

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF
THE MODERN RISK SOCIETY:
SOCIO-CULTURAL, ECONOMIC AND
LEGAL ASPECTS**

Monograph

Edited by

Nataliia Varha

Uzhhorod National University (Ukraine)

Bohdanna Hvozdetka

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (Ukraine)

eBook ISBN 978-80-88415-06-0

Print ISBN 978-80-88415-05-3

**OKTAN PRINT
PRAHA 2021**

Recommended for publication by the Uzhhorod National University (Protocol №4 dated 22.04.2021)

Reviewers:

Peter Jusko Professor, Head of Department of Social Work Faculty of Education Matej Bel University Banská Bystrica (Slovakia)

Beata Szluz Professor, UR, dr hab. Department of Family Sociology and Social Problems University of Rzeszow (Poland)

Fedir Sandor Professor, dr hab. Head of Department Sociology and Social Work Uzhhorod National University (Ukraine)

Editors:

Nataliia Varha Dr. habil. in Sociological, Associate Professor

Bohdanna Hvozdetska PhD in Sociological, Associate Professor

Challenges and opportunities of the modern risk society: socio-cultural, economic and legal aspects: monograph; Editors N. Varha, B. Hvozdetska. Praha: OKTAN PRINT, 2021, 169 p.

No part of this eBook may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording, or otherwise, without written consent from the Publisher.

The publication is assigned with a DOI number: **10.46489/CAOTM-21042601**

The paper version of the publication is the original version. The publication is available in electronic version on the website:

<https://www.oktanprint.cz/p/challenges-and-opportunities-of-the-modern-risk>

Passed for printing 26.04.2021

Circulation 50 copies

Cover design: *Bohdanna Hvozdetska*

eBook **ISBN** 978-80-88415-06-0

Print **ISBN** 978-80-88415-05-3

OKTAN PRINT s.r.o.

5. května 1323/9, Praha 4, 140 00

www.oktanprint.cz

tel.: +420 770 626 166

jako svou 46. publikací

Vydání první

© Copyright by OKTAN PRINT s.r.o., 2021

Contents

.....

I. INFLUENCE OF MEGA-RISKS ON THE SECTORS OF SOCIAL LIFE.....	5
1. THE PROBLEM OF CHILDREN'S OPENNESS TO THE DESTRUCTIVE NATURE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES.....	5
<i>Olexandr Tkachenko, Olexandr Golubev</i>	
2. SPOŁECZNE RYZYKO MIGRACJI PRACY LUDNOŚCI W ZAKARPACIU W WARUNKACH ŚWIATOWEJ PANDEMII.....	16
<i>Wiktoria Ruhle, Kristina Novosad</i>	
3. A TÁRSADALMI HÁTTÉR VIZSGÁLATA A KÖZÉPISKOLÁSOK SPORTKÖRTAGSÁGÁBAN MAGYARORSZÁGON.....	27
<i>Klára Kovács, Dániel Szabó</i>	
4. POLITICAL CYNICISM: UNIVERSAL SOVIET HERITAGE - AFTERTASTE – DANGER.....	39
<i>Hanna Lavrynenko</i>	
5. THE BORDER STRATEGY OF TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT IN TERMS OF PANDEMIC COVID-19.....	50
<i>Nataliia Warga, Karolina Sribna, Yevhenii Hoblyk</i>	
II. DESTABILIZATION POSSIBILITIES OF THE RISK SOCIETY.....	57
6. THE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON EDUCATION IN THE ASPECT OF INCREASING INEQUALITY (AS EXAMPLE OF SCHOOL EDUCATION).....	57
<i>Valentyna Chepak, Iryna Nechitailo, Tamara Zverko, Martin Kalamković, Jovana Kalamković</i>	

7. FREEDOM ANTI-NOMIES IN THE DUALITY OF RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF RISK SOCIETY.....	67
<i>Ayta Sakun, Tetyana Kadlubovich, Daryna Chernyak</i>	
8. SOCIAL RISKS FOR THE YOUTH IN THE DYNAMICS OF UKRAINIAN SOCIETY.....	77
<i>Olena Bartosh</i>	
9. FUNKCJONOWANIE JĘZYKA W KONTEKŚCIE ETNO-SPOŁECZNYM (NA PRZYKŁADZIE MNIEJSZOŚCI ETNICZNEJ BUŁGARSKIEJ).....	94
<i>Natalia Nikon, Bohdanna Gwozdecka, Maryana Lyashko</i>	
III. SOCIO-CULTURAL, ECONOMIC AND LEGAL CHALLENGES OF THE RISK SOCIETY.....	104
10. LEGAL REGULATION OF PUBLIC FINANCIAL POLICY IN UKRAINE: CHALLENGES, IMPACT OF RISKS, LANDMARKS.	104
<i>Larysa Trofimova</i>	
11. LEGAL PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES AS A FACTOR OF FINANCIAL ENSURING BUSINESS SAFETY.....	122
<i>Oleksandr Bryhinets, Anastasiia Kovalova</i>	
12. THE COMPETENCE OF RISK ASSESSMENT IN THE STRUCTURE OF EDUCATIONAL CONTENT.....	132
<i>Halyna Baluta, Andrii Abdula, Olena Olifer</i>	
13. ANALYTICAL RESEARCH METHODS AT E-COMMERCE ENTERPRISES IN UKRAINE.....	143
<i>Irina Lobacheva, Nataliya Koceruba</i>	
14. A HALLGATÓI MUNKA-VÁLLALÁS SAJÁTOS SÁGAI AZ EURÓPAI FELSŐOKTATÁSI TÉRSÉG KELETI RÉGIÓJÁBAN	154
<i>Kocsis Zsófia</i>	

7. FREEDOM ANTINOMIES IN THE DUALITY OF RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF RISK SOCIETY

Ayta Sakun

Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies,
Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

E-mail: ayta.s@ukr.net

ORCID ID 0000-0003-2340-3366

Tetyana Kadlubovich

Candidate of Political Science, Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies,
Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

E-mail: katanka17@ukr.net

ORCID ID 0000-0003-2021-2070

Daryna Chernyak

Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies,
Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

E-mail: daryna1804@gmail.com

ORCID ID 0000-0002-1515-6070

Introduction. The globalization processes have embraced modern civilization and affect the space and time transformation, personal aspects of social experience, identity change, form a society of risks. The problems of freedom are outlined in a new way, its antinomies become more clear, the duality of its rational and irrational dimensions is manifested. In today's world, which is full of intensity and dynamics of economic processes, political decisions and social development, freedom cannot act as an abstract ideal. A risk society demands to «find and intensify equality, freedom and self-formation» [1] through criticism of «the human rights realization, the modern democratic societies ideals, and, of course, freedoms» [2].

Literature review. The problem of freedom is interdisciplinary. It is considered «in the ontological, socio-philosophical, socio-legal, ethical-moral and aesthetic contexts, etc» [3]. I. Berlin, L. Svendsen, I. Bychko, P. Ivanyshyn, M. Popovych, V. Lyakh, A. Loy, G. Tulchynsky and other scientists tried to fundamentally investigate the category of freedom. In Ukraine for the last decade the authors of the monographs I. Bredun, O. Onishchenko, V. Slyusar, I. Trukhin, Z. Shved and others have made the category of freedom the subject of their

research; a number of dissertation researches (U. Oliynyk, V. Lyymar, M. Zakala, V. Denisenko, etc.) were defended on this subject.

Results. The scientific literature analysis has revealed the study state of the problem of freedom and its antinomies in the duality of the rational and irrational dimensions of a risk society.

Freedom has always been a leading philosophical problem, one of the leading categories of philosophy. «A notable characteristic of the freedom concept is the multiplicity of its meanings» [4, p. 26]. For a reason today there are about two hundred definitions of the concept of freedom, which «testifies to the multidimensionality and ambiguity» of this phenomenon [5], its complexity and contradictions. Thus, in different contexts, freedom is understood as an essential characteristic of human existence that motivates people to think and act in accordance with their own ideas and desires, independence from external factors, unlimited choices and activities, realization of one's own goal, inner desire for something and so on.

The idea of freedom is already present in the philosophy of antiquity, «when freedom became a phenomenon of thought, through which man could rationally place himself outside the real» [6, p. 166]. Christianity is interested in the problem of free will. «Freedom of will and simply freedom became synonymous concepts, and the presence of freedom was experienced in complete loneliness, «where no one could prevent a fierce battle in which I fight with myself,» a deadly conflict that takes place in the «inner home» of the soul and dark «nook hearts» [6, p. 167]. For New time thinkers, freedom is the autonomy of the individual, based on rationality (B. Spinoza), or on the establishment of laws that, on the one hand, give freedom to the person, and on the other – limit it in the interests of others (J. Locke, T. Hobbes and others). The revolution in the freedom understanding takes place in classical philosophy (I. Kant, J. G. Fichte, F. W. Schelling and G. W. F. Hegel), where the problem of freedom is analyzed through the prism of acts of self-consciousness, the priority of spiritual principles of human life. An ambiguous understanding of freedom is asserted. Freedom – and self-determination, and the ability to choose, and conscious action, and irrational desire to go beyond the natural and social world. Non-classical philosophy (S. Kierkegaard, M. Berdyaev, J.-P. Sartre, A. Camus, etc.) interprets freedom as the first authenticity and effective factor of social and cultural life. Representatives of existential psychoanalysis and humanistic psychology (E. Fromm, W. Frankl, A. Maslow, K. Rogers, etc.) reveal freedom as a way to overcome alienation and creative self-actualization of man. Ethical and ontological approach (M. Heidegger, M. Foucault, etc.) sees freedom as the basis of attitude to oneself and to others. Social and philosophical strategy of freedom draws attention to individual (F. Hayek, J. Rawls, M. Friedman, etc.) and universal principles of freedom (C. Taylor, A. McIntyre, M. Zandel, etc.). The position of K. Jaspers, Y. Habermas, M. Riedel, M. Bakhtin, G. Tulchynsky and others allows us to explain freedom through the principles of the communicative paradigm, which is based on the understanding of human existence as «being-with-others», and to

understand freedom as a responsibility not only for one's own existence, but also for the existence of the Other. «Man has freedom to the extent of his universality, that is, the ability to go beyond his single, separate existence, both natural and social. Freedom is in the mind of those who think and act not in isolation from others, but together with others, in the context of a unifying the whole being» [7, p. 89].

Thus, the history of consideration of such philosophical category as «freedom» indicates the presence of antinomies of different quality. Such antinomies are conscious-unconscious, individual and social, moral and immoral, unique and universal, rational and irrational.

«Freedom is a human phenomenon, which is directly related to the individual self-consciousness, his spiritual culture» [7, p. 89]. «Freedom acts as a condition and imperative of moral development» [8], and therefore was and remains an independent value, which in society is organically associated with a reasonable understanding of the world and a reasonable attitude to it. But researchers concluded that from the standpoint of abstract-theoretical approach to freedom, it combines both rational and irrational (9, 10, 11). Freedom appears as a special, suprarational phenomenon in view of the specificity of man, who is «open to nonbeing, revealed in the transcendent, metaphysical as prenatal and supernatural. This quality allows a person to comprehend real life, going into its context, taking a position of out of existence in relation to it. Man, in contrast to the animal, has access to another dimension of experience – the metaphysical one» [12]. It is the metaphysics of human existence that generates human dignity, the manifestation of which is the love of freedom, generates the antinomy of rationality and irrationality of freedom.

Rational and irrational as freedom antinomies can be easily illustrated by the example of cognitive and social human activity. «Freedom defines human existence as such,» states E. Fromm, «but the concept of freedom changes depending on the degree of self-awareness» [13, p. 38].

For thousands of years it has been recognized that man is an intelligent being, whose activity is determined by certain rational interests. Freedom is possible because, according to L. Svendsen, a person has the ability to «think and consider different alternatives. We act from the perspective of our desires and preferences, ...but we can choose how to act, taking into account the same desires and preferences» [4, p. 74]. Freud's theory drew attention to the study of irrational, subconscious phenomena that determine human behavior. Freud and his followers not only studied irrational phenomena, but also proved that they can be explained quite rationally. Thus, it was found that the individual changes only when «society increases the pressure on its natural inclinations» [13, p. 25], thereby including the mechanisms of psychological protection, in particular, sublimation. It is sublimation, this subconscious mechanism, that becomes the driving force of civilization, urges man to change, to violate established laws and principles, to make discoveries. H. Arendt describes freedom in a similar way [6, p. 161]. For her, freedom is virtuosity, ie perfect skill, when the performance itself is important, the activity itself, for example, when playing the flute, ballet dance, etc. «Action is an expression of freedom» [14, p. 449], «to be free and to act is the same» [6, p. 161].

Sublimation and virtuosity cannot be explained rationally. K. Jung also connects freedom with the «autonomy of the unconscious». Thus, the irrational properties of freedom come to the fore.

More rational understanding of freedom allows us to interpret it as a new view of existing things, as a challenge to dogmatism and conservatism. If there had not been such irrational views of existing orders, unconscious urges for a new or unconscious manifestation of spontaneity and virtuosity, humanity would not have made any discoveries, there would have been no civilizational development. The process of development of human freedom, according to E. Fromm, is «the process of human development, mastery of nature, the growing role of reason» [13, p. 50].

On the other hand, the rational understanding of human existence shows that in the world there are connections and relationships, factors that contribute to immutability, stability of laws and conditions of existence of processes, phenomena, systems, they ensure the stability of existence, emergence, functioning of natural and social objects. These connections can be called the concept of «non-freedom», which is opposed to the concept of «freedom». It is non-freedom that acts as a «guardian» of stability, in a certain way it is a «necessity», an expression of objective laws of development. The degree of necessity development is reality, realized, embodied on the basis of necessity or chance, opportunity. Reality is reasonable and rational. But over time, reality loses its relevance, loses its rationality and requires replacement, because the assessment of the rationality or irrationality of social reality can not be uniform in the whole society, which is a conglomeration of social groups. These changes lead to an action that changes the world: «to act means to change the image of the world» [14, p. 445]. But not any action could be called freedom. It requires consideration of existing circumstances and limitations, analysis of opportunities and lack of coercion.

People are faced with new dimensions of reality, they seek to achieve a certain goal, thereby changing the reality that exists. The basis of purpose, according to J. P. Sartre, is freedom. «Freedom is not an accident, the thinker writes, because it turns to its being to see it in the light of its purpose, it is a constant avoidance of chance. It is the interiorization, the «annihilation,» and the subjectivization of chance, which is thus changed into arbitrary choice» [14, p. 488]. «Freedom exists only through choice that is determined by purpose» [14, p. 494]. Freedom as an activity acts «as a disagreement with reality, with various aspects of objective and subjective reality, with activities based on this disagreement to change and improve the surrounding reality» [9, p. 18]. If we use ontological terminology, then in the understanding of J. P Sartre «freedom is the insufficiency of being in relation to this being...», a kind of «hole of being», «nothing being» [14, p. 494], in the understanding of M. Berdyaev, «freedom is rooted in nothing, in the abyss, in nothingness» [15]. «Freedom is an escape from being involved in being» [14, p. 495]. Turning into nonbeing, or non-natization, is freedom.

This irrational «hole of being» gives the impression that freedom «goes» ahead of rationality. An active, critical and responsible person, capable of neatization, changes the existing foundations with the help of «irrational»

breakthroughs, building his own reality, unlike the existing one. It has always been so. For example, Albert Einstein with his relativity theory, or Elon Musk with his «irrational» trips to Mars. One of the most important signs of freedom, according to O. Nikiforov [10, p. 294], is the violation of rationality standards, which is manifested in the setting of goals or in the creation of unusual means and ways to achieve it. This element is «an indicator of the individual uniqueness» [10, p. 295], which operates, and the activity itself will be irrational, because «deviation from the norms of rationality is assessed as irrational» [10, p. 295]. «Everything new is irrational because it does not meet the standards of rationality that make us slaves to the past» [10, p. 295]. Rational reformist, revolutionary changes are not immediately recognized by all as rational, because they first fall into the category of irrational. But rationality «catches up», turning the free activity (which seems irrational) of individuals into a rational activity for all [9, p. 17]. Therefore, the rationality or irrationality criterion of certain changes brought about by rational free activity, is practice. Freedom reflects the permanent conflict of one who seeks to limit any activity within the laws of existing existence, and one who seeks to expand the scope and improve the conditions of their existence, to overcome the freedoms (restrictions) that have arisen [9, p. 18].

In this sense, freedom acts as a spontaneous, creative process that creates something new, unknown, thereby forming a new non-freedom (stability, order). New relations, processes, thoughts are being produced. In the social dimension, freedom is a destabilizing factor, as it causes the reformation of «links in the system that lead to change, development of the system and its components» [9, p. 22]. Therefore, freedom is often frightening, and people try to find strategies to escape from freedom, avoiding the transformation «into a small part of a huge machine» and become a «full and well-dressed robot» [13]. In this E. Fromm saw a characteristic feature of modern society. The possibilities of freedom are determined by the possibilities of a certain system (political, economic, social). At the same time, freedom is a necessary condition for the transition from one stable state (non-freedom) to another (new non-freedom). In this context, freedom – the absence of order – gives rise to another order. Whereas something that now appears to be chaos... will be explained in a new kind of order in the future [16, p. 128], a new lack of freedom. The result of the interaction of freedom and non-freedom (creativity and stability), which can act both independently and together, at the same time, is the dynamics of development: «in the social world, at all its levels, traditional subsystems are retained and, on the other hand, new subsystems are constantly emerging, which in turn are transformed, changed» [9, p. 23]. As a result, the composition, quantity and quality of the main subjects of social and cultural, political, economic and other relations in society are changing. Of course, changes occur in the process of fighting for them, which can be difficult and long-lasting. The old order always resists, strives to stay, turning to the rationality of man: everything is already built, stable, ordered. And man, sometimes can not overcome external, social slavery, but «remains free in the spirit» [15], capable of change, to overcome the obstacles that arise in the fight against the old «non-freedom».

The risk society faces neatization at every step: various monopolies, stereotypes and ways of doing things are destroyed. «Monopoly of science rationality, professional monopoly of men, sexual monopoly of marriage, political monopoly of politics lose their positions» [1, p. 68]. Such changes can be explained if we keep in mind that modern economics, politics, culture are complex systems, the development of which cannot be strictly fixed, one that corresponds to verified calculations, programs and formulas, because the laws of social development manifest themselves differently in different conditions and in accordance with the ratio of social and political forces in society. Each specifically-historical, social given has its own reality and its own system of institutional, value-normative, intellectual determinations, priorities, advantages, which are in a state of constant change and renewal. The development of society is not a linear evolution, a harmonious development. There are paradoxical phenomena, coincidences and situations of uncertainty, progressive shifts and phenomena of decline, breakage and stagnation. «Man is not able to control all energy flows: social, semantic, physical, but seeks freedom in his existence and decision-making – with which of these flows and in which direction he will move» [16, p. 127]. The causality of the world is constantly disturbed. Various probabilities create so-called points of extreme instability, when the situation can change in any of the many possible directions, which makes the civilization and a particular society history (as well as each individual) a nonlinear process. Only the evolution of closed systems seems to be completely rational, due to causation. But the level of entropy, chaos and disorder is constantly increasing even in closed systems. As a result, a new system is formed – complex, unstable, nonlinear, capable of constant self-organization, which organizes the world in a new way, brings to a new level the quality of life. Open systems are described by synergetics. Therefore, the relationship between freedom and non-freedom, rational and irrational acquires a synergistic meaning, because it is about stability and instability.

Thus, neatization, spontaneity, chance act as characteristics of freedom in a synergistic sense. In general, synergetics distinguishes two types of randomness. The first type, which before the emergence of synergetics was considered the only scientifically reasonable, a chance as a way to identify the need. Synergetics reveals another kind of chance, a chance, rich in possibilities, when necessity is born of chance. It is this kind of coincidence that gives impetus to new natural and social processes. This principle of self-organization, which explains the development of the complex from the simple and the emergence of order from chaos, is called emergence, which is characteristic of open systems.

Every existential space in which a person is, is a space between the old and the new. The new attracts human attention, «when being violates its own causality and reveals incomprehensible freedom» [16, p. 127]. «And even if an individual is deeply rational, life is sure to show him its redundancy» [16, p. 128]. Then a person will have a choice: to recognize himself as an organic part of the external laminar world, to accept the vector of its development or to realize that any activity is the result of free choice, and therefore the objective ceases to be decisive, «and then the

perturbation epicenter will appear in the laminar flow that will lead to turbulent vortices and possible emergence» [16, p. 128]. There are times when being objectively becomes turbulent. And then a person «moves in time with being and experiences the act of creativity, realizes the ontology of being and its emergent qualities, while feeling admiration» [16, p. 128]. Thus, it can be argued that freedom, on the one hand, reveals «inaccessible in the laminar flow ontology», «and this kind of freedom is called rebellion» [16, p. 129], and, on the other hand – the excess of life causes another kind of freedom - creativity, which begins with the creation of an ideal model and ends with its implementation in reality. «Freedom of creativity means the ability to create new tools, set new goals, create conditions that were not possible before» [10, p. 290]. The paradox is that both kinds of freedom open a new order, perhaps incomprehensible at the time of its discovery, but which can be realized over time.

Modern risk society seeks different understanding of freedom and non-freedom in the context of rational and irrational as phenomena of social cognition and thinking culture. Thus, the French modern thinker E. Moren, characterizing the complexity of modern knowledge and its ability to acquire knowledge, points out: «The human mind must beware of its mental products, which at the same time are vital to it. ... We should make our theories more civilized, that is to form a new generation of open, rational, reflective, self-critical, self-reforming theories.. ... We need a paradigm that opens the possibility of complex cognition to crystallize and take root» [17, p. 35]. The realization of complexity, nonlinearity, openness brings to life innovations in the social, economic, political, spiritual spheres of society. Innovation is the result of creative activity, innovation, through which the planned changes take place and urgent problems are solved. Scholars note that the essence of the «modern age» is «the transition from the traditions domination to the innovation domination» [18]. Modern society that is the «knowledge society», deals with ideas more than with material processes, achieving its goal through innovation, especially in thinking. Innovation is a kind of indicator of growth, development, realization of human abilities. And freedom is the most important condition for growth.

Following W. Beck, the emergence of «civil initiatives and social movements» [1, p. 68], the birth of new «directions of search», experimental forms of «interaction with social conditions», «alternative and youth subcultures» [1, p. 68] can be considered peculiar innovations in public life. «New social movements... are... an expression of new dangerous situations in a risk society» [1, p. 68], but also a sign of living space, which is «freed from tradition» [1, p. 68]. Such social innovations are the result of spontaneous activity, which takes place «by itself, on its own initiative» [13, p. 262], which is true freedom. The free creative activity of an individual can be manifested in various spheres of his life and testifies to a person's acquisition of freedom, which allows him to «realize his own personality being himself» [13, p. 261].

Spontaneous activity is also an integral part of market relations, which become the basis of civil society. Thus, the thinker-economist F. von Hayek understands the market as an institution of unpredictable and unexpected

innovations, the development of which occurs spontaneously, in the interaction of rational and irrational. His reasoning is based on the fact that the freedom of entrepreneurial activity gives a person a special sense of creative self-realization, fills him with confidence in himself and his mind, a sense of self-worth of his inner world. Neither a slave who is forced to work nor a worker who works for the vital necessity of survival has such confidence. Only a free person has such confidence. This confidence is dynamic because it is «based on the spontaneous activity of man himself; he finds it constantly, in every moment of his spontaneous life. This is the confidence that only freedom can give» [13, p. 267]. «The desire for freedom is the desire for self-expression, self-realization, because only free activity allows the subjects to express their essential features» [10, p. 289].

Such freedom, according to E. Fromm, I. Berlin, is positive, because it is a «realization of the individual» and involves «unconditional recognition of the individual uniqueness» [13, p. 267]. Positive freedom implies that «a person becomes the center and purpose of his own life», and «the highest goal is his individuality development, his personality realization» [13, p. 268]. M. Berdyaev did not see a person without individuality. Only individuality can be an indicator of «a certain height of man” who strives for freedom. The thinker wrote: «the individual often means the irrational, the opposite of the general, the obligatory, the reasonable, the normative» [15]. In order to acquire individual qualities, to know freedom, creativity that frees from slavery is necessary. Without creativity, the individual full realization is impossible, because creativity is the most essential manifestation of man in the world, it «liberates» the flow of spontaneity, directing its power to the further development of thinking and practice in line with social innovation. Spontaneity, creativity can be interpreted as an impulsive release into the consciousness of irrational energies hidden in the realm of the unconscious.

Freedom is «the inner need, the need for self-realization, a colossal examination of existence» [7, p. 89], which contains turbulent flows, bifurcations, deviations from the path, periods of stagnation, latent stages, followed by turbulent events. Freedom is a manifestation of inner creative balanced chaos as freedom of thought and action. «Creativity is liberation from slavery» mentioned M. Berdyaev [15]. And only creative rise is a freedom indicator.

Conclusion. Thus, the analysis of human behavior and activity in a risk society allows to distinguish freedom rational and irrational antinomies as an interdisciplinary phenomenon, which are manifested in social, economic, cognitive and psychological aspects, reflecting the transformation of all social life forms, demonstrating a new world of human life.

Freedom is a phenomenon that has a personal dimension and concerns, first of all, human self-consciousness. The irrationality of freedom is revealed in the unconscious mechanisms of human activity (in sublimation and inclinations to the new, in insights), in the phenomena of virtuosity (perfect skill), spontaneity, creativity, in various actions that are a violation of habitual rationality. Freedom is a disagreement with the existing reality, its neatization.

Globalization has become a qualitatively new manifestation of modernity, generating new crisis phenomena it unites the world on new terms, produces a risk society. The key to understanding such a world is the spatio-temporal configuration, which is characterized by turbulence generated by the information and telecommunications revolution. The world economic, social and political picture is changing. The development of information communication means has caused a profound transformation in the perception of man himself and his place in the world, ways of self-identification. The freedom phenomenon activates the civilization progress, its complexity and ambiguity. Simple forms of social and cultural, political, economic self-organization were built into a hierarchy of both controlled (rational) and spontaneous (irrational) processes, asserting themselves in the formation of changing environmental challenges. By identifying global trends and order parameters of complex dynamics, there is a chance to implement productive trends. These include the problem of the relationship between «freedom» and «non-freedom», which correlates with the rational and irrational processes taking place in the modern world. Creativity as a freedom condition and result is inseparable from knowledge, which in the rational and irrational synthesis determines the spontaneity of social and individual.

But freedom is the driving force of civilization. And even in a risk society, its irrationality will save life on the Earth.

REFERENCES

1. Bek U. (2000) *Obshhestvo riska: Na puti k drugomu modernu* [Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity] M.: Progress-Tradiciya, 383 s.
2. Adamben Q. (2008) *Wyjatkow stan*. Krakow: Korporacja Halart.
3. Savytska I. M. (2013) *Svoboda yak zvilnena svidomist: istoryko-filosofskyi dyskurs* [Freedom as a liberated consciousness: historical and philosophical discourse] *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriya : Teoriia kultury i filosofii nauky* № 1057, Vyp. 49 (1). S. 67-71. Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKhITK_2013_1057_49%281%29__16 (Last accessed: 20.02.2021)
4. Svendsen L. Fr. H. (2016) *Filosofiya svobody* [Philosophy of freedom] L'viv : Vydavnytstvo Anetty Antonenko ; K. : NikaTsentr, 336 s.. *Seriya : Teoriya kul'tury i filosofiya nauky*. № 1057, Vyp. 49(1). S. 67-71.
5. Liakh V. V. (2004) *Sotsialni, osobystisni ta ekzystentsiini vymiry svobody* [Social, personal and existential dimensions of freedom] *Multyversum. Filosofskyi almanakh*. Vypusk 44, 255 s. Retrieved from: https://www.filosof.com.ua/Jornel/M_44/Ljah.htm (Last accessed: 18.02.2021)
6. Arendt X. (2002) *Mizh mynulym i maibutnim* [Between past and future] K.: Dukh i litera, 321 s.

7. Kremen V. H. (2008) *Filosofiiia liudynotsentryzmu v stratehiiakh osvitnoho prostoru* [Philosophy of anthropocentrism in the strategies of educational space] K.: Pedahohichna dumka. 424 s.

8. Kiselev G.S. (2006) *Smysly i cennosti novogo veka* [Meanings and values of the new century] *Voprosy filosofii*. № 4. S.3–16. Retrieved from: http://www.gskiselev.com/ideas_and_values_of_a_new_era.html (Last accessed: 17.02.2021)

9. Ioshkin V. K. (2006) *Nesvoboda i svoboda v racional'nom osmyslenii mira* [Non-freedom and liberty in the rational understanding of the world] *Voprosy filosofii*. № 8. S. 15-28

10. Nikiforov, A.L. (1995) *Sootnoshenie racional'nosti i svobody v chelovecheskoj dejatel'nosti. Istoricheskie tipy racional'nosti* [The relationship between rationality and freedom in human activity. Historical types of rationality] T.1. M.: Institut filosofii RAN, 350 s. S.282 – 298.

11. Levin G. D. (1995) *Diskussija. Istoricheskie tipy racional'nosti*. [Discussion. Historical types of rationality] T.1. M.: Institut filosofii RAN, 350 s. S.114 – 133.

12. Tul'chins'kij G.L. (2006) *O prirode svobody* [On the nature of freedom] *Voprosy filosofii*. №4. S. 17–31.

13. Fromm, Je. (2006) *Begstvo ot svobody. Chelovek dlja sebja* [Escape from freedom. Man for yourself] M. : ACT: ACT MOSKVA, 571 s.

14. Sartr Zh. P. (2000) <https://www.ipph.ru/pca38e14f1c64709cf0d955ff56fb2618&t=1613752009&s=yes> (Last accessed: 19.02.2021)

16. Strigin M. B. (2019) *Absurd ili jemerdzhentnost'?* [Absurd or emergent?] *Pivovarovskie chtenija. Sinteticheskaja paradigma: nauka, filosofija, religiovedenie : sbornik materialov konferencii*. Ekaterinburg : Delovaja kniga, S. 126-129. Retrieved from: https://elar.urfu.ru/bitstream/10995/78279/1/978-5-88687-251-4_45.pdf (Last accessed: 15.02.2021)

17. Moren Je. (2007) *Obrazovanie v budushhem: sem' neotlozhnyh zadach* [Seven complex lessons in education for the future] *Sinergeticheskaja paradigma. Sinergetika obrazovanija*. M.: Progress-Tradicija, 593 s. S.24-96

18. Fedotova V. G. (2010) *Social'nye innovacii kak osnova processa modernizacii obshhestva* [Social innovations as the basis of the society modernization process] *Voprosy filosofii*. № 10. S. 11-12. Retrieved from: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=209&Itemid=52 (Last accessed: 13.02.2021)