

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF UKRAINE
Center for Humanities Education of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

01001, Kyiv–1, 4 Tryohsvyatitelska St.,
tel . (044) 278–30–13, fax 278–87–20

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SOLUTION
CRISIS SITUATIONS IN SOCIETY**

ANALYTICAL REPORT

based on the results of work on a research topic

"Sociocultural and cognitive factors of transformations and integrations

"methodology of humanities and natural sciences"

(2018–2020)

Kyiv — 2020

FROM THE CONTENT

Introductory part

Section I

The essence and content field of the crisis phenomenon.

Chapter II

Methodological pluralism in the study of crisis situations in society.

Conclusions and recommendations

INTRODUCTORY PART

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the entire social world has been in a permanent state of crisis, which manifests itself in all spheres of its life without exception. This leads to the need for a significant reorientation of scientific research. The understanding of stable, recurring, regular processes and phenomena is increasingly being replaced by the study of non-standard, turning -crisis processes. In the socio-philosophical context, crisis as a complex, changeable and multifaceted phenomenon is a rather significant phenomenon, ignoring which is unacceptable. Crises are brought to life by a wide variety of reasons and, as a rule, provoke social and individual manifestations of consciousness to function according to unusual laws or even to violate established rules and laws. This, in turn, significantly affects the individual, collective and social existence of people. In view of the above, it is *relevant* to understand the essential characteristics of the crisis phenomenon from the perspective of modern socio-philosophical knowledge.

The purpose of this scientific research is the methodology for studying the phenomenon of crisis, the causes of this state, the nature of its manifestation, and the determination of the limits of effective influence on crisis processes. The purpose has led to a number of research *tasks* :

- analysis of the interpretations of the crisis available in the literature”;
- identifying the main characteristics of various manifestations of the crisis;
- assessment of the significance of philosophical concepts related to crisis processes;
- analysis of the methodology for studying crisis situations from the perspective of determining the extent of the possibility of their resolution.

The novelty of the study is formulated in a number of theses:

- crisis can and should be considered as one of the states of human existence (from the individual to society as a whole);

- the historical logic of the formation of ideas about the crisis is carried out in the direction from negative to positive-adaptive perception of it. The latter is understood as a manifestation of passive struggle with the crisis;

- among other reasons, crisis phenomena in society are based on certain transformations at the level of individual and social consciousness;

- the internally contradictory nature of crises and the diversity of their manifestations do not allow us to give preference to any one method of studying these phenomena and force us to use a pluralism of methodologies .

Field of application : the results obtained can be used in scientific research (social sciences and humanities), educational, and social and management spheres.

Keywords : individual, personality, society, crisis, risk, catastrophe, law.

P AT WITH D AND L AND

The essence and content of the crisis phenomenon

A crisis is a situation in which any community or individual questions the foundations of its own existence or the existence of the surrounding world, as a result of which stable stereotypes of perception of the environment, standards of assessments, permissible explanations are destroyed, and the boundaries of traditional historical types of worldview are blurred. A crisis is dangerous because it represents a state of instability, is a factor that threatens the integrity and stability of society or specific social groups and individuals. At the same time, it cannot be said that a crisis is an entirely negative phenomenon, because in many ways it is a turning point in the historical movement, shaping future events that are radically different from the events of the recent past and present.

There have never been periods in history in which specific crisis processes did not manifest themselves. Society always has more or less significant problems, on which the probability of the corresponding crisis phenomena depends to one degree

or another. A distinctive feature of modern crises is that they no longer seem to be something external, accidental, separate and local. The modern state of crisis is a process that unfolds as various factors and forces interact in an unpredictable way, disrupting the usual, everyday rhythm of life, causing anxiety and stress among the population, carrying potential and real threats to the basic values and structure of social systems. For example, uncertainty about the future today is caused not only by the state of the economy or politics, but also by demography and ecology. At the same time, crisis is also manifested in historically traditional areas. Thus, European citizens demonstrate increasing distrust of financial companies and the free market as a whole. The level of trust in democratic institutions, political party programs, statements by state leaders, etc. is falling. This decline in trust has caused various crisis processes and contradictions, including in the banking sector, interstate, interethnic and interfaith relations. As a result, there is an increase in the number of various populist movements, "pocket" parties and an increase in their influence on public opinion.

The combined study of these phenomena and the trends that accompany them demonstrates the need for a reassessment of political initiatives, values, and a serious scientific adjustment of the concept of "crisis." This is especially important for Ukrainian society, which many modern researchers say has been in a state of "transit" for thirty years without a clearly defined end point (See: *Shulga M. Crisis as a threat to public security // Crisis in Ukraine: the zone of impact. The view of sociologists. — Kyiv: OOO "Drukarnya Biznespoligraf", 2010. — P. 10).*

One of the first to speak of crisis as a philosophical concept was J.-J. Rousseau. He used it to describe the political situation of his time, when the old institutions of the state no longer corresponded to the new social, economic and cultural situation. J.-J. Rousseau was sure that social development at the end of the 18th century would enter a critical phase in which the existing foundations of European states would be overthrown by revolution.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, "crisis" became one of the key concepts in social philosophy and philosophy of history, where the historical process was

conceived mainly as an endless series of contradictions and conflicts. Thinkers of various directions and schools turned to the study of the causes of the main economic, social and political changes, as a result of which old and new ideas about law, justice and morality began to contradict each other. The political philosopher of the 19th century A. Ruge argued that the purpose of crisis is humanity's break with its past. One of the foundations of Marxism was also a theoretical analysis of the mechanism of crisis situations in society.

At the turn of the 19th–20th centuries, on the basis of accumulated practical experience, theoretical and methodological principles for the study of crisis began to form. The most tangible results were achieved here by the German philosopher of the late 19th and first third of the 20th centuries. E. Husserl with his hermeneutic and phenomenological analysis. It was he who identified social consciousness as the basis for the emergence of crisis situations and explored the essence of “crisis consciousness”. In his opinion, crisis consciousness is both proactive and conservative. Proactive - because it can be both a consequence and a cause of the transition of culture into a state of crisis (according to the theorist, crisis consciousness became one of the main causes of the revolutions of the 20th century). Conservative because to one degree or another it manifests itself even after the end of the crisis. The most expressive statement of the thinker's main conclusions was his words about the crisis of all European humanity.

From the point of view of E. Husserl, the basis of the crisis of humanity is the transformation of the essence of scientific knowledge and the loss of the latter's vital significance. That is, humanity, having lost faith in science as a universal philosophy, has simultaneously lost the meaning and purpose of its existence. He was sure: the crisis of Europe is rooted in the errors of rationalism. At the same time, he emphasized: this does not mean that rationality is "evil" or plays a secondary role in the formation of human attitudes towards the world. The philosopher is convinced that "rationality in the true and highest sense in which we use it, which originated in Greece and became an ideal in the classical period of Greek philosophy, of course, requires reflective clarification, but it is it that is called upon in its completed form

to guide development" (*Husserl E. The Crisis of European Humanity and Philosophy* [Electronic resource]: <http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000060/>). The "crisis", according to E. Husserl , can be explained both by the apparent destruction of scientific rationalism and by a whole series of contradictions within rational culture. He considered "naturalism" and "objectivism" in man's attitude to the world to be the most serious contradictions. He emphasized that there are two ways out of the crisis of European existence: the "decline" of Europe in the alienation of its rational meaning of life, hatred of the spirit and descent into barbarism, or "the revival of Europe in the spirit of philosophy thanks to the heroism of reason, which finally overcomes naturalism" (*Ibid*).

However, the philosopher's calls to streamline the rationalist principles of science in order to avoid the crisis of scientific knowledge and, as a consequence, the crisis of humanity, were not heard. Therefore, it is natural that the " crisis of consciousness" spread and quickly transformed into the " crisis of culture". Already in the middle of the 20th century. in culturological projections, the consequences of this crisis appear as the emergence of the "mass man" (H. Ortega y Gasset, E. Mounier), a state of "homelessness" (M. Buber) and an increasingly dominant technocracy (L. Mumford). The "loss" of God led the personality to a state of despair, fear and anxiety (P. Tillich), to the appearance of an "inhuman" person and an "unnatural" nature (R. Guardini). One of the key directions of thought of the 20th century. was the philosophy of existentialism, in which the introjection of the events of the crisis of culture into the structure of the personality is traced. In the context of various statements about the crisis of social institutions of bourgeois society, J. Huizinga expressed the opinion about the " barbarization of society."

In modern social sciences, the concept of crisis is closely interrelated with the concepts of "risk" and "catastrophe". These are terms that very often serve to reflect apocalyptic fears. Risk is usually associated with what can precede a crisis and influence its occurrence; catastrophe or collapse, on the contrary, is associated with the result to which the development of risk factors or an uncontrolled crisis can lead.

Thus, a crisis is perceived as something that directly precedes a catastrophe or collapse, creates and causes them. The catastrophe and the collapse that follows it, in turn, are perceived as some higher phases or final stages of the crisis, as negative culminations of crisis development. A catastrophe, in fact, can be perceived as a synonym for collapse, or a collapse can be considered a catastrophe that is absolutely destructive in nature (See: *Parker G. Crisis and Catastrophe : The Global Crisis of the Seventeenth Century Reconsidered / Geoffrey Parker // American Historical Review . — 2008. — 113 (4). — R. 1053–79; doi:10.1086/ahr.113.4.1053*).

The concept of "risk" became popular in the literature in the second half of the 1980s thanks to the German sociologist W. Beck, who believed that industrial society produces, as an unconscious consequence of its economic growth and technical development, such situations in various spheres of life that can cause irreversible processes in them that can lead to the self-destruction of civilization. In his opinion, a society that creates danger and risk on a mass scale is a "risk society."

According to the English sociologist E. Giddens , the concept of risk originates in the insurance system, which was formed in the 16th and 17th centuries. in connection with the sharp increase in sea voyages. Risk is a potential danger, that is, something that can, but does not necessarily have to occur. Initially, this concept was related to the danger associated with the difficulties of overcoming significant distances, especially at sea. Later, it began to be applied in the areas of banking operations and investment activities, where it is not always possible to clearly predict the likely consequences of relevant economic decisions and actions. Therefore, risk is associated with the awareness of probability and uncertainty . Capitalism, based on competition, constantly calculates future profits and losses, and therefore is constantly associated with risk. This encourages people to expand and strengthen the insurance system, thanks to which people have faith in the ability to influence and manage the future.

The above indicates that the idea of risk has been an integral part of the modern worldview from the very beginning, but the nature of today's risks is completely different from that of the industrial society. The society of the 19th

century. built its insurance system as a guarantee for business entities of stability and profit in the conditions of specific risks. It is based on an accurate calculation of the level of risk and a reasonable calculation of the amount of compensation (compensation) for losses incurred. Thus, a certain rational context is introduced into the sphere of uncertainty and potential threats.

However, in relation to today's risks, such protective measures of the past do not work. Modern risks are completely different. To a large extent, they are devoid of specific social limitations. Their new quality is that the threats concern not some specific place (for example, an industrial enterprise), but life on this planet in all its manifestations. In short, these are global risks that are increasing, even as people try to mitigate their local manifestations.

A characteristic feature of modern risks is their “insurmountability”, which is associated with the way in which these phenomena spread: they become “ticketless passengers of normal consumption. They travel with wind and water, hide in everything that is most necessary for life - with the air we breathe, with food, clothing and household life - they overcome all the strictly controlled protective zones of modernity” (*Beck U. Risk Society . On the Way to a Second Modernity / Trans. from German by V. Sedelnyka and N. Fedorova ; Translated by A. Filippova . - Moscow: Progress-Tradition , 2000. - P. 7*).

The next important characteristic of these risks is “latency”, that is, “hiddenness”. In this regard, a problem arose that was unknown to the society of the 19th century: how to “record” risks at all, to realize the fact of their presence? They are far from always amenable to empirical verification, although there are measuring devices and scientific equipment for diagnosing these phenomena. Thus, the destructive consequences of the Chernobyl or Fukushima disasters are generally beyond the limits of human perception and, in part, even scientific justification, although science has all the possibilities for their study. This situation reveals the paradoxical nature of risks, which leaves its mark on the entire course of crisis processes. In view of this, U. Beck modifies the famous statement of K. Marx and states that in a risk society, social “consciousness determines being”. Risks become

objective and adequately perceived only due to the fact that they are recognized by experts. However, until they are scientifically or legally recognized, they do not exist. At least in the legal, medical, technological and social sense. As a result, the risks are not “suppressed”, not overcome, not compensated. That is, society only thinks that it is fighting them.

U. Beck argues: the emergence of a risk society, which is formed as a result of the modernization of social relations, is a fundamental social change, which, however, does not occur openly, but “secretly”, like some kind of “quiet revolution”. This is a revolution without a subject and without a change in elites, and at the same time one that affects the common fate of all living beings on this planet. In conditions when, as a result of global interconnection and global context, individual types of threats are intertwined and intensified, some even suggest that we should talk about a “world risk community” (See : *Beck U. World Risk Society* . — Cambridge : Polity Press , 1999. — P. 95).

Investigating the nature of the formation of crises, the French mathematician R. Thom raises the question: does a crisis always manifest itself through visible signs, symptoms ? He believes that in relation to living beings, risk factors remain relatively imperceptible, sometimes even completely absent. This is due to the fact that usually, while one or another function of the organism is exposed to adverse consequences during a crisis, its general structure often remains intact (*Thom R. Structural Stability and Morphogenesis : An Outline of a General Theory of Models* . — Reading (MA): Addison – Wesley , 1989. — P. 23). Based on this, in the author’s opinion, it is necessary to fundamentally distinguish between crisis and catastrophe. A catastrophe “is a phenomenon that is inherently clearly visible, a certain observable discontinuity , an absolutely obvious “fact”. A catastrophe is an event that negatively and irreversibly changes the previous state and leads to great damage. A crisis can be latent or sneaky. Quite often it manifests itself only in a quantitative (rather than qualitative) failure of a certain regulatory process: this is <...> a case of an inflationary crisis in the economy. However, there is an obvious

relationship between a crisis and a catastrophe: a crisis often announces a catastrophe, predicts or causes it" (*Ibid.*).

Thus, the concept of catastrophe is fundamentally important for understanding the meaning of the concept of "crisis". Catastrophe theory develops mainly as a branch of mathematics (one of its founders is R. Thom), but has also found expression in other disciplines - biology, psychology, medicine. Within the framework of the specified theory, a specific problem is understood: how, as a result of the accumulation of small effects, important events of a catastrophic nature can occur. In the field of social sciences, interest in catastrophes, especially of an ecological nature, was aroused by the work of C. Perrow " Normal Accidents : Living with High Risk Technologies" (please provide references) and received further development in connection with the orientation of researchers to the issues of modernization risks, which was initiated by the above-mentioned work of W. Beck.

Crises are now perceived not only as an expression of instability in certain areas of social existence, but also as "universal human situations" that people have encountered since time immemorial, struggling with them, and often overcoming them. Some thinkers perceive crisis as a certain attribute of the modern era, as something that essentially reflects and accompanies its development from the very beginning. A significant part of theorists defends the idea of the constant presence of signs of crisis in world history. They have been asserting themselves with particular force since the beginning of the 20th century. Therefore, the conclusion is made that "the crisis that is occurring goes far beyond the framework of finance and economics, that it reflects the exhaustion of the civilization in which we lived in the second half of the 20th century, and with a deeper look, much longer" (*Knabe G. God konca history Twentieth anniversary end history / (Electronic resource):* <http://www.russ.ru/pole/God-konca-istorii>).

The above partly explains why crises manifest themselves so diversely in social life. They are single and unique, as well as those that are periodically repeated; they arise as transitional states between two stages of development, and also relate

only to the internal processes of specific historical stages. However, no matter what sphere of social life it concerns, whether it lasts for a long time or quickly, the crisis always proceeds painfully and destructively.

Crises can be structured according to a number of characteristics:

- 1) by the sphere of origin and course - geopolitical, political, social, economic, technological, etc.;
- 2) by the specifics of manifestations and tools for resolving them — military, demographic, interethnic, production, trade, financial, etc.;
- 3) by the scale of crises and the damage they cause - global, regional, national, sectoral, etc.

Today, there are various theoretical studies of the phenomenon of crisis. They present attempts to comprehend a wide range of issues: the causes of crisis states, the relationship between the objective and subjective in a crisis, its driving forces, the dialectics of the necessary and the accidental in a crisis, the features of the manifestation of a crisis depending on its subject field, the structure and functions of a crisis, etc. A large proportion of these studies belong to the social sciences, which are primarily interested in crisis states in social relations. Such phenomena often manifest themselves in specific areas of social life or are global in nature. In view of this, one of the most notable developments attracts attention - the concept of the French philosopher P. Ricoeur on the "regional" and "general" concept of a crisis. The researcher thinks about how from individual crisis centers that form "regional" ideas about a crisis, one can move to a "general" or "global" idea of it.

According to P. Ricoeur, the first "center" of the formation of a "regional" idea of crisis is medicine, in which a crisis is a state of illness when its "hidden pathology" is manifested and the question of whether recovery will occur or not is decided. The second "center" is the field of psychophysiological development, where the concept of crisis is used not to reflect the threat of some catastrophe, but to emphasize those periods of development that are characterized by increased imbalance and vulnerability (for example, individual maturation). The third "center" is designated as the "cosmopolitical" model and concerns considerations about the

crisis at the level of world political history. The fourth, " epistemological ", model is associated with development in the field of science (in T. Kuhn's interpretation, it is about a paradigmatic crisis). The fifth "center" is the economic sphere. It is the economic crisis, which is characterized by autonomy, periodicity and global character, according to P. Ricoeur , that represents one of the main impulses for the development of the general theory of crisis. The author himself, based on the analysis, comes to such a generalizing idea, in which the crisis is defined as a pathology of the process of temporalization of history; the latter (pathology or temporalization ???) lies in the dysfunction of the normal relationship between the horizon of expectation and the zone of experience (See : *Ricoeur P. La crisis : a phenomenon specifically modern ? // Review from theology and from philosophie . — 120/1. — 1988. — RR. 1–19*).

Another position is taken by the German economist K. Borchardt . He believes that it is worth distinguishing between crises “in oneself” and crises “for oneself”. The former are a crisis state of objective reality, which people (yet) are not aware of, while the latter are a situation when manifestations of crisis become a conscious component of human activity. However, within the framework of this awareness, a crisis can be viewed in different ways: as a “warning” (in the sense that something needs to be done to avoid the worst – a catastrophe or collapse); as a “malignant disease” that needs to be treated in order to continue living healthy; as a “benign disease” that makes no sense to treat, but simply needs to get over it in order to strengthen the immunity of the “organism”; as a “fate” against which it is useless to do anything. A sense of threat or even fear of death is characteristic of crisis consciousness. The thought of a crisis is often associated with a moment of surprise, because the moment of crisis itself usually appears suddenly, unexpectedly and creates an avalanche effect. At this time, there is an urgent need to find a solution, which, however, is accompanied by a lack of time and uncertainty.

Attempts to resolve crisis situations can be direct intervention in them. However, it also happens, especially in situations of political crises, that bypasses are sought from the immediate epicenter of the crisis. As a result, the crisis process

is slowed down for a certain time, and then, as a rule, manifests itself with increased force.

P AT WITH D AND L AND AND

Methodological pluralism in the study of crisis situations

Since a crisis is not just a “special period” in the functioning of a particular system, but the culmination point of the manifestation of the quantitative and qualitative transformations accumulated here, which generate a fundamentally different state of its existence, it is extremely difficult to propose any one methodology for studying this phenomenon. Theoretical analysis of various crises that have occurred in the past in almost all spheres of social life makes it possible to draw conclusions about certain patterns of crisis processes. This, in turn, allows us to predict the occurrence of crises with considerable caution and to propose certain ways of overcoming them.

Crisisology as a separate, rather young, field of knowledge, the object of which is to understand the complex of issues and problems related to the emergence, functioning and resolution of crisis situations, has its own history. In this context, we can talk about its separate periods:

the first — from the beginning of the 20th century to approximately the mid-1970s: the formation of concepts of crisis as a social phenomenon (W. Thomas, A. Bogdanov, P. Sorokin, Y. Habermas) and concepts of disaster as an offshoot of concepts of crisis (G. Prince , L. Carr , R. Kutak , etc.);

the second - from about the mid-1970s to the end of the 20th century: substantiation of the concept of "crisis management" within the framework of disaster concepts (R. Stallings , R. Dines and E. Carantelli); substantiation of the concept of crisis as a common and routine phenomenon; use of the results of

sociological research in management and administration; emergence of the profession of crisis manager;

the third - from the end of the 20th century to the present: attempts to create an integrated concept of crisis and crisis management; rapprochement with other disciplines and approaches; introduction into scientific circulation of special terms to explain emergent crisis phenomena of a "complex society" (E. Carantelli , A. Boyne , N. B. Andersen, etc.).

It is easy to see that the general vector of crisis concepts is a movement from the notions of this phenomenon as a synonym for catastrophe, anti-norm to the justification of its inevitability, regularity and naturalness. This, in turn, forces the formation of psychological readiness for the emergence of a crisis in any sphere of life and adequate behavior of subjects in these difficult conditions at the level of individual, collective and social consciousness.

The theory of crisis and social change was developed in the first decade of the 20th century. by the American sociologist W. Thomas. A crisis, in his opinion, is a phenomenon that "disturbs the usual course of things" and requires a new model of behavior to act in changed conditions. The sociologist divides crises into external and internal in relation to a social group. He writes about three main factors, the presence of which contributes to the successful overcoming of a crisis by a social group: the presence of leaders; a sufficient level of development of the group, including the availability of necessary technologies; the desire for progress and flexibility in decision-making.

The concepts of "crisis management" and "crisis communications" widely used in modern literature were formulated by sociologists R. Dines and E. Carantelli on the basis of a large-scale study in 1976 "Organizational communications and decision-making in crisis situations". They analyzed more than 300 examples of practical activities of various social actors in various crises. Considerable attention was paid to such interrelated elements of crisis management as the decision-making algorithm, coordination of actions, "vertical" and "horizontal" communication, etc. Understanding this, as well as other empirical studies of crises, gave rise to the

formation of a new perception of this phenomenon - as a cognizable and manageable process. Crises increasingly began to be interpreted as an integral part of people's lives. Enterprises, organizations, institutions began to take into account the threat of crises in their activities. A new profession has emerged - crisis managers, for whom crises are a normal, "everyday" phenomenon.

The turn of the 20th–21st centuries is characterized by experts as the beginning of a new historical period — the period of the “world risk society” (the term “era of crises” is also used). The consequences of terrorist attacks, social and economic upheavals, disasters and epidemics have significantly intensified and have become less and less controllable due to globalization processes, new technologies and the powerful informatization of society. In the conditions of a “complex society”, crisis management strategies that were used earlier have ceased to work (See: *Kravchenko S. A. Sociological diagnostics complex of society // Materials IV All-Russian sociological congress " Sociology and society : global calls and regional развитие »: Materials of IV Next All-Russian sociological congress / ROS, IS RAN, AN RB, ISPPI. — M.: ROS, 2012. — P. 100–112*). “We have many answers to the crisis formations of the past; but the questions themselves have changed radically,” notes one of the world’s leading experts on crisis management P. Lagadek . The “Era of crises” is characterized by the following characteristic features:

- increasing cross-border and trans-systemic nature of crises;
- the growing role of mass media and “mass self-communication ” (new social media) in the development of crises, the expansion of “ victimization ” of the population (feeling like a victim of crisis circumstances) and the reduction of crisis response time;
- strengthening the factor of new technologies in the genesis and consequences of crises;
- weakening of the role of the state and strengthening of the role of private companies and transnational corporations as a reason for the amplification of crises (priority of economic benefit over security, weakening of state control over many

processes, low effectiveness of legal, economic and other sanctions applied by the authorities);

- increasing threats associated with asymmetric confrontation with international network criminal and terrorist groups;
- politicization of crises and their consequences;
- mutation of crises, the formation of new complex forms due to combinations of crisis elements, the transformation of crises into a “self-sustaining process” through reproduction or flowing into new phases.

Taking into account the above, we can distinguish three types of theories of social change, which are capable of methodologically ensuring the influence of social subjects on crises in modern conditions. The first type includes the so-called cyclical theories. According to them, changes in society have a circular nature. In the theories of the second type, the emphasis is on the aspect of discontinuity (development can have the character of a revolutionary leap). The third type is theories of linear, continuous development, which are mostly (but not always) associated with the idea of evolution.

Theories of cyclical changes are present in two main variants. Within the framework of the first, history is interpreted from monistic positions. It has a single vector of development. Development itself is internally divided into certain periods that periodically return (repeat). According to the second variant, history is viewed in a pluralistic manner: it is not unified, because it is formed and functions due to the existence of individual (specific) cultures, civilizations, each of which goes its own circular path - from birth through the stage of maturity to decline and disappearance. The first variant can be demonstrated by the theory of the circulation of elites of the Italian sociologist V. Pareto, as well as the concept of changing cultural supersystems, formulated by P. Sorokin. The second variant is represented by the teachings of the German philosopher O. Spengler, and especially the monumental twelve-volume treatise "Understanding History" by the British historian A. Toynbee. In both variants of cyclical theories, the phenomenon of crisis is given an important place. In the first case, the crisis is associated with the situation

that precedes the transition of the social system to another phase of development, in the second - with the movement towards the declining, decadent phase of the historical cycle, aimed at the disappearance of specific social systems.

Theories that include the idea of discontinuity (revolutionary change) include Marxism and some concepts of historical sociology in the United States that develop Marxist theory (See: *Moore B. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy : Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World . — Beacon Press , 1993. — 559 pp .*). Various concepts of revolutions and breaks in development can be found in other philosophical and sociological teachings . An example is the poststructuralism of the French philosopher M. Foucault (*Foucault M. Archaeology of Knowledge. — K.: Osnovy, 2003. — pp. 5–29*), which discusses historical ruptures, as well as the theory of scientific revolutions of T. Kuhn. Within the framework of all these interpretations, the crisis announces the end of one historical period and announces the arrival of a new , qualitatively different period.

Theories of linear development emphasize the continuous course of history, which proceeds in a linear manner. Changes in this case are usually perceived as a process and result of shifts that gradually accumulate and necessarily generate a new quality of social systems. Theories of this type in the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. were largely influenced by the idea that human history follows a path of progress. Not the least role here was played by the theory of evolution, which was born in the 19th century.

In this regard, the classical evolutionism presented by G. Spencer and E. Durkheim, and neoevolutionism , which was especially developed within the framework of structural functionalism and systems theory (N. Smelser , T. Parsons, N. Luhmann), deserve attention. From the standpoint of the theory of evolution, the Austrian sociologist M. Prisching examines the topic of crisis. He connects evolution with the problem of the need for social equilibrium and adaptation as an adaptation to the living conditions in which society finds itself, and in this context he considers the crisis as an "adaptive deficit" (See: *Prisching M. Krisen : Eine sociological Untersuchung . Wien , 1986. — P. 66*). The concept of crisis interpreted in this way

applies to a wide variety of social phenomena. This includes economic, financial, ecological crises, growth crises, crises of the welfare state and public administration, crises of legitimacy and identity, etc.

In addition to various concepts of the theory of social change, an important role in understanding the problems of crisis, catastrophe and collapse is played by the parameter of spatial and temporal boundaries. The French historian F. Braudel states that in the variety of temporal flows of history, one can distinguish : a) short temporal processes associated with the individual fates of people and individual events; b) cyclical processes, an example of which can be economic cycles ("business cycles"); c) long periods of time (See: *Braudel F. Grammar civilizations* . — M., 2008. — Section 1).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The position of representatives of various social sciences regarding the problems of crises is not unanimous. However, the vast majority of researchers tend to conclude that the capitalist economy has deprived the phenomenon of crisis of something unusual, and the policy of globalization has made the crisis "as normal as any other phase of the historical process" (See: *Holtfrerich K. L. To discussions on economic politics Germany from Weimar to Hitler // Economic politics* . — 2016. — Vol. 11. — No. 3. — P. 209–223). Many theorists today even attribute a healing nature to crises, since thanks to them the subsequent historical process can move towards a new upward phase. The exception is, perhaps, the world economic crisis of 1929, which proceeded differently than its predecessors and was distinguished by unprecedented destructive consequences.

In our opinion, we should, as before, beware of exaggerated optimism and hope for the productivity of economic crises. They need to be studied and the knowledge gained used for further correction of the state of the economy and politics. In view of this, one of the key issues today is what character and

significance should be given to the current manifestations of the economic crisis in the world, including in Ukraine. It is still unclear whether this is one of the many phases that appear within the framework of recurring economic cycles, or whether the nature of this crisis is different - deeper and more significant? Today, one can increasingly hear the statement that the crisis of the financial industry in 2006 was only an "interlude before the escalation into a global crisis." Many arguments are given in support of this thesis:

- the tendency to create very large economic entities (conglomerates of firms) that cannot be effectively managed democratically is increasing;
- authoritarian regimes today are able to promote their economic potential more effectively than Western democracies;
- in developed Western countries, the number of jobs that can provide adequate living conditions for averagely gifted people has been decreasing for a long time; the latter, thus, lose hope of maintaining the existing standard of living;
- developing countries are unable to achieve Western levels of well-being either on their own or with outside help.

There are even more radical forecasts that Oxford sociologists are working on. They boil down to the fact that humanity has now entered a turbulent and “dark” period of history, which may last several decades and will most likely lead to significant changes on a global scale. In the modern world, the “light” is seen at the end of a historical phase of medium duration, which originates in the crisis of the 1970s. Three factors will play a key role in global world changes: the final crisis of capitalism as a world system; the decline of former capitalist hegemons and their replacement by new ones; an ecological shock of global proportions, which causes other further changes (See: *Wallerstein I., Collins R., Mann M., Derluigian G., Calhoun C. Does Capitalism Have a Future ?* — Oxford , New York : Oxford University Press , 2013. — PP. 163–192). According to these authors, we can expect that a systemic crisis of such magnitude will sow destruction and stimulate active violent actions. One example of this is the mass demonstrations of African Americans in 2020 against the US government's policy in the field of national

relations. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the possibilities of collective strategies for how to deal with such situations and prevent violent actions by various social actors.

The results of the scientific research are presented in 38 publications (total volume 45.7 d.a.) in Ukraine and abroad, including three collective monographs: “The Great Kyivan” Mykola Berdyaev / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. — Kyiv: Publishing House of Dmytro Buraga , 2018. — 532 p. (26.3 d.a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva , T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Taranov , etc.); Philosophical Self-Determination of Gustav Shpet / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. — Kyiv: Publishing House of Dmytro Buraga , 2019. — 462 p. (19.2 d.a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , etc.); Stages of Life of Yakov Golosovker / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences. — Kyiv: Dmytro Buraga Publishing House , 2020. — 520 p. (22.5 d. a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Taranov , etc.).

Sociocultural Prerequisites for the Transformation of Scientific Methodology” (13 d. a.) has been submitted for publication (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Vilchynska , etc.).

The results of scientific research work were tested by the performers at 34 scientific conferences and round tables.

Scientific supervisor of the topic
 Doctor of Philosophy , Professor, Senior Researcher
 Central Scientific Committee of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
 M. Yu. Savelyeva