



*Tetiana Vlasova, Oleksandr Pshinko, Olha Vlasova*

*Dnipropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport named after academician V. Lazaryan*

## Postmodern conflictology: issues of theory and approaches to methodology

The problematization of the classical concepts in the postmodern philosophy has created some definite challenges that stipulate the development of the “Theory” in its interdisciplinary conceptual meanings and practical applications. The latter demands a certain “list” of the new notions and implies requirements for theorists to reflect the scientific diversity without reducing it to any kind of “theoretical unity”. For these reasons the purpose of this article is the conceptual reconstruction of the notion of the conflict in the specific postmodern context of its sociocultural, political and ethical meanings and senses. The methods of the research are mainly based on the principle of the anthropocentric paradigm, which stipulates the use of the interdisciplinary comparative-critical approaches and social construction methods in the general problematic field of postmodernism. While analysing conflict theories such schools of philosophy as existentialism, phenomenology and pragmatism are considered to be valid in the descriptions of both the actual conditions of the individual human existence and abstract human qualities. The practical aspects of this paper involve the empirical representation of the principles of the value and the sense in the problematic aspects of conflict resolution with the stress on the concepts of the discursive communication. The obtained results allow to come to the conclusion that the most influential transformations are connected with such postmodern conflict problems as asymmetrical threats and unstable security architecture. The latter proves that the methodological approaches to conflictology should be evaluated from the point of presumably successful resolutions against the background of different spatial and temporal factors, which, in its turn, means creating new administrative modalities of conflict management. It should be stressed that in the context of the conflictological tendencies of the globalizing societies the special place should be occupied by the principles of

K.- O. Apel’s discursive ethics and M. M. Bakhtin’s doctrine of the “responsible dialogism”. Nowadays political approaches cannot be effective in the conflict resolutions without the classical ideals and the absolutes, without the impact of the Pathos, which means implied significance of the “relatively Utopian” ideas and their application in the conflict resolution, the potential possibilities of their realization in the conflict situations.

**Keywords:** *anthropocentric paradigm, asymmetrical threats, security architecture, moral responsibility*

*Тетяна Власова, Олександр Пшінько, Ольга Власова*

*Дніпропетровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені академіка В. Лазаряна*

## Конфліктологія в постмодерні: теоретичні проблеми та методологічні підходи

Оскільки фундаментальні проблеми філософії розглядаються в постсучасній гуманітарній науці в руслі міждисциплінарної «Теорії», у цій статті актуалізується проблема недостатньої розробленості концептуальної сфери проблемного поля «конфлікту» як культурного і політичного феномена в аспектах динаміки теоретичних і прикладних досліджень останніх років. Мета статті – концептуальна реконструкція поняття конфлікту в специфіці його соціокультурного, політичного і морального змісту. Методи дослідження базуються на структурі антропоцентричної парадигми, що зумовлює використання методологічних принципів системного компаративно-критичного та міждисциплінарного аналізу із супутніми прийомами феноменології та соціального конструктивізму в загальному полі філософії постмодернізму. Практичне значення роботи полягає в емпіричній репрезентації ціннісно-сміслових принципів вирішення конфлікту в проблематиці різних сфер дискурсивної комунікації. Отримані результати дослідження дозволяють зробити висновок про те, що найбільш значні трансформації в розвитку конфліктології як нової галузі науки пов’язані з проблемами асиметричних загроз і нестабільною архітектурою безпеки із загальним акцентом на питаннях репрезентації та легітимації конфлікту як концепту та феномена в його просторово-часових вимірах. У межах відходу від нездоланності конфлікту класичних бінарних опозицій стверджується значення принципів дискурсивної етики К.-О. Апеля і доктрини «відповідального діалогізма» М. М. Бахтіна. Відзначається особливе місце категорії «вчинку» як в раціональному, так і утопічному мисленні з подальшим висновком про те, що «відносно» утопічні ідеї та ідеали вирішення конфліктів мають потенційну можливість реалізації.

**Ключові слова:** *антропоцентрична парадигма, асиметричні загрози, архітектура безпеки, моральна відповідальність*

### The definition of the problem.

The postmodernization of the traditional concepts and classical notions creates challenges for individuals and societies, for professionals and laymen, who, while being in the different social positions, understand that they have to think differently and reflect in various ways if they want to have any- whatever - vision of tomorrow. The “Theory” in its interdisciplinary scope has been recently going through a period of painful transformations of the “old school” scientific trends and the developments of the new problematic fields of research, disciplines and branches of science. Nowadays it seem incapable of consensus, however the researchers still claim to be consolidated in the generalized field of the science, the arts, the humanities, – in that what is called the “Theory”. In fact, it is a “curious” situation as it demands to examine new subdisciplinary fields of knowledge simultaneously in accordance with its apparently generalized character. It demands a new list of the “conceptual personages”, which is open to the development and transformation in philosophy; moreover it demands the task for a theorist to comprehend the scientific diversity without reducing it to the theoretical unity (Deleuz, & Guattari, 2000). Nowadays philosophers as a rule seem to agree with G. Deleuze and F. Guattary that they are “friends of the concepts”, that search, fixation and retention of the meanings for the legitimization of the human’s existence is an objective of the philosophers’ work, that philosophy being diverse and ambivalent, deals with notions and concepts, which per se must have universal meanings for the human beings, – in the final analysis.

At present the fundamental problems of the political aspects of philosophy are analyzed by the scientists with the accent on the applied research, with the focus on the “conflict” as a political and sociocultural phenomenon, as a factor of the dynamics of the social and political actions and actors. With this kind of the social and political interrelation the conflict paradigm is included in the basic comprehension of the categories and concepts of the postmodern theory. On the other hand, it is evident that the nature of conflicts, which nowadays is often taking the form of radicalization, is deeply rooted in the individuals’ nature, his/her

psychology influenced by ideological factors.

In the conflict theory the prominent position is occupied by the mainstream narrative: there are evil forces waiting for their time to act, and when time comes, the evil is labelled as “violence” (Galtung, 2010). It is obvious that the scientific analysis should be done not only at the level of the political processes, but also at the level of the individuals’ lives, their identities and identifications: it should be noted that at present much attention is paid to the Man’s ‘nature’, human beings’ genetics in the study of various kinds of conflicts, which is connected with the significance of such postmodern characteristics as individuation, segregation and pluralism. By all means, this does not mean that strong collective identities do not play significant social roles, but rather to say that these identities are interwoven into a number of others, and they act as a kind of “attachment” to some definite collective identities, still this kind of the definite “membership” is under the question in many cases: no doubt, collective identities are losing their “permanent character”. As J. Ortega y Gasset mentioned, social roles we played were not natural and fixed representations of identities (Ortega y Gasset, 1994). Nowadays those roles are extremely optional, and the need for the management of “Self”, for the empowering of “Self,” accentuates the significance of the psychological processes in the study of conflicts and their resolutions. In this context the questions of text narratives and discourses seem quite an important preoccupation in the analysis of the given theme: could we outline what relations there are between problems of textuality, narratology, discourses and the field of the political science? Of course, nowadays scientists do not seem to research them as distinctly separate domains, however there exists a tendency to define textuality and narratology in the sphere of theory, though political/conflict issues are mainly associated with practice. Scientists arise the questions: if an individual is a part of the predetermined scenario, what the relationship is between an individual in the “scenario” of conflicts and the role of discourses and narratives. The conflict paradigm is integrally connected with the recognition of the discourse character of the theoretical knowledge. Taking this as a fact, it is necessary to maintain that people always deal with the “unfinished narratives”, with



the ‘incomplete histories’. Each new event, every new actor opens new possibilities in the ‘conflict narrative’, which, in its turn, opens the ‘door’ to analyzing conflicts and ‘constructs’, to the methodology of constructivism in its general meaning. As it seems, the comparative-historical approaches are not fully adequate in understanding conflict evolution and distribution. The radically new impact of conflictology criticism is to be found not only at the level of classical political teachings in philosophy, but also at the level of some ‘unconventional’ methodological approaches, moreover, – at the level of politics with its specific features and aspects.

It should be mentioned that postmodern scientists have politicized existing critical methods greatly. As a result, conflict analysts are considered to be tolerantly pluralistic in their choices of methods and approaches, because any approach should be evaluated not from the point of its ‘neutral’ or ‘objective’ character, but from the point of its successful ‘appropriateness’ to the given aims, tasks and ends.

**The analysis of the research and publications.** During the past decades, – concerning our country, since the beginning of the third millennium, scientists and ‘policy-makers’, engaged into the investigation of the conflictology issues, have studied mostly the problematization of the conflict resolution and the conflict management. In large part the growing interest to conflictological theories has been a consequence of the globalistic tendencies, which might have had the opposite aims, – in each case the underlying problem was the same: the shifts in the political, social and cultural world’s ‘landscape’ seemed to represent a more everchanging time than the entire world had ever known. As W. Simon writes, we now increasingly live our lives in ways that are ‘different from any others that humanity has previously known’. The ‘postmodern conditions’ are unanimously characterized by scientists with the accent on the intense pluralization, individuation and multiplicity of choices that were simply unknown in any other era (Simon, 1997, p. X–XI). Since then and up to now the politological studies have tended to reflect a recurrent pattern. In most cases they not only reflect the problematic universalizing tendencies of academic schools, – in general,

they tend to revise the specific types of theorizing, found in the particular schools of thought. As for the subject areas, the political studies are also clearly allied: political teachings in philosophy (world processes, political conflicts and national security), business management (organizational issues), conflict management and resolution (the wide sociocultural context), conflictology as a discipline (pedagogical content and representation of the subject). However, the correlation between the strict disciplinary approach and the interdisciplinary methods has been changed lately in the general context of the postmodern ‘Theory’. The latter is well-represented in one of a few fundamental works on the issue of conflictology published recently (Onditi, 2020). In the book ‘Conflictology: Systems, Institutions, and Mechanisms in Africa’ F. Onditi initiated a substantial discussion on how extensively the interdisciplinary approach could contribute to the comprehension of conflict. His analysis covers both cultural systems and socio-biological mechanisms; hence the importance of the conflictology as a discipline, claims the author. He asks an important question we should answer in order to realize scientific approaches to the discipline ‘Conflictology’, to present scientific methods and prescriptions to resolutions of conflicts: does individual genes influence human behavior? How then should neurological factors and systems be altered in order to prevent extremism and radicalization? It is evident that F. Onditi pays great attention to the psychology and human genetics in his research of war conflicts and their resolution against the background of the political situation in Africa, and it is clear that he renders the traditional macro-level studies as outdated and not valid under the present condition.

F. Onditi stresses the significance of studying the conflict patterns and process at the different spatial and temporal levels: local, national, regional and global scales; and within this scope different typologies and approaches exist, the various strategies outline the methods of conflict prevention, which means creating new institutional structures, coordination mechanism, capacity-building initiatives as well as administrative modalities of conflict management, which enhance structures for cooperation by building resilience based on principles of self-reliance, mutual respect and

solidarity. Those principles have to sustain appropriate social context through post-conflict reconstruction and fostering sustainable development (Onditi, 2020, p. 1).

The brief account of tendencies and directions that are represented in the universities throughout the world demonstrate as a rule the following approaches to the theme: Conflict Resolutions, Conflict Transformation, Peace Studies, etc. The business and personal conflict situations are under analyses in the manuals for university students, where the problems of conflicts and the subsequent original concepts are given not only as a the science over decisions of conflicts, but also as a kind of art and practical experience of preventive maintenance and decisions in business and personal conflict situations (Vishnyakova, 2010). Organizational issues are, in general, a widely-used topic in such kind of manuals, either comprehensive or brief (Love, 2016). Role-playing as a teaching method is preferred by many university instructors dealing with the discipline of conflictology. While claiming that the conflict is unavoidable, they propose possible reactions to conflicts: accommodation, compromise, collaboration, confrontation/ competition (Lechman, 2007, p. 5–6). In their books scientists accentuate the idea that successful management of conflicts in organizations depends on the ability to quickly and effectively manage conflicts. To this end they give some guides for effectively communicating with the employers, understanding and using organizational politics (Dana, 2001).

With the fundamental view in the perspective, it is worth mentioning the book by H.-W. Jeong “Conflict Management and Resolution: An Introduction”, in which the author presents an overview of the main conflict theories. The book covers the following four concepts in detail: negotiation, mediation, facilitation, reconciliation. The “anatomy” of conflicts and their management are analyzed as conflict evolution, conflict transformation and dimensions of conflict management. In covering various kinds of conflict management and corresponding activities, the key focus of the book is on linking negotiation, mediation and facilitation methods to different stages of the conflict. The author stresses the multiple facets of conflicts – behavioral and psychological aspects of conflicts - and accentuates the statement that conflicts over matters of values

are closely connected with the “life meaning” (Jeong, 2019, p. 8).

Another influential trend in conflictology deals with world’s processes, political conflicts and national security. The authors analyze methodological approaches to the investigation of geopolitics under the conditions of globalization, conflictological problems of transformations of the contemporary societies (power and opposition, power resources, distribution, the national idea and national security, ideology and conflict-discursive communication, the role of mass media, ethnic-political conflicts, factors and tendencies in the current global and national political situations etc.) (Mirovye protsessy, politicheskie konflikty i bezopasnost, 2007). The Ukrainian scientists pay significant attention to the problems of conflictology as a response to the hybrid war actions in the Eastern part of Ukraine (Hrabovs'ka, 2020), to the interpretation of this Russian-Ukrainian conflict in the Western analytical studies (Kulyk, 2020). It is worth mentioning that the issues of gender conflicts are also extensively analyzed by the Ukrainian researchers (Vlasova, 2020).

In the sphere of university education some scientists have been engaged in publishing textbooks and manuals for students, – mainly of law and business administration. In this kind of textbooks the issues of the logical character are presented as a rule parallel with the analysis of the problems of conflict management and conflict resolution (Herasina, & Trebina, 2012; Lukin, 2007; Tsyurupa, 2004). At this point it is again necessary to note that quite a fundamental corpus of literature is not taken into consideration here on purpose, mainly, because of the limitations of the format of the article, – we mean feminist and gender theorizing around the demand for the woman’s access to the public sphere and power operations, which includes an immense field of conflicts represented mostly in the classical oppositions of rational/irrational, private/public, etc. Moreover recently the appeal to the intersection between gender, race, class and sexuality has caused a number of conflicts, which are well known thanks to the great attention of mass media, – however, this theme is not under analysis in this particular paper.

**The purpose of the article** is the conceptual reconstruction of the notion of the conflict with



the bias on the specific features of the postmodern conflict problematization and its representation in the communicative discourses of different school and trends in the contemporary science.

### **The main material.**

Nowadays “conflict” as a term seems to be a word belonging to metalanguage as a kind of “technical word”. When scientists claim that conflictology is meta-science, they in fact claim that it occupies some privileged position. Taking this into consideration it is necessary to mention that there are three main problems in any “meta” position: representation, reproduction and legitimation (Arnesen, & Peters, 2018); in other words: Who are the representatives? How are they selected? What is the outcome of the decision making process? Of great interest is also the question to what extent these three aspects matter for decision acceptance among ordinary citizens. All mentioned above is closely connected with the subject of “general values”; sociocultural values, in particular, with the issues of difference and heterogeneity, identity and identification. Excepting the economic problems of conflicts, which are beyond the scope of this research, conflicts over matters of sociocultural, religious and ethnic principles; matters, which stay in the domain of identities and identification, are posed by many scientists as a total concern with survival and new meanings in life (Jeong, 2019, p. 8).

Concerning the definitions of the “conflict”, it is important to stress that they differ to some extent – more or less –, still the most significant ones are the meanings, which are attached to this term in the individual interpretation, “working understanding” of the relevant concepts, which are used in the conflict discourse. Here it is important to note that “the dictionary is merely a snap -short of our vocabulary at one point in time” (Jarn, 1999, p. 3). However it is worth to mention how H.-W. Jeong accentuates the ways of conflict “manifestations”: “Conflict is manifested through adversarial social action, involving two or more actors with the expression of differences often accompanied by intense hostilities” (Jeong, 2019, p. 3). As political and social conflict relations are, as a rule, embedded in structures related to power “share-holders”, the key postmodernity conflicts, based on the dichotomy “globalization-nationalism”, has been in the focus of mass-media attention all over the world since 90s of the last century,

and the related term “global threats” has been one of the most used ones since that time and up to now. On the other hand, some related dichotomies of “globalism-nationalism” and “patriotism-extremism”, “dominant culture VS minor cultural group” represent sociocultural mutations, which demand the thorough and accurate “anatomy” of the conflicts, which are unavoidable in the contemporary situation of global contradictions and local catastrophes. As researcher point cut, in all conflicts there is a mainstream narrative and several local narratives, which differ in different conflict situations. The narrative as a concept is of paramount importance as culture is determined and exists due to some definite “histories”, and people – subjects and objects of “History” (in its ontological meanings) identify themselves with certain “narratives. In fact, culture is ` histories, which people tell`. From the phenomenological point of view any theory is – and has to be – history. As G. Wheeler puts it, everything begins with some definite “picture of the world”, then some conditions are provided and the “event” has taken place, individuals obtain some “result”. So the construction is as follows: a situation – an event –a result (Galtung, 2010, p. 398).

Thus the culture represents a concrete narrative, which is put in the local context, the contexts are different in a great number of ` signs” – both signifiers and signified: an event is a real problem too, because in postmodernism it is sure to be the new and highly-contested concept (Zizek, 2014). It is evident that in the narrative structure, given above, an event represents a conflict. The social nature of the “conflict” is perfectly expressed in the famous words by E. Durkheim: “Since the world expressed by the total systems of concepts is the world as society represents it to itself, only society can furnish the generalized notions according to which such a world must be represented” (Jameson, 1996, p. 8). It is generally acknowledged that postmodernism is “ahistorical”, and it puts to the question the entire notion of historical knowledge. On the other hand, F. Jameson, one of the postmodern “titans”, writes as a slogan: “Always historicize!”. He accentuates his idea that in the cultural sphere we are confronted with a choice between analysis of the “objective” structures of a given cultural text (the historicity of its forms and contexts)

and something rather different, which stipulates the interpretative codes by means of which we read and understand the texts in question (Jameson, 1996, p. 9). The problem of social “heterogeneity” here in its connection with the problem of the “Other” as a potential source of social and psychological conflicts. In the postmodern conditions there is not a social-philosophic theory so far, which might exactly correspond to the realities of the contemporary heterogeneous society. The limits, the borderlines have not been established yet within which the life strategies, the modes of social behavior can be turned into social practices. Moreover, in the heterogeneous society the very principles of the “society” are open to criticism, any new theory might be rejected as not being adequate. The research of the heterogeneous society needs new methodological approaches, this demand is of great significance now, because the lack of the effective theoretical and methodological tools of research shows that nowadays philosophy – in its broad meaning – is approaching its limits (Kerimov, 2007, p. 5). ...In the binary opposition “globalism – nationalism” the second number is in fact used as a synonym of “patriotism” and it signifies the features of hating or showing love of one’s country and readiness to defend it, thus it accentuates the heterogeneity of “We”, and the difference of the “Other”. It should not be right to stress the “collective identity”, we, citizens and compatriots, are not identical in all the respects, in any case, there are differences among us; but when it comes to defending our common position – whatever it could be – it is usually clear, that the “Other” difference is more important, and it outbalances all the “pros” (Barash, Vlasova, Martseniuk, & Charkina, 2020). As Z. Bauman puts it, the borderlines, which separate “us” from “them”, are clearly stated, defined and understood by all the “actors”: both subjects and objects of the social actions. First of all, there is a “conflict”, a desperate attempt to differentiate the “members” in the opposition, then to separate them to the extremes because the characteristics of the antagonist groups are given as undisputable proofs of the differences, which do not permit any reconciliation per se (Bauman, 2008, p. 190). Unfortunately, in the processes of conflicts, which are taking place all over the world now, we do not see all the steps outlined by theorists; in fact, some very important stages

are as a rule missing, such as principles of settlement and resolution management (H.-W. Jeong), or social-constructive assemblage of peacekeepers (F. Onditi).

The “dialogue” as means of the intercultural (in the broadest possible meaning) communication, the “dialogism” of the interpersonal relationship as the method of theorizing are known to be perfectly in the conceptual constructions of M. M. Bakhtin. The scientist stresses that any deed of human being, the stipulation and the responsibility connected with the deed, are grounded in the very “dialogue nature” of Man, his/her creative activity, and the sense of the aim of the dialogue as an act of communication.

In M. Bakhtin’s dialogism the key words are “responsibility” and “must”, an individual’s choice is determined by his/her “corpus” of value (Bakhtin, 1979, p. 113). The human being is vitally active due to his/her inclusion in the dialogue structure of being, the process of the dialogue makes a person look at oneself from the other person’s point of view, which does not mean to bend to the will of the “Other”, and the moral guarantee is here the “responsibility” of doing the ‘deed” (Bakhtin, 1979, p. 109). The central idea that combines all Bakhtin’s works is an idea of the “personified” historical comprehension; the scientist accentuates the problem of the “alien” words, “alien” speech, which being born in the dialogues of the past, are never stable or “finite”, they are to be transformed, to be renewed in the process of the future development of the dialogues. According to Bakhtin’s thought, any communication implies the presence of the “dialogue relations”. M. Bakhtin stresses that the dialogue relations cannot be simplified as the notion contradiction, struggle, quarrel, disagreement. It is “agreement” that is one of the most important forms of the dialogue relations.

It is significant to claim, concerning the ethical conceptions of the globalizing societies, that the special place in this context is occupied by K.-O. Apel’s discourse ethics (Nazarchuk, 2002). The idea of Apel’s discourse ethics implies a simple and practical purpose of providing an answer to the contemporary global threats, being the universal ethics of the collective responsibility for the world’s future.

K.-O. Apel’s ethical doctrine states that only in the process of the free and responsible



discussions (dialogues) of the world's problems mankind can find the possibilities for overcoming conflicts and managing our own destinies (Nazarchuk, 2002, p. 19). The theoretical ground in Apel's teaching is the "discourse", i.e. speech, – "text" as "speech in its interaction with the extralinguistic, pragmatic factors: social, cultural, psychological, political ones. Again it stresses the significance of the "linguistic turn", the importance of the "word", which, according to M. Bakhtin, is always searching for the responsive understanding as this lies in the "nature" of the word "the word ought to be heard".

If K.-O. Apel comes to his "final substantiation" of Truth from the pragmatic and linguistic standpoints E. Husserl, who is considered in this measurement Apel's opponent, – treated philosophy as "exact science", though it was K.-O. Apel, who stressed issue, – in the aspects of the ethical norms. E. Husserl as the predecessor of Apel's line of philosophy, accentuates the idea that for him the "real world" is the world of having not only things, but of possessing values, the world of the good, it is a "practical world" with the "ordo of being" in the temporal consequence of living the life (Gusserl, 2009, p. 91). At the same time it is very important, – proceeds E. Husserl, – to come to the interaction with the surrounding people and to realize jointly the objective space-time reality as being real for all people (Gusserl, 2009, p. 95).

Thus for an individual the core of the conflict can be considered in the context of "Ecclesiastes" words: "All things come alike to all, there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked (Ecclesiastes, 9, 2); it is well-known that the main thing is formulated as happening to be in the "right place" at the "right time": "I returned and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, not yet favour to man of skill; but time and chance happeneth them all" (Ecclesiastes, 9, 11). Consequently, the personality conflict can be often cause by the wrong "chronotope", as it seems from the "ordinary life" standpoint.

It goes without saying that M. Heidegger in his great phenomenological works could not but deal with the problem of the "good". His analysis of Plato's "The Republic" in this

respect reveals his ideas (Khaydegger, 2001, p. 175–176).

The good in its primary responsibility for the 'Other' does not mean to choose the God, according to E. Levinas, it implies to be deprived of the very possibility of making a choice. Ethics is complete submission of the "natural order" to the order of the good and the evil, claims E. Levinas; the "true universality" is based on the asymmetry and hierarchy of the good and the evil. The good makes a person *per se* because the good provides a possibility to choose the idea (thing, man/woman, etc.) that Man "by himself" would not ever choose. The good is a pure and simple meeting – meeting the Other (Levinas, 2012). In Levinas' logic any subject is, in fact, the subject exactly to the extent, to which he/she is the "hostage" of the Other; because from the very beginning "I" is effectively captivated by the Other. For any individual placing himself/herself in the Other's position it means replacement and responsibility.

Taking into consideration all the ideas, thoughts and suppositions mentioned above, it is evident that the methods to any conflict resolution necessarily imply the dialogue approaches, the conceptual apparatus that can mirror morals and ethics from the point of view of the "absolute" concepts of the good and the evil. It is evident that nowadays when there is no Truth and no moral absolutes, when everything can be "interpreted" and, consequently, is relative, the quest for the effective formulas of conflict resolutions cannot be abandoned. Not being too optimistic we should admit that the dialogue perspective requires "two-way" moment, which is, in fact, often recognized as an imperfect and temporary way, however this is the way that may put the opponents closer, not to Truth as such (we should not be so idealistic) but to finding broader explanations for people's behavior and understanding its meaning. Only an ethical politics, linked to the "absolute" ethical categories can help to prove that some class or group is good or "positive" and the other one is "reprehensible" or "wicked".

There arise a lot of debates of different trends of thought or schools of science. By all means we consider it is necessary to stress the acquisition of the Utopian thinking in this approach to conflict management.

In the postmodernity the abandonment of

ground narratives is known to doubt Y.W.F. Hegel's idea that with the progress we would be more and more "at home in the world". Postmodern philosophers, as a rule, unanimously agree that as J. Habermas puts it, the modern project is incomplete. Postmodernism is known to have been in progress for at least fifty year, but people – philosophers and ordinary men/women – are still conscious of the "postmodern trouble" of living without the security of classical universal truths and certainties; as a result, we are less and less "at home" in the world where local conflicts are spreading with the unprecedented speed. Some postmodern philosophers insist that it is absurd even to believe that there will be "comfortable conditions" for a human being in the postmodern world. They argue from different points of view – beginning with Nietzsche – to L. Wittgenstein's late philosophy or American philosophical pragmatism. For W. James the truth of a statement lies in its practical consequences, so according to James, we choose our "truth" by what difference it will make in practice (James, 2019) – putting it as "ordinary language philosophy".

Postmodernism, on the whole, claims that the "direct" knowledge of our own nature is inconceivable, thus we can never "live comfortable" without any conflicts. The morals and ethical laws of the modernity are, as it follows, mistakes, they are not only philosophical errors, but also moral and political ones – and we should admit that in the beginning of the XXIst century the attempts to control nature and society by application them with reason and "good sense" have become increasingly problematic. Nevertheless we are still thinking of political progress and of conflict resolutions, we still believe in rationality, we still feel sure of "sense" and the ultimate foundations of the human morals, we still rely on the key philosophical concepts of being. Here the evitable question arises if this unflinching tendency has something in common with the Utopian modus of thinking, if "dialogism" as the only true way to conflict resolutions is nothing else but an Utopian component of the political and philosophic thinking.

The problem seems to touch upon the idea of combining the rational and the Utopian in the situations when both components cannot suppress each other with the subsequent question: what do in fact Logos and Pathos do when they

interrelate with each other? The researchers ask if the unresolvment of the dilemma is only a snare, a trap of the philosophic tradition. Since Aristotle the political space is conceived through the category of the "deed", which needs something more than clear and definite understanding (Pospelova, 2007, p. 22). Then it seems logical to prove that the "political reason" cannot operate without ideals, without the actions of Pathos. Here it should be accentuated that the rigid opposition of the notional and the Utopian is incorrect. K. Mannheim is known to propose the relative Utopia and the absolute Utopia, though F. Jameson calls in question "Mannheim overtones" of the dual perspective of ideology and Utopia (Jameson, 1996, p. 296). The specific problems addressed here demand to assume that the "relative Utopias" can be realized and the very fact of their realization seems to be that feature, which in the political perspective differs them from the ideology per se: the Utopian scenarios are often not without rational components, and the latter proves their theoretical and practical potentials.

#### **Conclusion.**

On the whole, the conceptions of conflicts in the interdisciplinary problematic field share definite basic principles, consequently they demand the analysis of the current subdisciplinary conflict issues in accordance with the generalized theoretical apparatus. However, some conflict tendencies, especially those ones, which have been developed recently, at some certain strategic moments tend to distance themselves from the methodological procedures traditionally associated with the theory of conflictology. The most influential transformations, both in theory and praxis, concern, as a rule, such conflict points as asymmetrical threats and security architecture. Thus, conflictology as a problematic branch of knowledge is open to the rethinking of the approaches to the ideological programmes and structural limits of values, concerning certain social groups, classes, etc., generally speaking, opposing parties. Here the accent is on the methods of the construction of the forms and relationships between the theory and practice among the opposing groups and the notions, which these groups conceptualize as their values and targets. Taking into consideration the fact that the conflict paradigm is inseparable from the discursive nature of the "unfinished narratives"



and “interpreted histories”, it is necessary to accentuate that each new conflict with its new conflict actors opens new possibilities to analyzing conflicts as sociocultural constructs, to the methodology of constructivism in its generalized meaning, however, it is obvious that the radically innovative conflict criticism is present not only in the traditional political teachings but also in the “unconventional” methodological approaches. The latter proves an assumption that the methodological approaches to conflictology should be evaluated not from some abstract “objective” standpoint but from the point of presumably successful resolution of the given aims and targets. It should be noted that scientists accentuate the significance of studying conflict patterns at different spatial and temporal levels: local, national, regional and global ones, and it is admitted that within different temporal and spacial limits different typologies and strategies have to be used, which means creating new administrative modalities of conflict management.

It should be stressed that all the political conflicts are closely connected with the sociocultural and religious factors, with the subject of the “values”, with the issues of difference and heterogeneity, identity and identification, it should be stressed that the discourse of the global threats is one of the most used nowadays and such related dichotomies as “globalism –nationalism”, “patriotism –

extremism” cannot be ignored as they represent mutations, which demand thorough analysis of the “anatomy” of the conflicts, which at present are taking place with the evident acceleration. In this context of great importance is the problem of the “Other”, that “borderline”, which separates “us” and “Others”. It should be claimed that in the context of the globalizing societies, – which by all means cannot be ignored, – the special place ought to be occupied by the principles of K.-O. Apel’s discursive ethics and M. M. Bakhtin’s dialogue communicative relations: Apel’s and Bakhtin’s doctrines of free and responsible “dialogism”, and here the idea of “God” as it is understood by Heidegger, Husserl, Levinas and other modern philosophers is represented being a “pure and simple” meeting the “Other”, and the latter means possibilities for any binary replacement with moral responsibility. Of course, the problem of “Truth” – philosophical absolutes included – arises great difficulty for postmodern thought. The political space is known to be conceived through the category of the “Deed”, which needs something more than “pure reason”: “political reason” cannot be effective in conflict resolutions without ideals, without the impact of the Pathos. The relative Utopias can be realized, their scenarios always possess rational components, and the latter makes the valid contribution to the theoretical and practical components of the contemporary conflictology.

## REFERENCES

- Arnesen, S., & Peters, Y. (2018). The Legitimacy of Representation: How Descriptive, Formal, and Responsiveness Representation Affect the Acceptability of Political Decisions. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00104140177207024>.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1979). Avtor i geroy v esteticheskoy deyatel'nosti [Author and hero in aesthetic activity]. In: *Bakhtin M. M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]*. (pp. 7–180). Moskva : Iskusstvo [in Russian].
- Barash, Y. S., Vlasova, T. I., Martseniuk, L. V., & Charkina, T. U. (2020). Specific character of the Crimean Karaims' origin and their faith transformation in the hermeneutic circle of history interpretations. *Universum istoriyi ta arkhelohiyi – The Universe of History and Archeology*, 3 (28), 1, 116–124.
- Bauman, Z. (2008). *Tekuchaya sovremennost [Fluid modernity]*. Moskva: Sankt-Peterburg : Piter [in Russian].
- Dana, D. (2001). *Conflict Resolutions*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Delez, Zh., & Gvattari, F. (2000). *Chto takoe filosofiya? [What is philosophy?]*. Moskva: Akademicheskii Proekt [in Russian].
- Galtung, F. (2010). *A Theory of Conflict. Overcoming Direct Violence*. Transcend Peace University.
- Gusserl, E. (2009). Idei k chistoy fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoy filosofii [Ideas for pure phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy]. Moskva: Akademicheskii Proekt [in Russian].
- Herasina, L., & Trebina, L. (2012). *Konfliktolohiya [Conflictology]*. Kharkiv: Pravo [in Ukrainian].
- Hrabov's'ka, I. (2020). Poshuky shlyakhiv ta metodiv protystoyannya putinizmovi: ukrayins'ki realiyi [Search for ways and methods to oppose Putinism: Ukrainian realities]. *Ukrayinoznavchyy al'manakh – Ukrainian Studies Almanac*, 26, 45–50 [in Ukrainian].
- James, W. (2019). Pragmatism, Meaning of Truth, and The Varieties of Religious Experience (AJBT Classics). Independently published.
- Jameson, F. (1996). *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Routledge.



- Jarn, D. (1999). *Dictionary of Conflict Resolution*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jeong, H.-W. (2009). *Conflict Management and Resolutions: An Introduction*. New-York: Routledge.
- Kerimov, T. Kh. (2007). *Nerazreshimost [Undecidability]*. Moskva: Akademicheskii Proekt [in Russian]
- Khaydegger, M. (2001). *Osnovnye problemy fenomenologii [Basic problems of phenomenology]*. Sankt-Peterburg: Vysshaya religiozno-filosofskaya shkola [in Russian].
- Kulyk, V. (Ed). (2020). *Interpretatsiya rosiys'ko-ukrayins'koho konfliktu u zakhidnykh naukovykh i ekspertno-analitychnykh vydannyakh [Interpretation of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in Western scientific and expert-analytical publications]*. Kyiv: IHIEND im. I. F. Kurakha NAN Ukrayiny [in Ukrainian]
- Lechman B. (2007). *Conflict And Resolutions*. Aspen Publishers.
- Levinas E. (2012). *Totality and Infinity*. New-York: Springer.
- Love T. (2016). *Organizational Issues: Conflicts And Resolutions*. Tiffony Love.
- Lukin Yu. F. (2007). *Konfliktologiya: Upravlenie konfliktami [Conflictology: Conflict Management]*. Moskva: Akademicheskii Proekt, Gaudeamus [in Russian]
- Mirovye protsessy, politicheskie konflikty i bezopasnost [World Processes, Political Conflicts and Security]*. (2007). Moskva: ROSSPEN [in Russian]
- Nazarchuk, A. V. (2002). *Etika globaliziruyushchegosya obshchestva [Ethics of a globalizing society]*. Moskva : Direktmedia publishing. [in Russian]
- Onditi F. (2020). *Conflictology: Systems, Institutions, and Mechanisms in Africa*. London: Lexington Books.
- Ortega y Gasset (1994). *The Revolt of the Masses*. New-York: Norton.
- Pospelova, O. V. (2007). *Politika, utopicheskoe myshlenie i feminizm. Novye napravleniya politicheskoy nauki [Politics, utopian thinking and feminism. New directions of political science]*. Moskva: ROSSPEN [in Russian]
- Simon, W. (1997). *Postmodern Sexualities*. London & New-York: Routledge.
- Tsyurupa, M. V. (2004). *Osnovy konfliktolohiyi ta teoriiy perehovoriv [Fundamentals of conflictology and negotiation theory]*. Kyiv: Kondor [in Ukrainian]
- Vishnyakova, N. (2010). *The Conflict – Resolve It Creatively: Practical Training in Conflictology*. Xlibris Corporation LLC.
- Vlasova O. (2020). Henderna temporal'nist' yak vymir sotsial'nykh konfliktiv : ukrayins'kyy kontekst [Gender temporality as a dimension of social conflicts: the Ukrainian context]. *Ukrayinoznachyy al'manakh – Ukrainian Studies Almanac*, 26, 39–44. [in Ukrainian]
- Zizek S. (2014). *Event*. London: Melville House.

### **Vlasova Tetiana**

Dr. SC., Full Prof., <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5040-5733>, [vasovat2@gmail.com](mailto:vasovat2@gmail.com)

### **Pshinko Oleksandr**

Dr. Sc., Full Prof., <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1598-2970>, [pshinko@r.diit.edu.ua](mailto:pshinko@r.diit.edu.ua)

### **Vlasova Olha**

Ph.D. Assos. Prof., <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5040-5733>, [358358olga@gmail.com](mailto:358358olga@gmail.com)

Стаття надійшла / Article arrived: 09.01.2021

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 15.02.2021