

**UDC 111.1:[17:364]**N. K. PETRUK<sup>1\*</sup>, O. V. GAPCHENKO<sup>2\*</sup><sup>1\*</sup>Khmelnyskyi National University (Khmelnyskyi, Ukraine), e-mail nataliia.petruk@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-6085-9034<sup>2\*</sup>Khmelnyskyi National University (Khmelnyskyi, Ukraine), e-mail gapchenkoov@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-4899-5110**Principles of Discourse Ethics and Human Existence in Times of War**

**Purpose.** The authors of this paper seek to comprehend, on the basis of ethics of discourse and communicative philosophy, the dimensions of human existence in times of war. This involves solving the following research tasks: to show the importance of moral and ethical norms in the structure of human existence and to emphasize the need for their observance by a person in the realities of war; to find out what the role of responsibility and co-responsibility is in preserving the space of human existence in times of war; to explore the influence of discourse on the establishment of rational and social dimensions of human existence, formation of communicative space of understanding. **Theoretical basis.** The ideas of communicative philosophy and principles of discourse ethics, focused on the problems of substantiating ethical norms and values in their relationship with the human life world, and its activities are underlying the research. The analysis of human existence in times of war was carried out considering the theoretical and methodological foundations of philosophical anthropology. **Originality.** It is substantiated that the recognition of the universality of moral norms and values, and the productive power of communication contribute to deepening the understanding of the complexity and versatility of human existence in times of war. It has been determined that human existence's rational and moral dimensions acquire particular significance in the context of russian aggression against Ukraine. The role of discourse was defined for affirming the humanistic foundations of human existence, in achieving cohesion, interaction, social solidarity, which is a condition for human development as a collective and unique being. It is noted that in war conditions the value of individual forms of human existence is complemented by the obligatory responsibility and co-responsibility for a person, awareness of the significance of coexistence in a situation where there is a threat to human life. **Conclusions.** The study of human existence involves the use of the methodological potential of discourse ethics, the significance of the ideas of which is increasing in the modern world because of the dangers caused by russian aggression against Ukraine. The recognition of the power of universal moral norms and the productive power of communication results in the affirmation of the humanistic foundations of human existence, the formation of the communicative space of understanding and consent necessary for a person. In times of war, the need for communicative rationalization of human existence, awareness of the value of morality and human humanity becomes obvious.

**Keywords:** person; human existence; discourse ethics; war; discourse; communication; responsibility; co-responsibility

**Introduction**

A person's awareness of his/her being in the modern world is determined by various factors – from feeling safe to understanding the possibilities and prospects for the realization of human essence under conditions unacceptable for human existence. Such conditions are generated by war. In the realities of war, when there are threats to human life when the usual and understandable dimensions of human existence are destroyed, the need to preserve all manifestations of human existence acquires special meaning for a person, and the understanding of the importance of joint responsibility for one's actions increases. The war gave rise to rather controversial processes: on the one hand, a person demonstrates the manifestation of all his/her strengths and capabilities, shows high moral qualities, and on the other, negative features of human nature "germinate" – aggression, anger, cruelty, hatred. Threatening and destructive tendencies toward the person, caused by russian aggression against Ukraine, prompt the need to comprehend various dimensions of human existence in times of war and use the methodological potential of communicative philosophy and ethics of discourse. The war against Ukraine was unleashed by a

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

cruel, inhuman country, immoral people who are guided not by the norms of universal morality and the principles of humanity but by barbaric laws and distorted ideas about human nature and morality. This war, which is a war for our common existence with the civilized world, for a person and our culture, has sharpened a person's perception and understanding of his/her own existence.

The comprehension of human existence, especially when a person tries to preserve his/her essence in the face of the danger of destroying the world in a soulless whirlwind of war, destruction, and death, acquires increased relevance and sharpness. Defining the main imperatives of human life, justifying human solidarity through the recognition of the equality and responsibility of all members of the communicative community of humankind, discourse ethics postulates strategies for the development and preservation of human existence under conditions of a "morally unfavorable situation" (D. Böhler), which is war.

To analyze the problem outlined in this paper, the works of the outstanding thinker, and creator of discourse ethics Karl-Otto Apel were used, the significance of whose ideological and philosophical heritage is enhanced by the threatening situation caused by war, violence, and aggression. Recently, there has been considerable interest both in communicative philosophy in general and in the ethics of discourse by K.-O. Apel, in particular. One piece of evidence is the scientific activity of the Kyiv School of Communicative Philosophy headed by A. Yermolenko (1999, 2021, 2022); the translations of works by K.-O. Apel (1999a, 1999b, 2009), J. Habermas (2000a, 2000b, 2001), V. Höslle (2003), D. Böhler (2014, 2017, 2022); opening the primary sources of communicative philosophy to the reader (Sytnichenko, 1996), the application of ideas of discourse ethics in the study of Ukrainian realities, taking into account the possibilities of theoretical substantiation and practical legitimation of the value-normative system of Ukrainian society (Kultaieva, 2022), discourse of war in communicative philosophy (Bystrytsky & Sytnichenko, 2022). The role of communication philosophy in modern dynamic sociocultural contexts is studied by Y. Bystrytsky, R. Zymovets, and S. Proleiev (2020). The use of the heuristic potential of discourse ethics allows, in our opinion, for a more in-depth description of human existence in the realities of war.

### Purpose

This paper is aimed at studying human existence in times of war on the basis of ethics of discourse and communicative philosophy, outlining the significance of the moral and ethical dimension of human being in the realities of war, clarifying the role of ethics of responsibility in preserving human existence, traditions, and institutions of human culture. Important research tasks are to study the role of discourse in the development of the moral consciousness of the Ukrainian people, in the creation of those forms of human existence that constitute an alternative to reality generated by aggression and war, clarification of a new content of ethical norms and principles in the context of war (in relation to the human social world).

### Statement of basic materials

Communicative philosophy, ethics of discourse is the area of modern philosophy whose subject is the study of the problems of everyday speech communication between people, discourse substantiation of the principles of morality, ethical norms, and values. At the same time, the principles of discourse ethics are of universal importance: it manifests itself in the recognition of communication as a fundamental feature of human existence, in determining the binding nature

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

of ethical norms of individual and social life. A. Yermolenko (2022) notes that the norms of communicative philosophy are an alternative to "a state of uncertainty in values when various norms and values coexist side by side" (p. 32). It is in times of war that the need for communication, in reasoned discourse, which takes into consideration the interests of all its participants, is especially important and relevant for a person since war creates real threats to people and human existence. Despite the fact that under the conditions of war, various discourse practices are curtailed "because it is difficult to discourse when you are shot at" (Yermolenko, 2022, p. 33), the importance of communication in the modern world due to the war against Ukraine unleashed by the Russian aggressor is only deepening.

The ideas of communicative philosophy have value not only in analyzing the aspect of practical reason, and ethics, but can also be applied to attempts to analyze various dimensions of human existence, to characterize the existential manifestations of a person in times of war. Communicative philosophy proves not only the potential possibility but also the urgent need to substantiate the ideals of human coexistence and understanding under conditions when a person faces new challenges, and the need to search for new meanings during the war becomes especially relevant.

According to the creators of communicative philosophy, a person does not exist outside of communication; communication is a universal principle of human life. Every communicative act of a person, according to Karl-Otto Apel (1973a), a priori, even before real implementation, has as its prerequisite communicativeness (p. 205, p. 208). Communication is the instance through which individuals acting communicatively have the opportunity to jointly discuss and justify their actions, ethical norms, and values. Consequently, communication, verbal communication becomes a prerequisite for any human experience. A special type of reality, the "medium" of unlimited understanding, is language, which is a communicative community and as such is responsible for consensus, for norms and goals of the practice. Real communicative, or a semantic community in the form of a language community is also noted by D. Böhler. It is about "an ideal argumentative community, or a universum of discourse, in the sense of a logically significant authority, namely the instance of reason", writes the philosopher (Böhler, 2022, p. 8).

Within the framework of the "unlimited communicative community" or "speech-communicative intersubjectivity", understanding, and agreement are achieved, moral and practical norms are developed that are essential for a person and his/her being in an "unreasonable, morally unfavorable situation – an example can be Russia's expansionist war of aggression against Ukraine" (Böhler, 2022, p. 19). The ideal communicative community is a model and prerequisite for real communication, in which discussion is carried out and a consensus is reached between its participants. The principles of an ideal communicative community show their significance, especially when it comes to manifestations of human existence, the value of human life, shared responsibility, preservation of human rights and dignity, in fact, the preservation of human form even under inhuman conditions of war.

Attaching great importance to ethical issues, K.-O. Apel believes that reason or tradition, which are capable of sanctioning the results of activities, do not act as the only authoritative authority in the search for common norms and values of human life. Only the communicative community should be a binding authority for all its members, "it supports communication, forces an intersubjective understanding of social norms" (Apel, 1973a, p. 210). Actually, such an essential connection, a solid relationship between people is communication. Within the framework of speech-communicative interaction, understanding, agreement, and moral and practical norms can be developed.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

---

The concept of "communicative community" by K.-O. Apel is used to characterize ideal or transcendental communication. The philosopher believes that the possibilities of real communication, in which discussion should be carried out and a consensus is reached between its participants, are insufficient for this since the question of the argumentation criterion remains unresolved. In addition, in actual communication, it is quite likely that a false consensus will be reached. Apel (1973a) thinks of ideal communication as a controlling and legitimizing authority, which, as an a priori form, establishes the authenticity of meaning and mutual understanding (p. 248).

The principles of an ideal communicative community are embodied within a real communicative community, and a universal requirement for a person who asserts his/her existence under war conditions is compliance with the norms of the human community, human rights, and dignity. In the process of communication, the best qualities of a person are manifested – firmness of convictions, determination in actions and activities, concentration in protecting oneself and one's relatives from the enemy. At the same time, the enemy here is perceived as a distorted human essence. Owing to communication, stereotypes, and limitations of thinking about evil in human nature are leveled. Evil does not always lie in a person's frank desire to do something terrible but is often associated with a refusal to evaluate his/her actions from the point of view of morality, with a lack of thought about his/her own responsibility for his/her choices and his/her actions.

K.-O. Apel was convinced that a new ethic must be created that takes responsibility for today's human actions and their future consequences on a global scale. Formulating the basic principles of the ethics of responsibility, the philosopher emphasizes that such ethics requires solving problems by achieving understanding and intersubjective harmonization of ethical norms and principles, as well as the equality of all members of the communicative community (Apel, 1973b, p. 359, p. 361). The universality of the norms and principles of ethics of responsibility lies in the fact that their strength is manifested in actual communication, and in public life. K.-O. Apel emphasizes that provided that reason is not a sufficient guarantee of observance of moral norms, ideals and values of human coexistence, it is necessary

To set and justify an initial ethical norm that would perform the function of what is proper in relation to each individual and on the basis of which it would be possible to reach a binding understanding with all other people, in principle, in all practical matters, and ultimately adhere to the established agreement. (Apel, 1973b, p. 347)

The main principles of ethics of responsibility can be applied in the analysis of the situation of a person and his/her existence in times of war, as well as in justifying the experience of social existence under conditions when war destroys the usual and civilized norms of human relations and forms of human life. The norms of ethics of responsibility can be considered as the basis for the establishment of those forms of human (social) life, the existence of which is impossible without reaching an agreement and understanding. Consequently, all forms of human existence must be discursively grounded (by reaching a consensus in the process of discussion or discourse).

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Under war conditions, the focus of human existence shifts to the ability of a person to show his/her strength in unification, ties of solidarity and mutual assistance. A person feels that s/he belongs to the world in which s/he should live – the world of good, support, trust, and order, to his/her Home, to a community of people close in spirit and common interests. Cohesion, unification, and coordination of one's actions to achieve a clear goal are necessary signs of human existence in the realities of war.

From the standpoint of communicative philosophy, the possibility of coordinating a person's social plans is concentrated by communicative action. According to J. Habermas (2000a), the socio-integrative energy of communicative action manifests itself most fully in those individual life forms and life worlds that are connected with each time specific traditions and areas of interest (p. 30). The social energy of these life contexts is transferred to the real life of a person in a time of war. Therefore, the expressive features of human existence in the realities of war are activity, social energy, consolidation around the goals of protecting his/her homeland, awareness of responsibility for the fate of the country.

A necessary requirement for the preservation of a person's humanity and the expression of the ability to socially significant action is the achievement of social consensus. In communicative philosophy, by achieving social consensus, discourse becomes a means of substantiating norms and values – a model of speech reasonable and free from any coercion. Theoretical discourse is a form of argumentation in which opposing truth claims are reduced (Habermas, 1981, p. 39). If in communicative action meanings are uncritically assumed in order to exchange information and experience that is necessary for the implementation of human actions, then in discourse problematic claims to meaning become the main theme and no exchange of information occurs. It is through the discourse that "we try by justification to re-establish consent, which becomes problematic in communicative action", writes J. Habermas (1981, p. 115). In this sense, it is about understanding (discourse understanding).

Discourse does not require categorical thinking and language, the normativity of actions, or the unambiguity of actions, it is the result of actions and activities oriented specifically to understanding. In discourse, a person treats another person as a subject. And this leaves a significant imprint on the nature of relations between people. Despite the fact that real communication is, of course, different from the model of pure communication and ideal discourse, the ideal discourse can be seen as a theoretical model of actual communication between people and as a model of human coexistence.

Owing to the power of discourse, a person receives greater opportunities for free judgment, and choice of actions and activities. Discourse becomes especially important in the realities of war, when the savagery and cruelty of the enemy are opposed to the system of values and ideas, and trust, compassion, and kindness become essential features of human existence.

Discourse (as well as communicative action) is determined by a single goal – consensus. It concerns both the proposed content of statements or intersubjectively significant mutually expected actions, as well as the thoughts and intentions of a person, the general norms of human activity. Discourse is the practice of communicative relationships to reach an agreement, and at the same time it becomes a form of gaining social consensus. Discourse creates the same (symmetrical) conditions for the selection and implementation of speech and communicative actions for all participants and thereby excludes any coercion, and therefore appears as "communication unlimited by domination". According to K.-O. Apel (1999b), discourse "constitutes philosophically and politically the last authority by which and through

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

---

which the joint responsibility of people for their activities and the consequences of their activities should be sanctioned" (p. 400).

Reflecting on the theme of reason in the paradigm of communication and ethics of discourse, D. Böhler (2022) writes that discourse is "certain a priori, it is an irreversible accompanying phenomenon of human life" (p. 13). Discourse is the duty from which moral duties are derived, it is the highest regulatory principle of action in accordance with a given situation, "specified primarily by the ethics of responsibility as a target benchmark for will and behavior" (Böhler, 2022, p. 18).

Thus, the principle of "D" (the principle of discourse) contains both logical and moral grounds for justifying norms for any situation. Therefore, it can be used to analyze different dimensions of human existence in unstable, unreasonable situations of "morally unfavorable situations", which is the war waged against Ukraine. The principle of discourse is aimed at reaching agreement between people, considering all interests and rational arguments corresponding to the situation. The advantages of the principle "D" are manifested in unstable circumstances affecting a person and the forms of his/her being in the world, in a situation of war and aggression by the enemy, false information, and false propaganda. Of course, the principle of discourse cannot be used to justify war criminals and murderers but, as Böhler writes, it is quite expected that informed consent is necessary to punish and isolate such criminals. Therefore, he agrees with Apel that, along with the idealistically interpreted principle of discourse as a "moral principle", a realistic moral and strategic "complement principle" is also needed, which aims to apply the principle of "ideal community" in a real community as a possibility of the existence of an actual society. Therefore, a "moral and strategic specification of the moral principle" is inevitable (Böhler, 2022, p. 19).

Ethics of responsibility or discourse ethics presupposes human interaction and community. The discourse registers, on the one hand, the autonomy of the individual, and on the other – his/her belonging to those forms of life that are intersubjectively recognized by him/her. The value of the individual, individual forms of life are complemented by an awareness of the significance of his/her coexistence with another, relations of trust and mutual recognition. It is especially important to take this into account in the context of Russian aggression against Ukraine. The principles of ethics of responsibility (communicative ethics) are focused on the preservation of being as such, as well as "such conventions and institutions of the human cultural tradition that are commensurate with the ideal scale of discourse ethics" (Yermolenko, 1999, p. 163). Their observance is a condition for the humanity of human existence.

However, the war creates some situations of problematic attempts to rationalize the ethics of responsibility. On the one hand, there is an urgent need to comply with generally accepted moral norms (a priori ethics of responsibility) for all people without exception. On the other hand, there is a real awareness of the impossibility of doing this when aggression is committed against the country and its people, and the aggressor acts outside the field of morality and moral principles and considers himself free from morality and moral values. In the context of Russian aggression against Ukraine, the savagery and cruelty of the enemy are opposed by the weapons of Ukrainian soldiers and the moral values of the Ukrainian people, and compassion, understanding, support, and kindness are essential signs of human existence. Even in the worst, most tragic times for human existence, a person must remain human and preserve his/her moral character.

The main norm of discourse ethics is the idea of the discursively organized responsibility of humankind for its collective actions since, as K.-O. Apel (1999a) writes, today the dangers that

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

concern humanity as a whole are real, and it is because of the common danger that people must assume joint responsibility (p. 231). Society must create such forms of institutional legitimation of ethical norms and values, which at the same time are the principal conditions for its moral improvement. In general, it is about the possibilities of ethical reason to compensate for the selfishness and excessive self-confidence of a person in many situations, which s/he caused. Responsibility goes beyond the performance of institutional roles, and human actions cannot be assessed only through the category of success (in politics, economics, production, in the performance of official duties and observance of official status). There must be moral responsibility for the consequences of human actions.

The requirement of communicative philosophy not to level general ethical norms and to adhere to humanistic values in relation to a person and the world complements the idea of preserving those life forms in which the unique being of the person is represented. Apel has no doubt that it is the ethical reason that can respond to the challenge of the situation caused by the active person – homo faber. The creation of a new ethic of responsibility means that a person must move away from the narrow framework of goal-oriented activity and direct his/her essential forces to ensure the possibility of coexistence and survival in modern realities. The conditions of coexistence in the world imply the development of a number of qualities in a person, which would determine the person himself/herself to cohabitation and solidarity with others. In this sense, the words of J. Habermas that in the name of moral universalism, one cannot level and ignore another person are true. Only by granting freedom in human development, as well as individual life forms, "can universalism of equal respect for everyone and solidarity with all who have a human face be defended" (Habermas, 2000a, p. 25).

The war creates a range of complex moral problems for a person, solving which largely affects the existence of a person and various manifestations of his/her being in society. Communicative philosophy and ethics of discourse offer their own version in their solution, focusing on the importance of universal moral norms and principles, the observance of which can be the basis for preserving human existence as coexistence and a condition for further improvement and development of a person and his/her life world. This philosophy defends the rational content of morality, which implies respect for everyone and common joint responsibility for each other. The principles of ethics of responsibility are a prerequisite for solving many problems that a person faces at a time when his/her country is fighting against the enemy. Under conditions of war, a person must act and act in such a way as to preserve his/her essence and ensure the survival of the human race.

One of the most important values of human existence in today's Ukrainian realities, under war conditions, is freedom: freedom of action, freedom of discussion, and equal communication between participants in social, political, and cultural processes in the country. The value of freedom is an integral characteristic of human existence and reveals the powerful potential of a person in times of trials and struggle for his/her independence. In the actions of a free person, the maximum self-realization of human essence and humane manifestations of human existence takes place. To a large extent, due to the awareness of the universality of ethical norms and the significance of humanistic values, a Ukrainian person develops his/her best qualities and gains experience of coexistence and democratic development.

The substantiation of moral and value dimensions of human existence through the recognition of the universality of moral norms and principles is accompanied by the use and application of such classical ethical categories as "responsibility", "justice", "sovereignty of the individual",

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

---

"duty", "conscience". Of particular importance for defining the social dimensions of human existence is the concept of co-responsibility. Awareness of the importance of human interaction and social solidarity, coexistence under conditions when it comes to threats to human life and humanity in general, is strengthened and exacerbated in times of war. In this case, universal moral norms and universal human values can be considered as a counteraction and a means of restraining manifestations of hatred, cruelty, and immorality. In the realities of war, a person must protect and respect the dignity of his/her own existence and be responsible not only for himself/herself but also for other people, for the entire living world. "The painful wounds on the body of Ukraine caused by russian aggression are further evidence of the need to return to the policy of mutual respect and recognition of universal values", writes M. Kul'taieva (2022, p. 53).

Overcoming depersonalization in the terrible and bloody time of war, a person must remain human and preserve his/her likeness, his/her essence, and moral character – without malice, and cruelty but in dignity. The war that is now being waged by the aggressor against Ukraine is a war of life against death, of people against inhumans. This is a war of free people against a soulless, totalitarian machine. The existence of a Ukrainian person during the war is a unique phenomenon, which has no analogs in modern history. It manifests itself through the will to live, freedom of choice, and responsibility, through the protection and assertion of independent human existence and freedom. This guarantees the authenticity of a person, his/her being in the world, and expresses the desire to overcome alienation and preserve his/her life when the enemy encroaches on the very existence of the Ukrainian person, this desire is to remain himself/herself.

### Originality

The role of communicative philosophy and ethics of discourse as a paradigmatic basis for understanding human existence in times of war, which contributes to understanding its complexity and versatility, and awareness of the significance of its rational, moral, social dimensions, is investigated. It has been established that there is a close connection between the content of moral norms and the existential manifestations of a person under war conditions. It is shown that communicative rationalization of manifestations of human existence occurs through substantiation and practical legitimation of values and norms of morality. It is substantiated that the guidelines of discourse ethics acquire particular relevance for a person due to the threats brought by russian aggression against Ukraine. In times of war, a value-neutral objectified worldview loses its force, and ethical norms and values that are universal in their content become a sign of true human existence. They form the life world of a free personality, which is an alternative to the hostile world of hatred, aggressiveness, and inhumanity. The role of discourse in the humanization of human existence, in achieving cohesion, interaction, mutual recognition, and social solidarity has been characterized, which is evidence of social potential inherent in human existence and expression of the fundamental need for the formation of communicative space of understanding.

It is substantiated that war demands a person to radically revise the criteria in assessing one's existence: responsibility and joint responsibility become very important in times of war. The value of the individual, individual forms of human existence is complemented by the awareness of the significance of coexistence in modern Ukrainian realities. In the context of russian aggression against Ukraine, the role of understanding and interaction between people is growing, which is the basis for the creation in the processes of communication of a common space for all human existence, its humanization.



## Conclusions

Thus, the study of various dimensions of human existence in times of war requires taking into account the ideas and conclusions of communicative philosophy, ethics of discourse on understanding the productive power of communication, and awareness of the significance of universal moral norms and principles in the characterization of human existence. Communicative philosophy is focused on determining the universal conditions for possible understanding and analyzing the content of ethical norms and principles in relation to the human social world.

War tests a person and "exposes" such dimensions of existence that emphasize his/her ability to understand another, cooperate, direct his/her forces to ensure the possibility of life and survival in crisis situations. The conditions of coexistence in a world where there is a war imply the development of a number of qualities in a person that should determine the person himself/herself to cooperate and coexist. The ethics of responsibility becomes the ethics of joint responsibility of people for their actions and their consequences. In the fundamental requirement of discourse ethics, the demand for the discursively organized responsibility of humanity for its collective actions, the postulate of humanization of human existence clearly stands out.

The reception of the ideas of communicative philosophy and ethics of discourse on Ukrainian soil, the rethinking of the limiting principles of human existence in the context of war provide essential arguments for the conclusion that compliance with moral and ethical norms and principles is a condition for the development of a person and human existence. The normative ethics of discourse necessitate the survival of the Ukrainian people and at the same time preserve their essence under the conditions of Russian military aggression against Ukraine. Under the inhuman conditions of war, the need for communicative rationalization of concrete manifestations of human existence clearly appears, the need to preserve the moral character and strengthen the moral consciousness of a person is unconditional.

## REFERENCES

- Apel, K.-O. (1973a). *Transformation der Philosophie: Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft* (Vol. 1). Frankfurt am Main. (in German)
- Apel, K.-O. (1973b). *Transformation der Philosophie: Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft und die Grundlagen der Ethik* (Vol. 2). Frankfurt am Main. (in German)
- Apel, K.-O. (1999a). Die Situation des Menschen als ethisches Problem (A. Yermolenko, Trans.). In A. M. Yermolenko, *Komunikatyvna praktychna filosofii* (pp. 231-254). Kyiv: Libra. (in Ukrainian)
- Apel, K.-O. (1999b). Diskursethik als politische Verantwortungsethik in der gegenwärtigen Welt situation (A. Yermolenko, Trans.). In A. M. Yermolenko, *Komunikatyvna praktychna filosofii* (pp. 395-412). Kyiv: Libra. (in Ukrainian)
- Apel, K.-O. (2009). *Diskurs und Verantwortung: Das Problem des Übergangs zur postkonventionellen Moral* (V. Kuplin, Trans.). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)
- Böhler, D. (2014). *Vidpovidalnist za maibutnie z hlobalnoi perspektyvy. Aktualnist filosofii Hansa Yonasa ta etyky dyskursu* (A. Yermolenko, Trans.). Kyiv: Stylos. (in Ukrainian)
- Böhler, D. (2017). Rozmysly shchodo nashoho osereddia v umovakh zovnishnikh i vnutrishnikh zahroz. *Philosophical Thought*, (2), 54-56. (in Ukrainian)
- Böhler, D. (2022). Unity of mind and its differentiation according to Karl-Otto Apel. *Philosophical Thought*, (2), 7-22. (in Ukrainian)
- Bystrytsky, Y., & Sytnichenko, L. (2022). Philosophy and discourse of war: conflict of worlds as the limit of Jürgen Habermas's communicative theory. *Philosophical Thought*, (3), 64-82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.03.064> (in Ukrainian)
- Bystrytsky, Y., Zymovets, R., & Proleiev, S. (2020). *Komunikatsiia i kultura v hlobalnomu sviti*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns: Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung* (Vol. 1). Frankfurt am Main. (in German)
- Habermas, J. (2000a). *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln* (D. Skliadnev, Trans.). St. Petersburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
- Habermas, J. (2000b). *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (A. Onyshko, Trans.). Lviv: Litopys. (in Ukrainian)
- Habermas, J. (2001). *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne* (V. Kuplin, Trans.). Kyiv: Chetverta khvyliia. (in Ukrainian)
- Hösle, V. (2003). *Praktische Philosophie in der modernen Welt* (A. Yermolenko, Trans.). Kyiv: Libra. (in Ukrainian)
- Kultaieva, M. (2022). Karl-Otto Apel: the art of living in the modus of the discourse ethics. *Philosophical Thought*, (2), 52-65. (in Ukrainian)
- Sytynichenko, L. A. (1996). *Pershodzherela komunikatyvnoi filosofii*. Kyiv: Lybid. (in Ukrainian)
- Yermolenko, A. M. (1999). *Komunikatyvna praktychna filosofiiia*. Kyiv: Libra. (in Ukrainian)
- Yermolenko, A. M. (2021). *Dyskurs. Komunikatsiia. Moralnist*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (in Ukrainian)
- Yermolenko, A. (2022). Karl-Otto Apel's ethics of discourse as the "first philosophy" of the third paradigm. *Philosophical Thought*, (2), 22-38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.02.023> (in Ukrainian)

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Apel K.-O. *Transformation der Philosophie*. Bd. 1: Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft. Frankfurt am Main, 1973. 379 s.
- Apel K.-O. *Transformation der Philosophie*. Bd. 2: Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft und die Grundlagen der Ethik. Frankfurt am Main, 1973. 447 s.
- Апель К.-О. Ситуація людини як етична проблема / пер. з нім. А. Єрмоленка. *Комунікативна практична філософія* / А. М. Єрмоленко. Київ : Лібра, 1999. С. 231–254.
- Апель К.-О. Дискурсивна етика як політична етика відповідальності у ситуації сучасного світу / пер. з нім. А. Єрмоленка. *Комунікативна практична філософія* / А. М. Єрмоленко. Київ : Лібра, 1999. С. 395–412.
- Апель К.-О. *Дискурс і відповідальність: проблема переходу до постконвенціональної моралі* / пер. з нім. В. Купліна. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2009. 430 с.
- Бьолер Д. *Відповідальність за майбутнє з глобальної перспективи. Актуальність філософії Ганса Йонаса та етики дискурсу* / пер. з нім. А. Єрмоленка. Київ : Стилос, 2014. 149 с.
- Бьолер Д. Розмісли щодо нашого осереддя в умовах зовнішніх і внутрішніх загроз. *Філософська думка*. 2017. № 2. С. 54–56.
- Бьолер Д. Єдність розуму та його диференціація за Карлом-Отто Апелем. *Філософська думка*. 2022. № 2. С. 7–22.
- Бистрицький Є., Ситніченко Л. Філософія і дискурс війни: конфлікт світів як межа комунікативної філософії Юргена Габермаса. *Філософська думка*. 2022. № 3. С. 64–82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.03.064>
- Бистрицький Є., Зимовець Р., Пролєєв С. Комунікація і культура в глобальному світі. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2020. 416 с.
- Habermas J. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Bd. 1: Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung. Frankfurt am Main, 1981. 533 s.
- Хабермас Ю. *Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие* / пер. с нем. Д. В. Складнева. Санкт-Петербург : Наука, 2000. 377 с.
- Габермас Ю. *Структурні перетворення у сфері відкритості: дослідження категорії громадянське суспільство* / пер. з нім. А. Онишка. Львів : Літопис, 2000. 318 с.
- Габермас Ю. *Філософський дискурс Модерну* / пер. з нім. В. М. Купліна. Київ : Четверта хвиля, 2001. 424 с.
- Гьосле В. *Практична філософія в сучасному світі* / пер. з нім. А. Єрмоленка. Київ : Лібра, 2003. 247 с.
- Култаєва М. Карл-Отто Апель: мистецтво жити у модусі дискурсивної етики. *Філософська думка*. 2022. № 2. С. 52–65.
- Ситніченко Л. А. *Першоджерела комунікативної філософії*. Київ : Либідь, 1996. 138 с.
- Єрмоленко А. М. *Комунікативна практична філософія*. Київ : Лібра, 1999. 487 с.
- Єрмоленко А. М. *Дискурс. Комунікація. Моральність*. Київ : Наукова думка, 2021. 439 с.
- Єрмоленко А. Етика дискурсу Карла-Отто Апеля як "перша філософія" третьої парадигми. *Філософська думка*. 2022. № 2. С. 23–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.02.023>

---

Н. К. ПЕТРУК<sup>1\*</sup>, О. В. ГАПЧЕНКО<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Хмельницький національний університет (Хмельницький, Україна), ел. пошта nataliia.petruk@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-6085-9034

<sup>2\*</sup>Хмельницький національний університет (Хмельницький, Україна), ел. пошта gapchenkoov@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-4899-5110

## Принципи дискурсивної етики і людське буття в часи війни

**Мета.** У статті автори прагнуть осмислити на засадах етики дискурсу та комунікативної філософії виміри людського буття в часи війни. Це передбачає вирішення таких дослідницьких завдань: показати значущість морально-етичних норм у структурі людського буття та наголосити на необхідності їх дотримання людиною в реаліях війни; з'ясувати, якою є роль відповідальності та співвідповідальності у збереженні простору людського буття в часи війни; дослідити впливи дискурсу на утвердження раціональних і соціальних вимірів людського буття, формування комунікативного простору порозуміння. **Теоретичний базис.** Основу дослідження складають ідеї комунікативної філософії та принципи дискурсивної етики, сфокусовані на проблемах обґрунтування етичних норм та цінностей у їх взаємозв'язку з життєвим світом людини, її діяльністю. Аналіз буття людини в часи війни здійснено з урахуванням теоретико-методологічних засад філософської антропології. **Наукова новизна.** Обґрунтовано, що визнання універсальності моральних норм і цінностей, продуктивної сили комунікації сприяє поглибленню розуміння складності й багатогранності людського буття в часи війни. Установлено, що раціональний та моральний виміри людського буття набувають особливої значущості в умовах російської агресії проти України. Визначено роль дискурсу в утвердженні гуманістичних засад людського буття, у досягненні згуртованості, взаємодії, соціальної солідарності, що є умовою розвитку людини як колективної та унікальної істоти. Зазначено, що в умовах війни цінність індивідуальних форм людського буття доповнюється обов'язковістю відповідальності та співвідповідальності за людину, усвідомленням значущості співбуття в ситуації, коли існує загроза людському життю. **Висновки.** Дослідження людського буття передбачає використання методологічного потенціалу етики дискурсу, значущість ідей якої посилюється в сучасному світі через небезпеки, спричинені російською агресією проти України. Визнання сили універсальних моральних норм і продуктивної сили комунікації має своїм наслідком утвердження гуманістичних засад людського буття, формування необхідного для людини комунікативного простору порозуміння і згоди. У часи війни очевидною стає необхідність комунікативної раціоналізації людського буття, усвідомлення цінності моральності та гуманності людини.

*Ключові слова:* людина; людське буття; дискурсивна етика; війна; дискурс; комунікація; відповідальність; співвідповідальність

Received: 22.12.2022

Accepted: 19.05.2023