

## *РОЗДІЛ II*

# Соціальна філософія та філософія історії

УДК 241.12:316

Alexander Durmanenko

### **Philosophical-social analyse of fears: ontogenesis, phylogenesis and theory of structuration**

The article analyzes the phenomenon of modern social risks and fears, as matches a certain state of social development.

**Key words:** social structure, fears, risks, ontogenesis, phylogenesis, structuration.

**Statement of the problem.** The present human society can be described by a large number of concepts representing its wide variety of fields. The dynamism of social life, economic instability, cultural transformation, processes of globalization and informatization and coexist with the crisis, convincingly testifies to the peculiarities of modernity, its inconsistency and ambiguity. The human desire to systematize leads to the interpretation of our time as a postindustrial, information society, of the postmodern epoch of late modernity or radical modernism, other, not less sonorous concepts. Without referring to the differences in each of the theories, as a joint can distinguish the understanding of the fact that at least the second half of the twentieth century is a unique and radically different from the past, and therefore is such that it requires rethinking the previous experience. Among the major signs of this distinction, we can certainly emphasize the avalanche-like growth of threats in the external environment and the actual unpreparedness of the individual to this, unreadiness to overcome that traditional ways – socialization and adaptation, it is almost impossible.

Sociology offers his own vision of the features of social processes and their impact on the individual. Similar approach is based on a combination of objective and personal items and emphasizes the existence of ambiguous relation between man and the community. A special place in this combination is allocated a term such as: the risks, dangers, social fear, and catastrophic consciousness, security of the individual and of some others. Actually, the novelty of this approach and is defined as interest precisely such a «dangerous» aspect of human society, and the social interpretation of habitual concepts.

We turn to this issue, given that the recent sociological theories, including the theory of structuration, in which the concept of ontological security of the individual is in fact a key, clearly indicates a dysfunction of a certain state at least the last hundred years. Rises appropriate question is why this period is particularly critical what is characterized by such crisis (if it available) and public manifestations it finds? We do not aim to clearly define and explore images fears that prevailed in the public consciousness and, therefore, in the consciousness of the individual at different stages of development of human civilization. The complexity and relative “youth” of such sociological researches inevitably would lead to excessive speculative character and the use of subjective conclusions.

Just to study images of fear “obsolescence” is extremely complex. It is need a spiritually and physically “belong” to a certain epoch, a concrete social environment, to feel it mood. Modernity from the beginning understood as a higher stage of development, in comparison with the previous epoch that is less developed. This is what explains the interpretation of modernity as a stage of “adult” humanity. It is well worth to remember that in a very short time, throughout history, we also considered as a part of the past, besides imperfect.

---

© Дурманенко А., 2016

Thus, the purpose of the article is to determine on the basis of the application of the basic principle of the theory of structuration to the problem of our research on the interdependence between the personal perceptions of risk - personal fears and social fears as to the attitude to risk of social consciousness. Last determining "the atmosphere" in the society, influence on the personality, to the same extent as the collection of personal views about threats to attitudes and shape public awareness of the risks and determine, relatively speaking, which is feared the people.

In our investigation, we do not aim to clearly describe the images and specifics of social risks and fears of today. Actually, the clear separation of terms is fairly difficult to adhere in exploring such subjective phenomena as risks, fears, their images. We proceed from a certain scheme, which consists of understanding the availability of a certain social risks, either real or imaginary threats on key aspects of human life in society. With the awareness of the members of the community to these risks, there is a feeling of fear, when determining the general characteristic of the public consciousness, the consciousness of a specific individual enters into certain images. Accordingly, the very existence of such images that come from your own, personal (due to close personal factors) awareness of the individual that was mentioned above risks, contributes to the general images of the fears of the public consciousness, thus ascertaining two-way communication without an explicit determination between individual and social, and finally, creating themselves images of risks. As we can see, the wide involvement of the staff of the phenomenological concepts leads to a certain kind of methodological difficulties which complicate the clarity and simplicity of the conclusions of our investigation. First of all, we seek to characterize modernity as a special state of human civilization, full of risks, negative thoughts and fears, however, which are quite usual for a man, and on the basis of the ideas of onto- and phylogenesis perception of risks to establish the reasons for such a situation.

To answer these questions, it is expedient, in our opinion, it would be appropriate to refer to the concepts of ontogenesis and phylogenesis in the processes of risk perception and sense of fear, as the answers to them. We apply the transformation of primary biogenetical Haeckel's law, according to which, every organic form in his personal development and complication that has the name – ontogeny, in a certain way, repeats the basic phases of the formation and complications appearance, in our case, the social – phylogenesis. Of course, this approach is vulnerable to criticism because we are not able to speak confidently about the state of public consciousness and especially about their "projection" on the individual "I" in the past [4].

However, it is understood that, first of all, pay attention to the present social, identified with the maturity of the human race. It is an appeal to the psychological theories clearly outlines the similarities of this age stage of development, which is characterized by a state, when "...the idol of the future changes on the real modern", contemporary quite utilitarian and self-valuable, with the last decades of the human civilization [6, p. 12].

Appeal to the theoretical masterpieces of our investigation problem demonstrates the ambiguity and complexity of both the interpretation and comprehension of the phenomena risk, fear and social fear and forms of individual reactions to various threats. Since the problem of fear, in various forms, throughout the history of civilization troubled man, it is clear that elements of philosophy, dedicated to it, we find in the works of each of the great thinkers and scientists. However, as we have already noted, you need to adapt these ideas to the needs of our study.

To mark off psychological researches, primarily paid attention to the personality, spiritual and psychic basis of fear, anxiety and various neuroses, addressing the socio-philosophical researches of the problem, note the relatively small number of works. So, first of all, highlight the work S. Krasikova relating to modern theories of risk, and also employment of their creators E. Giddensa, U. Beka, N. Lumana. Also, valuable, there are developments of M. Vitkovskoi and V. Andrusenka devoted to studying of features of social fears, V. Shlyapentoha – on effect, of social consciousness, V. Kuznyetsova – about the sociology of security V. Gryshayeva – about social risks and crises, and some others. However, each of the researchers focused on the specific characteristics of that, of course differ from our approach to social risks, fears and reactions to them.

Fear, as we have noted previously, it is firstly psychology negative painted an emotion that is a reaction to the imaginary or real danger. Despite some negative aspects of experience such a state that is possible in his absence, the fear has a number of positive functions. So, it activates the inner strength of the individual and prepares it for the adequate reactions to the situation. Also, fear is the regulator for the conduct both

individual and group, because the fear of a different sort of sanctions, giving rise to a conscious, voluntary social perception of coercion, provides integration and stability. Understanding under the sanctions set of actions is employed by the authorities for the management of subordinates, i.e. ensure they can perform the necessary social action, or the prevention of unwanted (that is generally characterized by the notion of coercion) because of the threat of punishment or a reward, we see that in its negative part (the threat of punishment) sanctions, through a constant feeling of fear by members of society is an emergency guarantee of its integrity and internal cohesion of [9, p. 15].

A certain ambiguity of a clear definition of the nature of fear – like emotions, affective or emotional state, makes contact psychological developments. So, one of the classics of Soviet psychology A. Leontiev regarding devotes to the research of a similar perspective of the essence of human emotions work “Needs, motives and emotions”. In it, emphasizing the leading role of human activity and its motives, the scientist considers emotion as some indicator testifying to the “color” of a man, and future consequences. Clearly differentiating affects emotions, A. Leontiev writes the presence of the emotional experience of the person, which allows comprehending already done, reproduce the conditions of the activity, as well as to build as a clear workable plan, conduct, and to predict its emotional background.

As for fear, researcher, highlighting it and a number of other concepts, considers as an emotional process, thus offering a special place as the domestic regulator activity. Fear arises as an oriented subjective signal that reflecting the external sense of objects and situations, directs, or on the contrary, rejects the planned activities to achieve them [7, p. 9].

Note also about the possibility of affective component of fear, which adds to the already mentioned by us complexity in the analysis of this experience. Considering the affect how strong and fairly short-term emotional experience, a certain inner surge, accompanied by changes in the movements of the face, and in her perception of the surrounding reality, which is due to external factors on the threat of basic social and biological functions, needs and instincts, we can notice the compliance to such a determination as a fear.

The next category is the feeling is not very common, but not less informative, because this stands for emotional processes have a clear objectivity and orientation. A person can clearly describe what exactly causes admiration, love, hate, or fear. From the above “emotional spectrum” just the feelings turn to the idea of classification, where the role played by social structures is not the final statement.

The danger of “immersion” in terms leads to the delimitation of understanding affective fears, as primarily associated with extremely strong emotional stress, affecting and reflected in the processes, which, as noted A. Leontiev “...come in me”. But emotions, and among them and analyzed by us fear (which is conceived as an emotional process), as a reaction to the ongoing social risks associated with the ongoing activities of the individual and the state “...mine ‘I’” [7, p. 23].

As we can see, the activity appears to be the cornerstone of the concept of the researcher, since it is associated with and motives, and their use figurative phrase “emotional background”. This is consistent with the objective orientation of the whole science of that time period in which worked A. Leontiev. However, in the quoted work find confirmation of the suitability of the proposed by us to consider the ideas of onto – and phylogenesis of a fear.

From the above, one can clearly trace a connection emotional processes with a total maturity of the individual is determined by the intellectual, emotional, and social experience, maturity internal “I”, performed by the social functions and finally activities. A. Leontiev writes that even the lowest emotions are the result of evolution, and later – existing socio-historical conditions that have developed instinctive biological forms to the new look, including even mimic movement. Social complication of the structure of society, forms of communication also had its influence, which led to the broadening of functions of emotions and their manifestations in facial expressions and gestures, as a distinctive sign, the legend. Respectively, and the very nature of emotional processes and their experiences of the person, not to mention their causes, recall originate from activities, which was also subjected to the inevitable complications, changed, or, speaking the language of our theoretical constructions – “matured”.

Understanding the emotional nature of fear, it is expedient, in our opinion, to consider the formation of perception through emotional maturity rights. However, we should distinguish between the notions of emotions and emotionally painted feelings. Fear is the last, because he usually has if not the reason of their origin-at least – source, no matter how amorphous it would not exist. According to this approach, obtain confirmation of adequate perception fears (perhaps not so much an adequate how many “Mature”) in the age

period, which is characterized by emotional stability, the completion of self-determination, i.e. the actual transition from child to adult, which corresponds to the older age of adolescence [8, p. 78].

Inherent to every stage of social development relations and interpretation of risks and social fears reflected in the basic socio-philosophical concepts of the evolution of civilization.

The first stages of human development dedicated to the fight for the survival of native species and are in constant clashes with the natural hazards that were the more dangerous than more primitive tools owned representatives of Homo Sapiens. This spontaneity and naturalness in the perception of the surrounding world with all its challenges, the lack of, first of all, the social experience (only the simplest rules of survival that gradually, the method of "trial and error" perfected), materialization and the spiritualization of environment, combine this first period of human civilization with the childhood of the individual. Actually, this period can serve as a starting point of our study, however, it was followed by the gradual complication in the perception of the world and all that is in it, and from this (or as a consequence) – complication of the social structure, tools, activities, modified risks and their awareness of, and response to community.

Drawing parallels, we note that the individual at the first stages of its development also has a very vague idea about the fear and its causes. Considering the development of the child as receiving and accumulating information on the environment, which comes primarily from the nearest environment can see that in accordance with these risks, the absence of their own positive or negative experience, perceived indirectly, and their potential consequences, and the apprehension – fear is not realized. Similar is happening in the society.

Since the emergence of philosophy, as of the first scientific source of comprehension of the world and human nature, it is arises the problem of security, which gives an idea of the main fears of the time. Securities is understood as purely a physical notion and threats or have very real character and connected with everyday life and nature, or are supernatural.

Of special interest is Medieval, which first, develops a special image of the fear of God, secondly, characterized by periods of this modern catastrophic consciousness (for example, Millennium expectations), and thirdly, it becomes interesting to subjective aspects of the reaction of an individual to external threats. The age of Enlightenment raises the question of the dual character of fear – on the one hand, the fear makes you run, and on the other, leads to the emergence of mutual interest. The fear of that epoch concerns of irrational social order, and peace seems to be the greatest boon.

German classical philosophy, as the personification of the epoch, considers purely transcendental nature of fear, as the cause of which is the total overwhelming evil. Hegel speaks about the mechanisms of fear, as a consequence of the contradictions of existence and emphasizes the positive aspects of fear; a strong personality can overcome and use it for good. L. Feuerbach gives a definition, which holds the fear of both the sense of depending on the subject, without which or through which the individual is nothing, the subject, which destroy it. It is this understanding and appropriate interpretation of death, as the main source of fear, formed the basis of the philosophy of religion thinker.

Such ideas find in the voluntaristic fear of A. Schopenhauer, the criticism of religion as impersonation fear and weakness of F. Nietzsche, pioneer of the existentialism of W. Kierkegaard. According to the last, particularly emphasizes human nature to fear that clearly indicates its main source is the awareness of the person's own limbs [6, p. 18].

Rethinking the nature of fear, its sources come in philosophy with ideas of P.Sartre, which suggests the possibility of control of the person above destructive feelings.

As we see, none of these concepts does refer to social fears, not to mention the risks. It is difficult to speak about certain social images of fear in these periods, however, even from such surface sources can install somewhat simplistic, individualism and supernaturalness in the interpretation of fear, of course quite different.

It is the twentieth century appears age of a maturing society, which is reflected in the complexity and various aspects of this philosophical ideas W. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Jung research and develop new aspects of fear, as multilayer socio-personal feeling that has both psychological and social characteristics, and which to a large extent lay the modern understanding of this phenomenon. It can say that it is freudism from which takes his path analysis of fears not only philosophy and psychology, and other humanitarian sciences.

In confirmation of gradual interest of humanitarian disciplines of the problems of perception of fear shows philosophical direction of existentialism, among others, pays considerable attention to this problem. By this time, the deepest research differ psychology that considers the emotions and feelings as an integral

part of the mental life of man. It is worth remembering neofreudists, overcoming biologism and ambivalence inherent in the classical teachings of Freud, they pay attention to other components of the human unconscious. So, K. Horney directly considers the modern society, as hostile and such, that being the source of “primary fear”, causes nervousness. As a reaction to them, and irrationality in the awareness of one's own existence, people have to apply a range of protective mechanisms. In general researcher calls the consequence of their actions “narcotisation of fear”, while keeping in mind as a direct – with the help of psychotropic substances and alcohol, and portable – rough, energetic activity, often destructive or groundless. These are the ways of protection generate four main neuroses of our time: neurosis attachment (search for love, understanding, that makes use of ersatz-substitutes these feelings); neurosis authorities (the desire for power, prestige); neurosis obedience (the desire to be like everyone, not stand out among others); neuroisolation (rejection and an escape from society). However, Horney notes the futility of attempts to self-overcoming these neuroses, strengthen the alienation of the individual [9, p. 103].

In sociology, the concept of “fear” comes from the twenties of the XXth century, primarily through the study of social change, disasters and their reflection in the public consciousness, which operated S. Prince, L. Carron, P. Sorokin, etc. It was just then the concept of risk begins to apply not only the sphere of practical activities in terms of financial or insurance, and sociologists interested in mechanisms of design in the individual mind in the form of fears.

The risk is understood as the probability of unfavourable situation. Highlights on the characteristic of perception of risks as the assessment of their likelihood and future negative impact, hence always risks are remote in time, and therefore the probability of their occurrence generally estimated or due to the presence of a personal experience, or against them social consciousness, that is determined public expectation.

It is also necessary to distinguish between risks and threats. Threats, respectively, is extremely remote in the future occurrence of the events that exist purely theoretical or have a low probability of occurring. Subjectivity risks or their objectivity, in our opinion, in general, is defined or experience, or public expectations. So, the same situation that is considered from the standpoint of the negative impact is of such objective factors.

Traditionally, it is consider a certain functions of risks. First of all, this article examines the positive functions. Firstly, stimulated by developments protective reactions to negative impacts, which are so far only theoretically, secondly, negative expectations are forced to turn out certain innovations, as a response to the threats, thirdly, a risk assessment makes adequately count motivational factors, and actually refer to the results of the activity [2, p. 162].

Taking into account the peculiarities of risk, as their creation by an individual or entity can assume that the society with its further development will be the ability to cause the least probability. On the example of modern developed national states can see that the understanding of individuality is sacrificed to the public interest and the relevant those stereotypes of conduct. Hence, creation of individual risks will not play a significant value.

Features of the modern life, which E. Giddens calls “to slip through out of” and characterizes through the categories of dynamism, instability, multi-variant, are forced to rethink the notion of risk and attitudes of the public consciousness. The emergence of science, which is called “science about the risk”, expresses particular social life postmodern. Science about the risk now aims to study characteristics of the phenomena and processes threatening the normal everyday life of each of us [3].

A characteristic of social life today is best described via post images. Fragmentation, disruption, unbalance, dehumanistic are just some of the main signs of describing the social world. It is no coincidence that each of scientists today – E. Giddens, U. Bek, N. Luhmann, in varying degrees, belongs to the cohort of scientists. “Risk society” of U. Bek clearly emphasizes the inherent to all institutions of reflexive modernity, i.e. modernity in the terminology of the author, such inherent characteristics as the constancy of the risk, due to the crucial processes in all social structures. The usual world already is not a usual one and unchangeable – it is exactly this feature is one of the main sources of concern, which turns into normal unconscious fear.

Scientists have extremely negative attitude to the ideas of a new society, as such, where the consumption of goods and services is crucial, because this by starting the process of production, to endless expands of it, thus giving rise to new forms of threats and accordingly fears. The globalization that is from the 70's of the XXth century was perceived as a necessity and chance for the future, today it is perceived as a threat by itself. E. Giddens observes that it is the globalization “removes” the individual from the local socio-cultural environment, altering it. It is clear that such ideas are still at least 100 years ago could not occur [4].

It is difficult not to agree with the opinion that each of the risks is the result of our own activities. The most important is that this thesis clearly understood and strongly reinforced in society. This is according to one of the features of today's fears – we ourselves are its sources. Of course, in the epoch of more “young” mankind risks attributed to purely supernatural forces, irresistible forces of nature, punishment for sins, the inevitability of fate, but not the consequences of the activities of the people themselves.

Today there is such a thing as social distribution of risks. In the society of modernity most risks were clearly associated with the class structure. Possessing a certain capital, you can move away from certain threats. However, this did not apply to social fears, since, as we have already noted, its sources are not associated with the company itself. Today the suspension of risk does not imply complete safety. U. Beck identifies this phenomenon “boomerang” – risks of return to those who are trying to through the accumulation of capital to back away from the threat as itself produces a new one [1, p. 102].

If to consider, in the framework of our hypothesis, today's society as “adult”, it is quite understandable issued the complexity of deterministic relations, analysis and evaluation of risks, their non-linearity. Today's risks are perceived as special social constructions that established in various spheres of human life, historically acquire various forms of perception of the public consciousness. In this context we can speak about special inherent to each epoch of the risks, and also of the diversity of the historically conditioned forms reactions to them – social images of fear.

Society of the risk is nameless. As the risk level all, whatever income, whatever the intellectual level of the individual, or it position and none of them is specifically taking responsibility for their occurrence. On the contrary, the political struggle, economic development, inclusion in the world community produces new threats, risks and, in the end, fears that with the help of mass media lose the locality, the second becomes the property of the whole society, acquire fantastic forms, but accumulating only lead to apathy and a depressing feeling unreasonable uncertainty. The main priority of civilization is security, the receipt of which is in a paradoxical manner connected with the necessity of constant bloat hearth of fear, fear that unites and requires new sources, the role of which are available to the world's terrorists, environmental threats, whether the threat of democracy.

Summing up, we can come to a conclusion that the search of calm, just as a spiritual quest, is eternal. Whatever the level of development did not acquire the human civilization, as it did not affect the risks (which, of course, over time, will acquire new forms, and new fears of people, which in essence are a mere variants of the eternal inherent in all living beings emotional experience, ways of prevention and overcoming them is the same – social motives of self-indulgence and self-soothing socio-stimulated and created symbols of fear and certainly mystical-religious beliefs.

#### References

1. Бек У. Общество риска. На пути к другому модерну / У. Бек. – М. : Прогресс-Традиция, 2000. – 228 с.
2. Гидденс Э. Судьба, риск и безопасность / Э. Гидденс // THESIS. – 1994. – Вып. 5. – С. 56–70.
3. Гидденс Э. Ускользящий мир: Как глобализация меняет нашу жизнь / Э. Гидденс. – М. : Весь мир, 2004. – 122 с.
4. Исаев К. «Общество риска» в условиях глобализации / К. Исаев // СОЦИС. – 2001. – № 12. – С. 44–50.
5. Катастрофическое сознание в современном мире в конце XX века (по материалам международных исследований) – М. : АСК, 2000. – 197 с.
6. Красиков С. Исследование рисков в западной социологии / С. Красиков // СОЦИС. – 2008. – № 9. – С. 12–19.
7. Леонтьев А. Н. Деятельность. Сознание. Личность / А. Н. Леонтьев. – М. : Политиздат, 1975. – 304 с.
8. Ядов В. Структура и побудительные импульсы социально-тревожного сознания / В. Ядов // Социол. журн. – 1997. – № 3. – С. 77–89 .
9. Яницкий О. Н. Социология риска / О. Яницкий. – М. : Изд-во LvS, 2003. – 206 с.

**Дурманенко Олександр. Філософсько-соціальний аналіз страхів: онтогенез, філогенез і теорія структуризації.** У статті проаналізовано феномен сучасних соціальних ризиків і страхів, а відповідно й певний стан соціального розвитку.

**Ключові слова:** соціальна структура, страхи, ризики, онтогенез, філогенез, структуривання.

**Дурманенко Александр. Философско-социальный анализ страха: онтогенез, филогенез и теория структуризации.** В статье анализируется феномен современных социальных рисков и страхов, которому соответствует определенное состояние социального развития.

**Ключевые слова:** социальная структура, страхи, риски, онтогенез, филогенез, структурирование.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії  
01.02.2016 р.

