

є постаті рабовласника, феодала-землевласника і власника капіталу). Якщо ж відносини економічної рівності знову стануть передумовою гранично досяжних темпів культурного розвитку, які будуть умовою виживання людського роду, то знову (у неможливості чого був переконаний ідеолог людської нерівності Аристотель, котрий був певен, що ткацькі верстати ніколи не зможуть самі ткати тканини, плектри – грати на кіфарі, а будівельні машини – будувати храми) економічна рівність стане природнім типом суспільних відносин, санкціонованих і захищених законом. І тоді на зміну економічній людині у якості природньо домінуючого людського типу прийде людина соціетальна, що докорінно змінить правовий ландшафт сучасної цивілізації. Достатньо уважно вивчити матеріали т.зв. «Давоських форумів» за останнє десятиліття, щоб побачити, як саме соціетальні (а не суто економічні) параметри сучасних людських суспільств поступово стають пріоритетними для сучасної світової інтелектуальної, політичної і підприємницької еліти.

Джерела:

1. Європейський словник філософій: Лексикон непрекладностей / пер. з фр. Том другий. К. : Дух і літера, 2011. 488 с.
2. Манжура В.И. Антопосоциокультурная тотальность (АСК) – поверхность и глубина. *Грани*. 2006. №3. С. 62–68.

Smaznova Iryna

*Head of the Department of Philosophy, Professor, Doctor of Law
National University «Odessa Law Academy»*

MILITARISM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The culture of militarism, expressed in the mentality of Europeans, is attributed to the emergence of the phenomena of nihilism and terrorism in Europe as a reaction to disappointment with the illusion of «European civilization» and an attempt to revive its own culture.

Terrorism, by its nature, can also be viewed as a reflection of the militaristic tendency of the mentality of the European nation, since the culture of militarism gives rise to aggressive methods of counteracting the existing order. It is not by chance noted that «after a short period of unsuccessful attempts at the peaceful embodiment of social utopia, the agitation of the narodniks with their Orthodox mentality was replaced by the only thing that seemed possible – terror» [2, p. 120]. At the same time, «narodniks' terrorism in Tsarist Russia (the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries) is the only concrete historical type of terrorism, where exactly the altruistic attitude as the fulfillment of a personal sacrifice for the good of the person («people» and «labor classes») is most fully manifested and brightly» [2, p. 69]. The salvation of an individual is possible only strictly within this community and through it.

This theory captures the socio-philosophical aspect at the level of intercultural conflict, but the clarity of the historical and socio-cultural context of a civilizational clash is insufficient. «The most important objective sign of nihilism (anti-tradition) of modern Western civilization is an indisputable fact: the universe is less and less perceived as order and more and more as chaos. Thus, the first participant in the clash of civilization, it would be wrong to designate only as a «Western Christian civilization». The latter is a Christian in its origins civilization that has passed a long period of decadence and nihilism and is on the verge of «complete nihilism» – the most profound blurring of traditional values. In the spiritual foundation of this civilization, Christianity is preserved only as a private one, by no means the most important element, the dominant component being the ideology of neoliberalism. Therefore, it would be more correct to call the first participant in the clash of civilizations as a «liberal-democratic civilization», as E. Kuliev, in particular, does. In such conditions, conflict is a clash between two value systems: neoliberalism and Islam.

The opposite goal has been set by the movement of Islamic fundamentalism, although its causes lie in the response, including to the militarism of the European mentality. Today, fundamentalists oppose the «revived and renewed» community of believers based on national traditions and spiritual heritage, appealing to the expe-

rience of the early Muslim community of the times of the Prophet Muhammad, which appears as an attempt to get rid of moral values with pronounced militarism of the West, with its cult of individualism [2, p. 152–153].

In essence, pursuing the goal of clearing the European mentality, the movement of Islamic fundamentalism went through several stages of its development until the tradition of terrorism matured within it. A characteristic feature of all ideological trends in Islam is conservatism.

In the aspect of the conflict of civilizations and cultures, the idea of militarism received a global sound in the work of the well-known political scientist S. Huntington, who introduced the global conflict of civilizations and came to explain the spread of these global threats [3]. Hence the recognition of a cliché about Islamic fundamentalism and related Islamic extremism and terrorism as a product of the clash of European and Muslim civilizations, not only at the level of political and economic rivalry, but also at the level of culture, basic values and beliefs.

It can be stated that militarism has become a part of modern culture, a way of human thinking and being. No matter how sad it is to talk about it, but this is our reality – the «culture» of militarism. It seems that in order to assert a culture of peace, we must know the «culture» of militarism.

The culture of militarism is a paradoxical phenomenon: love and care for «our people is manifested in indifference, and sometimes cruelty to «aliens». Such an attitude to the division into friends and foes comes from building relationships in tribal communities, when the survival of the individual was possible only within «his» community, including through the use and even destruction of outsiders. Approval of the culture of militarism found an active response both in the minds of the inhabitants, and the great thinkers and politicians.

The Russian philosopher N. A. Berdyaev wrote that nations must periodically go crazy to fight, but on the other hand, war, with a spiritual due attitude towards it, ennobles and elevates the human soul, it speaks of a distinctive historical reality, gives a courageous sense of history [1, p. 190, 192–193].

War as a component of the structure of militarism became the subject of high art. An uncountable number of novels, novellas, poems, operas, songs, canvases, sculptures, and monuments have been written and created about the war. All of them are dedicated to the great and outstanding commanders and military leaders, the courage and heroism of known and unknown soldiers who fell on the battlefield. We know the names of Macedonian, Napoleon, Suvorov, Kutuzov, Zhukov and other commanders of whom the people and the country are proud of, for whom they have won brilliant victories and who have since owned the glory of these victories. To be a military man at all times and in all countries was considered an honor. Military service attracts more and more new generations of people who dream of military uniforms, military ranks and awards, military merit and military glory. But in its essence to be a military man is to be able and ready to kill and die.

Today, the growing interconnectedness of the world makes even the thought of world war even more unacceptable. Nevertheless, the probability of a large-scale, including nuclear war, cannot be ruled out, and the number of local wars and conflicts grows from year to year.

Militarism as a state of the European mentality, absolutizing the capabilities of the military sphere, its methods, means and technologies of warfare is often used to solve problems that go beyond ensuring national defense. The militaristic policy, expressed in the militarization of its means, the justification of armed violence and its transformation into a tool for solving political, economic and social contradictions within the country and in the sphere of international relations. The influence of militarism on the global political process in the era of globalization and informatization is due to the acquisition of a transnational character by this phenomenon, contributing to the militarization of politics in various countries and regions of the planet.

In the era of globalization, the driving forces of militarization are ideological doctrines, advances in information technologies, and military-political planning of leading world states. Their concentrated influence leads to the transformation of militarism of national states, its adaptation to the tendencies of the development

of the institutions of democracy and the dehumanization of international politics. In practice, this is expressed in declaring the need to protect human values, human rights and freedoms, and calls for counteracting new threats. At the same time, the doctrine of deterrence, synthesizing informational influence and situational use of military force, is becoming a tool for ensuring the global expansion of the Western powers.

Despite the dramatic changes in the life of modern society, the essence of the militarization process is due to the same European mentality with its inherent aggressiveness. However, the new militarism, in contrast to past eras, thanks to the possibilities of informatization, is a global formation of global scale.

Back in the early twentieth century N. S. Trubetskoy in his work «Europe and Humanity» foresaw the horrific consequences of the Europeanization of the rest of the world, including the Muslim one: «The consequences of Europeanization are so grave and terrible that Europeanization has to be considered not good, but evil. Militarism as a «satellite of civilization» derives from the very essence of Europeanization and concerns the very essence of social life and culture of the Europeanized people. Even if the system was changed, the European states would have had, first of all, with fire and sword to lead the same system all over the world, and after that vigilantly ensure that no people changed this system» [6].

It can be argued that the modern militaristic policy of the United States, which was formed in the prism of the European mentality, continues to increase the pace of militarization, which inevitably attracts a response from other states and non-state actors, also resorting to various forms of militarization. The specific features of militarization in the 21st century consist in the multiplication of its subject composition, when along with the states and their coalitions and international organizations, non-state actors play an increasingly active role in world politics. The persistence of political instability in strategic regions of the planet causes a modification of the functions of military-political blocs, interstate unions, which go beyond their initial mission and aim at intervening in internal conflicts of nation-states, which, in particular, is due to the consequences of the global financial and economic crisis.

Today, despite the proclamation of human rights and freedoms, the mentality of Europeans retains the features of militarism, which leads to a clash of political and corporate interests of leading actors in international relations. The active promotion of military-political interests of states with a pronounced militaristic policy provokes similar measures by other powers, and also serves as a moral justification for the penetration and spread of the influence of organizations of transnational terrorism.

Thus, at the present stage of development for all cultures and civilizations, the danger of the policy of militarism remains, which undermines the foundations of the global order and opposes the introduction, development and application of mechanisms of tolerance. It is the rooting of tolerance that should restrain militarism and also lead to the harmonious coexistence of aggression and tolerance. The idea of tolerance is the basis of behavior in an individualized society, it must change the culture of militarism in the mentality of not only Europeans, but also representatives of other civilizations and nations, and otherwise the world will continue to shake aggression, conflicts, terrorist acts and wars.

References:

1. Berdyayev, N. A. (1970), *Filosofiya neravenstva. Pis'ma k nedrugam po sotsial'noy filosofii* [Philosophy of Inequality. Letters to enemies on social philosophy]. Paris : YMCA-Press.
2. Chudinov, S. I. (2007), *Terrorizm kak sotsiokul'turnyy fenomen: sotsial'no-filosofskiy analiz* [Terrorism as a sociocultural phenomenon: a socio-philosophical analysis]. Novosibirsk : NGASU (Sibstrin).
3. Huntington, Samuel P. (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York : Simon & Schuster.
4. Nietzsche, F. (2015), *Human, All Too Human*. Herts : Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
5. Trubetskoy, N. S. (2015), *Evropa i chelovechestvo* [Europe and humanity]. Moscow : Direct-Media.