34. Yaskevich V. S. Metodologiya i etika v sovremennoy nauke: poisk otkryitoy ratsionalnosti / V. S. Yaskevich. – BGEU, 2007. – 186 s.

35. Aforizmyi avtora. Ivan Petrovich Pavlov. Elektronnyiy resurs: http://letter.com.ua/Ivan_Petrovich_Pavlov_1.htm

36. Hartl P. Michael Polanyi on Freedom of science // Synthesis Philosophica. Croatian Philosophical Society. Zagreb, 2012. Vol. 54. N 2. P. 307-321 .

37. KATO Yasushi The Crisis of the Humanities and Social Sciences in the Age "Innovation" : Philosophy as a Critical Facilitator toward a "Civic Turn" of the University / Tetsugaku, International Journal of the Philosophical Association of Japan, Volume 1, Special Theme: Philosophy and the University April 2017 Edited and published by the Philosophical Association of Japan Faculty of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University – P. 8-23.

38. Fukuyama F. Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution / F. Fukuyama – Picador, 2003. – 272 p.

39. Polanyi M. Science, Faith and Society. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

И. П. Скиба
АНТРОПОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ ПРОБЛЕМ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ОБЩЕСТВА В КОНТЕКСТЕ ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ НАУКИ И СВОБОДЫ
В статье с позиции человеческого измерения исследуются проблемы современного общества, которые затрагивают взаимосвязь науки и свободы. Дается обоснование, что большинство современных проблем в своем основании содержат общую причину – антропологический кризис. Решение имеющихся проблем, по мнению автора, лежит в сфере взаимодействия свободы и знания. Приоритетность в решении существующих проблем предоставляется научному знанию, которое в соединении с общечеловеческими цінностями, наличием морального измерения, может удовлетворить знаниевую составляющую социокультурного выбора, который способен обеспечить обществу устойчивое развитие соизмерное с жизнью.
Ключевые слова: человек, свобода, мораль, наука, знание, сциентизм, антисциентизм, современное общество.

I. Skyba
ANTHROPOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF THE PROBLEMS OF MODERN SOCIETY IN THE CONTEXT OF SCIENCE AND FREEDOM INTERRELATION
The article investigates the modern society problems concerning the relations between science and freedom from the human-like perspective. **Introduction.** The author identifies the specifics of modern society, focuses on trends of its development, existing problems that actualize the subject of this study. **The aim and tasks.** The author explores the anthropological problems of modern society. Among the tasks is exploration the problems of freedom as the basis of any social development and science (scientific knowledge) as the main factor of modern social development. **Research methods:** systematic, cultural-historical and sociocultural methodological approaches are used in their dialectical interconnection. **Research results:** problems of society nowadays are increasingly acquiring anthropocentric, even sense-oriented coloring. The latter, in its turn, is connected with the values and freedom in man's life. A change in social development strategy is also a consequence of the choice of "critical mass" of people rather than one person. The choice is always made at the level of values and worldview. Therefore, the role of worldview disciplines is significantly increasing in the modern world. The modern problem of freedom is acquiring some peculiarities resulting from the processes of informatization and globalization, consumption strategies, the emergence of virtual reality and a virtual personality, and others. Freedom is integrated into the system of knowledge, immanently corresponds to its anthropological factors, and it is also directly proportional to the result obtained. Such a choice is possible if there is awareness of it, otherwise it withdraws from freedom and approaches chance and "blind" determinism. These days, both in the life of an individual and a society, the decisive role is given to scientific knowledge. On the one hand, it is the main factor of social development, since it is scientific knowledge that has the greatest influence on civilization choice. On the other hand, in modern social practices including the technical sphere there is a tendency of reduction of the status of science. It is manifested in the fact that scientific-technological progress is coming to replace scientific-technical one, that transforms the classical way of interconnection of science, technics and technology. At the same time, the development of postnonclassical rationality takes place inside the science itself, that combined with the formation of a synergistic picture of the world, is preparing new responses to the challenges of the modern world. **Discussion** The author more broadly refers to the conception of the dependence of freedom on knowledge. In particular, the views of B. Spinoza, M. Polani, M. Weber and others are considered. **Conclusion.** The current stage of the society development poses many challenges, threats and risks to humanity. Most of them point out to the anthropological crisis as their root cause. Certain results of social development (positive or negative) simultaneous and always are the consequences of a certain socio-cultural choice. Exclusively investigating and understanding the reason allows one to make another choice consciously, including one that is compatible with life.
Keywords: man, freedom, morality, science, knowledge, scientism, anti-scientism, modern society.

S. P. Kharchenko

UNFAIR ACTION AND ITS LEGITIMATION IN INTERNATIONAL SPACE: PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL CONTEXT

Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, spharchenko_1@ukr.net

Abstract. This investigation is devoted to the conceptualization of the "unfair action" phenomenon; determination of mechanisms of its legitimation in international space. The article states that understanding of fairness in primitive society was associated with unconditional execution of certain rules, regulations. In ancient Greece, the concept of "benefit" was remotely equal to fairness. In public mind, the concept of "benefit" slowly converted into the demand for a punishment for the breach of a general rule. Over time, the model of benefit was converted into a more sophisticated practice of empowering people. It is described that Christian morality allowed the equality of all people before the God. Feudal morals laid the basic proportional fairness. The quintessence of this model was the "noble origin". In bourgeois society fairness provided legal equality of individuals in civil society. Gradually political, legal, economic, academic institutions were formed. Modern ethical debates are focused on theories of fairness within which individuals in their social life are seen as interconnected elements, both mutually needed and in that sense, equal to each other. Individuals, living in the community, form a whole, a society, with common goals and interests.
In general, in a broad sense, unfairness is the folly of public life; it can be defined as the common denominator of all socially immoral disordered relations among people, as the last immoral-appeal instance in public affairs. It coincides with the immorality in its projection on the social sector; it is the lack of virtue in social institutions.

Keywords: equity, fairness, international space, legitimating, unfair action, unfairness.

Introduction

In today's globalized world voices about fairness and unfairness are sounding louder and louder. It should be noted that these pleas for fairness are still too weak, sometimes faceless, but they still inspire cautious optimism that modern man could not continue living in the solitude and moral vacuum.

For a long time, this world has been perceived in a purely "Orwell" sense as curved, distorted, unconcerned. Therefore, people are constantly asking whether all their actions as well as the actions of others are fair? Or they persist wondering if the justice is really worthless because of the inability to respond specifically this question since the antique times? Perhaps the mere existence of philosophy is an irritant factor, because this science insists on the moral component of human society.

Unfairness, apparent total, involves violence, lawlessness, and negations of any morality. And human consciousness "remembers" rather bad than good. But maybe this is bad in certain specified sufficiently precise installations: in public some people always say that "one law for all" and in fact it applies asymmetrically towards citizens.

In the sphere of international politics we also hear proclamations about humanity and equality, but, in fact, there are double standards. As a result of their use in the double meaning the legitimating of unfair actions is carried out.

The "legitimization" is the legalization of any new political regime, giving it legitimacy. As a means of legitimizing the regimes that come to power through revolutions, commonly referendums and general elections are used. Also we are talking about legalization of certain legitimate means of some persons as the commissioner for securities. Legitimating can result from external signs of the document (the formal legitimating) or from the actual circumstances, as the basis of the establishment of the right of ownership on paper (material legitimization). The formal legitimating of certain persons connected with the content of commercial paper and is sufficient not only to obtain execution on this paper, but also for the recognition of such person by its owner until the concerned person will not be proven otherwise (Benjamin, 2014**: 1**)**.** Thus, the concept of "infairness" can be defined only by opposing it with the concept of "fairness".

The aim and the tasks

This investigation is carried out by the conceptualization of the phenomenon of an action as unfair; mechanisms of its legitimation in international space are defined.

A key objective of the study is to measure the level of legitimating of unfair action in the contemporary international society.

Research methods

The author in the process of study uses philosophical-legal approach, because this problem was seen little in terms of philosophy of law. Also the study of the concepts of "equity" and "unfairness" is based on the use of cultural-historical and comparative principles.

Research results. In primitive society the understanding of fairness was associated with unconditional execution of certain rules, regulations. Fairness was seen as a clear adherence to the tradition and the ritual. In tribes the equality of all persons in the use of means of life and rights originally existed. Gradually the so-called Institute of ancestral revenge begins to form. During the same period, the allocation of a kind form separate individuals.

In ancient Greece, the concept of "benefit" (Δίκη or "custom", "lifestyles") was remotely equal to fairness. In the public mind, the concept of "benefit" slowly converted into the demand for the punishment for the breach of a general rule. This model of benefit is called the "retributive" justice. Over time, it was converted into a more sophisticated practice of empowering people. The emergence of private property gave rise to inequality in society. The distinction between "equity" and "unfairness" was entrenched in the minds in that context.

The "fairness" was not perceived as "equality". Stratification of people occurred in accordance to their social status. Heraclitus understood fairness as the law of the Logos, but claimed that its earthly nature was dual. Democritus believed that perceptions of fairness are relative. In his opinion "only God creates everything fine and good, and rightfully, so people think that one is unfair and the other is fair." He pointed to the objective nature of fairness. Its naturalistic foundation laid in the postulate – "what is believed to be fair, there is a fair and things of the nasty nature are unfair."

The Sophists were talking about the man as "the measure of things." In social philosophy of Plato the notion of "fairness" reflected life in the Utopian society, in which the representatives of the three estates faithfully perform their duties and do not interfere in the affairs of others. Their main objective is to "produce own things". This is true fairness. Aristotle used the notion of "fairness" in two ways – in wide and narrow – as justice and equality. He argued that equitable in relation to the other is equality (Ivin, 2004: 157). He wrote in his treatise "Policy", that if ones are relatively equal, then they should be equal in general; others, recognizing the relatively unequal, claimed the same inequality in all respects.

The first case described by Aristotle involves the position of the poor, that use their civil human equality with all as an argument, in order to achieve equality in everything else (property relations, position of status). The second case relates to a position of the privileged social strata, seeking its privilege to correlate with civil and human privileges, as if they were privileged, originally on the human purpose. The first error is misunderstanding that without property, status, and other inequalities, there would have been no original moral and civil equality of human beings. The second error is misunderstanding that the original moral and civil equality would be impossible in their property, status and privilege. Both – equality in morally-civil aspect, and inequality in all other respects – are the essence of the two fundamental supports of socio-orderly space (Ivin, 2004: 157) . There are two dedicated by Aristotle types (shapes) of justice: distributive or dividing, and retributive or equaling. They are represented as ways of distributing the benefits,

which are not enough for all those who claim to them, and which generally may not be distributed without someone have not cheated. They should be called private benefits, unlike the common goods that, on the contrary, by their nature, cannot be shared between individuals (Ivin, 2004: 158). It follows that not all benefits are called fairness.

Epicurus, Lucretius thought that the ground of fairness is the natural order of things. They focused on the relative nature of fairness. As circumstances are changing useful can transform into harmful, and fair – into unfair. Thus, fairness evolved from nature is the agreement about useful. Fairness itself does not have something tangible, but in the relationships of people, it is always a contract without damage.

St. Augustine and Th. Aquinas had the same views. Christian morality allowed the equality of all people before the God. Feudal morals laid the basic proportional fairness (Ivin, 2004: 158). The quintessence of this model is the "noble origin".

In bourgeois society fairness provides legal equality of individuals in civil society. Gradually political, legal, economic, academic institutions were formed. G. Grotius, T. Hobbes spoke on equal opportunities to accumulate wealth, but also about the power of law and the social contract. The age of Enlightenment has formed the foundation of the social and conventional models of fairness (these ideas are presented in the works of J.-J. Rousseau, F.-M. Voltaire, and C.A. Helvetia) (Ivin, 2004: 158). The concept of the social contract stipulated that people in primitive condition couldn't have perceptions of fairness. Unfairness is a violation of the agreement, which becomes the law. Therefore, prior to the law there is no injustice.

In turn, I. Kant, J. Fichte, F. Schelling include fairness into the sphere of morality that exists a priori. In their concepts the strict law is the greatest unfairness, but this evil can be on the way to law, because fairness refers only to the court of conscience. G. Hegel identified the Constitution in which will comes to consciousness and understanding of itself, this is a real existing justice that leads to the validity of the freedom and development of its reasonable definitions. K. Marx made correlation of the concepts of "equity" and "means of production". Fairness therefore has historical character; it is caused by unequal conditions of life of classes. In the turning points the oppressed masses feel the need for a radical change in the existing historical reality (Ivin, 2004: 158).

Differences between people will delve till such forms of public ownership, as the state and cooperative, have been phased. The sole privilege of the person, defining its position in society and producing its right to wealth, may be his personal work or public benefit activities.

Modern ethical debate focus on theories of fairness of J. Rawls. This theory has a synthetic nature, and summarizes the different levels and aspects of fairness, gives its ideal-typical model in liberal-democratic societies. Its normative framework are based on two principles:

1) "everyone should have equal rights in respect of the most extensive schemes of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar schemes for other freedoms";

2) "social and economic model of inequality should be arranged for those who a) was a loser to the greatest expected benefit of least achievers and b) did access to decision-making positions and provisions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity" (Ivin, 2004: 159).

Consequently, individuals in their life altogether in society are seen as interconnected elements, mutually needed and in that sense, equal to each other. Individuals form a whole, a society, that have common goals and interests. And this is true with respect to each of them. But where there is equity, unfairness is apparent. In this case, we may have the feeling that it is also needed.

Is it true that the whole world suffers from unfairness? First of all, we can consider "fair" and "unfair" through the prism of the ontological laws. From the point of view of ethics fairness is an equal opportunity to be happy. It is necessary as the highest good. Therefore, most of the concepts of fairness stem from the fundamental but equally available to all individuals universal values.

Moral principle of fairness comes from equality of an infinite set of centers of personality. In this model, individuals are equal, because each of them is the only one unique microcosm, seeking to comprehend the ultimate fairness of the macrocosm.

Archimandrite Sergy, exploring the origins of Biblical wisdom on the example of ancient civilizations revealed that in ancient literature the notions of "arbitrary acts", "divine will", "the suffering of the righteous" already existed (Archimandrite Sergy, 2018: 274). But the author was referring to the arbitrary nature of the creative action, where creativity is understood as the God's Providence. And creativity is born from anguish and spiritual revival. Not everyone is capable of spiritual transformation, searching for the truth.

L. Karsavin confirms the fact that the moments of individual identity are not completely independent personalities and in individual the personal genesis is rather weak, it can be only partly explained through our will to get knowledge about the individual as its subject. Testifying about the imperfections of all over the world, the individual personal exhaustion becomes the individuation of some common fact.

On the other hand, infinity of individuation of being of personal encounters on theoretical difficulties: on the existence of the "first" identity even in the logos and on the danger of bad infinity. The danger of bad infinity is eliminated if we discerned bad infinity and potential and correctly understood the attitude of the second one to the actual infinity. The first difficulty requires special surveys. By virtue of its birth, primarily and that is why the limb, unified identity of Logos is infinite and that is why without the initial. Consequently, there is among his moments-personalities, neither the first nor the last. But Logos is true infinity-limb, although we do not find its number. So the question arises as to how it should be calculated. You can calculate also moments-identities only if their order will not turn on their individuations, we understand the last as incalculable beginning of their account and zero. And it follows that ordinal calculus starts from the center and requires being (positivity) and nothingness (negativity) of any number

(Karsavin, 2003: 231-232). The author also speaks about the perfection of the highest Logos and the imperfection of each individual. Therefore, the partial perfection of the individual, saying about his links with the Highest, determined his attitude to morality as the true good. But not every concrete individual is capable of wanting to find links with the Highest.

In the international legal aspect fairness acts as the formal equality of requirements, laws, rules, regulations, through which individuals and their actions are measured, in this case that individuals become the subjects of law. And in morals, and in the law fairness turns out to be equality, but significantly different in its essence.

International legal fairness is equity of units, it is fully within the canons of arithmetic equality, in this sense only just it can be considered as equity, people here are equal as subjects of law, as if they had no other properties, interests, needs, goals, except the possibility to comply with the law. People are equal as "co-founders" of social spaces. But the very act of establishment is legitimizing inequality of classes and provisions, structuring the established social spaces (the division of labor, allocation of management bodies).

The problem is the combination of equality and inequality connection. The extraordinary difficulty of its solving is the main source of public unrest, occurring under the banner of the struggle for justice.

Discussion

In terms of the influence of society on human nature the "unfairness" can be explained from different points of view. In particular, J.-J. Russo noted that the natural inequalities, along with emerging inequality, historically discreetly find an increasing importance, and the differences among individuals, venturing into because of differing external circumstances, become more tangible, more constant in their manifestations and begin influence on the destiny of individuals (Russo, 2006**:** 751**)**. That is, if we consider "unfairness" as inequality, then it is partly natural. Society (in particular the international society) only deepens the controversy, legitimizing unfair actions in law. Power of law embodies the will to power. We can also hold power through the will of the majority, which involves their forcing to submission.

A. Schopenhauer asserted that unjust actions lead to suffering. If the will is harder, the manifestations of its disorder become stronger and that means suffering. A world that is much more intense manifestation of the will to life than this real world, is the greatest suffering, it would be, consequently, hell (Schopengauer, 2007**:** 42).

Unlike the concepts of good and kindness with which taken alone individual phenomena evaluated, fairness characterizes correlation of several phenomena in terms of the distribution of already existing good and evil among people. In particular, the notion of fairness requires consistency between the practical role of different individuals (social groups) in society and their social situation, between their rights and duties, between the act and reward, effort and reward crime and punishment, merit and public recognition, as well as the equivalence of mutual exchange activities and its products. Mismatch in these ratios estimated as unfairness.

W. Sombart stresses that the urge for power, which he designates as a sign of the modern spirit, a joy from the fact that we have the opportunity to show our superiority over others. Ultimately this is consciousness in weakness, resulting in this sense, as we have seen, an important part of children's values. True internal and natural grandeur man never ascribes especially high value to external power (Sombart, 2007: 257). Fairness is a common moral sanction of the joint lives, considered primarily in terms of colliding desires, interests, and responsibilities; method of validation and distribution of benefits and burdens among individuals of their co-existence within single social space.

Conclusion

In a loose sense, unfairness is the folly of public life; it can be defined as the common denominator of all socially immoral disordered relations among people, as the last immoral-appeal instance in public affairs. It coincides with the immorality in its projection on the social sector; it is the lack of virtue of social institutions.

In a special, narrow sense, unfairness is the immoral authorized disproportion in the distribution of benefits and burdens of shared lives, the degree of imperfection of the ways of cooperative activities and the lack of balance in the society and the state, a conflict of interests.

Unfairness is a way of human relations to one another, indirect relations to benefits, which they all claim to. The unfair man and unfair society are the essence of those which cannot find the moral measure of the distribution of benefits and burdens, and such a measure itself can be considered immoral.

Bibliography

1. Архимандрит Сергий (Акимов). Библейская Книга Экклезиаста и литература мудрости Древней Месопотамии. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Издательский дом «Познание»; Общецерковная аспирантура и докторантура; Православная энциклопедия, 2018. – 312 с.

2. Benjamin S. Osenbach. Do civil society organizations undermine state-building?// Center for development and strategy. 2014, vol. 2014 no. 1, pg. 1/1.

3. Зомбарт В. Расшатанность духовной жизни // Тень парфюмера / Морис Бланшо, Вернер Зомбарт, Элиас Канетти. – М.: Алгоритм, 2007. – С.257-286.

4. *Карсавин Л. П. Путь православия* / Л. П. *Карсавин*; Сост. и вступ. ст. П. О. Никонова. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ»; Харьков: «Фолио», 2003 г. 557, [3] с.

5. Руссо Ж.-Ж. Исповедь. Прогулки одинокого мечтателя. Рассуждение о науках и искусствах. Рассуждение о неравенстве : [сб.: пер. с фр.] / Жан-Жак Руссо. – М.: НФ «Пушкинская библиотека»: АСТ: АСТ МОСКВА, 2006. – 884, [4] с.

6. Справедливость // Философия: Энциклопедический словарь / под. ред. А. А. Ивина. – М.: Гардарики, 2004. – 1072 с.

7. Шопенгауэр А. Воля как мир и представление // Афоризмы житейской мудрости / А. Шопенгауэр; Пер. с немецкого. – М.: Эксмо; СПб.: Мидгард, 2007. – С. 27-553.

References

1. Arhymandryd Sergy (Akimov). (2018). Bibleiskaja Kniga Ekkleziasta i literatura mudrosti Drevnej Mesopotamii [Biblical Book of Ecclesiastes and literature of wisdom of Ancient Mesopotamia]. Moscow: Izdatelskij dom «Poznanie»; Obshchetzercovnaja aspirantura i doktorantura; Pravoslavnaja entsiklopedija [in Russian].

2. Benjamin, S. Osenbach. (2014). Do civil society organizations undermine state-building? *Center for development and strategy*, 1:1-2 [in English].

3. Blansho, M. & Kanetti, E. & Sombar**t**, W. (2007). Rasshatannost duchovnoj zhizni [Shakiness of Spiritual Life] Ten'

parfyumera [The *Shadow* of the *Perfume* Apprentice]. Moscow: Algoritm [in Russian].

4. Karsavin, L. (2003). *Put Pravoslavija [Way of Orthodox Christianity]*. Moscow: ООО «Izdatelstvo AST»; Harcov: «Folio» [in Russian].

5. Russo, J.-J. (2006). Ispoved. Progulki Odinokogo Mechtatelja. Rassuzhdenie o naukah i iskusstvah. Rassuzhdenie o neravenstve [The Confessions. Reveries of a Solitary Walker.

Discourse on the Arts and Sciences]. Moscow: NF «Pushkinskaja biblioteka»: AST: AST MOSKVA [in Russian].

6. Justice // Filosofiya: Entsiklopicheskiy slovar [Philosophy: encyclopedic dictionary]. A.A. Ivin (Eds.). Moscow: Gardariki [in Russian].

7. Schopengauer, A. (2007). Volya kak mir i predstavlenie [The World as Will and Representation]. Aforizmy zhiteyskoy mudrosti [Aphorisms of worldly wisdom]. Moscow: Eksmo; SPb.: Midgard, 2007.

С. П. Харченко
НЕСПРАВЕДЛИВОЕ ДЕЙСТВИЕ И ЕГО ЛЕГИТИМАЦИЯ В МЕЖДУНАРОДНОМ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ: ФИЛОСОФСКО-ПРАВОВОЙ КОНТЕКСТ

В данном исследовании осуществляется концептуализация феномена действия как несправедливого, определяются механизмы его легитимации в международном пространстве. Ключевой задачей исследования является измерение уровня легитимации несправедливого действия в современном международном социуме. В статье показано, что в первобытном обществе понимание справедливости было сопряжено с безусловным исполнением определенных правил, предписаний. Справедливость рассматривалась как четкое следование обычаю, ритуалу. В этот же период выделения из рода отпочковываются отдельные индивиды. В Древней Греции понятие «благо» отдаленно приравнивалось к справедливости. В общественном сознании понятие «благо» постепенно преобразуется в требование наказания за нарушение общей нормы. Такую модель блага назвали «ретрибутивной». Христианская мораль при этом допускала равенство всех людей перед Богом, а феодальная мораль заложила базовые основы пропорциональной справедливости. Квинтэссенцией этой модели является «благородное происхождение», В буржуазном обществе справедливость предусматривает правовое равенство индивидов в гражданском обществе. Несправедливость определена как неразумность общественной жизни; ее можно следует понимать как общий безнравственный знаменатель всех социально неупорядоченных отношений между людьми, последнюю безнравственно-апелляционную инстанцию в общественных делах. Она совпадает с безнравственностью в ее проекции на социальную сферу, является отсутствием добродетели у социальных институтов.

Ключевые слова: легитимация, международное пространство, несправедливое действие, несправедливость, равенство, справедливость.

С. П. Харченко
НЕСПРАВЕДЛИВА ДІЯ ТА ЇЇ ЛЕГІТИМАЦІЯ В МІЖНАРОДНОМУ ПРОСТОРІ: ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-ПРАВОВИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

Вступ. В даному дослідженні здійснюється концептуалізація феномена несправедливої дії, визначаються механізми її легітимізації в міжнародному просторі. **Мета і завдання: о**днією з головних цілей роботи є вимірювання рівня легітимізації несправедливих дій в сучасному міжнародному соціумі. **Методологія дослідження:** автор застосовує філософсько-правовий підхід, оскільки ця проблема недостатньо висвітлена у філософії права. Також концепти «справедливість» і «несправедливість» передбачали застосування культурно-історичного і компаративного підходів. **Результати дослідження.** В статті показано, що в первісному суспільстві розуміння справедливості базувалося на безумовному виконанні певних правил, норм. Правосуддя розглядалося як чітке дотримання традицій, ритуалу. У Древній Греції концепція «блага» віддалено нагадувало правосуддя. В суспільній свідомості ця концепція поступово перетворюється на вимогу покарання за порушення загальних правил. Дана модель блага представлена як ретрибутивна. Християнська мораль репрезентує справедливість як рівність усіх людей перед Богом, а феодальна мораль є пропорційною справедливістю. Квінтесенцією цієї моделі є «благородне походження». В буржуазному суспільстві справедливість забезпечує правову рівність осіб у громадянському суспільстві. **Висновки.** Несправедливість визначається як нерозумність суспільного життя; її слід розуміти як спільний знаменник всіх соціальних невпорядкованих аморальних стосунків між людьми, як останню аморально-апеляційну інстанцію в суспільних справах. Воно збігається з аморальністю в її проекції на соціальний сектор, являється відсутністю чеснот в соціальних інституціях.

Ключові слова: легітимація, міжнародний простір, несправедлива дія, несправедливість, рівність, справедливість.

Т. Г. Шоріна

АНТРОПНИЙ ПРИНЦИП І ФІЛОСОФІЯ КОСМІЗМУ: ОНТОЛОГІЧНІ ТА ЕТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ

Національний авіаційний університет, tshorina@gmail.com

Анотація. У статті досліджуються метафізичні аспекти космологічних та філософських дискусій у розумінні Космосу як «людиновимірної» системи світу в контексті змісту сильного антропного принципу. Доведено, що принцип доцільності в антропній картині світу не співвідноситься з антропоцентризмом та телеологією. Критично осмислено натуралізм еволюціоністів у розумінні свідомості та людини. Наголошено, що принцип цілепокладання лежить в основі розвитку лише соціальної форми життя. Проаналізовано морально-етичні імперативи діяльності людини в її земному та космічному призначенні.

Ключові слова: антропний принцип, космологія, Всесвіт, людина, життя, свідомість, глобальна еволюція, натуралізм, матеріалістична діалектика, гуманізм.

Вступ

Антропний принцип – один із принципів сучасної космології, навколо якого з кінця ХХ ст. і до наших днів невпинно точаться світоглядні дискусії. Формулювання цього принципу зумовило сплеск антропологічних версій, які розглядаються як антикоперніканські. Антропний принцип дає можливість вирішити проблему взаємозв'язку між глибинною структурою Всесвіту, що еволюціонує, та існуванням у ньому людини (суб'єкта, що пізнає, спостерігача). Цей підхід в космології пояснюється новою методологією: в класичній науці включення людини в контекст космологічних міркувань вважалося метафізичним залишком «антропоцентризму», а, отже, не приймалося за науковий аргумент. У постнекласичній космології ситуація змінилася.

Термін «антропний принцип» запропонував англійський математик і теоретичний астрофізик Б. Картер у доповіді на симпозіумі в Кракові 1973 року на честь 500-річчя М. Коперника. Він сформу-