

UDC 130.2:008.2

T. V. DANYLOVA^{1*}^{1*}National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv), e-mail danilova_tv@ukr.net;
ORCID 0000-0002-0297-9473**THE DESIRE FOR RECOGNITION IN THE CONTEXT OF FRANCIS FUKUYAMA'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY**

Introduction. Francis Fukuyama in his famous book “The End of History and the Last Man” assumes that human history should be considered as the battle of ideologies that reaches its goal in the universalization of Western liberal democracy. Author’s ideas have gained many supporters. At the same time, they were subjected to severe criticism that reflected the important trends of political life and ideological preferences. Leaving aside the criticism based on geopolitical and civilizational confrontation and confusion which confronts Fukuyama’s theory, it should be stated that anthropological aspect of Fukuyama’s theory has vastly evaded philosophical comprehension. **Purpose.** This article attempts to test Fukuyama’s theory through the lens of philosophical anthropology and analyze human desire for recognition in the context of Fukuyama’s World History. **Methodology.** The analysis is focused on human desire for recognition as a significant dimension of human nature. The author has used hermeneutical methodology and anthropological integrative approach. **Theoretical basis and results.** Fukuyama is not satisfied by merely economic interpretation of history emphasizing that human is not simply an economic animal. Economic development fails to explain why people advocate the principles of liberal democracy. The author goes back to Hegel’s non-materialistic view of history based on the struggle for recognition. According to Fukuyama, this deeply rooted human desire for recognition is the great motor of history and cause of tyranny, conflicts, and wars. But at the same time, it also acts as a psychological foundation of many virtues – the spirit of citizenship, courage, and justice. Throughout history, this desire for recognition was not satisfied. Only modern liberal democracy provides universal recognition of all humans ensuring and protecting their rights. **Originality.** Fukuyama’s concept is important and interesting because it draws attention to the sphere of human values, which essentially influences the basis of personality structure. Unlike traditional liberalism, which focuses on materialism and justice, Fukuyama considers the struggle for recognition, the spiritual search for human dignity and equality (or superiority) the major component of social transformation. Human acts as a central point of political, cultural, economical space: he/she is the creator and the creation. **Conclusions.** Over time, the concept of Fukuyama has undergone significant changes. Modern civilization has been facing with an acute problem of growing inequality, serious financial crisis, political havoc and military conflicts, migrants and refugees problem. But so far the idea of liberal democracy has no real competitors.

Keywords: Francis Fukuyama; Universal History; desire for recognition; thymos; megalothymia; isothymia; liberal democracy

Introduction

Yoshihiro Francis Fukuyama, the famous American philosopher, political scientist, and political economist in his book “The End of History and the Last Man” used modernization theory in explaining the grandiose events during the late 20th century period. He brought existing theories and ideas into line with global trends. Fukuyama’s theory was designed during the destruction of the authoritarian regimes and the establishment of democracy. At that time, a triumph of the market economy and global modernization seemed inevitable. The relevance of the “end of history” concept thus consists in creating a new political and philosophical paradigm in the context of the modernization approach.

Fukuyama’s book reveals a very interesting aspect of civilization theory. The author talks about the ups and downs of such ideologies as absolutism, fascism and communism. He assumes that human history should be considered as the battle of ideologies that reaches its goal in the universalization of Western liberal democracy. Fukuyama argues that although the goal has not been reached in the material world, the idea of the Western liberalism is becoming dominant.

Author’s ideas have gained many supporters. At the same time, they were subjected to severe criticism that reflected the important trends of political life and ideological preferences. S. Huntington characterized it as a harmonious world paradigm based on the premise that the end of the “cold war” brought an end to a large-

scale geopolitical conflict. However, as he stated: “The one harmonious world paradigm is clearly far too divorced from reality to be a useful guide to the post-Cold War world” [11, p. 32]. Some researchers have argued that Fukuyama’s theory is the personification of the Western ideas, the rationale for the Western expansion, apologia for the rights of the “golden billion”, the confrontation between the Atlanticist world and Eurasia [1; 2]. However, these concepts, when empirically tested, does not seem to offer much explanation. There is also a trend to interpret Fukuyama’s concept within the broader philosophical discourse [3; 12].

Leaving aside the criticism based on geopolitical and civilizational confrontation and confusion, which confronts Fukuyama’s theory, I am inclined to agree with Chan-young Yang, who states: «The overwhelming majority (not all) of the misconceptions about Fukuyama are products of inadequate communication rather than misinterpretation. Many commentators tend to read Fukuyama selectively, skipping the sections where he artfully addresses the raised and potential objections» [15].

Having experienced phenomenal success, the theory of Fukuyama faced with challenges. Thus, soon after the Soviet Union collapse, various conflicts have broken out with the renewed vigor, and Fukuyama’s concept was declared to be obsolete. The scientist continued to defend his position, but his views have undergone significant changes. Initially Fukuyama tried to explain the challenges of time in terms of desire for recognition, economy, and science. Later thinker had to explain the problems of societies in transition, growing flames of ethnic and religious conflicts, withdrawal from democracy in terms of culture. He interpreted culture as the basis for identity of society and the necessary condition for effective economic development and liberal democracy. At the beginning of the 21st century he reviewed his position and became an active supporter of a strong state [9]. In general, Fukuyama rejects the idea of accelerating the process of democracy dissemination and puts new emphasis on the explanation of historical development. He proposes new estimates and projections. Analyzing the mass protests swept across the world in recent years – from Brazil to Egypt and Turkey – scientist focuses

on the revolutions of the new global middle class: “Everywhere it has emerged, a modern middle class causes political ferment, but only rarely has it been able, on its own, to bring about lasting political change” [10]. However, despite all the difficulties, the movement of the middle class dissatisfied with its social alienation is gaining strength, that is why “no politician in the U.S. or Europe should look down complacently on the events unfolding in the streets of Istanbul and São Paulo. It would be a grave mistake to think, “It can’t happen here” [10].

Sometimes the concept of Fukuyama is interpreted as follows: nothing important is going to happen in the human history. However, the thinker does not mean that nothing will happen in the future. He rather stresses that liberal democracy as the system has no serious competitors today (after the collapse of communism and fascism). Fukuyama is wrongly interpreted as apologist for American triumphalism as the only one possible glorious end of human history. Though, for Fukuyama, not USA but the European Union has become the most realistic embodiment of his ideas [14].

Anthropological aspect of Fukuyama’s theory has vastly evaded philosophical comprehension. However, the problem of human nature is a key factor in understanding the dynamics of civilizational process and, thus, in defining the horizons of human future [5]. Carefully analyzing underlying motivations of the human soul/psyche, Fukuyama leaves room for multifaceted human development and, respectively, for the world’s future project.

Purpose

This article attempts to test Fukuyama’s theory through the lens of the contradictory human nature and analyze human desire for recognition in the context of Fukuyama’s World History.

Methodology

In the context of the research I do not appeal to philosophical anthropology as a particular approach/paradigm represented by M. Scheler, H. Plessner, A. Gehlen. Instead, philosophical anthropology is understood as a “discipline within philosophy that seeks to unify the several empirical investigations of human nature in an effort to understand individuals as both creatures

of their environment and creators of their own values” [13].

The analysis is focused on human desire for recognition as a significant dimension of human nature.

Theoretical basis and results

According to the researcher, liberal democracy may constitute the “end point of mankind’s ideological evolution” and the “final form of human government”, that is, the so-called end of history. As Fukuyama states, his views are criticized because of misunderstanding of the notion “history” used by the author. Critics understand history as a sequence of events, while Fukuyama defines it as “a single, coherent, evolutionary process, when taking into account the experience of all peoples in all times” [8, p. xii]. For the further exploration of history with its beginning and end, Fukuyama uses Hegel’s concept of “the end of history” along with its later interpretation given by Russian-born French philosopher A. Kojève. For Hegel, the French Revolution was an event that marked the triumph of the liberal and democratic system. While actually existing society has not yet reached this state, the idea of universal human rights to liberty and government with the consent of the governed have been implemented in the form of ideology. According to A. Kojève, dissemination of liberal ideas will significantly contribute to resolving religious, ethnic and political conflicts inherent in previous history, and economic activity will be the main area of human rivalry.

Following Hegel, Fukuyama examines ideas as the driving force of history. Hegel interprets these ideas as ideologies that include political doctrine along with religious, cultural, and moral values of society. Ideologies, without affecting the material world directly, nevertheless have a significant impact on global development. According to Hegel, the ideology is the basic factor that guides the movement of the world in the long run. Thus, for a deep awareness of all that is happening in the world it is necessary to take into account the history of ideologies. Contemporary economic policy, which interprets the world only in terms of needs, desires and purely rational actions, can not fully interpret life choices per se. For example, to explain the success of Asian Tigers from the perspective of the

viability of the free market without taking into account the social aspects of the work ethic, thrift and other moral qualities is to ignore the role of ideology in all modern world events. Fukuyama emphasizes the importance of this argument, because it means that economic liberalism does not generate a liberal policy on its own, or vice versa, but both of these components are the result of the previous development of consciousness.

Fukuyama makes two parallel attempts to define a universal history. The first is to find modern science’s regulators that explain the direction and logic of history. He believes that modern science is the only one important social activity, which has a significant impact on all societies. The logic of modern science promotes universal evolution in the direction of capitalism, since the experience of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries indicates that over recent decades centrally planned economy (although it was sufficient to achieve the level of industrialization in the middle of the 20th century) has been becoming inadequate for the development of the complex post-industrial economic system, in which information and technical innovations play a significant role.

However, Fukuyama is not satisfied by merely economic interpretation of history emphasizing that human is not simply an economic animal. Economic development fails to explain why people advocate the principles of liberal democracy. That is why the thinker offers the parallel option for defining history that considers human as a whole. The author goes back to Hegel’s non-materialistic view of history based on the struggle for recognition: “Man differs fundamentally from the animals, however, because in addition he desires the desire of other men, that is, he wants to be “recognized”. In particular, he wants to be recognized as a human being, that is, as a being with a certain worth or dignity. This worth in the first instance is related to his willingness to risk his life in a struggle over pure prestige. For only man is able to overcome his most basic animal instincts – chief among them his instinct for self-preservation – for the sake of higher, abstract principles and goals” [8, p. xvi]. People come into the fight, and the fear of death submits the weaker (in terms of fear) to the stronger. That is the way the relationship “mas-

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

ter – slave” is emerged. The stakes in this bloody game are not food, shelter or safety, but prestige in its purest form. Following Hegel, the author sees a glimmer of human freedom in this battle determined by non-biological needs.

According to Hegel, the contradiction “domination – subordination” has been overcome as a result of the French Revolution (Fukuyama adds the American Revolution): this contradiction was “replaced” by universal and mutual human recognition. State recognizes human dignity by granting him/her rights. Fukuyama emphasizes that Hegelian interpretation of liberal democracy and its Anglo-Saxon interpretation vary significantly. In Anglo-Saxon liberalism the quest for recognition should be subordinated to the enlightened self-interest.

The desire for recognition – thymos – is inherent (or should be inherent) in human nature. Thymos is the Platonic conception introduced in “The Republic”. It can be understood as longing for recognition and need for approval, that is, the respect of human dignity. Thymos is one of three parts of the human soul; the other two are the reasoning and desiring parts. This desire for recognition Fukuyama considers as the great motor of history and cause of tyranny, conflicts, and wars. But at the same time, it also acts as a psychological foundation of many virtues – the spirit of citizenship, courage, and justice. Conformism with his/her own conscience is regarded as the opposition to the recognition: it manifests narrowly selfish desires to obtain every material gain and has little to do with the recognition.

Economic human (with prevailing desiring part of the soul) demonstrates conformism, since his/her desire replaces the striving for recognition. Recognition seekers fight for their dignity as well as for their fellow citizens. Economic man, the consumer is guided primarily by desires and reason, calculation and personal gain, while recognition seekers are deeply motivated to rise up and fight back in order to demand recognition for their value, the value of their group or class. From this perspective, racism, nationalism, feminism and the like can be explained.

But not all people want to be evaluated as equal to others: they seek to be recognized as superior to others. Such inflated self-esteem is

megalothymia. Megalothymia displays itself as tyranny, nationalism, imperialism, etc. Its opposite is isothymia, the desire to be recognized as equal to each other. “Megalothymia and isothymia together constitute the two manifestations of the desire for recognition around which the historical transition to modernity can be understood” [8, p.182].

Throughout almost all of the human history, the desire for recognition was not satisfied. The slaves did not win recognition of their own worth, their humanity. But the masters were not satisfied too, as the slaves were not the “right esteemers” because their humanity was not complete. The masters have sought recognition by the other masters, and this search was linked to the struggle that resulted in turning weaker into a slave. The lack of recognition by the masters motivated the slaves to change the world around them. In the work process, the slaves learned to transform nature, use the tools for the production of consumer goods, produce more advanced tools, thus, they invented new technologies. Respectively, science and technology and at the same time the idea of freedom are the inventions of the slaves who were dissatisfied with the contradiction between the idea of freedom and its implementation. Thus, the historical progress has been made by the slaves.

Modern liberal democracy provides universal recognition of all humans ensuring and protecting their rights. Any child born in the liberal states is entitled to certain rights that are recognized by the other people and the state. People’s self-government abolishes the distinction between the masters and the slaves: everyone is assigned to at least a small dominant role. Domination takes the form of democratic laws dissemination. These laws are certain universal rules under which any human is his/her own master. Thus, the recognition becomes mutual: the state guarantees the rights of the citizens, and the citizens agree to abide by its laws. The only limitation on these rights is the situation when they occur to be self-contradictory, “when the exercise of one right interferes with the exercise of another” [8, p.203].

Under liberal democracy – the best governance option characterized by the disappearance of the fundamental contradictions – mutual respect and recognition will be realized in the

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

form of universal rights; unequal recognition of the masters and the slaves will be replaced by universal and mutual recognition; all citizens will recognize each other's human dignity. In the future, levels of military conflicts will become less and less intense, though the probability that small conflicts will escalate remains. Of course, not all social problems will be solved; the tension between liberty and equality will exist: there are no such things as absolute freedom or absolute equality. However, according to Fukuyama, it is liberal democracy that is the best option of social political development. Humanity moves toward liberal democracy that will replace the irrational desire to be recognized as superior by the rational desire to be recognized as equal among equals.

Originality

Fukuyama's concept is not limited to economic explanation of liberal triumphalism. It is important and interesting because it draws attention to the sphere of human values that essentially influences the basis of personality structure. Unlike traditional liberalism, which focuses on materialism and justice, Fukuyama considers the struggle for recognition, the spiritual search for human dignity and equality (or superiority) the major component of social transformation. Human acts as a central point of political, cultural, economical space: he/she is the creator and the creation. An American researcher considers liberal democracy to be not just the last, but also the best regime aimed at achieving the highest good. Fukuyama was often accused of excessive optimism, anticipation of the euphoria that engenders the illusion of harmony. However, the author of the "End of History" is fully aware of the challenges the future society and its citizen – the "last man" – will face: "The passion for equal recognition – isothymia – does not necessarily diminish with the achievement of greater de facto equality and material abundance, but may actually be stimulated by it" [8, p. 295]. On the other hand, the desire to be superior to others is manifested in all aspects of human life: "Thymos is the side of man that deliberately seeks out struggle and sacrifice, that tries to prove that the self is something better and higher than a fearful, needy, instinctual, physically determined animal. Not all men feel this pull but

for those who do, thymos cannot be satisfied by the knowledge that they are merely equal in worth to all other human beings" [8, p.304]. The question of the human future and the ways to harmonize the three parts of human soul – the desire, thymos and reason – is still yet to be answered: "to the extent that liberal democracy is successful at purging megalothymia from life and substituting for it rational consumption, we will become last men. But human beings will rebel at this thought. That is, they will rebel at the idea of being undifferentiated members of a universal and homogeneous state, each the same as the other no matter where on the globe one goes. They will want to be citizens rather than bourgeois, finding the life of masterless slavery – the life of rational consumption – in the end, boring. They will want to have ideals by which to live and die, even if the largest ideals have been substantively realized here on earth, and they will want to risk their lives even if the international state system has succeeded in abolishing the possibility of war. This is the "contradiction" that liberal democracy has not yet solved" [8, p.314].

Reading Fukuyama's book, we are faced with his peculiar interpretation of thymos as the driving force of history. Fukuyama interprets A. Kojeve, who, in turn, interprets Hegel. It was subjected to serious criticism [4]. However, criticizing, we can "throw out the baby with the bath water". Let us remember that the whole history of humanity with its diverse ideas and opportunities, cultural and civilizational concepts is more or less successful interpretation of interpretations. "There are no facts, only interpretations", F. Nietzsche says. I think that the author's intention to consider human as an active creator of history who might determine its final destination is an important and valuable aspect of "The End of History".

Conclusions

Certainly, humanity has not reached a brighter future yet. Modern civilization has been facing with a serious consequence of a financial crisis, political havoc and military conflicts, migrants and refugees problem, as well as with growing inequality that, in fact, appears to be an unsatisfied desire for recognition. "American democracy is finally responding to the rise of

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

inequality and the economic stagnation experienced by most of the population. Social class is now back at the heart of American politics, trumping other cleavages – race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, geography – that had dominated discussion in recent elections” [6]. But it is still not too late and so far the idea of liberal democracy has no real competitors [7].

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

1. Баранов, В. П. Доктрина Тоффлера-Фукуямы-Хантингтона и реальность мира [Electronic resource] / В. П. Баранов. – 1996. – Available at: http://www.zhurnal.ru/nepogoda/tfh_doctrine.html. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
2. Ильин, А. Н. Возможен ли конец истории по Ф. Фукуяме? [Electronic resource] / А. Н. Ильин // Знание. Понимание. Умение. – 2012. – №3. – Available at: http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2012/3/Ilyin_End-of-History-Fukuyama/. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
3. Малахов, В. С. Еще раз о конце истории [Electronic resource] / В. С. Малахов // Вопросы философии. – 1994. – №7 – Available at: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/Article/Mal_KonIst.php. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
4. Blunden, A. Fukuyama on Trust and Recognition [Electronic resource] / F. Blunden. – 2003. – Available at: <http://home.mira.net/~andy/works/fukuyama.htm>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
5. Danylova, T. V. The Theory of Civilizations through the Lens of Contemporary Humanities / T. V. Danylova // Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research. – 2016. – №9. – P. 55-62. doi: 10.15802/ampr2016/72231
6. Fukuyama, F. American Political Decay or Renewal? [Electronic resource] / F. Fukuyama // Foreign Affairs. – 2016. – Vol. 95, No. 4. – Available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2016-06-13/american-political-decay-or-renewal>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
7. Fukuyama, F. At the ‘End of History’ Still Stands Democracy [Electronic resource] / F. Fukuyama // The Wall Street Journal. – 2014. – Available at: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/at-the-end-of-history-still-stands-democracy-1402080661>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
8. Fukuyama, F. The End of History and the Last Man / F. Fukuyama. – New-York : Macmillan Inc., 1992. – 418 p.
9. Fukuyama, F. State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century / F. Fukuyama. – Cornell : Cornell University Press, 2004. – 160 p.
10. Fukuyama, F. The Middle-Class Revolution [Electronic resource] / F. Fukuyama // The Wall Street Journal. – 2013. – Available at: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887323873904578571472700348086>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
11. Huntington, S. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order / S. Huntington. – New York : Simon&Schuster Paperbacks, 2011. – 368 p.
12. Khmil, V. V. Ambiguous Janus of Modern Democracy / V. V. Khmil // Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research. – 2016. – №9. – P. 47-54. doi: 10.15802/ampr2016/72228
13. Olafson, F. A. Philosophical Anthropology [Electronic resource] / F. A. Olafson // Encyclopaedia Britannica. – 2009. – Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophical-anthropology> – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
14. Postel, D. The 'end of history' revisited: Francis Fukuyama and his critics [Electronic resource] / D. Postel // Open Democracy. – 2006. – Available at: https://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-fukuyama/intro_3493.jsp – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.
15. Yang, C. Revisiting Fukuyama: The End of History, the Clash of Civilizations, and the Age of Empire [Electronic resource] / C. Yang. – Middletown : The Honors College, 2010. – 141 p. Available at: http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1405&context=etd_hon_theses. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 14.12.2016.

Т. В. ДАНИЛОВА^{1*}^{1*}Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України (Київ), ел. пошта danilova_tv@ukr.net;
ORCID 0000-0002-0297-9473

ПРАГНЕННЯ ДО ВИЗНАННЯ В КОНТЕКСТІ УНІВЕРСАЛЬНОЇ ІСТОРІЇ ФРЕНСІСА ФУКУЯМИ

Вступ. Френсіс Фукуяма у своїй славетній книзі «Кінець історії та остання людина» наголошує на тому, що людська історія повинна розглядатися з точки зору битви ідеологій, що досягла своєї мети в універсалізації західної ліберальної демократії. Нова теорія здобула багато прихильників, які захоплено зустріли її появу. Одночасно вона була піддана гострій критиці, в якій відбилися важливі тенденції політичного життя, а також ідеологічні пристрасті авторів. Залишивши осторонь критику, засновану на геополітичному і цивілізаційному протистоянні, необхідно зазначити, що антропологічна складова теорії Фукуяма практично зникла з поля зору критиків. **Мета.** У статті здійснено спробу дослідити теорію Фукуяма крізь призму філософської антропології та піддати аналізу людське прагнення до визнання у контексті Світової Історії Фукуяма. **Методологія.** Автор використовував філософську герменевтику та антропологічний інтегративний підхід. **Основна частина.** Фукуяма не задовольняється лише економічним трактуванням історії, підкреслюючи, що людина не є просто економічною твариною. Економічний розвиток неспроможний пояснити, чому люди стають прихильниками принципу народного суверенітету і гарантій основних прав під управлінням закону. Автор повертається до гегелівського нематеріалістичного погляду на історію, заснованого на боротьбі за визнання. Саме прагнення до визнання з боку інших людей Фукуяма розглядає в якості двигуна історії і причини тиранії, конфліктів і війн. Але разом з тим воно ж постає як психологічний фундамент багатьох чеснот – духу громадянськості, хоробрості і справедливості. Протягом майже всієї історії людства прагнення до визнання не реалізовувалося. На думку Фукуяма, лише сучасна ліберальна демократія дає універсальне визнання всім людям, гарантуючи їм права і захищаючи ці права. **Новизна.** Концепція Фукуяма важлива і цікава тим, що привертає увагу до ціннісної сфери людини, яка суттєво впливає на формування структури особистості. На відміну від традиційного лібералізму, що ставив на чільне місце матеріалізм і справедливість, американський дослідник основним компонентом соціальних трансформацій вважає боротьбу за визнання, духовний пошук людської гідності та рівності/переваги. Саме людина виступає як центральна точка цивілізаційного простору, одночасно його творець і творіння. **Висновки.** З плином часу концепція Фукуяма зазнала суттєвих змін. Сучасна цивілізація зіткнулася з гострою проблемою зростаючої нерівності, серйозною фінансовою кризою, політичним хаосом і гострими військовими конфліктами, проблемою мігрантів та біженців. Однак і досі в сфері ідей ліберальна демократія не має реальних конкурентів.

Ключові слова: Френсіс Фукуяма; Універсальна Історія; прагнення до визнання; тимос; мегалотимія; ізотимія; ліберальна демократія

Т. В. ДАНИЛОВА^{1*}^{1*}Національний університет біоресурсів і природопользования, эл. почта danilova_tv@ukr.net;
ORCID 0000-0002-0297-9473

СТРЕМЛЕНИЕ К ПРИЗНАНИЮ В КОНТЕКСТЕ УНІВЕРСАЛЬНОЙ ИСТОРИИ ФРЭНСИСА ФУКУЯМЫ

Введение. Фрэнсис Фукуяма в своей знаменитой книге «Конец истории и последний человек» отмечает, что человеческая история должна рассматриваться с точки зрения битвы идеологий, достигшей своей цели в универсализации западной либеральной демократии. Новая теория приобрела много сторонников, которые восторженно встретили ее появление. Одновременно она была подвергнута острой критике, в которой отразились важные тенденции мировой политической жизни, а также идеологические пристрастия авторов. Оставив в стороне критику, основанную на геополитическом и цивилизационном противостоянии, необходимо отметить, что антропологическая составляющая теории Фукуямы практически исчезла из поля зрения критиков. **Цель.** В статье предпринята попытка взглянуть на теорию Фукуямы сквозь призму философской антропологии и подвергнуть анализу человеческое стремление к признанию в контексте мировой истории Фукуямы.

doi 10.15802/ampr.v0i10.87303

© Т. В. Данылова, 2016

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

куямы. **Методологія.** Автор использовал философскую герменевтику и антропологический интегративный подход. **Основная часть.** Фукуяма не удовлетворяется лишь экономической трактовкой истории, подчеркивая, что человек – это не просто экономическое животное. Экономическое развитие не в состоянии объяснить, почему люди становятся сторонниками принципа народного суверенитета и гарантий основных прав под управлением закона. Автор обращается к гегелевскому нематериалистическому взгляду на историю, основанному на борьбе за признание. Именно стремление к признанию со стороны других людей Фукуяма рассматривает в качестве двигателя истории и причины тираннии, конфликтов и войн. Но вместе с тем оно же выступает как психологический фундамент многих добродетелей – духа гражданственности, храбрости и справедливости. На протяжении почти всей истории человечества стремление к признанию не реализовывалось. По мнению Фукуямы, только современная либеральная демократия дает универсальное признание всем людям, гарантируя им права и защищая эти права. **Новизна.** Концепция Фукуямы важна и интересна тем, что привлекает внимание к ценностной сфере человека, существенно влияющей на формирование структуры личности. В отличие от традиционного либерализма, ставящего во главу угла материализм и справедливость, американский исследователь основным компонентом социальных трансформаций считает борьбу за признание, духовный поиск человеческого достоинства и равенства/преимущества. Именно человек выступает как центральная точка цивилизационного пространства, одновременно его творец и творение. **Выводы.** С течением времени концепция Фукуямы претерпела существенные изменения. Современная цивилизация столкнулась с острой проблемой растущего неравенства, серьезным финансовым кризисом, политическим хаосом и острыми военными конфликтами, проблемой мигрантов и беженцев. Однако до сих пор в сфере идей либеральная демократия не имеет реальных конкурентов.

Ключевые слова: Фрэнсис Фукуяма; Универсальная История; стремление к признанию; тимос; мегалотимия; изотимия; либеральная демократия

REFERENCES

1. Baranov V.P. *Doktrina Tofflera – Fukuyami – Hantingtona i realnost mira* [Toffler – Fukuyama – Huntington's doctrine and the reality of the world]. Available at: http://www.zhurnal.ru/nepogoda/tfh_doctrine.html. (Accessed 30 August 2016).
2. Ilin A.N. *Vozmozhen li konets istorii po F. Fukuyame?* [Is Fukuyama's end of history possible?]. Available at: http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2012/3/Ilyin_End-of-History-Fukuyama/. (Accessed 30 August 2016).
3. Malakhov V.S. *Esche raz o kontse istorii* [Once more on the end of history]. Available at: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/Article/Mal_KonIst.php. (Accessed 30 August 2016).
4. Blunden A. *Fukuyama on Trust and Recognition*. Available at: <http://home.mira.net/~andy/works/fukuyama.htm>. (Accessed 18 August 2016).
5. Danylova T.V. The Theory of Civilizations through the Lens of Contemporary Humanities. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 2016, no. 9, pp. 55-62. doi: 10.15802/ampr2016/72231.
6. Fukuyama F. American Political Decay or Renewal? *Foreign Affairs*. July/August, 2016. Available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2016-06-13/american-political-decay-or-renewal>. (Accessed 3 September 2016).
7. Fukuyama F. At the 'End of History' Still Stands Democracy. *The Wall Street Journal*, 2014, June 6. Available at: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/at-the-end-of-history-still-stands-democracy-1402080661> (Accessed 28 August 2016).
8. Fukuyama F. *The End of History and the Last Man*. NY, Macmillan, Inc. Publ., 1992. 418 p.
9. Fukuyama F. *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Cornell University Press Publ., 2004. 160 p.
10. Fukuyama F. The Middle-Class Revolution. *The Wall Street Journal*, 2013, June. Available at: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887323873904578571472700348086> (Accessed 23 August 2016).
11. Huntington S. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, Simon&Schuster Paperbacks Publ., 2011. 368 p.
12. Khmil V.V. Ambiguous Janus of Modern Democracy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 2016, no. 9, pp. 47-54. doi: 10.15802/ampr2016/72228.
13. Olafson F.A. *Philosophical Anthropology*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophical-anthropology> (Accessed 20 August 2016).
14. Open Democracy. Available at: https://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-fukuyama/intro_3493.jsp. (Accessed 25 August 2016).

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

15. Yang C. Revisiting Fukuyama: The End of History, the Clash of Civilizations, and the Age of Empire. Available at: http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1405&context=etd_hon_theses (Accessed 25 August 2016).

Dr. phil., prof. V. V. Tokovenko (Ukraine) recommended this article to be published

Received: 22 Feb., 2016

Accepted: 20 Sept., 2016