



УДК 1 (091)  
DOI 10.32782/NPU-VOU.2023.4(91).10

## **SUBJECTIVITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE: HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPTS**

© Matviienko O., 2023

### **Oleksii MATVIIENKO**

Postgraduate student of the Department  
of Philosophy  
of the Educational and Research Institute  
of Philosophy and Educational Policy  
Mykhailo Drahomanov State University  
of Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7846-6089>

**Key words:** subject, subjectivity, Ukraine, civil society, state, communication.

**Statement of the problem.** In the context of the expansion and complication of political and international communication in the twenty-first century, the issue of understanding the subject and subjectivity in communication is becoming more acute. A large number of questions arise, such as "Who is a subject?", "Who is a subject in communication?", "What can a subject as a participant in communication do to make it successful?", "What epistemological and ontological as-

*The article provides a historical and philosophical analysis of the concepts of "subject" and "subjectivity", reveals their semantic load and the importance of their scientific application for the formation of the subjectivity of civil society in Ukraine. The author of the article compares the individual and collective subject. The author emphasizes the need to study the processes of realization of the political subject and the subject in the international arena.*

pects should a subject have in order to make communication successful?", "What knowledge should one have in order to conduct a successful dialogue in the political and international arena?", etc.

For many, these questions may seem trivial and familiar, but in fact, most of them have a deep philosophical and psychological meaning that directly depends on the success of the subject in communication and the achievement of the goals that are set. The politi-

cal-communication approach here determines the socio-political and philosophical-social approach to the extent that this problem is deep and multifaceted.

It is worth noting that this problem is of particular relevance for Ukraine as a sovereign state, which is now going through a difficult path to establish its power and take the place of an independent player in the international arena.

The realization that the success of communication between countries in the international arena depends both on who is participating in the negotiations and whether the other side is ready to hear the interlocutor.

We have to admit that there is an organic relationship between management and the management process itself, in the relationship between self-organization and organization, which sets a wide range of subjectivity and non-subjectivity. Thus, we can observe the multifaceted nature of the subject and subjectivity, which requires both theoretical and epistemological analysis, which can be realized through the study of subjectivity as a principle of cognition and design of political communications. However, this is an extremely broad topic, so in this article we will limit ourselves to analyzing the philosophical and social preconditions of subjectivity and the meaning of the subject in the context of political communications, the tools and forms of filling civil society and Ukraine as a state with subjectivity.

**Analysis of research and publications.** To analyze the concepts of "subject" and "subjectivity", the author used classical philosophical works such as Aristotle's "Metaphysics", R. Descartes' "Metaphysical Reflections", I. Kant's "Critique of Practical Reason", "Critique of the Powers of Judgment", G.W.F. Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit", M. Heidegger's "Being and Time", M. Foucault's "Archaeology of Knowledge" and others.

**The purpose of the article** is to reveal the semantic load of the concepts of "subject" and "subjectivity" in their original meaning and interrelation with each other, to consider the problem of communication and political sub-

jectivity in the complex of all its main manifestations.

The main material of the article. The main role of the subject as a fundamental social category on which a large number of philosophical and psychological problems of the theory of knowledge, social and political philosophy and sociology are based. Determination and self-determination of social processes and phenomena, which is being discussed between postmodernists and their opponents, reveals new directions for the study of the concepts of "subject" and "subjectivity".

As a basic premise, let us define that subjectivity is both a process (when we talk about society) and a phenomenon, as well as a set of characteristics, qualities of real subjects, which include spiritual, cultural, social, economic, political, and public aspects in this concept. In its system of concepts, modern science connects subjectivity with such concepts as "subject", which is directly related to subjective analysis, the study of relations between subjects and the design of subjective models and interaction systems. When we define the possibilities of the ontological manifestation of the subject, they can be defined as empirical, social, political, visual, and historical subjects. According to M. Heidegger, subject is a Latin translation of subject as sub (under) jacio (to be in the basis) – literally means "put-in-the-base" [6, p.117].

In ancient philosophy, the concept of "subject" was mostly used as a mysterious one. This hidden basis was distinguished in everything that exists, in all things – these words "subject" and "thing" were almost synonymous. Thus, Aristotle pointed out that the thing ( $\sigma\eta$ ,  $\sigma\eta\tau\alpha$ ) is the essence, the being ( $\sigma\eta$ ,  $\sigma\eta\tau\alpha$ ,  $\tau\omicron$   $\sigma\eta$ ) of being ( $\tau\omicron$   $\epsilon\iota\eta\alpha\iota$ ). Likewise, a subject is the essence of being if what its subject implies is its own being-existence, what "underlies" its being-existence. That is why, in ancient philosophy, the problem of the subject was formed within the search for and definition of the essential. In the sense of and within the search for the essential characteristics of a person. For example, Protagoras believed that "man is the most intelligent of

all living beings" [1]. Trying to discover the secret of the essence of man, Aristotle came to the conclusion that man is usually the source of actions. And we can say this only about man, since only he is an actor (i.e., one who performs an action and who understands the consequences of his actions), none of the creatures, animate or inanimate, has this ability. This leads to the conclusion that it is man who is the force that generates actions. It was Aristotle who, rethinking Plato's ideas, introduced into the history of philosophy not only the idea of the object but also the idea of the subject. Defining that the world of ideas, which he defines as *Nous*, the Mind, necessarily thinks itself and is self-awareness, on the one hand, it is what thinks in itself, and on the other hand, it is what is thought.

According to M. Heidegger, Christian thinkers believed that the existence of a being is connected with its creation by God: every being is a created being [6, p. 87]. Medieval philosophy understands the subject as something real that exists in things themselves, and the object as something that exists only in the mind. This era is characterized by the humiliation of individuality; man and the whole world are subordinated to religious canons within which the subject exists. It was only in the Renaissance that the term "subject" acquired new forms and interpretations, enabling a person to think of himself as an independent personality-subject, but still feeling the limitations of his own existence and realizing his helplessness before the endless eternal life and the cosmos. It is only in the New Age that man becomes a "subject," the main and exclusive subject, and for the most part, thanks to the philosophical ideas of R. Descartes and his "cogito ergo sum," it is the "I" – man – who appears as an active subject. The secularization of philosophical thought resulted in the concept of "subject" losing its universal properties and beginning to be thought of as a single and exclusive one, relating only to the human being, because it is the human being who is the only and unique subject. For R. Descartes, the subject appears as an active principle, as the basis of itself and

all things, as something different from the object, and the concepts of "subject – object" are opposed. Thus, he defines the relationship between the "external" world of natural reality and the "internal" world of consciousness. The human individual ("Ego-I") appears as a single subject of being, acting rationally, thinking, having a certain independence and internal stimulation of its activity. The subject is the one who thinks. Everything else is the object of his cognition, thinking, that is, what he as a subject is aware of.

In classical German philosophy, the impossibility of the metaphysical-dualistic opposition of subject and object as two substances closed within themselves was presented. Here, the subject appears not as some "ideal thing" but as an independent activity, human activity. When we talk about Kant's philosophy, the problem of the human subject is of central importance to us. Because the main question of his philosophical system, which is present in every element of it, is the question "What is a human being?". Considering man not only as a goal of nature, which is similar to all organisms, but man for him appears as the last goal of this nature, in relation to which all other goals in nature constitute a system of goals, he puts forward the idea of the self-determination of the human subject. Formulating the problem of unity and difference of the empirical (individual), practical (moral) and transcendental (collective) subject, I. Kant defines and lays the foundation for the formation and understanding of the generic specificity of man, including the social nature of the human subject, the essence of which is his self-activity [5, p. 118]. In the philosophical systems of J. G. Fichte, F. W. Schelling and G. W. F. Hegel, the concept of "subject" again acquires an ontological status, not just an epistemological one, and the interpretation of this term returns to Christian doctrine. Thus, J. G. Fichte and I. Kant understand that the unity of the human subject is independent of the experience that precedes it, is its a priori basis. However, I. Kant considers the unity of the human subject in terms of its relation to the object, and for J. G. Fichte the subject

appears as an absolute "I-subject" as the only reality, the omnipotent power of creativity, the all-creating essence, which ultimately coincides with the self-consciousness of all mankind. F. W. Schelling, like J. G. Fichte, believes that the subject and the object initially form something unified, but unlike J. G. Fichte, he asserts the absolute identity of the subject and the object.

G.W.F. Hegel considers the subject in the unity of its cognitive and practical activity, not only and not so much as a "thinking being" but as a substance identical to the absolute subject-spirit that manifests itself in the object. For classical philosophy, the problem of understanding the "subject" was actually identical to the problem of interpreting the "I". However, for G.W.F. Hegel, the absolute subject is not the Self, but the Absolute Spirit, which is the basis of all reality. The individual self (i.e., the individual subject), according to G.W.F. Hegel, is derived from the Absolute Subject [2].

The twentieth century marks the emergence of the ideas of human self-development and creativity, most widely developed within the philosophical system of existentialism and psychology, the ontological basis of which was the rejection of the Cartesian dichotomy of body and spirit (respectively, object and subject) and the proclamation of human consciousness as the main element in the system of world formation. In the existential sense, the subject correlates with another subject, not an object. Considering the problem of the "subject," J.-P. Sartre emphasizes that we do not find any subject in consciousness – neither the psychological subject, which is already an object for consciousness, as it is revealed by reduction and is external and transcendental, nor the transcendental subject, which is simply a fiction that comes from the psychological subject. Such interpretations of the concept of "subject" became the basis for the development of new movements, such as structuralism, functionalism, and others, for which the subject takes on new meanings. The transition of the subject to the sphere of social existence does not mean simplification of the understanding of this concept, but rather new

vectors of understanding of this concept are emerging. The subject among people can find space for self-determination and realization.

A new stage in the understanding of the subject comes with the period when psychologists began to be interested in this concept. Along with the concept of subject, they began to define the concept of subjectivity as a certain characteristic that belongs to the acting subject. Here, the subject appears in several meanings, on the one hand, as the general ability of the subject to consciously self-regulate its activity, understanding the interdependence of the content of the subject's self-awareness and the structure of self-regulation of its behavior or action, on the other hand, attention is focused on the personal aspects of subjectivity, and the collective subject is also considered, which is manifested in the joint activities of people and we must not forget about the importance of the psychology of the subject in understanding the specifics of human existence. When considering this concept, we have to understand and take into account its theoretical and practical aspects, which is the basis of the "subjective paradigm" that is gaining the status of science. Such interpretations of the concept of "subject" lead to the emergence of new concepts that are important in the twenty-first century and can influence the fate of states, such as "political subject", "subject in the international arena" and others.

The subject and its inherent subjectivity are not something unreal or irrational, or a priori existing, this term is real. M. Foucault noted that the subject is neither a substance nor an a priori form of existence of a rational individual, but it is the result of the implementation of various practices of subjugation or liberation. That is why he proposed to abandon the a priori theories of the subject, since the subject is an integral element of human existence, i.e. a way of realizing a person's human essence [7]. At the same time, we should not forget that the subject is a carrier of not only the subjective but also the objective. A subject who possesses genuine scientific knowledge that has been accumulated by humanity can be a carrier of the

objective to a greater extent than a single fact that is taken in various random connections that are given to our perception. A subject is a person (or a group of people representing the same interests) who is active, integral, autonomous, a subject is someone who communicates, carries out activities and other types of specifically human activity. A subject is a qualitatively defined way of self-organization, correlation of external and internal conditions of activity. The principal characteristic of the subject is that a person experiences himself or herself as a sovereign independent basis for activity, capable of purposefully changing himself or herself and the world around him or her within certain limits, as well as of realizing successful communication. According to many researchers, subjectivity is a property that is inherent exclusively to humans.

If we are talking about political subjectivity, then it can also be inherent in collectives of people (it can be a certain group, a certain association, a society or even a society). Individual and collective subjects are interconnected people. Collective subjects do not exist without individual subjects who are part of collectives and ensure effective communication, and individual subjects cannot exist without collectives, since, as we know, since the time of Aristotle, a human individual is a collective and political being who is always part of some

collective (the concept of collective has the most general meaning here). However, collective and individual subjectivity, as well as collective and individual subject, are not equal and not identical to each other, although their interaction can be carried out through communication, certain activities, determination of a certain position, social activities, etc.

**Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research.** Summarizing the issues of the subject and subjectivity, it should be noted that today we have socio-philosophical and political foundations for the reconstruction of the subject and subjectivity, taking into account the new tasks that Ukraine is facing in times of great challenges. The basis of organizational and substantive subjectivity is activity, and an important condition and form of subjectivity is the attitude to a wide range of problems, which is based on independence, reflexivity, and goal-setting. When we talk about the Ukrainian state, we must take into account sovereignty. Recognizing the importance of individual and collective actors as the main participants in communication, we should pay special attention to their knowledge and skills for conducting a professional dialogue. However, one of the problems of Ukraine as a state is still the lack of subjectivity, representation of its truly professional political actors in the international arena, and the insufficient level of civil society.

## REFERENCES:

1. **Aristotle**, (2020). *Metaphysics*. Kharkiv: Folio. 300 c.
2. **Hegel, G.W.F.** (2004). *Phenomenology of the spirit*. Kyiv: Osnovy. 548 c.
3. **Descartes, R.** (2000). *Metaphysical Reflections*. Trans. from the French. Z. Borisyuk. Kyiv: Universe. C.21-298.
4. **Kant, I.** (2004). *Critique of Practical Reason*. Translation from German: I. Burkovsky. Kyiv: Universe. 240 c.

5. **Kant, I.** (2022) *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Translated by V. Terletsky. Kyiv: Tempora. 906 c.
6. **Heidegger, M.** (2003). *Being and time* / Trans. V.V. Bibikhina. Kharkiv: "Folio. 503. [9] p. (Philosophy).
7. **Foucault, M.** (2003). *Archaeology of knowledge*. Kyiv: Solomiya Pavlychko's publishing house "Osnovy". 326 c.

## Олексій МАТВІЄНКО СУБ'ЄКТНІСТЬ ГРОМАДЯНСЬКОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА В УКРАЇНІ: ІСТОРИКО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКИЙ АНАЛІЗ ПОНЬЯТЬ

*В статті проводиться історико-філософський аналіз понять «суб'єкт» та «суб'єктність», розкривається їх смислове навантаження та важливість їх наукового застосування*

для становлення суб'єктності громадянського суспільства в Україні. Автором статті проводиться порівняння індивідуального та колективного суб'єкта. Актуалізується необхідність дослідження процесів реалізації політичного суб'єкта та суб'єкта на міжнародній арені.

**Ключові слова:** суб'єкт, суб'єктність, Україна, громадянське суспільство, держава, комунікація.