world the desired freedom and happiness. But in practice, as in other similar cases, the brotherhood turned into terror” (p. 211).

At the beginning of the XX century there was a split of free thinking and atheism. On the one hand, various forms of atheism are formed: fascism

and Bolshevism, on the other hand there is secular humanism, which tends to agnosticism, rationalism, indifferentism, skepticism and tolerance towards believers. The latest trend is mainly related to European social democracy and liberalism (Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2018a).

During the post-war period, official ideology in the USSR continued to restrict the activities of religious organizations, but gradually incorporated Christian principles and virtues into their positions. According to historians, the “Moral Code of the Builder of Communism” was created on the basis of Christian commandments, the principles of which were repeatedly rethought, reformulated, but retained their conceptual basis (Vishniakov, 1965).

Post-Soviet socio-historical reality marked by the return of religious-humanistic values. However, it is accompanied by a general and uncritical denial of the values of Soviet culture. Among them humanistic values were recognized: mutual aid and mutual assistance, collectivism, belief in science and scientific and technological progress as the basis for building a society of equality and prosperity. These values were the regulators of the way of life of the Soviet people, the basis of an optimistic attitude towards the future, confidence in the reach of a bright future. At the same time, this did not prevent the authoritarian, atheistic Soviet state from suppressing freedom of conscience, persecuting the faithful and the clergy.

The democratic upsurge, many processes that took place during the perestroika and early 1990s, despite great economic difficulties and growing chaos, were marked by feelings of “repentance”. In this way, a cultural and psychological basis was prepared to move to the next stage of evolution in the relationship between religion and humanism in Ukraine.

The modern period of humanism development in Ukraine is characterized by the restoration of forgotten or forbidden pages of the national culture. First of all, the phenomenon of the so-called Spiritual or Religious Renaissance, aimed at criticizing the traditional idea of humanism of the Enlightenment, as well as Marxism, salvation for the renewal of the Gospel understanding of man, combining the liberal idea of freedom, creativity and dignity of personality with personality.

Christian humanism, forming the principles of relation to man, performs a significant regulatory and managerial function, setting the existential intentions of human existence, forming the sphere of spirit that becomes a condition for human existence, save it from the tribulations of the world, various forms of evil, both social and ideological and actually cultural. This applies above all to the values proclaimed by postmodernism as one of the newest forms of nihilism. Destroying both secular and religious systems of values, he leads to the erosion of the invariants of humanism, the deconstruction of universal

humanistic universals, to the crisis of humanism, the humanity crisis. The answer of religious humanism is a return to God, to religiosity. For the religious consciousness, it always comes with the understanding that the possibility of a post-modern human being to emerge from an existential crisis is possible only through God and his grace.

#### **4. Conclusions and discussion**

Appeal to the problem of humanism due to its large impact on the evolution of cultural and historical reality and a significant place in the management of society. Humanism is invariant in the search for the meaning of human existence, which is seen, above all, in the acquisition by man of his essence, humanity, and it is historical, since it is culturally conditioned by the understanding of the ontology of man, his humanity.

1. Humanism is a philosophical category and sociocultural phenomenon in the management of society, a system of ideas about humanity and conditions of its acquisition, which are specific-historical in nature and determined by anthropological and mental values of a cultural and historical reality.

2. Humanism as a worldview paradigm in management manifests its socio-cultural content in two ways: as an open system of values and as a toolkit for analyzing social reality in order to find the possibility or need to change social and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, humanism as a criterion for evaluating any social action is a component of virtually any management system and morality.

3. Humanism as a sociocultural phenomenon of management is realized through the objectification of its values in order to construct a humane society. The latter, in turn, is a condition for solving various ontological, axiological and pragmatic problems of human life. This creates a system of direct and inverse relationships between humanism and social practice (management).

4. Humanistic paradigms, moving from the sphere of theorizing to the practical plane, the plane of socio-cultural reality, management, become the methodology and practice of forming an effective social practice in various spheres of society.

5. Features of humanism interpretation in two aspects are as a philosophical category and socio-cultural phenomenon of management are interrelated, due to specific cultural and historical content. In the modern era, the problem of humanism is increasingly turning into the social plane. At the same time, the expert function of humanism grows, determining the correspondence of the quality of real relations between people, between man and the world in the whole humanistic norms, ideals of man and society of a particular era.

6. On the basis of historical-philosophical and comparative analysis, the two most common cultural-historical types of humanism and humanistic management have been identified: Eastern and Western.

6.1. Oriental, contemplative type of humanism refers to the humanism of Eastern religious-philosophical conceptualizations. It is characterized by: appealing to the idea of man about his nature; subordination to God, system, or ritual; the inability to understand man as the “center of the universe”; a certain shift of the orientations from humanism to humanity, non-violence; the absence of the possibility of individualization and personalization in the team, the presence of features of impersonal unity.

6.2. Western, active type of humanism, formed in line with the European cultural and historical philosophical tradition, characterized by the idea of a high position of man in society, the idea of anthropocentrism, the idea of free being, recognizing the high value of individuality and the possibility of realizing such immanent expressions of human needs, as self-creation, the acquisition of authenticity.

7. Contemplative humanism in the context of globalization can be seen as a potential component of active humanism, which finds its place in the latest forms of modern humanistic worldview. The installations of contemplative humanism become a platform for the development of environmental and noospheric humanism and humanistic management.

8. The use of the synthesis potential of Western and Eastern humanism becomes, for the globalizing world, a methodology of modernization processes in all spheres of socio-cultural reality. At the same time, an essential principle of this methodology is the idea of the co-evolution of all systems, their humanistic nature.

*Scientific novelty of the research results* is to deepen the understanding of the humanism essence as a philosophical category and sociocultural phenomenon in the management of society, as contradictory unity and mutual struggle of various humanistic opposites in the context of changing civilizational cycles, cultural and cultural differences.

*The practical significance of the obtained results* is manifested in the possibility of their use in the management activities of society, as well as in the addition of scientific theory and philosophy of humanistic management with new provisions on humanism as the basis of modern management system.

*Prospects for further scientific exploration in this direction* may be to justify a special state program that will provide intensive development of research in the field of humanistic management, creation of mechanisms of active human protection, society humanization, moral improvement, intellectual, mental health of the individual and society in general.



## Acknowledgement

This publication has been made in accordance with the theme of the Research Institute of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts within the theme: “Formation of the modern paradigm of management of socio-cultural activity in the context of civilization development” (the Project #0118U100544).

## References:

- Amonashvili, Sh. A. (2018). *Pesn' Velikoi Liubvi. Voin sveta. Tysiachu let spustia [Song of Great Love. Warrior of Light. A Thousand Years Later]*. Moscow: Svet (in Russ.).
- Aquinas, Th. (1273; 2010). *Summa Theologica* (Trans. in Lat.). Washington: Coyote Canyon Press.
- Aristotle (4th cent. BC; 2004). *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Trans. in ancient Greek). London: Penguin Classics.
- Atalay, B. (2014). *Math and the Mona Lisa: The Art and Science of Leonardo da Vinci*. Washington: Smithsonian Books.
- Augustinus, A. (398; 2015). *Confessions [Confessiones]*. Woodbridge: Gorette Publications (in Lat.).
- Baldwin, D., & Migneault, R. (1996). *Humanistic Management by Teamwork*. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited.
- Baudrillard, J. (2010). *The Agony of Power*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Berdiaev, N. A. (1952). *Ekzistentsial'naia dialektika bozhestvennogo i chelovecheskogo [The Existential Dialectic of the Divine and the Human]*. Paris: Ymca-Press (in Russ.).
- Boethius, A. (524; 1999). *The Consolation of Philosophy* (Trans. in Lat.). London: Penguin Classics.
- Bostrom, N. (2010). *Anthropic Bias*. London: Routledge.
- Campanella, T. (1602; 2006). *The City of the Sun*. Sydney: Read How You Want.
- Camus, A. (1935; 2008). *Christian Metaphysics and Neoplatonism* (Trans. in Fr.). Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Cangemi, J. P. (1980). *Effective Management, a Humanistic Perspective*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Chaadaev, P. Ya. (1831; 2011). *Filosofskie pis'ma [Philosophical Letters]*. Moscow: Rimi (in Russ.).
- Christ, K. (1990). *Neue Profile der alten Geschichte [Novelty Profile of old History]*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (in Germ.).
- Confucius (5th cent. BC; 1997). *The Analects of Confucius (Lun Yu)* (Trans. in ancient China). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cusa, N. (1440; 2016). *Learned Ignorance or Docta Ignorantia* (Trans. in Lat.). Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Deliagin, M. G. (2003). *Mirovoi krizis. Obshchaia teoriia globalizatsii [World Crisis. The General Theory of Globalization]*. Moscow: Infra-M (in Russ.).
- Dergachev, V. A. (2005). *Globalistika [Globalistics]*. Moscow: Iuniti-Dana (in Russ.).

- Descartes, R. (1641; 1999). *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy* (Trans. in Fr.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- d'Holbach, P.-H. (1756; 2008). *Christianity Unveiled by Baron d'Holbach* (Trans. in Fr.). London: Hodgson Press.
- Diderot, D. (1746; 2013). *Oeuvres Philosophiques [Philosophical Works]*. Paris: French and European Publications Inc (in Fr.).
- Einstein, A. (1940; 2012). *Einstein on Cosmic Religion and Other Opinions and Aphorisms*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Feuerbach, L. (1841; 2018). *The essence of Christianity* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: HardPress.
- Finogentov, V. N. (2009). *Religiozniy renessans ili filosofiya gumanizma? Mirovozzrencheskii vybor sovremennoi kul'tury [Religious Renaissance or Philosophy of Humanism? Worldview choice of Modern Culture]*. Moscow: URSS (in Russ.).
- Follett, M. P. (1942; 2014). *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. Eastford: Martino Fine Books.
- Fowler, J. D. (1999). *Humanism: Beliefs and Practices (Beliefs & Practices)*. London: Sussex Academic Press.
- Frank, S. L. (1930; 1992). *Dukhovnye osnovy obshchestva [The Spiritual Foundations of Society]*. Moscow: Respublika (in Russ.).
- Frankl, V. E. (1947; 2006). *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Friedman, Th. L. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fromm, E. (1968; 2010). *The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology*. New York: Lantern Books.
- Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st century*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Fuller, B. R. (1982). *Synergetics: Explorations in the Geometry of Thinking*. New York: Macmillan Pub Co.
- Fung, Yu. (2017). *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy: A Systematic Account of Chinese Thought from Its Origins to Present Day*. New York: Free Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1976; 2008). *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (Trans. in Germ.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Givishvili, G. V. (2009). *Filosofiya gumanizma [The Philosophy of Humanism]*. Moscow: Pokolenie (in Russ.).
- Gurevich, P. S. (2018). *Klassicheskaya i neklassicheskaya antropologiya: sravnitel'nyi analiz [Classical and Non-Classical Anthropology: A Comparative Analysis]*. Moscow, St. Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ, Petroglif (in Russ.).
- Habermas, J. (2003). *The Future of Human Nature*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Häggglund, B. (2007). *History of Theology*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing.
- Hancock, J. (2019). *Applied Humanism: How to Create More Effective and Ethical Businesses*. New York: Business Expert Press.
- Hegel, G. (1837; 2004). *The Philosophy of History* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Dover Publications.

- Heidegger, M. (1956; 1996). *The Principle of Reason*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hobbes, Th. (1651; 2014). *Leviathan*. London: Wordsworth Editions.
- Honnacker, A. (2018). *Pragmatic Humanism Revisited: An Essay on Making the World a Home*. London: Palgrave Pivot.
- Huxley, Ju. (1986). *Essays of a Humanist*. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Jaspers, K. (1949; 2016). *The Origin and Goal of History* (Trans. in Germ.). London: Routledge.
- Juergensmeyer, M. (2013). *Thinking Globally*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kalidasa (4th cent. BC; 2006). *The Recognition of Shakuntala* (Trans. in San.). New York: Clay Sanskrit.
- Kant, I. (1785; 2008). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (Trans. in Germ.). Washington: Wilder Publications.
- Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2019). Irrational Concept of Management Education. *Theoretical and Applied Aspects of the Development of Modern Psychology and Pedagogy*. Lviv-Torun: Liha-Pres, 101-119.
- Kremen', V. H. (2018). *Filosofiiia liudynotsentryzmu v osvith'omu prostori [Philosophy of Human-Centrism in the Educational Space]*. Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy (in Ukr.).
- Kudishina, A. A. (2005). *Gumanizm – fenomen sovremennoi kul'tury [Humanism is a Phenomenon of Modern Culture]*. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt (in Russ.).
- Kulish, P. A. (1879). *Khutorskaia filosofiiia i udalennaia ot sveta poeziiia [Farm Philosophy and Poetry far from the World]*. St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za (in Russ.).
- Kurtz, P. (2007). *What is Secular Humanism?* New York: Prometheus.
- Kuvakin, V. A. (2003). *In search of Our Humanity*. Amherst: Prometheus Books.
- Lamont, C. (1991). *Yes to Life*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Lektorskii, V. A. (2018). *Chelovek i kul'tura [Man and Culture]*. St. Petersburg: SPbGUP (in Russ.).
- Locke, J. (1690; 2014). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Lomonosov, M. V. (1765; 2011). *O sokhranenii russkogo naroda [On the Preservation of the Russian People]*. Moscow: Institut russkoi tsivilizatsii (in Russ.).
- Losev, A. F. (1989). *Istoriia antichnoi filosofii v konspektivnom izlozhenii [History of Ancient Philosophy in a Concise Statement]*. Moscow: Mysl' (in Russ.).
- Lucian (2th cent. AD; 2016). *Lucian* (Vol. 1) (Trans. in ancient Greek). London: Palala Press.
- Lytvynov, V. (2000). *Renesansnyj humanizm v Ukraini [Renaissance Humanism in Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Osnovy (in Ukr.).
- Martynshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2017). *Menedzhment doindustrial'noho suspil'stva: teoriia, istoriia, kul'tura ta mystetstvo upravlinnia [Management of Preindustrial Society: Theory, History, Culture and Art of Management]*. Bila Tserkva: Publisher Pshonkivskyy O. V. (in Ukr.).

- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2018a). Formuvannia suchasnoi systemy upravlinnia zhyttiedial'nistiu suspil'stva [Formation of the Modern System Management of Life Society]. *Visnyk Kyivs'koho natsional'noho universytetu kul'tury i mystetstv. Seriya: Menedzhment sotsiokul'turnoi diial'nosti* [Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity], 1, 7-24, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.1.2018.143383> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2018b). *Mystetstvo upravlinnia j osviti tekhnologii pidhotovky menedzheriv sotsiokul'turnoi diial'nosti* [Art of Management and Educational Technologies of Preparation of Managers of Social and Cultural Activity]. Bila Tserkva: Publisher Pshonkivskij O. V. (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2016). Tsyvilizatsiia u tochtsi bifurkatsii: zarodzhennia novoho sotsialnogo poriadku i suchasnoi modeli upravlinnia politychnoiu, ekonomichnoiu ta sotsiokul'turnoiu sferamy [Civilization at the Point of Bifurcation: the Emergence of a New Social Order and the Modern Model of Management of Political, Economic and Socio-Cultural Spheres]. *Ekonomika i menedzhment kul'tury* [Economy and Management of Culture], 1, 5-32 (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., Khlystun, E., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2019). The Cross-Cultural Communications in Business Trips: Statistical Measures in Coordinates of Ukraine. *Communications*, 21(4), 104-112.
- Matthew (1st cent. AD; 2011). *Evangelie ot Matfeia* [Gospel of Matthew] (Trans. in Synodal). Kharkiv: Folio (in Russ.).
- Mayo, E. (1945; 2008). *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London: Routledge.
- Men, A. (2018). *The Wellsprings of Religion*. Crestwood: St. Vladimirs Seminary.
- Mencius (4th cent. BC; 2016). *Mencius* (Trans. in ancient China). Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Moiseev, N. N. (1999). *Byt' ili ne byt' chelovechestvu? [To be or not to be Humanity?]*. Moscow: Ul'ianovskii Dom Pechati (in Russ.).
- More, Th. (1516; 2005). *Utopia*. Overland Park: Digireads.com.
- Nietzsche, F. (1888; 2017). *The Will to Power* (Trans. in Germ.). London: Penguin.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2019). *The Levelling: What's Next After Globalization*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Parsons, T. (1964; 2007). *Social Structure & Person*. New York: Free Press.
- Pinker, S. (2018). *Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*. New York: Viking.
- Pirson, M. (2017). *Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plato (4th cent. BC; 2018). *The Works of Plato* (Trans. in ancient Greek). New York: Independently Published.
- Rabinovich, V. L. (2008). *Chelovek v kul'ture: Vvedenie v metaforicheskuiu antropologiiu* [Man in Culture: An Introduction to Metaphorical Anthropology]. Moscow: Forum (in Russ.).

- Radishchev, A. N. (1809; 2001). *O cheloveke, ego smertnosti i bessmertii* [About Man, his Mortality and Immortality]. St. Petersburg: Piter (in Russ.).
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941; 2014). *Management and Morale*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1750; 2019). *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences* (Trans. in Fr.). Berwyn Heights: Heritage Books.
- Rozenberg, O. (1991). *Trudy po buddizmu* [Writings on Buddhism]. Moscow: Nauka (in Russ.).
- Sakharov, A. D. (1990). *Mir, progress, prava cheloveka* [Peace, Progress, Human Rights]. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel' (in Russ.).
- Sartre, J.-P. (1953; 2007). *Existentialism is a Humanism* (Trans. in Fr.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scheler, M. (1928; 2009). *The Human Place in the Cosmos* (Trans. in Germ.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Schweitzer, A. (1923; 1987). *The Philosophy of Civilization*. New York: Prometheus.
- Seneca, L. A. (64; 2017). *Letters on Ethics: To Lucilius* (Trans. in Lat.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Skovoroda, G. S. (1837). *Druzheskii razgovor o dushevnom mire* [Friendly Conversation about the Spiritual World]. Moscow: Tipografiia Reshetnikova (in Russ.).
- Sneyd, A. (2019). *Politics Rules: Power, Globalization and Development*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Solovyov, V. S. (1883; 2011). *Tri razgovora o voine, progresse, i kontse vseмирnoi istorii* [Three talk about War, Progress, and the end of World History]. Moscow: AST (in Russ.).
- Spinoza, B. (1662; 2003). *On the Improvement of the Understanding. The Ethics. Correspondence* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Dover Publications Inc.
- Stevenson, L. F., & Haberman, D. L. (1974; 2004). *Ten Theories of Human Nature Third Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sukhomlinskii, V. A. (1969; 2016). *Serditse ot daiu detiam* [I Give my Heart to Children]. Moscow: Kontseptual (in Russ.).
- Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1956). *Le Groupe Zoologique Humain* [Man's Place in Nature]. Paris: Albin Michel (in Fr.).
- Vernadsky, V. I. (1926; 2013). *The Biosphere and Noosphere*. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Vishniakov, A. S. (1965). *Moral'nyi kodeks stroitelia kommunizma* [Moral Code of the Builder of Communism]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury (in Russ.).
- Voltaire (1765; 2017). *La Philosophie de l'Histoire* [The Philosophy of History]. London: Forgotten Books (in Fr.).
- Voronkova, V. H. (2010). *Dekonstruktivna humanizmu v umovakh postmodernists'koi hlobalizatsii* [Deconstruction of Humanism in the Conditions of Postmodern Globalization]. Zaporozhye: ZDIA (in Ukr.).
- Zhukotskii, V. D. (2006). *Osnovy sovremennogo gumanizma: rossiiskii kontekst* [Fundamentals of Modern Humanism: the Russian Context]. Moscow: RGO (in Russ.).