

Atamanyuk Z. N. – Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Doctoral Candidate of the Department of philosophy, sociology and management of social and cultural activities, "South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushinsky"

UNDERSTANDING OF FREEDOM IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF EXISTENTIALISM

The purpose of the article is studying the philosophical concept of freedom in the philosophy of existentialism. Freedom acts as a universal value. People are striving for freedom, for only in it and through it can the creative human potential. There are many different definitions of freedom. Freedom is a state of mind, it is a philosophical concept reflecting an inalienable human right to realize one's human will.

Key words: freedom, philosophy of freedom, existentialism, philosophy of existentialism.

It is well known that since the time of the French Revolution freedom has been regarded as the greatest value of culture. Today, in our modern society, we are trying to restore the value of individual freedom, which we formally perceive as one of human and citizen's rights. The concept of "freedom" is increasingly used in the media, in the speeches of political leaders, is declared by the Constitution of our state. However, the meaning about this concept is different; often the most opposite ways of solving the problem of freedom of the human person are offered. But the category is not analyzed seriously in the modern Ukrainian context.

The purpose of the article is studying the philosophical concept of freedom in the philosophy of existentialism.

Only an understanding of freedom as a person's potential for a free choice of an alternative, as an opportunity to think and act in accordance with his ideas and desires, and not as a result of internal or external coercion, gives the person the opportunity to acquire spiritual freedom, to acquire himself as a person. Freedom is the possibility of choosing the option of non-freedom. Free can choose, not free obeys desires. Freedom is a state of mind, it is a philosophical concept that reflects an inalienable human right to realize one's human will.

Outside of freedom, a person cannot realize the wealth of his inner world and his opportunities. Freedom begins exactly where a person deliberately restricts himself.

So, freedom acts as a universal value. People are striving for freedom, for only in it and through it can be realized the creative human potential.

There are many different definitions of freedom. In the law, freedom is the possibility of a certain person's behavior (for example, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, etc.), fixed in the constitution or other legislative act. The category of freedom is close to the concept of law in a subjective sense, but the latter presupposes the existence of a legal mechanism for the implementation and corresponding duty of the state or another subject to take some action. Legal freedom does not have a clear implementation mechanism; it corresponds to the obligation to refrain from committing any acts that violate this freedom [1]. Thus, in the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen" (1789, France), human freedom is treated as an opportunity "to do everything that does not harm the other: thus, the exercise of the natural rights of each person is limited only by those limits that provide for other members of society the enjoyment of those same rights. These limits can be determined by law"[2].

The founder of German classical philosophy, Immanuel Kant, pointed to the inextricable link between freedom and the rule of law. He argued that a person is free if he must obey not to another person, but to a law compulsory for all [3].

Freedom is independence from the arbitrary will of the other [person]. As long as it does not interfere with the freedom of others in accordance with the universal law, it is the natural inherent right of every human being, due to its human nature.

It's according to the Constitution of Ukraine in Section II "Rights, Freedoms and Obligations of a Person and Citizen" in Art. 21, 22, 23, 24. Article 21: "All people are free and equal in dignity and rights. Human rights and freedoms are inalienable and inviolable". Article 22: "The rights and freedoms of man and citizen, enshrined in this Constitution, are not exhaustive".

The concept of freedom is connected with the existence of human freedom in ethics.

Freedom is the state of the subject in which he is the determining cause of his actions, so they aren't conditioned directly by other factors, including natural, social, interpersonally communicative, and individual-generic. The lack of choice, the options for the outcome of the event is tantamount to the lack of freedom.

Freedom as one of the main philosophical categories characterizes the essence of man and his existence. Therefore, the meaningful definition of freedom is the definition of freedom as something new for us, that it doesn't depend on us; it has never had any concrete foundations that we could find in any particular, individual culture. V. Dal adds the word "Sloboda" next to the word "freedom". He wrote: "Sloboda" is a free settlement. Freedom is "will, space, the opportunity to act in his own way: the lack of shyness, bondage, slavery, submission to another's will". Only the understanding of freedom as the potential ability of a person to freely choose an alternative, as the ability to think and act in accordance with his ideas and desires, and not because of internal or external coercion, gives the person the opportunity to acquire spiritual freedom, the acquisition of a person himself. Freedom is the possibility of choosing a non-freedom option. Free can choose, not free obeys desires. Freedom is a state of mind; it is a philosophical concept that reflects the inalienable right of man to realize his human will. Outside of freedom, man can not realize to realize one's human will. Freedom begins exactly where a person deliberately restricts himself.

In the history of the development of the concept of freedom, the concept of creative freedom gradually displaces the notion of freedom from obstacles (coercion, casuals, and fate). In ancient philosophy (in Socrates and Plato), it is primarily about freedom in destiny, then about freedom from political despotism (from Aristotle and Epicurus) and about the disasters of human existence (Epicurus).

In the Middle Ages, there was freedom from sin and the curse of the church were meant, and there was a disagreement between the morally demanding freedom of man and the required religion by the omnipotence of God.

In the Renaissance and the subsequent period, freedom was understood as the unhindered, comprehensive development of the human person.

Since the time of Enlightenment, the concept of freedom emerged from liberalism and the philosophy of natural law (Altusia, Hobbes, Grotius, Pufendorf, in 1689 in England - the Bill of Rights), was restrained by an ever-expanding scientific view that recognizes the dominance of the omnipotent natural causality and regularity. In German philosophy, from Meister Eckhart, including Leibniz, Kant, Goethe and Schiller, as well as German idealism to Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, the question of freedom was being raised as a question of the postulate of the moral and creative correspondence of the essence and its development.

According to Marxism, the person thinks and acts according to the motives and the environment (see Situation), while the main role in his environment is played by economic relations and class struggle. The ability of a person to analyze, self-analysis, modeling the presentation of the results of his actions and the subsequent consequences don't make a person free.

Spinoza defined freedom as the love of God and the love of God toward man: "From this we clearly understand what our salvation is, or bliss, or freedom - namely, in the constant and eternal love of God or in the love of God to man".

Some define freedom as domination of circumstances with knowledge of the cause, while others, like Schelling, claim that freedom is the ability to make choices based on the distinction between good and evil [6].

According to R. Mei, "... The ability to transcend from a momentous situation is the basis of human freedom. The unique quality of a human being is a wide range of opportunities in any situation, which, in turn, depend on self-awareness, on its ability to imagine taking different ways of reacting in a given situation" [6]. Such an understanding of freedom bypasses the problem of determinism in making a decision. No matter how a decision is made, the person will realize it, and at the same time he does not realize the reasons and the purpose of the decision, but the significance of the decision itself. A person is able to go beyond the immediate task (as we call objective conditions: necessity, stimulus, or psychological field), he is able to have some relation to himself, and already in accordance with this to make a decision.

Free being means the ability to do good or evil will. Good will possesses the authenticity of the unconditional, divine; it is limited to the unconscious life stubbornness of a simple definite being and true being.

According to Sartre's existentialism, freedom is not the property of person, but his substance. A person cannot differ from his freedom; freedom cannot differ from its manifestations. A person, since he is free, can project himself to a freely chosen goal, and this goal will determine who he is. Together with goal-setting, all values arise, things come from their non-differentiated and are organized into a situation that completes a person and to which he belongs. Consequently, a person is always worthy of what happens to him. He has no justification for justification.

The concepts of anarchism and freedom are closely related. The basis of the ideology of anarchists is the assertion that the state is a prison for the people. Against this assertion it can be put the fact that the state provides security and other common interests of its citizens, limiting their freedom. In other words, the state plays the role of a monopoly on the restriction of human freedom. In the context, we should note the works of such fantasies as Shekley and Bradbury, especially the story "Ticket to the planet Tranay", describing a society with radically different morals.

Erich Fromm argued that freedom is the goal of human development [7]: "In biblical terms, freedom and independence are the goals of human development; the appointment of human deeds is a constant process of self-liberation from the bundle, linking man to the past, to nature, the clan and the idols".

Existentialism is one of the most influential directions of modern Western philosophy. His name comes from the Latin. "Existential" - existence, therefore this direction is called "philosophy of existence". Existentialism began to consider person as a suffering, who has the freedom of choice and is responsible for his actions. Existentialism has originated in the 20 years of the 20th century between the two world wars, continued to be developed during and after the Second World War. Catastrophic historical shocks, the deaths of millions of people on the battlefields, made it particularly acute to feel the fragility of human existence heightened the question of his meaning. According to existentialism, in order to stand in such a world, it is necessary to understand our inner world. The main focus of this philosophy is on the spiritual resistance of man in the face of hostile world [9].

The main representatives of existentialism: in Germany it is Martin Heidegger (1889- 1976); in France, Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973), Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980), Camus (1913-1960), and Jose Ortega-i-Gasset (1883-1955) is close to this trend in Spain. Spiritual predecessors of existentialism are the French philosopher Pascal and the Russian writer F. Dostoevsky. F. Dostoevsky wrote that "if there is no god, then everything is allowed". This is the starting point of existentialism. In fact, everything is allowed, if God doesn't exist, and therefore a person is abandoned, he has nothing to rely on in himself, if existence precedes the essence, then reference to this particular human nature can never be explained. In other words, person is free, person is freedom.

M. Heidegger considers the category of freedom as the essence of truth itself in his fundamental work "On the Essence of Truth".

Freedom, according to Heidegger, is not the non-connectedness of an action or the ability not to do anything, but also not only the willingness to perform the necessary. Freedom is part of the disclosure of the being as such. The discovery itself is given in the existent participation, thanks to which the simplicity of the simple, "Presence" (das "Da"). In this person has the basis of the essence, which allows him to exist, that has been given for a long time, therefore the "Existence" of Heidegger doesn't mean here in the sense of the event and the "pure existence" of the being. "Existence" is also not "existential" here in the sense of the moral effort of man, which permits the existence of a being to be directed to him and based on his physical and mental structure. Along with the category of truth, Heidegger introduces the notion of the unbeliever, treating it as a wandering, "like a pit that he sometimes falls into; wandering belongs to the inner constitution of being, into which the historic man is admitted. Wandering is the sphere of action of the circle in which the existence, including in the cycle, is forgotten and loses itself. In this sense, wandering is a significant antipode in relation to the original entity, the truth. Wandering is revealed as openness for all action, the opposite of the essence of truth. The path of wandering, at the same time, creates the opportunity that a person can extract from the existential, namely, not to be deluded, while he himself recognizes it without penetrating the secret of man" [10].

The concept of freedom of Sartre has much in common with Heidegger's, they both tried to include freedom in the system of basic concepts of phenomenological ontology. However, Sartre tends to treat freedom as a deeper, basic ontological characteristic, as the basis of human activity. "The first condition of activity is freedom", - we read in *Genesis and Nothing*. Sartre believes that it is difficult to "determine" freedom, because it "has no substance", cannot be made for any necessity. So "existence precedes the essence and defines it", that common with Heidegger's. Why do we argue that Sartre's "freedom" is similar to Heidegger's? Because both of these occur are in the mode of individuality! This means that freedom is not only "not the same" for me and for the other - it is not even "one and the same" in different situations of my own being. Moreover, an attempt to somehow delay the way of action (and preference and choice) in another context means the loss of freedom. In other words: freely determining your behavior in one situation and trying to simply repeat this behavior in another situation, I act "automatically", so no means free.

We have already noted that "obvious" freedom becomes in the acts of "non-antisizing", "turning to Nothing", into the indifferent background of our world of everything that is not an intentional subject.

“There is nobody here!” - Parisian can say to his companion, looked into a cafe full of visitors. And she will perfectly and adequately understand him - they hoped to see their friends in this cafe. Therefore, freedom “is nothing more than this non-antisize”. In this case, non-antisizing in freedom has no basis other than freedom itself: otherwise, “we are not free, we cease to be free”, freedom turns out to be “strangled by the severity of being”.

One can say otherwise: freedom is “groundless” - like a free person. A person is not free - it is a “being”, the same object as a house or a stone; he doesn’t act as a person, in an existential sense. Therefore being free is necessarily a denial of the “simple” being.

It is impossible, according to Sartre, to treat freedom as a “fact of consciousness”, in a psychological manner. Freedom is holistic, “total”. “Total” is in the sense that it is merged into a bridge, “objective” of a certain definite situation, as it looks in the light of its goals, and “driving force”, began to be subjective, emotions, desires, passions, helping fulfill the intended action. It is impossible to confuse freedom with a whim and arbitrariness, which in the deterministic picture of the world resemble the epicurian wedge-wise, first of all because the “world of freedom” can’t be identified with the world of “things-in-ones”. These are fundamentally different “Universes”! A person is free only to the extent that he is not determined by the world of “things-in-ones”, as, indeed, with desires, speaking in Russian, of his own left foot. Freedom doesn’t mean unpredictable actions and desires of a person. It is in search of itself, or in choosing itself identity. And it is also in the choice of its objective world, which at the same time looks like “discovery”. But after all the choice - if it is a valid choice - is unconditional! The life (existential) solution is not the choice between whether to bring an umbrella or leave it at home; the choice is existential when the situation is fatal, when it is “critical”, and when there is no way to avoid the choice. Since a person is inevitably experiencing critical situations when there is no opportunity to choose and when the choice can’t be replaced by the calculation of chances - a person is “condemned” to be free, and his freedom is absurd (absurd, that is, groundlessness).

Person (a free person) is encountering obstacles everywhere that he doesn’t create; but he perceives them as obstacles, and their resistance arises for him as resistance only as a result of his free choice. The choice is always “against”!

That is why the philosophical treatise of Sartre “Being and nothing. The experience of phenomenological ontology” is devoted to the study of questions: what is being, what are the fundamental, existential relations between consciousness and the world, what are the ontological structures of consciousness (subjectivity) that make these relationships possible.

There is a reason for the absurdity of existence: “It is absurd that we are born, and it is absurd that we die”. The person, according to Sartorius, is a useless passion. Sartre understood how heavy the load of freedom was for a person who had no inner support suppressed by the legacy of the subconscious, constantly tormented by anxiety and fear of him. And he didn’t build illusions about the ability of a person to be truly free, especially since reality could dispel any illusions. Therefore, it is not surprising that all of Sartre’s works are permeated with criticism and dislike of the surrounding world. An individual in modern society Sartre understands as an alienated being, erecting this particular state in the metaphysical status of human existence in general [11].

A. Camus’s creativity is a never-ending philosophical search, which is aimed at a passionate experience for the Person who turned out to be a victim, witness, and accomplice to the tragic breakdown of time and history in the twentieth century. Camus, in his ingenious work “Myths about Sisyphus”, seeks to answer the question: “How to find hope for a positive being in a world in which religious hope has died?” Postulating the original perception of a person as absurd, he examines it as a characteristic of human “being-in-the-world”, alienated and unreasonable. He characterizes absurdity as the boundary of consciousness and clarity of understanding of being.

In the opinion of the author, the feeling of absurdity arises on the basis of the contradiction between man and the surrounding world or as Camus said “between the kter and the scenery”.

If the world is explained, even not so convincing, it is understandable and acceptable to person. But as soon as a person becomes aware of the illusory nature of this explanation, he begins to feel himself alien to the universe. Before a person raises the question: is it worth living to be lived?

An absurd penetrates into the consciousness of a person unexpectedly, when at some moment he suddenly feels devastation, fatigue from everyday being. Suddenly, he ceases to understand the meaning and purpose of this everyday life. The chain of habitual actions is torn, and it is precisely at this moment, in the author’s opinion, that the consciousness of a person who has stood before it in mechanical life begins to come into motion. Another factor of absurdity is time. A person living in the future suddenly realizes that his

time is just his enemy. As Camus says, there is a kind of rebellion of the flesh, directed against the influence of time, testifies to the truth, which is a challenge to the supreme world. Moving on to the notion of freedom, Camus points out that the absurdity reduces all chances of a person to a natural, eternal freedom, professed in religion, but returns freedom of action and inspires it. After realizing the absurd, the person understands: there is no higher freedom than freedom to be, the only freedom that serves as the basis for the truth.

According to Camus, the realization of the absurd involves replacing the quality of the experience of being with its quantity. In other words, it is important not to live as well as possible, but to survive as much as possible. And this, in turn, is to feel your life, your riot, your freedom as much as possible.

The feeling of the absurd allows a person to redefine his destiny. This can be considered one of the prerequisites for another concept considered by Camus in his work - the concept of rebellion.

“What is a rebellious man?” - Camus inquires. – “This is a person who says “no”. But he does not renounce: this is a person, already his first acting saying “yes”. The servant, who has fulfilled the Lord’s orders all his life, suddenly considers the last of them unacceptable”.

In a rebellious impulse born, albeit obscure, but consciousness: a sudden brilliant feeling that there is something in man that he can identify with at least for a time. Until now, the slave really did not feel this identity. Before his uprising, he suffered from all kinds of oppression. It has often happened that he was impartially carried out orders far more outrageous than the last one that aroused rebellion. The servant patiently accepted these orders; in the depths of his heart he may have rejected them, but, when he was silent, he was living his day-to-day cares, not yet aware of his rights. Having lost patience, he now begins to eagerly reject everything with which he had been tolerated before. Consciousness comes with rebellion. Bringing an example of a slave rebellion against his master, Camus concludes that the slave rebels against the former order, which denies something inherent in the community of all oppressed people. In itself, the individual is not the value he intends to protect. This value is made up of all people in general [12].

Conclusions. A theoretical analysis of the representation of the mass consciousness about life, death, the meaning of life and freedom turns out the interests to these questions in philosophy. This leads to humanistic self-affirmation. For a person any life represents value. The universal logic of reverence for life generates compassion not only to another person, but to everything alive. Respect for life gives birth to genuine freedom and gives meaning to human existence.

There is no rigid determination of the will and deeds of a person by some objective laws, because the way of being and the embodiment of the latter is human activity. Freedom of the person is inseparable from the freedom of society, we believe that the spiritual and psychological readiness of an individual to free actions hasn’t only personal content but also social.

REFERENCES

1. Беляев И.А., Максимов А.М. Целостность и свобода человека.- Оренбург: Оренбургский государственный университет, 2004. – 180 с. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=19463380>.
2. Беляев И. А., Максимов А. М. Свобода человека как целостного природно-социально-духовного существа // Интеллект. Инновации. Инвестиции. — 2012. — № 1. — С. 202—207. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=18750545>
3. Максимов А. М. Свобода как противоречие самобытия и инобытия / А. М. Максимов. — Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1998. — 200 с.
4. Беляев И. А., Максимов А. М. Свобода целостного человеческого существа в социально-личностном измерении // Вестник Оренбургского государственного университета. — 2011. — № 11 (130), ноябрь. — С. 139—145.
5. Канке В.А. Философия. – Москва: Логос, 1999. – 352 с.
6. Мэй Р. Вклад экзистенциальной психологии // Экзистенциальная психология. Экзистенция. — М.: Апрель Пресс, Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2001, с.183.
7. Фромм Эрих - Библейская концепция человека Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: https://vk.com/doc24773047_437170691?hash=30ec34514273d30ca7&dl=eedffde6efebd140d7
8. Толстой Л.Н. Война и мир / Валерий Шевченко. — Т. 4. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: http://old.prosv.ru/ebooks/lib/39_Tolstoi_Voina/T_4/
9. Філософія. Навчальний посбник та збірник текстів/ За редакцією М.Ф. Шмиголя. – Одеса: «Астропринт», 2003. - 135 с.
10. Хайдегер М. Бытие и время. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: https://vk.com/doc39946534_321209542?hash=58b435989c7bc200e3&dl=87e99baa393fc98441

11. Попова О.В. Н.А. Бердяев И Ж.-П. Сартр: два полюса экзистенциальной философии // Информационный гуманитарный портал «Знание. Понимание. Умение» / №1. – 2010.
12. Кремень В.Г., Ільїн В.В. Філософія: мислителі, ідеї, концепції: Підручник К.: Книга, 2005. — 528 с.
13. Лосский В.Н. Очерк мистического богословия Восточной Церкви. Догматическое богословие. М.: Центр «СЭИ», приложение к журналу «Трибуна», 1991.
14. Бердяев Н.А. Философия свободного духа. - М.: Республика, 1994. - 480 с.
15. Скирбекк Г., Гилье Н. История философии. – Москва: ВЛАДОС, 2000. – 800 с.

Добролюбський Андрій Олегович – доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри історії України Державного закладу «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»

УДК 117+13+17.023.32

ОСМИСЛЕННЯ ЛЮДСТВОМ ІСТОРІЇ ДУХОВНОГО ТА МАТЕРІАЛЬНОГО В СОЦІАЛЬНОМУ ВИМІРІ

Розглядається значення соціального як універсального інструменту аналізу осмислення людством історії духовного і матеріального. Досліджується роль глобального знання в розвитку людства. На підставі людського досвіду затверджується значимість філософського знання в нескінченному процесі життя.

Ключові слова: людство, матеріальне, духовне, соціальне, знання, глобальне знання, філософське знання.

Рассматривается значение социального как универсального инструмента анализа осмысления человечеством истории духовного и материального. Исследуется роль глобального знания в развитии человечества. На основании человеческого опыта утверждается значимость философского знания в бесконечном процессе жизни.

Ключевые слова: человечество, материальное, духовное, социальное, знание, глобальное знание, философское знание.

The importance of the social as a universal tool of analysis of mankind's understanding of the history of the spiritual and material is considered. The role of global knowledge in human development is investigated. On the basis of human experience, the importance of philosophical knowledge in the infinite process of life is affirmed.

Key words: humanity, material, spiritual, social, knowledge, global knowledge, philosophical knowledge.

Накопичений людством досвід духовного освоєння світового знання при всій відмінності світоглядних і методологічних позицій виявляє деякі загальні риси. По-перше, система філософського знання розглядається як процес, який розгортається в глобальному просторі і часі. Він протікає в силу певних причин. Ці причини є факторами, що зумовлюють розвиток людства і його спрямованість. По-друге, вже на ранніх етапах осмислення шляхів і доль різних країн і народів, цивілізацій і конкретних суспільств виникає проблематика, пов'язана з тим чи іншим розумінням єдності процесу знання, унікальності та своєрідності кожного народу, кожної цивілізації. Для одних мислителів історія людства має внутрішню єдність, для інших це проблематично. По-третє, у багатьох навчаннях філософське знання носить явний або прихований телеологічний (цілеполагаючий) характер. В релігії це хіліастична есхатологія (вчення про кінець земної історії), у матеріалістичній філософії – певний автоматизм закономірностей суспільного розвитку, з непохитністю долі провідних людство до світлого майбутнього або, навпаки, до світового катаклізму. По-четверте, філософське знання осягається як процес, що має свої стадії (етапи тощо) розвитку. Одні мислителі відштовхуються при цьому від аналогії з живим організмом (дитинство, юність та інше), інші беруть за основу виділення стадій особливості розвитку будь-яких елементів або сторін буття людей (релігії, культури або, навпаки, знярядь праці, власності тощо).

Знання Людства необхідно, з нашої точки зору, завжди осмислювати в контексті впливу