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**Summary**. The article studies the main approaches to the morals of the communication in the modern social philosophy. The author makes a conclusion about the necessity of the principle of complementarity between the universal formal ethics and the ethics of material values. According to the author this opens the way to self-realization of each member of society. The author emphasizes the importance of the study of the moral foundations of communication for the future development of ontology, epistemology, methodology and ethics.
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Studies of moral foundations of communication is still important due to several reasons. First, a lot of modern philosophers point out transition to the new paradigm of thinking, which has taken place since XX cent. till nowadays. Such change is expressed in attention to the moral problems and in attempt to overview ontological concepts of world and its phenomena. Epistemological problems became secondary in philosophical reflection. Thus mental bases of human being are influenced by leveling. Anyway, we think that communication includes intelligence (mental activity) as well as moral and axiological component of social life. It mean that the studies of moral foundations of communication will further “reset” also in epistemological problems in philosophy.

Secondly, one of the most important tasks of the modern social philosophy is defined by researchers as the urgency of methodological paradigms changes, namely social holism and individualism. The major methods, existing in modern philosophy before moral foundation of communication, are connected with this methodological division.

Thirdly, communication is connected with social practice. Practice philosophy in Marxism considered society as an extension, which covers all separate components. The consent of macrosubject was connected with social antagonism, while social practice acquired significance only because of economic, bureaucratic and all instrumental practice forms. It means that practice is connected with the work as with the type of coordinated and organized efficient activity. Modern concept of practice is connected with immediacy and spontaneity of human communication and actions.

Fourthly, there is no doubt for the social value of communication in practice, starting from individual to global relations. Here we can see different moral questions in international, interdenominational, interage and inter-gender communication etc.

Study and articles analysis. While studying communication phenomenon you can’t ignore the works by Apel K.-O., Buber M., Gabermas J., Gyosle V., Ermolenko A., Jonas G., Malahov B., Piters J., Riker P., sitnichenko L. A., that became methodological and heuristic bases for this research.

The object of the research is communication as interaction between the participants of social area.

The subject of our studies is moral foundation of communication.

The goal of our article is to study major methods of moral bases of communication in modern social and philosophical mind.

“Communication” is a word with a great history. It origins from Latin communicare, that means "to assign", " to share" or " to make common." The root here is mun-, associated with such words as «munificent» («generous»), «communiti» («community»), «meaning» («sense, concern»). In Latin comunicatio was connected with the mental sphere, it usually involved materiality. The concept of communication got mental sense only with the growth of individualistic culture and attention to human consciousness. Communication becomes almost comprehensive with the development of radio, television and especially the Internet and mobile communication. Jean Baudrillard in 1987 declares "ecstasy of communication" and outlines the problem signs, which lose tier meanings and become simulacra [20, R. 128]. In such case issues of trust, transparence, relations between people and the issues of so called “conflict of minds” [16, 18] in general sense take first place.

One of the attempt to put moral bases in the communication is opinion of the representatives of communication philosophy – one of the most powerful areas of contemporary philosophical concept. The founder of this philosophical direction Karl-Otto Apel refers to universal rational foundations of coexistence and interaction of people in general human social space. Communicative Philosophy tries to combine Kantian transcendental principle and the principle of intersubjective reflection relying on the moral and ethical basis. This provision requires at least a brief reference to the relationship between the universal formal ethics and material ethic values. Exploring this theme, Ermolenko A. M. wrote: "Ratio of material values ​​and ethos of formal ethics rules, the contradiction between what was given particularly in the twentieth century. It should be regarded primarily as the interaction of rational and existential dimensions of moral consciousness, moral sphere as a whole" [9, 7].

Kant's categorical imperative as a principle of universal maxim, finally moving away from the traditional theories of morality that is always addressed to specific cultural and historical forms of living together and founded the idea of ​​universal morality based on the principle of formal mind. Kant's categorical imperative as a principle of universal maxim, finally moving away from the traditional theories of morality that is always addressed to specific cultural and historical forms of living together and founded the idea of ​​universal morality based on the principle of formal unity mind. The formal universality should have priority in respect of any private content which prefer feeling. As noted by contemporary Ukrainian researcher Zymovets sensuality itself is morally neutral, but it is precisely the foundation "Particular temptations" to which man is exposed [10, 32].

The latter is understood him as traditional rules defined by community and values, that gives the horizon of thinking about the world and defines the structure of a person's world. Priori for this thinker means intuitive meaning "pure" or "absolute" facts arising from existing and evident with all their connections in sensual sphere. That means that priori in the interpretation of M. Scheler is based on some forms of traditional, cultural, and therefore, according to the thinker’s opinion, human and proper system of values. Let’s remind that Kant sees the bases in sunject and thinks that ethics can take place even if one particular subject exists. And here, as noted by Hosle, is some limitation of Kant moral philosophy [8, 44]. Tangible ethics also faces harmonization problems of different values, coordination problems individual worlds in common space. M. Sheler doesn’t solve the issue of atomistic being of ethic subject, but makes it more profound by giving grounds not only to reflexive atomistic being, but to the value. The subject, which due to Kant’s opinion was reasonable and free, became a particular horizon in certain world in opinion of Sheler.

Ethics of tangible values ​​is a ground for postmodern philosophy. For example, Peter Kozlowski believes that ethics of values ​​is the basis for determining the relation of the individual to the world. First of all free human existence implies an ethical experience "rather than mere willful decision in favor of some universal maxim" [11, 115]. This tangible ethics, according to the researcher’s opinion, carries unifying potential as well as willingness of individuals to work towards the common good.

In contrast, we support the views of those philosophers who feel the need to give the preference to "universal morality" [13, 74]. According to the justification of moral duties, paradigm of subjectivity must be supplemented with the intersubjective paradigm that opens the way for understanding the reciprocity of the most direct forms of human existence to the most universal. The emphasis on existential dimensions of interpersonal communication conceals the threat of the statement of such varieties of unity, which are especially identified on different grounds, it means that the pursuit of elite communication is limited by the community of the elected against all others. Of course, each of us wants happiness, good for our family and loved ones, peace and prosperity for our community. But accentuating these ethical considerations, we proceed to the position of individual ethics and cultural life of the differentiated good, which can’t solve general social problems. Communication, which is based on such ethics "squeezes" us, separating "our problems" and "their problems", dividing the world into "we" and "they." In this case we can’t talk about the social space, rather it will resemble a particular ethnic niche in which we drove ourselves. Without reducing the significance of the rising conditions in which we have experience, which accompanies us all our lives, we, as individuals, the beings who represent mental, moral, emotional part of the world, have a responsibility to those who along with us, and just for those, with whom we have the relationship according to time and space. But communication is the universal heritage of humanity and universal reality of social existence. This communication is for everyone without any exception. "Although modern society is so complicated that it doesn’t perceive itself as a dynamic unity anymore, but also de-society is unable to be without that relative point which is the base for formation of the unity of the intersubjective elaborated general will" [5, 279]. The language that has the oversubjective structure and makes the base for the reason that guides the current communicative personality is considered to be such point by the representatives of the communicative philosophy. The transformation of the Transcendental Philosophy in the wake of the language philosophy, according to K.-O. Apel is the removal of the principal differences between theoretical and practical philosophy [4, 92]. Language - is both realistic and historical relationship of language from which it is impossible to get out for its members, and a perfect relationship of the understanding. Initial basis for the intersubjective dimension of human existence K.-O. Apel considers being the consensual, communicative rationality. Only on the basic of such a "generalized reciprocity we can talk about consensual agreement as the communication as the ethical rationality" [3, 246]. Communicative mind is focused on the intersubjective understanding and mutual recognition, based on the universality of the common forms of life. That creates a communicative, intersubjective space, the existence of which is supported by the efforts of intelligent moral beings, thus the destroying of all the necessary structures of the compatible intelligent life affects everyone equally. Intersubjective communication is built, according to K.-O. Apel, on two fundamental assumptions. First one is the distinction of the propositional and performative aspects of speech, the second one is the theory of argument.

In propositional sentences we discuss something. To talk performative way, we do not just talk , but do something. Analysis of the performative expressions was carried out, in particular, by John Austin. This thinker emphasized the conventionally -effective nature of performative sentences: "... it is clear that there is actually some conventional procedure, the implementation of which is our aim, through our speech» [15 , 35]. Developing this idea, J. Searle examines verbal communication in the form of illocutionary acts, which become the practice in the form of certain minimal units of speech communication. The implementation of illocutionary acts are governed by rules that are distinguished to the regulatory and the constitutive by the researcher. The first of them regulate such forms of action that existed before them. However, the other have the ability to create or define new forms of actions, to create and regulate the act, the essence of which is logically depended on these rules. The essential feature of the illocutionary acts is the fact that they are both intentional (associated with the intentions of the subject) and conventional (based on intersubjective agreements) aspect [21 , 239 ].

The concept of the performative contradiction is one of the main concepts of communicative philosophy. According to this philosophical theory, if it claims to be important, can’t accept and assume not only formal but also performative contradictory statements. Unlike formal inconsistency, which is the contradiction between subject and predicate, performative contradiction lies in the discrepancy between form of the expression and its meaning, between what it means, and what it expresses.

Regarding the position of the argument, a real argument refers to a reflexive action for which we can formulate and express the counterargument that makes sense. It means that every argument provides a counterargument. Statements of the principle of universal states as regulatory principle, the idea of ​​absolute ideal communicative community as a transcendental reality. K.-O. Apel, considering society as a communicative community, posits two images of the community - the real and the ideal communication community. The ideal communicative community - an ideal type of such a community where the meaning of any argument is adequately understood and can be determined by its accuracy. The ideal communicative community is understood as the goal, but the goal, the idea which exists in real communicative community, whose members implement linguistic and semantic structure of transcendental mental world. The real solving of the problems, "even those that are ethically relative - must be possible consensually for all members of the unlimited ideal communicative community, if they directly discuss it among themselves" [2, 50].

The peculiarity and originality of K.-O. Apel’s approach lies primarily in the fact that he combines the intersubjectivity with the reflection, uses reflective arguments to justify the ethics [17, 21]. But the question arises whether back to reflexive transcendentalism brings us again to the latest version of the subject centrism. Is the concept of intersubjectivity that is filled primarily with the reflexive meaning, and embodies the ethical sense? Also, remember Karl Jaspers’ words, who wrote: "I can’t talk to all people. When I try to do this, communication is destroyed "[19, 140 ]. This view reflects both existential and reflexive human limits and its moral power.

As you can see, attempts to overcome the methodological shortcomings of social subject centrism, as well as holism, through the constitution of intersubjective field, encounters many pitfalls. A few significant points were added to this debate between liberals and comunitarists that occurred in the late twentieth century.

Without going into the details of this discussion , but we note that liberals believe moral goodness as the matter of choice of each individual. The individuals should decide what they are and what they try to get rid of. A common case is a requirement of justice, which limits the number of goals that they allowed people to strive for. When it was defined and established: the correct principles of justice, all the rest – is the personal ethics [14, 301 ]. Comunitarists also believe that liberal picture of intersubjectivity is atomistic. A man is shown as a self-sufficient being, whose willingness and ability of previously formed and regardless of social cooperation. In fact, if a member of the society got additional opportunities to make something important and worthwhile, it should be viewed as the heritage of all of the society [12 , 344 ]. Moral identity does not depend on how the person will be able to explain rationally their words and actions, and the success of their realization in life.

We believe that communication as a unity means not only good. There is a danger of relativistic collapse of mind "in a variety of disparate incarnations" that are constituted on the language of a particular world and reflect only the particular construction of reality. Communication in this case is a kind of understanding, the basis of which lies within "our" language, "our" actual joint life forms. That is, the desire for objectivity is replaced by the desire for unanimity in the speech community to which a person accidently belongs. It turns out that we should prefer this horizon of the interpretations, the basis for which is our own linguistic community and should check all different attitudes with our own scale.

This ethnocentrism is based on the submission by the assimilation of alien horizon of interpretations of our, that expands on his own expense. But the communication if we look at the situation not only from the side of moral particularism, should mean not only "They" must seek to understand things from "our" position, but "we" are just trying to understand things from "their» perspective. "Synthesis of the horizons of interpretation " [6, 284] is not the assimilation «our " their " but it is always supervised learning convergence of "our " and " their " positions, " because such concepts as the truth, rationality or justification (Rechtfertigung) although they are interpreted in different ways and apply according to the different criteria, play the same grammatical role in any language community " [5, 276-277 ]. In addition , the communication may act as a " the violence that pervades psychological and intellectual sphere and is discreetly as imposing of their own beliefs, distorted information , etc." [7, 54].

Accusations of “non-participation in the dialogue "are often used as a curse because someone does not correspond exactly as anyone would like. Hypothetical moral dialogue can stifle those who would prefer not to enter into it. The unity of the meaning can be not only in the scientific conversation or a conversation of a teacher with a student, but also in the conspiring of criminals. Forms of human activity and culture inherent to both common and not mutual character. Great part of culture is formed by the scattered signs, and successful communication depends on the imagination, freedom and solidarity of its members.

**Conclusion.** Thus, the communication component of the social life increasingly occupies one of the central places among the factors of social movements, is a new paradigm of understanding and at the same time one of the most important mechanisms of modern society. Ethical and moral subjective relationship is in the center of contemporary social and philosophical ideas. The main theme and methodological principle serves communication, dialogue, or - increasingly - communication. Communicative philosophy tries to expand the scope of this concept to the field of human communication and action. Representatives of the communicative philosophy , particularly K.-O. Apel and Habermas believe that the true communication can be in the equality of speech and action, and only after the constitution of equality, founded by moral universalism can be taken to the fine work of the highly fragmented distinctions, which the each one carries.

According to our view, the analysis of the moral foundations of communication brings social and philosophical research on new methodological level , the first step of which is the recognition of universal morality, which refers to any person belonging to any local culture. But according to the priority of the universality , such step as the implementation of universal principles of morality in its unique forms, is an integral thing. The realization of the complementary principle of the universal ethics and deontological ethics of the good life is more likely to have a perspective of self-realization which is based upon the universal standards that can affect on any ways of life. The concepts of "equality ", "flexibility", "universality" are abstract without the understanding of the significance of the individual.

The value of the individual is not only a function of its contribution to the rational communicative design of the social world, but also the guidelines which are brought to this world. These guidelines appear from the daily communication in the context of the living world, usual social institutions, understanding of the value of personality in the social world and personal and unique in nature.
Of course, a purely ethical and moral aspect is not limited by the meaning of communication and holistic approach to the social phenomena. At the same time, the moral orientation of the social research provides the search of the opportunities to update the understanding of the social world in relation to other factors of social development.
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**Kryzhanovska T. A. Moral Foundations of Communication. – Article.**

**Summary.** The article studies the main approaches to the morals of the communication in the modern social philosophy. The author makes a conclusion about the necessity of the principle of complementarity between the universal formal ethics and the ethics of material values. According to the author this opens the way to self-realization of each member of society. The author emphasizes the importance of the study of the moral foundations of communication for the future development of ontology, epistemology, methodology and ethics.
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**Крыжановская Т. А. Моральные основы коммуникации. – Статья.**

**Аннотация.** В статье исследуются основные подходы к моральным основам коммуникации в современной социально-философской мысли. Автор делает вывод о необходимости применения принципа комплементарности между универсальной формальной этикой и материальной этикой ценностей, что выходит в перспективе к самореализации каждого члена общества. Подчеркивается важность исследования моральных основ коммуникации для дальнейшего развития онтологии, гносеологии, методологии и этики.

**Ключевые слова:** коммуникация, мораль, разум, ценности, язык, индивидуализм, холизм.

**Анотація.** В статті досліджуються основні підходи до моральних основ комунікації в сучасній соціально-філософській думці. Автор робить висновок про необхідність застосування принципу комплементарності між універсальною формальною етикою і матеріальною етикою цінностей, що має перспективу в самореалізації кожного члена суспільства. Підкреслюється важливість дослідження моральних основ комунікації для подальшого розвитку онтології, гносеології, методології та етики.

**Ключові слова:** комунікація, мораль, розум, цінності, мова, індівідуалізм, холізм.