

UDC 101

DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.27.64.030

The problem of the typology of value phenomena and their classification in axiology (the paradigm aspect)

Elena N. Pesotskaya

PhD in Philosophy, Docent,
Professor at the Russian Academy of Natural History,
Associate Professor at the Department of philosophy,
Ogarev Mordovia State University,
430005, 68 Bolshevistskaya str., Saransk, Russian Federation;
e-mail: cerera-office@mail.ru

Svetlana V. Aksenova

Doctor of Medicine,
Professor at the Department of hospital surgery with
traumatology and orthopedics, eye diseases courses,
Ogarev Mordovia State University,
430005, 68 Bolshevistskaya str., Saransk, Russian Federation;
e-mail: aksenovamed@mail.ru

Lyudmila V. Chegodaeva

PhD in Medicine,
Associate Professor at the Department of hospital therapy,
Ogarev Mordovia State University,
430005, 68 Bolshevistskaya str., Saransk, Russian Federation;
e-mail: chegodaeva20@rambler.ru

Abstract

The social existence of the history of society and a man continues through the ontological foundations of the norms of activity, which are actualized by the historical memory associated with values. A classification of value phenomena in axiology is presented, built on the basis of a wide philosophical idea of values and an understanding of value depending on the aspect of its consideration: as an ideal (norm), as things, and a relation of significance. Social values mean the totality of all natural, social and spiritual phenomena that have positive significance for society in a certain period of history. The process of hysteresis and the articulation of memory is understood as the essence and as the moment of functioning of value phenomena. Based on the genetic principle, five types of value phenomena of anthropo-socio-cultural genesis are distinguished: value objectivity, primary value reality, value attitude, value norm, value orientation. Various variations of approaches to their typology based on different bases by a number of Russian scientists are also considered. A separate place is given to the paradigm aspect of the evolution of value consciousness and the analysis of the highest integrative values of mankind. As the political basis for the unification of mankind, the principle of subsidiarity is named.

For citation

Pesotskaya E.N., Aksenova S.V., Chegodaeva L.V. (2022) The problem of the typology of value phenomena and their classification in axiology (the paradigm aspect). *Kontekst i refleksiya: filozofiya o mire i cheloveke* [Context and Reflection: Philosophy of the World and Human Being], 11 (5A), pp. 264-271. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.27.64.030

Keywords

Personality, social value, value consciousness, value relations, foundation, norm of activity, typology, hysteresis, system, principle of subsidiarity.

Introduction

In the second half of the 19th century, axiology or the theory of social values and assessments as an independent philosophical science began to develop. In Russia, its development was restrained for a long time, which was primarily due to the fact that many axiological concepts in the West recognized the pluralism of value systems and the possibility of a person choosing certain value guidelines in life. In Marxism, such pluralism was denied. Only the ideals and interests of the working class were considered the only ones true. Secondly, modern axiology prioritizes universal human values as opposed to the class approach in Marxism. Thirdly, an important place among axiological movements belongs to religious and philosophical concepts that are incompatible with the "militant materialism" and atheism of Marxism. In modern philosophy, the general theory of values did not finally work out. Among all the diversity, several alternative concepts can be distinguished: naturalistic psychologism (C.I. Lewis, A. Meinong, R.B. Perry), transcendentalism of the Baden school of Neo-Kantian thought (H. Rickert, W. Windelband), personalist ontologism (M. Scheler), cultural-historical relativism (W. Dilthey, P.A. Sorokin, O. Spengler, A.J. Toynbee), sociologism (T. Parsons, M. Weber, F. Znaniecki) and some others. In addition, Russian philosophical science has three approaches to defining the concept of value: 1) as real objects and their properties created by people and used to meet certain needs (G.Ya. Golovnykh, V.P. Tugarinov, etc.); 2) as a normative ideal ("true values of socialism") (E.M. Penkov, V.G. Smolyansky, etc.); 3) as a positive significance of something for a person (S.F. Anisimov, L.M. Arkhangel'sky, A.M. Korshunov, L.N. Stolovich, V.A. Vasilenko, etc.) [Frolov, Malkin, 1994, 17]. Each of these approaches emphasizes one type of value phenomenon. In fact, value, depending on the aspect of consideration, can be an ideal (norm), and a thing, and an attitude of significance.

Research findings

In our broad understanding, social values mean the totality of all natural, social and spiritual phenomena that have positive significance for society in a certain historical period. Five types of value phenomena can be distinguished: 1) value objectivity; 2) primary value reality; 3) value relation; 4) value norm; 5) value orientation according to the genetic principle, i. e., in the order in which they occur. The first two types have a pronounced objective side. They do not only really exist, but also do not depend on the desire and choice of a particular person.

Value objectivity is the properties of an object (or phenomenon) through which it can perform a certain useful function in society. Natural (biological) phenomena may have a value object. For example, the positive properties of the earth's subsoil, favorable climatic conditions, solar radiation,

etc. Such properties can also have artificial phenomena created by people (machines, utensils, production technologies, scientific theories, etc.). Value objectivity exists previously and regardless of the value orientation of a particular person. It can be potential (i. e. unknown and unused) or real (used).

The first value reality is those objects and phenomena in which value properties are known (revealed) and which began to be used by people. It includes as material and spiritual values, as so as natural and artificially created by people. For example, mined minerals, solar energy, using practical technical inventions, recognized scientific theories, etc.

The following three types of value phenomena have a pronounced subjective side. They are connected with the conscious choice of people and exist mainly in the spiritual sphere.

A value attitude is an accepted attitude in society (i. e. recognized, established) positive significance of a particular phenomenon for a certain group of people (or for society as a whole) [Kagan, 1997, 93]. This is part of the holistic attitude of the individual towards himself, which has developed during anthro-socio-cultural genesis and is being formed anew during individual socialization. Thanks to this, it acquires the ability to perform a certain useful function, as from it comes an "estimated attitude" as a procedural social characteristic of human activity [Pesotskaya, 1996, 6]. Thus, in the socio-political sphere of modern society, the following values are generally accepted: sustainable peace, state security, legal order, political and economic freedom, social justice, stable development.

Value norms are rules and stereotypes of people's behavior that are enshrined in public prescriptions (moral and legal). They perform the function of activity regulators in society thanks to the instrumental character of the worldview [Pesotskaya, Zor'kina, Belova, 2017, 87]. An example is the universal norms of morality, without which no society can exist: honesty, truthfulness, politeness, care for children and the elderly, benevolence, etc.

Value orientations are such value representations that a given person is guided by in their actions. Their priorities (preferences) in choosing a profession are an important aspect of youth value orientations. For example, according to a survey at Mordovian State University, among history students of I-II courses [Frolov, Malkin, 1994, 198-210] professional priorities are as follows: 1) becoming a teacher (30-40% in different educational groups); 2) to becoming an entrepreneur (30-40%); 3) working in the field of management (10-20%); 4) engaging in science (3-5%); 5) other priorities (3-5%).

It is important to note the scientific interest in the hysteresis phenomenon [Anisimova, Borisova, 2019, 34; Knyazeva, 2011, 78] as a process to which, in principle, the functioning of value phenomena as complex systems is subordinate. Historical memory in this case acts as an articulated entity, and as the basis for their functioning by the organization of information about the past.

Along with distinguishing value phenomena by genetic principle, there are other approaches to their typology. Four forms of spiritual and value development of being (ideology, law (legal understanding), religion, art) are distinguished, without mentioning the foundations (criteria) of this division [Nersesyants, 2000]. Some Russian classifications [Talanova, 2014] are based on types of production: people, things and ideas. Accordingly, three types of values are distinguished: 1) the person himself (as the main value and self-value); 2) material things produced by man; 3) spiritual values. However, in this classification, from the axiogenic being of man, there is no natural world. We are talking only about artificial objects.

Within each of the listed qualitative types of value phenomena, several types of values should be distinguished. In the future, the work will mainly include an emphasis on non-value relations, norms and orientations. According to the traditional distinction of forms of social consciousness, one can distinguish types of values: moral, political, legal, aesthetic, worldview-philosophical, religious, epistemological (scientific), environmental, pedagogical and others.

In each form group, usually one value is recognized as the main one: Good – in ethics, (social) Justice – in politics, Equality (before the law) – in law, Beauty – in aesthetics, God – in religion, Truth – in knowledge (science), Freedom (entrepreneurship) – in economics, Harmony (personality) – in pedagogy, etc. Understanding the essence (content) of these values can be different and change depending on the historical stage of the development of society, the traditions of the country, the national characteristics of psychology, etc.

In the history of philosophy, three approaches have developed on the issue of the hierarchy of social values: classical, relativistic and system-constructive. The classical approach relies on the tenet of a unified, eternal (unchanging) and human-independent hierarchy of values. Its most bright representatives are N. Hartmann, H. Rickert, W. Windelband and others.

The relativistic approach is based on the statement of diversity, equality and independence of value systems of different social groups. It is held by many proponents of positivism and social psychology: J.S. Mill, M. Schlick, E. Spranger.

The system-constructive approach is based on the recognition of the existence of a holistic system of values in society and the need for its periodic change, restructuring, and reform. It has several alternative varieties according to priority value orientation. This is reflected in the works of C. Günzl, F. Nietzsche, A. Pececi, N.S. Rozov, P. Teilhard de Chardin, V.I. Vernadsky.

In modern conditions, the most interesting is the humanistic-oriented version of the third approach. It is quite clearly formulated in the concepts of C. Günzl and N.S. Rozov [Günzl, 1993; Rozov, 1998]. Synthesizing and clarifying the points of view of these authors, it can be concluded that the system of social values has a complex structure. It includes four subsystems that are located at three hierarchical levels: 1) common values (four groups of primary and five groups of secondary common values); 2) alternative values of the individual; 3) state-ideological values; 4) the highest integrative values of mankind. The first and fourth subsystems represent universal human values at the modern stage of social development, the second and third – social and group ones. First, we will focus on the first and second groups of the value system, which are located at the lower (basic) level of the hierarchy.

Common values limit a person, that is, they require their mandatory adoption and observance by each member of a modern civilized society.

Primary common values include: 1) basic vital values (life, health, bodily integrity and personal integrity); 2) basic civil values (freedom of conscience, speech, movement, choice of residence; the right to inviolability of the home and continuation of the family); 3) ethical values of everyday relationships, including religious and ethical (politeness, benevolence, honesty, modesty, etc.); 4) aesthetic values (the desire to create according to the laws of beauty, harmony, perfection).

Secondary values include: 1) political and legal (universal suffrage, court independence, media independence); 2) socioeconomic (freedom of business, the right to economic self-sufficiency of individuals, economic independence of countries); 3) environmental (preservation of man as a biological forms; cleanliness of air, water and soil; soil and landscape fertility; diversity of plant to animal life; radiation and bacteriological safety); 4) pedagogical (modern promising methods of human education); 5) epistemological (achievements of modern sciences). Alternative values show the ultimate target aspiration of the whole life and activity of a particular person. They can be different (alternative) in different people (and social groups) and freely selected by them (or even changed).

We highlight several groups of alternative values in modern society: 1) humanistic secular values (respect and love for man, Truth, Goodness, Beauty, Justice, harmony with nature); 2) religious Christian values (God, religious faith love for God and all people, Orthodox conciliarity, etc.); 3) social and group values (the benefit of their family, the interests of their labor collective, the interests of an elite group); 4) conservative values (folk traditions, ideals of the monarchist state, etc.); 5) national

values (interests of their people, nation); 6) creative and labor values (when the scientist devotes his whole life to science, the inventor – to a new discovery, the composer – to musical creativity, etc.); 7) individual-selfish values (personal good; in this case, conflict with society is almost inevitable if the individual does not learn to coordinate his individualistic aspirations with public ones, or skillfully hide them).

All value groups are interconnected. In addition to the named hierarchical system classification, there are more specific classifications of values by individual features, which makes it possible to distinguish ethical (whole group), aesthetic, epistemological, material and spiritual, group and universal values, etc.

If we consider the state-ideological and higher integrative values of mankind, then first it should be noted that in a particular country, generally significant and alternative values have a kind of interpretation and their priorities. It depends on national traditions and the prevailing state ideology. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the influence and peculiar "pressure" of a special subsystem of values – state-ideological. They have a fundamental philosophical and political science rationale. Sometimes in several countries in a certain historical era, similar value priorities dominate.

As the most popular and staged can be called: asceticism (Christian monasticism of the Middle Ages, equalizing tendencies "barracks communism" in a number of countries in the 20th century); hedonism (the slave aristocracy of ancient Rome; major capitalists of the period of rapid development of the bourgeois system in France and other countries); Orthodox conciliarity ("silver age" in Russia); class-party sociocentrism ("Soviet period" in Russia); utilitarianism and pragmatism (the USA of the second half of the 20th century); global hegemonism (a new US value orientation since the late 1990s). Each of the named value groups is distinguished by specific historical and national-state limitations. However, the emergence and existence of such priorities is inevitable (naturally), while there is a national-state division of society.

Besides state-ideological, there are values of a special kind – the highest integrative values of mankind. Their main purpose is to coordinate the common interests of all countries and peoples in the name of the survival of mankind at the current crisis stage of its development. The most important of them, according to the concept of the Austrian philosopher C. Günzl, are the following.

- 1) Recognition of the unity of the space world and humanity. It manifests itself not only in the links of the exchange of matter, energy and information, but also in the general evolutionary orientation of the world (the gradual emergence of more complex and perfect integral structures). This general orientation is ensured by the influence of unified space (information and energy) forces.
 - 2) Accepting the inevitability of an evolutionary transition to the integration integrity of all mankind – global integration. This process is the main content of the modern era. It began with the collapse of the "bipolar world," the cessation of the confrontation between the two social systems (socialism and capitalism) and crisis processes in connection with the restructuring of value systems.
 - 3) The definition of the spiritual basis for the integration of universal humanistic values. This it means, first of all, a new understanding of a person in which they have self-value. A particular person does not act as a means in the hands of any political forces, but as an independent (free) social subject of the historical process and its main goal (in terms of its self-improvement).
 - 4) Recognition of the economic basis for the integration of partnerships that are based on certain principles, as well as free mutually beneficial cooperation. This implies the equality of all forms of ownership (individual, private, cooperative, state) freedom of the market relations with limited state regulation, state support for small producers [Günzl, 1993, 10-12].
-

Finally, the definition as a political basis of such a union of a new principle of survival (instead of selection) – the principle of subsidiary. It says: "If I am better at something than you, then how can I help you" (C. Günzl). Its use is possible under conditions: deideologization of interstate relations, political dialogue, refusal to use military force in interstate relations, equality of all states (large and small), exclusion of attempts at global dominance of a separate country or block of countries. The highest integrative values of mankind do not cancel state-ideological. The latter will exist as long as there are nation states.

In modern society, there is a paradigm shift in value thinking. Globally, there are four main trends in the evolution of value consciousness are manifested: 1) expansion as a desire to impose its system of values on the whole world (religious fanaticism of the Wahhabis (a reactionary sectarian current that broke away from Islam); 2) self-isolation as an attempt to preserve its outdated value system, isolated from the surrounding world (North Korea, Cuba); 3) multipolulation as recognition of self-sufficiency (self-worth and uniqueness) in the development of national-cultural traditions such as West – East – Russia, etc. (some political scientists call up to a dozen or more similar "poles," declaring their originality almost the main direction of world development); however, this is essentially a reverse movement – from the integrity of the world to its artificial fragmentation; 4) partnership integration as global unification of all countries on the basis of recognition of a certain range of common values for all – the highest integrative values of mankind (they were discussed in the previous issue), while preserving the national-state identity of each country and the development of mutually beneficial partnership. The first three trends are dead-end development pathways. Only the latter opens up a progressive historical perspective.

Conclusion

Partner integration is accompanied by a shift in the paradigm of value thinking. It is known that, relative to modern Russian society, we can talk about a double paradigm shift. On the scale of the country, this means, first of all, the rejection of the party-class approach in the state ideology and the recognition of the priority of universal humanistic values, "dialogic thinking" (according to M.M. Bakhtin) and the philosophical reflection of "historical memory". In this perspective, historical memory finalizes the actualization of life, extending it in an existential vector in the direction of synthesis of philosophical and scientific knowledge about man. Cardinal transformations of public consciousness are characteristic of the entire historical era. The main content of the modern era consists in the transition to the worldwide, planetary integration of mankind, determining the order and importance of human values in terms for preserving civilization. This process takes place and is accompanied by contradictions and crisis phenomena. It is based on a change in the paradigm of value thinking. It means understanding and acceptance by all countries of the highest integrative values of mankind, which should be put above state-ideological, social-group and personal interests.

References

1. Anisimova S.Yu., Borisova T.V. (2019) Rol' mezhdistsiplinarnogo podkhoda v filosofii istorii [The role of the interdisciplinary approach in the philosophy of history]. *Aspirantskii vestnik Povolzh'ya* [Postgraduate bulletin of the Volga region], 7-8, pp. 32-36.
2. Frolov D.E., Malkin V.I. (1994) *Aktivnost' lichnosti studenta (aksiologicheskaya kontseptsiya v kompleksnom sotsiologicheskom issledovanii)* [Students' activity (the axiological concept in a comprehensive sociological study)]. Moscow: Universum Publ.
3. Günzl C. (1993) *Novoe vremya – novoe myshlenie – novoe soznanie* [New time – new thinking – new consciousness]. *Vestnik Mordovskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Mordovia University], 4, pp. 9-14.

4. Kagan M.S. (1997) *Filosofskaya teoriya tsennosti* [The philosophical theory of value]. St. Petersburg: Petropolis Publ.
5. Knyazeva E.N. (2011) Temporal'naya arkhitektura slozhnosti [Temporal architecture of complexity]. In: *Sinergeticheskaya paradigma: sinergetika innovatsionnoi slozhnosti* [The synergetic paradigm: the synergetics of innovative complexity]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya Publ., pp. 66-86.
6. Nersesyants V.S. (2000) *Politiko-pravovye tsennosti: istoriya i sovremennost'* [Political and legal values: history and modernity]. Moscow: Editorial URSS Publ.
7. Pesotskaya E.N. (1996) *Prirodno-biologicheskie faktory sotsial'noi aktivnosti lichnosti (filosofskii analiz). Doct. Diss. Abstract* [Natural and biological factors of social activities of an individual (philosophical analysis). Doct. Diss. Abstract]. Saransk.
8. Pesotskaya E.N., Zor'kina A.V., Belova L.A. (2017) *Teoreticheskie osnovy integratsii meditsiny i filosofii* [Theoretical foundations of the integration of medicine and philosophy]. Saransk.
9. Rozov N.S. (1998) *Tsennosti v problemnom mire: filosofskie osnovaniya i sotsial'nye prilozheniya konstruktivnoi aksiologii* [Values in a problematic world: philosophical foundations and social applications of constructive axiology]. Novosibirsk.
10. Talanova K.S. (2014) *Definitsiya i tipologiya tsennostei* [The definition and typology of values]. *Sotsiologiya* [Sociology], 2, pp. 89-93.

Проблема типологии ценностных явлений и их классификации в аксиологии (парадигмальный аспект)

Песоцкая Елена Николаевна

Кандидат философских наук, доцент,
профессор Российской академии естествознания,
доцент кафедры философии,
Национальный исследовательский Мордовский
государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева,
430005, Российская Федерация, Саранск, ул. Большевистская, 68;
e-mail: cerera-office@mail.ru

Аксенова Светлана Владимировна

Доктор медицинских наук,
профессор кафедры госпитальной хирургии
с курсами травматологии и ортопедии, глазных болезней,
Национальный исследовательский Мордовский
государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева,
430005, Российская Федерация, Саранск, ул. Большевистская, 68;
e-mail: aksenovamed@mail.ru

Чегодаева Людмила Викторовна

Кандидат медицинских наук,
доцент кафедры госпитальной терапии,
Национальный исследовательский Мордовский
государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева,
430005, Российская Федерация, Саранск, ул. Большевистская, 68;
e-mail: chегдаeva20@rambler.ru

Аннотация

Социальное бытие истории общества и человека продолжается посредством онтологических оснований норм деятельности, которые актуализирует историческая память, связанная с ценностями. В статье представлена классификация ценностных явлений в аксиологии, выстроенная на базе широкого философского представления о ценностях, понимания ценности в зависимости от аспекта ее рассмотрения как идеала (нормы), как вещи и отношения значимости. Социальные ценности означают совокупность всех природных, социальных и духовных явлений, обладающих положительной значимостью для общества в определенный период истории. Процессы гистерезиса и артикуляции памяти понимаются как сущность и как момент функционирования ценностных явлений. Исходя из генетического принципа, авторы выделяют пять типов ценностных явлений антропосоциокультурогенеза, к которым относятся ценностная предметность, первичная ценностная реальность, ценностное отношение, ценностная норма, ценностная ориентация. Также рассмотрены различные вариации подходов к их типологии на основе разных оснований, предложенных рядом российских ученых. Особое внимание уделяется парадигмальному аспекту эволюции ценностного сознания и анализу высших интегративных ценностей человечества. В качестве политической основы объединения человечества назван принцип субсидиарности.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Песоцкая Е.Н., Аксенова С.В., Чегодаева Л.В. The problem of the typology of value phenomena and their classification in axiology (the paradigm aspect) // Контекст и рефлексия: философия о мире и человеке. 2022. Том 11. № 5А. С. 264-271. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.27.64.030

Ключевые слова

Личность, социальная ценность, ценностное сознание, ценностные отношения, основание, норма деятельности, типология, гистерезис, система, принцип субсидиарности.

Библиография

1. Анисимова С.Ю., Борисова Т.В. Роль междисциплинарного подхода в философии истории // Аспирантский вестник Поволжья. 2019. № 7-8. С. 32-36.
2. Гюнцль К. Новое время – новое мышление – новое сознание // Вестник Мордовского университета. 1993. № 4. С. 9-14.
3. Каган М.С. Философская теория ценности. СПб.: Петрополис, 1997. 205 с.
4. Князева Е.Н. Темпоральная архитектура сложности // Синергетическая парадигма: синергетика инновационной сложности. М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2011. С. 66-86.
5. Нерсесянц В.С. Политико-правовые ценности: история и современность. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2000. 256 с.
6. Песоцкая Е.Н. Природно-биологические факторы социальной активности личности (философский анализ): автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук. Саранск, 1996. 16 с.
7. Песоцкая Е.Н., Зорькина А.В., Белова Л.А. Теоретические основы интеграции медицины и философии. Саранск, 2017. 186 с.
8. Розов Н.С. Ценности в проблемном мире: философские основания и социальные приложения конструктивной аксиологии. Новосибирск, 1998. 292 с.
9. Таланова К.С. Дефиниция и типология ценностей // Социология. 2014. № 2. С. 89-93.
10. Фролов Д.Е., Малкин В.И. Активность личности студента (аксиологическая концепция в комплексном социологическом исследовании). М.: Универсум, 1994. 383 с.