Interdisciplinary Studies of Complex Systems
No. 23 (2023) 179–190

https://doi.org/10.31392/iscs.2023.23.179 UDC 7.01:124.4

The ideal in the cultural system: a structural-functional analysis

Lidiya Chorna[1], *Tamara Rozova*[2,3], *Serhii Rusakov*[2,4], *Gennadii Tselkovsky*[2,5]

Abstract. The article examines the specifics of the functioning of the ideal as a cultural concept defined as a polysystemic whole. The structural-functional analysis reveals the conceptuality of the ideal as a component of cultural practices and cultural system, which, performing the function of determining the future, has spatial and temporal characteristics and is embodied in the concrete, single. The content of the functional system within which the ideal is constructed is determined. The functional system has a goal-setting essence, the core of which is ideal images. The concept of "negentropy" is introduced, as the opposite of the concept of entropy, and which characterizes the ordering function of the ideal. The deconstructionist postmodern approach and the structural-functional approach to the definition of the ideal are contrasted. The author reveals the organismic nature of the ideal as intertwined and conditioned by human nature and human activity.

Keywords: ideal, functional systems of culture, culture system, multifunctionality, polysystemicity, negentropy, universum, Kyiv School of Philosophy

Introduction

The category of "ideal" is semantically tense. It reflects an understanding of the desired future, a model, a system, everything that is considered the best, necessary and regulatory effective. But at the same time, the category "ideal" also reveals the phenomenon of the individual, the one that carries the universal in it. The problem of the ideal has concerned thinkers of all times and peoples, and remains a relevant issue for research today. The relationship between the ideal and its practical realization is a hot topic of discussion in contemporary philosophical thought. The problem of the ideal has to some extent permeated the work of almost all famous philosophers from antiquity to the present. The question of understanding the ideal and ideals is fundamental to the philosophical comprehension of human existence. What ideals and goals a person or a society has, such a future awaits them. Therefore, it is necessary

[1] Odessa Polytechnic National University. chorlidiya@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8527-2416
[2] Dragomanov Ukrainian State University, Kyiv, Ukraine
[3] t.v.rozova@udu.edu.ua, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5168-425X
[4] s.s.rusakov@udu.edu.ua, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8494-9445
[5] h.a.tselkovskyy@udu.edu.ua, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2652-9506

to comprehend the problem of the ideal from the perspective of understanding the future. Thus, in this study, attention will be paid to the analysis of the ambivalence of the ideal, and the ideal as a functional system of culture will be considered.

The purpose of the article is to study the ideal as a functional system, to define it within the framework of sociopragmatics, and to interpret the ideal in the context of the forms of mastering the future in culture.

The relevance of the study is based on the ambivalence of the ideal. Ambivalence leads to the fact that it is interpreted in different ways. On the one hand, the ideal is understood as the perfect, complete, constructed in images, norms, models, and patterns of the desired future. On the other hand, the ideal as a stable, established way of being and an ideal construction is both a guarantee of realization and feasible harmony in various spheres of culture. This harmony begins with the ethical, aesthetic, and artistic spheres of culture and ends with legal norms that are instructive in nature.

Statement of the problem. The very approach to the ideal as a functional system indicates that the ideal is defined within the framework of sociopragmatics. It is defined within a social system oriented towards a certain consumer, a certain social community. It legitimizes the ideal, sees it as the goal, task and purpose of its existence. The social community is oriented in one way or another to the regulatory functions that this ideal implements.

Analysis of the basic results of previous studies and the literature used. Neurophysiologists were the first to consider the concept of a "functional system" in Ukrainian science [1–6]. Their research was largely based on the solid work of foreign scientists: Hilary Putnam, John Searle, Alan Turing, Ned Block, Tamar Gendler, Frank Jackson, David Lewis, Thomas Nagel, Sydney Shoemaker [7–25].

However, Ukrainian humanities faces an important task: to expand the concept of a functional system to the concept of a "functional system of culture".

Presentation of the main research material

The horizon of self-realization of the functional system of culture is the space-time continuum. Thus, culture can also be interpreted as a certain social system in which mechanisms for predicting the future function. This future appears as a polysystemic integrity. It is described in the context of different systems — the sphere of art, the sphere of ethics, and the aesthetic. In other words, in this way, system analysis becomes polysystemic, and functionality is interpreted broadly — as a project, as a system of goal-setting. This also includes mechanisms for identifying goal setting and goal realization. Such mechanisms of identification are formed as an ideal, as a model of the desired future. The model becomes the systemic source and basis for the functioning of various systems of society. "At present, the development of a number of specific scientific disciplines puts forward the task of studying specific forms of the s of the world at different levels of the organization of matter, in particular, at the level of living matter. The spatio-temporal structure of the world is the foundation on which primary life acquires its basic qualities, and living beings acquire those qualities that are adaptive in the process of their evolution, up

to the highest stage — man" [30, p.265]. Thus, the philosophical aspects of the functional system are considered mainly as types of the system of human adaptation to the space-time continuum. We interpret the philosophical aspects of the functional system as the unity of social time and space. In turn, this unity is fixed in certain forms of activity. This actualizes the need to identify those special features of the temporal structure of the world that have become a kind of categorical imperative for the development of life on Earth. It should be noted that we use the Kantian category of "categorical imperative" not because it looks like a nice metaphor. We use the concept of "categorical imperative" because the ideal always exists in the form of a normative framework, a system of goals, a core of goal setting. The ideal creates the possibility of realization, which can be defined as imperative, a task that is described in the system of social forecasting and goal setting as a project.

The project can be interpreted in a rather broad sense as a goal-setting activity that defines the supergoal of human existence in life. In this case, the supergoal is associated with the core or system of goals. The system of goals determines the polysystemic whole, which forms the universal unity of systems of human existence or cultural practices. Cultural practices are the effective mechanisms of the functional system of culture. It should be emphasized that the goal-setting system in the context of anticipation and vision of the future as feasible is a rhythm, i.e., cyclism, due to which the organism adapts to extreme phases of development. Cyclism allows you to fit into the space-time framework of the system's existence, which makes it possible for the chronotope to exist. Thus, space-time can be understood as a life cycle and, thus, a strategy for adaptation and survival can be developed. However, when it comes to a functional system within a culture, adaptation alone is not enough. It plays an important role as an orientation activity. In addition to adaptation, there is another reality of the modification of spatio-temporal relations, their transformation, the formation of a new continuum and a new chronotope. This new chronotope becomes the chronotope of culture, or of those cultural practices in which new temporalities of human activity are realized. "It is difficult to find such moments in the history of civilization about which one could say that it was then that the idea of the integrity and unity of the world emerged. Probably, from the very first attempt to understand the world, a thinking person faced a vulnerable harmony between the whole, the universum, and individual details and parts. However, in the essence of the human mind, it always deals with the immediate, with its environment, which is competitive, is a certain niche of distribution that creates those specific images that affect the course of activity in the knowledge of the world" [30, p.267].

Thus, we are talking about what is called the universum. The ideal itself can also be understood as a universum, a projection of "all possible and impossible worlds" onto the world of the ideal, if we define the universum according to Serhii Krymsky. The universum as a projection of all possible and impossible worlds onto the world of the Ideal constitutes the dichotomy of ideal and reality. This dichotomy of the Ideal defines consciousness as denoting the goal, the purpose, the means of goal setting. This dichotomy of the Ideal presupposes a future result. It includes all the artifacts of culture that become carriers of the Ideal. This includes not only human consciousness, but also individual images,

models, norms verbalized and implemented in pictorial constructions, in acts of goal-setting. They can have any form, can be embodied in a subtle form: the form of a gesture, the form of defining a volitional imperative. However, all of this indicates that we are facing an image that can be called a universum.

The difficulty of today's interpretation of the ideal and the ideal is that there is no longer a universum, but a multiversum. The multiversum is a synthesis of universalist systems and interpretations, a significant number of opportunities to find integrity at the level of metaconstructions. In turn, metaconstructions as a phenomenon of the ideal can no longer withstand the overstrain that arises. Therefore, there is a temptation: either to turn again to the proto-substance — Nature, Spirit or the Absolute in the form of a divine source, or vice versa — to define the ideal purely nominally? The nominalist definition of the ideal as a realized construction, embodied in a single thing, implies the imperative dimension of human will, goal-setting, which is fixed as a norm, model, cliché, canon, and rule. At the same time, such a rule can be understood in the context of a system of deviation from its implementation or in the system of an unambiguous imperative response to it. We can say that the above set as a whole raises the problem of the multifunctionality of the ideal. Due to multifunctionality, not only one function is realized, but a vector of functional self-fulfillment of the ideal arises as a problem of the adequacy of the ideal in the context of the multiversum. Multifunctionality implies universal intentions, universal motivations that appear in culture in a complex field of spatio-temporal temporalities of the ideal. "Proponents of the systemic approach emphasize more and more insistently that the system is the isomorphic principle that permeates and passes through all the boundaries that have historically developed between different sciences, despite the fact that these sciences study supposedly qualitatively different classes of phenomena — organisms, society, machines" [30, p. 268].

This is a rather capacious characterization of the class of phenomena — organisms, society and machines. One can interpret society as a machine, an organism as a machine, and vice versa, a machine as an organism. All these metaphors are familiar to science, starting with La Mettrie. They go back to mechanicalism and industrialism, to the interpretation of the desire machine in postmodern discourse. Postmodern discourse suggests that goal-setting, the ideal as a functional system, carries the image of mechanicalism, uniform schemes, mapping, or adaptive principles and regulations of a person in society. In other words, the ideal bears the characteristics of an organism as a system.

If we consider society as a unity of the organismic and the mechanical, this makes it possible to define the ideal as a certain matrix. It gives rise to a model with the efficiency and functionality of a machine, a functional mechanism, and carries out certain normative actions. The matrix acts as an organism, carries an evolutionary branch, a folded code. Such a code is defined in different ways, but most often within the framework of preformism — as a kind of convoluted historical process of the existence of organisms in history, in culture, in society. All of this is fulfilled by the definition of harmony, which on a wide sociocultural basis acquires its own either organismic or mechanistic features, which are associated with the mechanics of determinism. Regardless of human desire,

civilization is increasingly industrialized. It comes to a dialogic relationship between man and nature, man and machine, man and all functionally operating devices. Man also plays the role of either an organism, a machine, or a quantum of society to a certain extent. He (the quantum of society) becomes the bearer of sociality itself and of the ideal that we associate with various differentially structured ideals. These ideals include ethical, aesthetic, legal, political, and other ideals. Thus, the functional system is primarily linked to the activity system. In this case, the following questions must be addressed in the context of the activity: what is the expected result? How should this result be achieved? What mechanisms should be used to achieve this result? How does the system have confidence in achieving the result?

Thus, a functional system is a system of effective acts and the verification that is necessary for its adequate functioning. However, if we try to extend the category of functional systems to sociopragmatics, to the functioning of cultural structures, substructures that perform the function of the ideal, then, of course, such statements are not enough.

In order to expand the concept of a functional system as a general scientific principle, it is necessary to add to the socio-cultural matrix within a system or polysystem

a) goal setting, goal realization within the culture,

b) a model of the culture itself,

c) on the basis of this model, determine its systemic components,

d) to develop functional mechanisms on the basis of the system-forming components or models.

These are the mechanisms that deprive us of the functionality of the Modern era, which was characteristic of the avant-garde, structuralism, and the functionality of social systems. It should be emphasized that the functionality of the Modern era is defined within the framework of mechano-determinism as a certain matrix of adaptability. It defines functionality itself more broadly within the framework of integrative processes. Such processes in the modern context of the culture of the post-Soviet space are difficult to transform and adapt to other systemic factors. These factors determine the modernization, transformation, transit, and mechanisms for transferring systemic quality from other systems to the systems of those cultures that have been cornered in the context of the functioning of the so-called communist ideal. This entire context has become our problematic field of description, descriptions, and interpretation of the phenomenon of the ideal as a functional, i.e., multifunctional whole within the framework of a multisystem analysis of socio-cultural practices.

Let's turn to the systemic-activity interpretation of culture, which is provided in the studies of the Kyiv school of philosophy, where a complex transformation of the category of "activity" took place. The complex of goal-setting itself remained systemic, where the simple components of labor, according to K. Marx: labor, means of labor, and result were interpreted as the goal, means, and achievement of the goal. Subsequently, they began to distinguish the subject of labor, the subject of activity, which was defined primarily as the bearer of the entire socio-cultural potential, as a universum, according to S. Krymsky. The means of labor were seen as a full-fledged palette of all means of cultural creation, a motivated result, which fixed the prerequisite for its achievement as

a polysystemic integrity. This approach deploys goal-setting activities in the space of cultural artifacts and systematically enriches the model of the future.

At the same time, it is important to note that culture is not just an activity. Culture includes:

a) a sphere of state associated with sensuality, with the aesthetic aspect as a sensual activity and an effective sphere of motivation,

b) the sphere of behavior, which is associated with morality, ethics, and Kant's categorical imperative as a necessary condition for the behavioral, acting space of self-realization of any activity.

The question arises: which of these components — behavior, activity, state — is systemic? Many researchers have tried to point out that the initial stage of culture formation was not activity, but behavior. We emphasize that all archaic cultures began with the creation of a taboo system. A taboo system is a behavioral complex, a system of initiation, i.e., transfer from one social unit to another. This made it possible to perform taboo behavior. The system of activity was determined by this behavioral complex.

The state began to be formalized as a super-reality of culture rather late. The interest in the transformation of states, their development and definition occurred in the Middle Ages.

Activity as the main formative principle emerges in the first interactive civilization as a systemic code. This civilization is antiquity. We can define the following sociocodes of culture:

- nominal (archaic cultures),
- professional (emerged in the Middle Ages),
- conceptual (defines the system of activity as a marker of culture).

Thus, the above analysis shows that culture in its evolutionary space, i.e. in the chronotope of culture creation, was not homogeneous. It was not unambiguously determined by one or another factor of culture creation. The same goes for the ideal. It can be defined as an ideal of activity, an ideal of state, an ideal of behavior. The ideal is also the subjective principle, carrier, and motive that was achieved in these spheres and was dominant. We can distinguish periods when culture was defined purely in terms of substance. These periods are reflected in different concepts. For example, in the systems of idealism that date back to antiquity, where the spirit, eidos, and ideal are the ideal as such. In these concepts, the ideal is the structuring principle of matter. In materialist concepts, activity becomes this structuring principle (for example, in Marxism). Subsequently, a post-interpretation emerges when materialism "returns" again. This is how the theory of postculture emerges, where culture is primarily a possibility of producing the "Great Other," the Ideal, the Absolute. If culture loses these qualities, it actually loses what is called culture, i.e., it becomes postculture. However, this kind of substantialism speaks to a certain archaization of culture.

The Kyiv school of philosophy is forming a different vision of culture that departs from substantialism. This model can be called phenomenological. Its representatives are V. Shynkaruk [28], S. Krymsky, V. Ivanov, and Y. Bystrytsky. They defined culture as something in which the world is given to a person. It is no longer a space-time continuum, it is not just the whole

set of activities that are basic to the Marxist approach to interpreting culture, but it is the place of the European paradigm in which a person is possible. M. Heidegger [31] interprets ethos, according to Heraclitus, as a place in which a deity is possible. He determines that it is the predication of the ethical in culture, starting from antiquity, that is formed as a place. And if so, then a strong-willed, effective person comes to the fore. No wonder Heidegger writes that the first atomic bomb exploded in Poem of Parmenides On Nature. In other words, man has become the one who transforms the world — active, strong-willed.

This raises problems that are outlined by Edgar Morin, one of the researchers of large systems, director of the Institute for Strategic Studies in France. He states that the order of nature is much better than the order of man [32]. The entire postmodern paradigm is a new wave of return to nature. But this return is enriched by the latest determinism, the computer electronic revolution. Man begins to probe not only his conscious and subconscious. He is probing the creative laboratory space of the natural foundations of existence, the space of the cell. A person tries to consider the innovative processes taking place at the micro level, to interpret them in the context of modern interpretation. Thus, the project as a goal-setting activity tries to be adapted to bifurcations, creative driving processes. They occur automatically if we extend the mechanistic principle of determinism to nature. This is a design, modeling principle that is associated with fractal-type systems. They are focused on micro-intervals of existence. In this way, a genetic algorithm is modeled in design activity, which creates an image. We are at an interesting stage of modern post-positivism. It encourages us to focus not on the transcendental projects of the German classics, nor on the socio-pragmatism of Marxism with its economic determinism. It allows us to focus not on the ethical and aesthetic constructions of the ideal, which are well described in Schelling's systems of transcendental idealism or in the system of criticism of Kant and Hegel. The sociopragmatics of the ideal as a functional system is becoming a dimension that is now being formed in the context of the latest algorithmic search for the ideal. The ideal now functions as a multiverse, as a polymodal system. The ideal is formed as a polysystemic whole in the context of different subsystems of culture.

Thus, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the modern polysystemic vision of the problem of the ideal is based on the theory of dynamic systems. Today, it is necessary to study the ideal as an identity on the verge of destruction and loss of identity. The need for such a study of the ideal is related to globalization, ecology, and the meta-ecological context. These processes indicate rather complex socio-cultural transformations. They are based on a dialog of cultures. Globalization processes lead to the adaptation of one culture by another, to the inoculation of ideals, principles, and norms. Globalization processes lead to the transformation of a colonizing culture into a culture that is capable of adaptation and the creation of new subcultural realities. Such subcultural realities require not only the development of new programs and projects, but also the creation of ideals as actors in metacultural relations, actors in the civilizational process. In this civilizational process, the ideal acts as an ambivalent integrity. It combines a dichotomy and preserves a

universal polyvalence. In other words, it retains the attraction to the universal, which in individual dimensions preserves the possibility of the whole. This creates the interpretation of the functioning of the ideal that becomes the key to the modern methodological analysis of the ideal as a functional system, as a prediction of the future, as a project.

Today, the environmental threat prompts people to turn to the system of searching for alternatives not only within the framework of finding binary oppositions. It puts a person in front of a new polyvector polymodal matrix. It is associated with polyfunctionality, with the multiple manifestations of normative structures of culture, which are defined through the concepts of "attractor", "pattern", "mediation", "transformation and transmission of information".

Let us define them as components of the functional understanding of the ideal in the context of culture creation. Thus, the concept of pattern — a template, model, scheme — is a scheme-image that acts as a representation or a sensory concept. A pattern is understood as a repeating template or image. The polysystems approach acquires the features of an ecological approach as the preservation of the natural socio-cultural potential of society, as well as the preservation of human beings. This paradigm becomes an imperative, as it is the basis for structuring the entire space of realization of the ideal as an ideal in the context of the eco-future. It is difficult to disagree with Edgar Moren, one of the researchers of large systems, who writes that going beyond cybernetics requires the following prerequisites:

1) understanding the basis of the physical complexity of the principles of disorder and the full use of the idea of disorder not only as a phenomenon of disorganization, but also as an organizing phenomenon;

2) development of the idea of a feedback loop into the idea of recursive organization;

3) appeal to the generic concept of "machine", which becomes polycentric;

4) fundamental complication of the management relations — communication and comprehension of the complexity of the relationship between them; complication of the relationship: management — communication, appropriation — liberation, apparatus — organization — environment [30].

Thus, there is a certain instrumentalization of system-creating activity, which is understood both within the framework of cybernetics, that is, the idea of feedback, and sibernetics (this concept is introduced by Edgar Morin) as an ecological, metaphysical appeal to the original sources. E. Morin states that only when a system is inherent in entropy, when it is constantly rejuvenating itself, turning to its origins, and thus operating on the basis that any order correlates with disorder. Disorder, negentropy, and the destructive line fit into the adaptive strategy of the recursion loop. There is a feedback that is renewing, juvenile determined. The rejuvenation of the system, its renewal, is a necessary functional characteristic that is defined within large systems as the principle of the action acceptor. For Edgar Moren, the action acceptor is the recursion loop as not so much a prediction of the future as a projection into that future. The recursion loop acts as the origins of systemogenesis and systemicity of a functional system. Speaking of entropy and negentropy as a unity of order and disorder, which actually characterizes a functional system, E. Morin states: "From the point of view of change, entropy and negentropy are

two readings of the same value: one (value) with a plus sign, the other (value) with a minus sign. ...Thus, any system can be read according to its entropy as S or negentropy as -S" [30, p.276].

Thus, using this metaphorical formula, Morin shows a certain generalization of the functioning of large systems and their interpretation. Any cyclic process interpreted as an ecological system carries the principle of renewal of integrity and exists as a constantly scanning holism. Where holism is a principle of systemicity that dominates all components of the system. At the same time, orin writes that the principle of holism must be correlated with anti-holism, the definition of the separate, the individual as a carrier of systemicity. Being extremely important, this binary opposition of holism (total systemicity) — anticholism (as system creation on the basis of the individual, separate, special) makes it possible to address the multifunctional realities of the existence of systems. They are formed on the basis of a recursion loop. Thus, it can be argued that the introduction of systemic constructions into scientific circulation will help to interpret the phenomenon of the ideal and the ideal as a polysystemic integrity.

The concept of entropy (from the ancient Greek ἐντροπία — turning, transformation) is widely used in the natural and exact sciences. It was first introduced in thermodynamics and interpreted as an irreversible dissipation of energy. Today it is used in mathematics and information theory. Entropy is interpreted as a measure of disorder in a system. "Negentropy" is a concept created by adding a negative value to the concept of entropy and defining its opposite. Thus, negentropy means a measure of order and organization of a system.

"Entropy and negentropy, although characterizing the same quantity, correspond to antagonistic processes in terms of organization, disorganization, and degeneration. On the one hand, reorganization and regeneration, even development and complexity, on the other hand, processes occurring within closed systems or inactive organizations correspond to a simple understanding of the concept of "entropy" that does not take into account any opposite directional non-gentropic reality. However, negentropic processes cannot do without entropy-increasing processes. This means that the idea of negentropy is complex, carries a direct opposite, and immediately makes it difficult to have a general understanding of entropy that includes both processes. So, we know that any organization is necessarily paid for by an increase in entropy. Negentropy, to the same extent as it corresponds to the constantly active game of the organization, i.e. work, can only cooperate with entropy as its by-product" [30, p. 277].

Thus, negentropy as an adaptive factor and a modifying principle indicates that the development of a system, in this case, the system of culture, carries epicenters of entropy growth. But over time, thanks to the recursion loop, it creates the need to overcome these epicenters. Thus, by rejuvenating the system, a new increase in quality and consistency appears. All this provides a methodological basis for understanding the socio-cultural processes of globalization. This allows us to interpret the integration of the megaspace of cultural interactions. In this way, both entropic and negentropic trends can be identified. It should be noted that the unity of entropy and negentropy

is a complex process, where entropy is a scanning axis of imitation, and negentropy is a permanent negation, a series of reverse recursive shifts. This process indicates the need to invent a new harmony and new instrumental systems. Any actor of socio-cultural interactions (ideal, norm, functional scheme, gestalt, pattern, attractor) should be considered from the standpoint of total systemicity. Thus, actors as effective procedural factors, determinants of these processes, should be defined from the standpoint of total systemicity (holism and anti-holism). But it is also necessary to take into account the role of the special, the individual, the one that carries the possibility of variations, the possibility of avoiding entropy. Polysystemic integrity is characterized by the fact that the same socio-cultural subject can be an actor in different systems. A socio-cultural subject can actualize itself in different dimensions of cultural interactions both within a culture and in the intercultural space.

Conclusions

The functioning of ideals fits into the complex socio-cultural space of contemporary systemic realities of vision, development, destruction, renewal, modernization, and new systemic decline. Ideals require not just modernization, transfer, or transit, but a complete deconstruction (to use postmodernist vocabulary) and a critical attitude to all mechanisms of culture formation. On the other hand, it is necessary to find a genetic algorithm that is naturally determined, organismic. The genetic algorithm cannot be denied by any deconstruction, by cultural codes associated with different religious and political systems. At the same time, idols are often identified with ideals. However, the most important characteristic features of an ideal are:

Firstly, it is natural, organismic;

Secondly, the basis for the ideal should be the socio-cultural matter that has its own polysystemic integrity and dimensionality;

Thirdly, there must be images that make it possible to inscribe the ideal not just in the matrix of cultural intentions, but to comprehend it as an acceptor of the action of cultural systems in the context of different relations, different actors of cultural creation.

Thanks to these features, the ideal itself becomes an actor, a carrier of acts, performs acts of goal setting and goal realization.

Thus, neither any Westernization nor romanticization of ideals (Atlanticism, Slavism, nationalism) will help in this extremely problematic space of global relations. Ideals exist, but their existence is horizontal. The very functionality and reality of the sociopragmatics of the ideal as an orientation to meet the cultural needs of the actors of interaction is the most important problem of our time. All the global limits to growth noted by the Club of Rome representatives only state the fact that many surrogate projects are emerging: environmental, communication, and universal ethics. However, all of them are essentially eclectic. Therefore, the dimension of cultural self-sufficiency of identity, the integrity of each individual actor, and universal ideals that are linked to the ecological ideal and make it possible to predict the future. It can be realized on the basis of harmony that appeals to humanity, not to a particular image that is somehow involved in the globalization processes of our time.

References

[1] Kokun, O. M. 2006. *Psykhofiziolohiia: Navchalnyi posibnyk* (K: Tsentr navchalnoi literatury)

[2] Kokun, O. M. 2004. *Optymizatsiia adaptatsiinykh mozhlyvostei liudyny: Psykhofiziolohichnyi aspekt zabezpechennia diialnosti: Monohrafiia* (K.: Milenium)

[3] Korolchuk, M. S. 2003. *Psykhofiziolohiia diialnosti: Pidruchnyk dlia studentiv vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv* (K: Elha, Nika-Tsentr)

[4] *Psykhofiziolohichne zabezpechennia boiovykh pidrozdiliv v ekstremalnykh umovakh: Metod, posib.* Edited by M. S. Korolchuk (K: MOU, 2001)

[5] Filippov, M. M. 2003. *Psykhofiziolohiia liudyny: Navch posib.* (K: MAUP)

[6] Chaichenko, G. M., Tsybenko, V. O., Sokur, V. D. 2003. *Fiziolohiia liudyny i tvaryny: Pidruchnyk dlia stud. biol. spets. vyshch. navch. zakl.* (K.: Vyshcha shkola)

[7] Block, Ned. 1980a. *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, Volumes 1 and 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[8] Block, Ned. 1980b. *Troubles With Functionalism.* In Block 1980a, 268–305.

[9] *Functionalism and its varieties in Philosophy of Mind* https://medium.com/@francescofranco_39234/functionalism-and-its-varieties-in-philosophy-of-mind-6fba8949f26e

[10] Gendler, Tamar. 2008. *Belief and Alief.* Journal of Philosophy 105(10): 634–663.

[11] Jackson, Frank. 1982. *Epiphenomenal Qualia.* Philosophical Quarterly 32: 127–136.

[12] Lewis, David. 1972. *Psychophysical and Theoretical Identifications.* In Block 1980a, 207–215.

[13] Lewis, David. 1980. *Mad Pain and Martian Pain.* In Block 1980, 216–222.

[14] Nagel, Thomas. 1974. *What Is It Like To Be a Bat?* Philosophical Review 83: 435–450.

[15] Putnam, Hilary. (1960) 1975. *Minds and Machines.* Reprinted in Mind, Language, and Reality, 362–385. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[16] Putnam, Hilary. 1963. *Brains and Behavior.* Reprinted in Putnam 1975b, 325–341.

[17] Putnam, Hilary. 1967. *The Nature of Mental States.* Reprinted in Putnam 1975b, 429–440.

[18] Putnam, Hilary. 1973. *Philosophy and our Mental Life.* Reprinted in Putnam 1975b, 291–303.

[19] Putnam, Hilary. 1975a. *The Meaning of Meaning.* Reprinted in Putnam 1975b, 215–271.

[20] Putnam, Hilary. 1975b. *Mind, Language, and Reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[21] Searle, John. 1980. *Minds, Brains, and Programs.* Behavioral and Brain Sciences 3(3): 417–457.

[22] Shoemaker, Sydney. 1984. *Identity, Cause, and Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[23] Shoemaker, Sydney. 1996. *The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[24] Turing, Alan, M. 1936. *On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem.* Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 42 (1): 230–265.
[25] Turing, Alan, M. 1950. *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*. Mind 49: 433–460.
[26] Shynkaruk, V. I. 1996. *Poniattia kultury. Filosofski aspekty* / Fenomen ukrainskoi kultury: metodolohichni zasady osmyslennia. Kyiv: 8–61
[27] Chorna, L. V. 2023. *Transformatsiia Idealu v prostori Digital Humanities* / Digital transformations in culture: Scientific monograph. Riga, Latvia: "Baltija Publishing,". 91–118. https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-319-4-6
[28] Boichenko, M. I. 2011. *Systemnyi pidkhid u sotsialnomu piznanni: tsinnisnyi i funktsionalnyi aspekty.* Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo "Promin".
[29] Chorna, L. V. 2016. *Ideal yak peredbachennia maibutnoho.* In Hileia: naukovyi visnyk. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats, edited by V. M. Vashkevych. Kyiv: VIR UAN. Vyp. 112. 219–223.
[30] Chorna, L. V. 2016. *U poshukakh idealu: monohrafiia.* Kyiv: "Osvita Ukrainy".
[31] Heidegger, Martin. 1950. Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes. In: Holzwege. Frankfurt am Main.
[32] Morin, Edgar. 1977. La Méthode. La Nature de la nature, t. 1. Paris: Le Seuil, coll. "Points".