

UDC 316.356.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32840/2707-9147.2023.97.4>

YU. V. ROMANENKO

Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor,
Professor at the Department of International Media Communications
and Communication Technologies
Institute of International Relations
of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

**IDENTIFICATION OF VALUE IDENTITIES:
THEORETICAL AND SOCIAL-PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE.
PART 1**

The article constructs a theoretical characterization of key value identities and individual mechanisms of their recursive assembly into internally interconnected sets of identities, a fragmented review of identity theories, which are basic to the subject of this article's research, is carried out. As a result of the conducted research, it was concluded that the sets of value identities represent a hierarchical set of meanings from different axiospheres (spheres of value consciousness), which are typical for different cultural systems.

It is noted that in the most general sense, any value identity can be part of a set with both homogeneous and heterogeneous value identities. In the first version of the set completion, relations of correspondence-subordination and recursion are established between the identities, which means that the value identities of the highest levels will be isomorphic to the value identities of the lower levels. Recursiveness also means that when internalizing the value identities of lower levels (for example, artistic), the completion of the value identities of a person and/or social group (community) at higher levels will take place according to the principle of isomorphism of cultural meanings. It is emphasized that the logic of recursion predicts and assumes that higher value identities undergo replication at lower levels, which allows achieving vertical and horizontal integration of culture, social system (social institutions and social groups) and individuals. Higher (value) identities provide mainly vertical integration and "work" on the synergy of culture, social institutions and social groups.

It was established that in the second variant, identities will undergo splitting and fragmentation, which will be accompanied by a number of cultural, social and mental effects, starting from external influence, central (cultural) corruption and ending with socio-schizophrenic and suicidal processes in the individual psyche, from the emergence of multiple regional movements (separatist and irredentist) and local wars to banal bewilderment, confusion, uncertainty of the perspectives of individuals and social groups. In postmodern conditions, the splitting and fragmentation of identities acquires pronounced permanence, which entails both the devaluation of identities and their continuous re-election and the creation of their simulacra.

Key words: identities, value identities, religious identities, worldview-philosophical identities, ideological identities, social-moral identities, legal identities, artistic identities.

Formulation of the problem. Identity as a concept that is used to define subjectivity in one or another of its manifestations became the subject of understanding in many concepts. At the same time, the emphasis in the studies of various authors was on the polymorphism of identities, their differences, while the problems of their hierarchization and the formation of recursive sets, which in any cultural system are necessary for the formation of elite groups and social institutions, as well as an integrated mental system of a person who lives in the everyday world of resistant self-evidents.

The purpose of the article is the theoretical characterization of key value identities and separate mechanisms of their recursive assembly into internally interconnected sets of identities. A separate task of the article can be considered a fragmented review of identity theories, which are basic to the subject of this article's research.

Analysis of research and publications. The theoretical foundations of understanding identities as constructs of value consciousness are represented by a number of concepts, including Freudian and social psychoanalysis (interpersonal directions of H. Sullivan and E. Erikson, analytical psychology of K.-G. Jung); sociological and socio-psychological constructivism (constructionism) – K. Gergen, E. Glazersfeld, R. Harre, etc.; structural functionalism and neofunctionalism (F. Alexander, N. Luman); postmodernist theories (D. Friedman, Z. Bauman) [1–13; 15].

In Freudian and interpersonal psychoanalysis [12; 15], in Jungianism, the common denominator of the understanding of identity is a number of ideas regarding a) the mostly unconscious and traumatogenic origin of identities as dependent on the types of character organization, object relations, and archetypes; b) the residual mechanism of planting identities in inculturation and socialization, which means that identities are the “remains” of someone else's censorship, which is internalized not through conscious choice, but through grafting-introjection; c) ways of impact of identities on society and the psyche, which are tangential to emotional contagion (archetypes in Jung), which occurs due to the numinosity of the corresponding archetypes and their fascinating potential for the personal psyche

The planting of identities in psychoanalytic logic is determined by intergenerational differences in the values of parents and children. At the same time, parents, trying to be in a censorious image, often do not understand the content of the censorship they instill, due to which the formation of identities is split and fragmented. The traumatogenicity of the censored content itself, however, is related not so much to the content itself, but to the “technologies” of vaccination. Although orthodox (Freudian) psychoanalysis is focused mainly on sexual, gender and bodily identities, the inclusion of the latter in the character structure corresponds to the possibility of their retransmission.

For Jung, identities are defined through the structure of archetypes. Values show signs of stability and universality due to their rootedness in the archaic layers of the soul. Archetypes express historically stable

archetypes that have the ability to replicate, serving as vectors for the crystallization of philosophers, ideologues, religious insights, artistic, mythological, and dream images. Archetypes form a certain set, which, however, can be divided into theomorphic, anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, stocheomorphic, rheomorphic. Archetypes are characterized by fascination and numinousness, due to which they determine the charisma of individual leaders and the passion of various communities in (ethno)national and world history [12].

In value identities, archetypes are revealed in the ways of presenting sacred First Reality (God, angels, demons, etc.); social institutions (church, education, army); subpersonalities, spiritual and mental states (Shadow, Self, Persona, Mask, Ego (Hero), Anima, Animus, Puer (Eternal Youth), Senex (Wise Elder), Eternal Child, Great Father, Great Mother, Animal, Healer, Mystic sister or brother) etc. At the same time, archetypes are subject to selective internalization through symbols [12].

The unconscious, through archetypes, enables a repository of symbols for science, art, religion, morality, law, which form several layers: racial, ethnic, national, social-group, professional, family and correspond to the life experience of various human communities. Therefore, the personal unconscious accumulates and reproduces symbols of various origins, which act as companions of religious, philosophical, ideological, artistic, etc. identities.

Regarding the understanding of identities, constructivism is represented by a group of theories created in socio-humanitarian studies (psychology, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies), the common ideas of which are: a) an emphasis on the constructive-forming functions of identities, which form both the optics of the vision of the world and the system references of his understanding; b) on the linguistic and cultural-historical conditioning of identities, their mediation by culture-specific language constructs; c) constructive alternativeism (multiple ways of internalizing identities) and cultural pluralism of sets of identities [3–5; 10].

Valuable cognition is the construction of an internal world of values through two interrelated processes: selective internalization of typified contents-values of certain axiospheres (sectors of the cultural system) and production of identities through the construction of psycho-appropriate meanings-values of a new content.

The very process of construction, construction, which is active, however, mediated by the linguistic structures of language, is of fundamental importance for constructivism; value identities are a compromise that is formed in the zone of intersection between the psyche of the subject (individual or (macro-, micro)group) and typified cultural meanings thanks to the transformation of these typified meanings into a culturally individualized product.

The construction of identities takes place on the basis of conventional social realities, therefore, those cultural meanings that are consciously

accepted on the basis of free and selective expression of will. Constructionists therefore assume that the sets of cultural identities of any community are always fragmented and relative.

Thus, identities are the product of building classifications of objects through cognitive structures, our actions, and language categories that we use to make sense of what we perceive. Having created various conventional social realities at the intersection of cognitive structures, actions, speech categorizations and our personal experiences of the first second and third, we get value identities that guide our behavior and shape our further representations. Such formation occurs through selective focusing of attention on what is significant, with the transformation of the insignificant into the background.

At the same time, value identities form a kind of “prisms” through which we selectively perceive certain theories, accepting part of them and filtering out part of them, so that only that part of theories and empirical knowledge (experience) that contributes to the reproduction of one or another is accepted value identity, and through it – the entire set of value identities.

From the concept of E. von Glasersfeld, who talks about a radical constructivist understanding in comparison with the traditional theory of cognition and cognitive psychology, the understanding of value identities as constructs of internalized value knowledge, which allows to achieve the greatest usefulness, success, viability in the construction of theories and social practice, emerges. The author thinks pragmatically, because identities are not counterparts of abstract “objective reality”, but tools for coping with reality, regardless of their “truth”, “truthfulness”, “justice”, etc. [3, p. 81].

K. Gergen reasons similarly as a supporter of L. Wittgenstein’s linguistic positivism, who advocates a neo-pragmatic position. For the author, value identities are constructs with which we operate in the context of answering questions about the possibility of winning/losing from the way of life that is stratified by one or another subject through a set of value identities [2].

In this aspect, the opposite of constructionism and representationism is revealed, in which knowledge about values, theories and facts remain mere abstractions, not merged with our subjective reality. Representationist logic is guided by structural functionalism and structuralism, in which the entire inner reality of a person, built through the internalization of cultural and social meanings, is deprived of considerable freedom of construction, since the discourse transmitted through language enslaves and makes individual human thoughts and acts of experience dependent. Due to categorizations as thinking frames in structuralist and structural-functional logic, not so much the effect of multiplicity/divergence is achieved, but the effect of uniformity.

Therefore, the constructionist methodology advocates cultural pluralism in the construction of both individual value identities and their sets and hierarchies, which means that: a) the content of value identities differs in different cultures and they are similar only by formal features;

b) individuals and social groups can selectively assimilate or not assimilate certain identities, leaving “vacuities” in their place or filling them with heterogeneous meanings, which leads to diffusion, disintegration and fragmentation; c) personal or socio-group choice de-absolutizes value identities.

According to H. Putnam’s apt expression, no one can look at the world through the optics of value identities “through the eyes of God”, or have an “outsider’s view” or a “metaposition” (“superposition”). Anyone whose vision of the world is framed through a set of identities has relevant references, which, however, are adequate only within the cultural system and have their own limited value relevance [9].

Thus, in some legal systems (of the Euro-continental type), the implementation of laws as general norms seems to be the pinnacle of equality and justice. However, in other legal systems (case law), such “legalistic justice” and “legalistic equality” will be considered the height of injustice and the height of inequality, and the corresponding identity will be fully or partially devalued.

Also known in Chinese practice, the calculation of “social points” for Confucian morality with its point control of everyone and everything will seem natural and normal, therefore, such hyperprotective meanings will undergo internalization. At the same time, for any individualistic culture, the very method of inculcating morality through voluntary “brainwashing” and forced “re-education” through the means of revising opinions and inculcating collective censorship through discussions in penitentiary conditions will seem the apotheosis of unacceptability.

What is acceptable for Confucian moral and legal identities will be evaluated almost as “death” through the lens of different identities and the corresponding set of identities. This is what J. Kelly, H. Putnam and T. Naigell [8–9] point out in their studies of personal alternative constructions.

The structural-functionalist understanding of value identities is based on the logic of recursion, that is, the repeated reproduction of the same content in variations of different forms. Structural functionalism assumes the variability of value identities only in a certain “corridor” of autopoiesis. Value identities as higher cultural references are designed to create a reality that corresponds to them and due to the correspondence can communicate with certain subjects.

The hierarchy of value identities is a self-description (full register) of values that can undergo selective internalization. The author of this article adheres to the synthesis of constructionist and structural-functionalist logic: in order for value identities to be internalized at all, their “repositories” – axiospheres – are necessary. And these repositories are necessary precisely so that through them the consciousness of a person has the opportunity to strategically choose and re-choose identities, making a choice about their complete or fragmented internalization.

Value identities are sets of selectively internalized cultural meanings presented in the psyche of a person and society, based on identification with which the centering and formation of the world order, strategizing the corresponding world order of the social order (social system), informalized references of self-preservation of society or individual social groups, formalized social-normative systems and the spread of reference images for cultural imitation [4–6: 11].

A set of value identities consists of religious, philosophical, ideological, socio-moral, legal, artistic elements. Religious and philosophical identities are central (other identities are “completed” into a set of identities in the image and likeness of religious and philosophical ones). Such completion occurs through recursion¹.

The postmodern understanding of value identities, which is presented in the concepts of D. Friedman and Z. Bauman, is marked by statements of multiplicity, crisis, confusion, general disorder in the choice of identities and self-identifications, the impossibility of their completion into sets and hierarchization.

According to Friedman, in modern conditions there is a process that the author calls “ethnification of identity”, meaning the emergence of social identity, which is based on a specific change of consciousness in the vector of history, language, and race. Emphasizing the artifactuality of socially constructed identities, Friedman nevertheless does not consider them false or ideological. Moreover, according to the author, it would be dangerous and irrational to deny the authenticity of multiple ethno-cultural identities. According to Friedman, a permanent fragmentation has occurred in the system of once unified hierarchical identities. Currently, ethnic, nationalist, religious-fundamentalist and local types of identities are represented in their plurality [15].

Fragmentation of identities is pervasive and is matched by subnationalism; ethnic and local movements; conflicts and local wars; the formation of communities based on local characteristics, which have their own cultural self-awareness and strive for autonomy from national-state centers; the strengthening of fundamentalist religious movements and, as a result, the weakening and transformation of the nation-state principle, a component of one of the components of the modern project and the world social and political order based on it. This transformation of the global order is accompanied by the emergence of global economic and political classes, lumpenization and migration of large population groups [15].

According to Z. Bauman, in the historical stages prior to modernity, identity was not a “private matter” or a “private concern”. She was a product of a society that totally absorbed the individual. Today, society, the very form of our sociality, depends on personal self-determination, that is, individualization. Individualization is a process opposite to “social

¹ Recursion is the definition, description, or representation of any object or process within that object or process, i.e., a situation where the object is part of itself.

prescription” in state society, since modern identity is no longer ascribed as a social fact of a person’s stay in a social state, but is achieved by a person through constant proof of his class status [14].

A person as a social actor is responsible for the realization of the everyday task of self-identification and for its consequences. De jure individual autonomy (although not necessarily de facto) in modern conditions replaces prescriptive and coercive state identity with its self-determining class strategy, which requires daily persistent efforts [14].

Self-determination of identity, starting from the times of classical modernism and ending with the modern post-information society, procedurally coincides with the adaptation of a person to the formed social types and patterns of behavior, with imitation of models, with raising the cultural level, with ambitions not to go beyond the norm, to “fit” into a designated niche. However, the “individualization” of the identities of the post-information global society differs from the times of identification of classical modernity precisely by its equation with “flowing” modernity. The author talks about the fact that the identities that a person seeks to acquire and “confirm” are quickly transformed and can hardly reliably act as the goal of someone’s life” [14].

The goals themselves become vague and uncertain, a source of anxiety and the “great unknown” in human life. This means that the problem of identity changes formal and substantive features, “consisting not so much in finding and acquiring the chosen identity (identities) and forcing others to recognize it (them), but in timely re-choosing the identity (identities) under the circumstances of its (their) devaluation and loss of proper attractiveness [14].

Presentation of the main material of the study. Religious identities are central, that is, they set a central sense-image that denotes the Sacred Primal Reality for the individual and society. The image of the Sacred First Reality can be in the spiritual sphere, in the sphere of society, man and natural (bodily) reality. Individuals, social groups and societies can make objects of deification spiritual reality, social reality, human (mental, spiritual) reality, natural/animal, organismic reality.

Table 1.1

Religious identities

| General types of religions and religious identities | Content |
|--|---|
| 1 | 2 |
| Noocentric (spiritualistic) | The image of a spiritual (spiritual reality), foreign to consciousness (superconscious spiritual reality) |
| Cosmocentric and sociocentric | Images of physical and social reality (example: Confucianism in which the object of sacralization (deification) is Chinese society as a great mass – “Heavenly”). |

Table 1.1 (ending)

| 1 | 2 |
|--|--|
| Anthropocentric (psychocentric) | Images of people and psychic reality (e.g. Buddhism, in which the enlightened person and enlightened human consciousness are deified; Shinto, in which the “way of the warrior-hero” is deified) |
| Somatocentric (naturocentric) | Images of natural and physical reality (biological reality) |

Philosophical worldview identities are determined by the type of worldview, since philosophy as a sphere of spiritual and value reflection of worldview is derived from worldview. Philosophical worldview identities themselves recurse with religious ones, since philosophy in a rational-logical form offers a theoretical model of one or another world order. Let’s pay attention to the fact that this world order is a recursion of the Image of the sacred primal reality (God or deity/deities).

In the most general form, philosophical concepts are divided into idealistic and materialistic. Their typology is presented in the table below.

Table 1.2

Philosophical identities

| | Noocentrism (spiritualism) | Cosmocentrism and sociocentrism | Anthropocentrism | Somatocentrism/naturocentrism (materialism) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Idealistic | – | Idealistic cosmocentrism (deified physical nature and the cosmos as a world order and deified society and society as a world order, the prototype of which is the organism) | Idealistic anthropocentrism – man as a god-like/angel-like being (superman) with signs of spiritual perfection (example – Renaissance philosophy, Italian humanism) | – |
| Materialistic | – | Materialistic cosmocentrism (physical nature and the cosmos as an ordinary natural substance and a combination of material elements governed by the laws of physics) and sociocentrism (a social system, the prototype of which is any mechanism) | Materialistic anthropocentrism (a person is an ordinary physical body, and his psyche is only a product of brain activity) | – |

Ideological identities offer one or another version of the social order, which acts as a continuation of the world order presented in the philosophical and ideological identities.

Ideology offers one or another model of order based on the ratio of four components: cultural (value patterns, or simply values), political (goal-setting, or goal-determining and mobilizing), economic (adaptive), and integration-socialization (communication-integration). Simply put, social order in ideology is culture/cultural superstructure in the form of meanings/value patterns+politics/political goal achievement/mobilization of individuals/communities to achieve general social goals+ economy as the satisfaction of basic organismic needs through adaptation to the natural environment (adaptation) + maintenance of communication between the person and all the listed subsystems (social integration/communication). Ideology describes the status of each of the elements of the social order and how they interact.

There are five basic types of ideological identities:

- A) left-wing radicalism (communism);
- B) left centrism (socialism, demosocialism);
- C) centrism (liberalism);
- D) right-wing centrism (nationalism, conservatism);
- E) right-wing radicalism (fascism).

Table 1.3

Ideological identities

| Ideological identities and components | Left Radicalism (Communism) | Left centrism (socialism, demosocialism) | Centrism (liberalism) | Right-wing centrism (nationalism, conservatism) | Right-wing radicalism (fascism) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Culture / cultural superstructure | policy/ political goal achievement | Culture / cultural superstructure | economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs | Culture / cultural superstructure | policy/ political goal achievement |
| policy/ political goal achievement | economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs | policy/ political goal achievement | social integration/ communication (person and population) | policy/ political goal achievement | Culture / cultural superstructure |
| economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs | Culture / cultural superstructure | social integration/ communication (person and population) | Culture / cultural superstructure | economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs | social integration/ communication (person and population) |
| social integration/ communication (person and population) | social integration/ communication (person and population) | economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs | policy/ political goal achievement | social integration/ communication (person and population) | economy as satisfaction of basic organismic needs |

The differences between different ideological identities relate to the importance of different subsystems. For left-radical identities, politics and economics are the highest-level priorities, while culture and the person with integration (social communication) remain “below” them. Therefore, communists are “bad statist” and “bad economist” because politics and economics, which stand above culture and are fused/merged in the state, which becomes the sole owner of the means of production, are effectively doomed to inefficiency and corruption.

Demo-socialists (center-left) and conservatives/nationalists (center-right) put culture in the highest place in order to support the politics of influence of cultural elites and thereby achieve better social integration/communication of the individual (left-centrism), or higher economic well-being of financial oligarchs (right centrism). At the same time, left centrists achieve higher social integration by improving mechanisms of redistribution in the economy, and right centrists – stimulation of private economic initiative and reduction of redistribution projects.

As it becomes obvious, the bearers of left-radical identities recurse materialist sociocentrism in philosophy, or simply “bad materialism”, which emphasizes the fact that society is basically likened to a mechanism, and a person is a separate wheel, which, in case of damage and breakage, subject to replacement. In such a society, the economy and politics are mostly of low quality due to the targeted destruction of cultural elites and their transformation into a servitariat.

Socio-moral identities determine informalized, sanctioned by the power of public opinion, strategies for establishing the norms of self-preservation of society and/or its individual groups.

Depending on the methods of establishing moral norms, three key moral systems are concerned: dogmatism/rigorism, conventionalism, and relativism (situationism).

In moral dogmatism (rigorism), moral norms/precepts are not subject to discussion and revision and must be fulfilled unconditionally, severe sanctions are provided for their non-fulfillment.

In moral conventionalism, norms/precepts are subject to discussion and personal (collective) revision/correction and must be fulfilled unconditionally, severe sanctions are provided for their non-fulfillment.

In moral situationism, norms/precepts do not have a clear meaning, are subject to discussion and revision in each specific situation, and their compliance is conditional and may include harsh negative sanctions or no sanctions at all.

In turn, individuals and social groups can be the subjects of the implementation of moral norms. Therefore, dogmatism, conventionalism and situationism can be combined with individualism or collectivism.

Socio-moral identities recurse with and perpetuate ideological identities as they offer different strategies for preserving individuality and/or community.

Table 1.4

Moral identities

| | Dogmatism | Conventionalism | Situationism (relativism) |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Individualistic | Individualistic dogmatism | Individualistic conventionalism | Individualistic situationism (relativism) |
| Collectivistic | Collectivistic dogmatism | Collectivistic conventionalism | Collectivistic situationism (relativism) |

Moral identities recurse with philosophical and ideological identities.

Thus, left-radicals are materialistic sociocentrists and, at the same time, collectivist situationists in morality (for communists, moral norms either do not exist or are assimilated to legal norms, contain few positive incentives and many punitive sanctions for non-compliance). Therefore, left-wing radicals do not contribute to the preservation of society by reducing the level of morality of the population and the immorality of the authorities

Right-wing radicals and right-wing centrists as idealistic sociocentrists (in their philosophy understand society as a social organism in which parts are not subject to implementation, replacement, etc.) in their moral identities are supporters of collectivist dogmatism. Consequently, in societies with a conservative-oriented and fascist-oriented ideology, the moral rigidity of the elites grows, which corresponds to both intolerance of deviants and the irrevocability of moral norms, which in such societies cannot be reviewed or discussed.

Legal (legal) identities are determined by formalized, state-sanctioned strategies for establishing norms of self-preservation of society and/or its individual groups.

Legal identities recurse with moral ones and by the method of internalization as legalistic (internalization through laws, and therefore generally recognized norms of law, which are binding for all), precedentialist (internalization through judicial and administrative precedents – decisions of individual judicial and administrative instances, which are applied by analogy), religious-customary (mostly norms of religious morality, fixed in one or another written religious sources and reproduced in state norms).

These identities correspond to three key types of legal systems that exist in the world and under which the internalization of these identities takes place. It is about the legal system of European (continental), Anglo-Saxon (precedent) and religious-customary (eastern) types.

Table 1.5

Legal identities

| European (continental) | Anglo-Saxon | Religious and customary |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| legalistic | precedential | Habitual and behavioral |

Legalistic legal identities can be seen as a recursion of individualistic or collectivist dogmatism in morality, hence individualistic-dogmatic and collectivist-dogmatic identities; precedentialist identities – as a recursion of individualistic conventionalism in morality (only what can be considered moral is what individuals have concluded a convention about because it is moral, the same in case law); in the religious-customary legal system, what corresponds to established practices and patterns of behavior that correspond to them will be considered legal and legal. Customary-behavioral identities in law will be a recursion of collective-conventionalist identities in morality.

Artistic identities are associated with meanings of art that are selectively internalized in society and the psyche. Artistic identities are associated with commitment to four types of artistic activity: framing, hedonistic-entertainment, professional, and amateur. It is about commissioned art (as it coincides with the purposeful planting of appropriate exemplary images, plots, etc.), that is, it is education-propaganda; mass art, which is focused on distraction-entertainment; professional art, which is intended for a narrow circle of the artistic elite; amateur art, which is the product of impulsive projection in one or another field.

Table 1.6

Artistic identities

| Art -science (realism, abstractionism, cubism) | Art-ideology- propaganda (socialist realism, futurism) | Professional art (academicism) | The art of exemplary feelings (sentimental- ism, baroque, symbol- ism, romanticism, etc.) |
|---|---|---|--|
| Realistic identities | Propaganda identities | Academic identities | Aesthetic identities |

Conclusions. Sets of value identities are hierarchical collections of meanings from different axiospheres (spheres of value consciousness) that are typical for different cultural systems. In the most general sense, any value identity can be part of a set with both homogeneous and heterogeneous value identities. In the first version of the set completion, relations of correspondence-subordination and recursion are established between the identities, which means that the value identities of the highest levels will be isomorphic to the value identities of the lower levels. Recursiveness also means that when internalizing the value identities of lower levels (for example, artistic), the completion of the value identities of a person and/or social group (community) at higher levels will take place according to the principle of isomorphism of cultural meanings. The logic of recursion predicts and assumes that higher value identities undergo replication at lower levels, which allows achieving vertical and horizontal integration of culture, social system (social institutions and social groups) and individuals. Higher (value) identities provide mainly vertical integration and “work” on the synergy of culture, social institutions and social groups.

In the second option, identities will undergo splitting and fragmentation, which will be accompanied by a number of cultural, social and mental effects, starting from external influence, central (cultural) corruption and ending with socio-schizophrenic and suicidal processes in the individual psyche, from the emergence of multiple regional movements (separatist and irredentist) and local wars to banal bewilderment, confusion, uncertainty of the perspectives of individuals and social groups. In postmodern conditions, the splitting and fragmentation of identities acquires pronounced permanence, which entails both the devaluation of identities and their continuous re-election and the creation of their simulacra.

Bibliography

1. Gergen K.J. Realities and relationships: soundings in social construction. Cambridge (MA) : Harvard University Press, 1994.
2. Gergen K.J., Hosking D.M. If you meet social construction along the road: A dialogue with Buddhism. *Horizons in Buddhist psychology: Practice, research and theory*. Chagrin Falls, Ohio : Taos Institute Publications, 2006.
3. Glaserfeld E. Radical constructivism: *A way of knowing and learning*. L.: The Falmer Press, 1995.
4. Harre R. Metaphysics and methodology: Some prescriptions for social psychological research. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 1989. V. 19. № 5. P. 439-453.
5. Hermans H.J.M. The dialogical self: Toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology*. 2001. V. 7(3). P. 243-281.
6. Lincoln Y.S. Guba E.G. Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. *The handbook of qualitative research. 2 ed.* / Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2000. P. 163-188.
7. Mead G. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
8. Nagel T. The view from nowhere. N.Y. : Oxford Univ. Press, 1986.
9. Putnam H. Reason, truth and history. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981.
10. Raskin J.D. Constructivism in psychology: Personal construct psychology, radical constructivism, and social constructionism. *Amer. Communication J.* 2002. V. 5. Iss. 3. P. 7-24.
11. Varela F., Thompson E., Rosch E. The embodied mind: cognitive science and human experience. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 1993.
12. Юнг К.-Г. Символы трансформации. М. : АСТ, 2008. 731 с.
13. Bauman Zygmunt *The Individualized Society*. Wiley? 2013
14. Friedmann J. Order and disorder in global systems: a sketch. *Social research*. 1993. Vol. 60. № 2.
15. Erikson E. Identity and the life cycle. N.Y.; L., 1994.

Романенко Ю. В. Ідентифікація ціннісних ідентичностей: теоретична і соціально-прагматична перспектива. Частина 1

У статті побудовано теоретичну характеристику ключових ціннісних ідентичностей та окремих механізмів їх рекурсивного комплектування у внутрішньо-взаємопов'язані набори ідентичностей, здійснено фрагментований огляд теорії ідентичностей, які є базисними для предмету дослідження

цієї статті. В результаті проведеного дослідження зроблено висновок про те, що набори ціннісних ідентичностей являють собою ієрархізовані сукупності сенсів з різних аксіосфер (сфер ціннісної свідомості), які є типовими для різних культурних систем.

Відзначено, що в найзагальнішому розумінні будь-яка ціннісна ідентичність може входити в набір як з однорідними, так і з різнорідними ціннісними ідентичностями. В першому варіанті комплектування набору між ідентичностями вибудовуються відносини кореспондентності-супідрядності та рекурсивності, що означає, що ціннісним ідентичностям найвищих рівнів будуть ізоморфними ціннісні ідентичності нижчих рівнів. Рекурсивність означає також, що при інтерналізації ціннісних ідентичностей нижчих рівнів (наприклад, мистецької) добудова ціннісних ідентичностей особи та/або соціальної групи (спільноти) на вищих рівнях буде відбуватися за принципом ізоморфізму культурних сенсів.

Наголошено на тому, що логіка рекурсії передбачає і припускає, що вищі ціннісні ідентичності зазнають реплікації на нижчих рівнях, що дозволяє досягти вертикальної та горизонтальної інтегрованості культури, соціальної системи (соціальних інститутів та соціальних груп) та окремих осіб. Вищі (ціннісні) ідентичності забезпечують переважно вертикальну інтеграцію і «працюють» на синергійність культури, соціальних інститутів та соціальних груп.

Констатовано, що в другому варіанті ідентичності зазнаватимуть розщеплення та фрагментації, що буде супроводжуватися низкою культурних, соціальних та психічних ефектів, починаючи від зовнішнього впливу, центральної (культурної) корупції і закінчуючи соціо-шизофренальними та суїцидентними процесами в індивідуальній психіці, від виникнення множинних регіональних рухів (сепаратистських та іредентистських) та локальних війн до банальної розгубленості, злутаності, невизначеності перспектив окремих осіб та соціальних груп. В умовах постмодерну розщеплення та фрагментація ідентичностей набуває вираженої перманентності, що тягне за собою як знецінення ідентичностей, так і їх неперервне переобирання та створення їх симулякрів.

Ключові слова: ідентичності, ціннісні ідентичності, релігійні ідентичності, світоглядно-філософські ідентичності, ідеологічні ідентичності, соціально-моральні ідентичності, правові ідентичності, мистецькі ідентичності.