

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОХОРОНИ ЗДОРОВ'Я УКРАЇНИ
Харківський національний медичний університет

**ПРОБЛЕМА ЛЮДИНИ
У СОЦІАЛЬНО-ГУМАНІТАРНОМУ
ТА МЕДИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСАХ**

*Матеріали міжвузівської науково-практичної конференції
з міжнародною участю*

**29 березня 2018 року
м. Харків**

Харків
ХНМУ
2018

In short, there are valuable arguments for and against the practice of voluntary euthanasia that are synthesised by Margaret Battin, as follows:

a) For: respect for personal autonomy, relief of the pain and unbearable suffering, and quality of life;

b) Against: intrinsic wrongness of killing, integrity of the profession, and potential abuse (slippery slope).

The debate over the legalisation of euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide often warned of a “slippery slope”, predicting abuse of people in vulnerable groups, namely children. Indeed, some of the worst fears of legalising euthanasia and physician-assisted death will still remain because, as stated by John Keown, it will always be difficult to implement strong mechanisms of supervision and control with the potential for abuse of vulnerable populations.

References:

1. Dubler N (2005) Conflict and consensus at the end life. *Hastings CentRep* 35: 19–25.
2. Harris J (1991) *The value of life. An introduction to medical ethics.* Routledge, London.
3. World Medical Association (2006) International code of medical ethics. Adopted by the 57th WMA General Assembly, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
4. World Medical Association (2015) *Medical Ethics Manual.* In: Williams JR, (3rd Edn.), Ferney-Voltaire.
5. Boudreau J (2011) Physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia: Can you even imagine teaching medical students how to end their patients’ lives? *Perm J* 15: 79–84.
6. Lindblad A, Löfmark R, Lynöe N (2008) Physician-assisted suicide: A survey of attitudes among Swedish physicians. *ScandJ Public Health* 36: 720–727.
7. Curlin FA, Nwodim C, Vance JL, Chin MH, Lantos JD (2008) To die, to sleep: US physicians’ religious and other objections to physician assisted suicide, terminal sedation, and withdrawal of life support. *Am J HospPalliat Care* 25: 112–20.

*Karpenko K.I.,
KhNMU*

ECOLOGICAL COMMUNICATION AS THE COINCIDENCE OF WOMEN’S AND MEN’S ATTITUDE TO NATURE

The existence on the turn of the millennia has put a lot of questions to people, which compels a new look at the world, on values that all seemed obvious to everybody. Among them, perhaps the most acute is the environmental issue and the question of the distribution of roles in society between men and women. Philosophical discourse, carried out in this context, highlights the gender dimension of people-to-nature relationship. The possibility of its articulation is

connected with the democratization of modern societies, the development of the latest technologies and information processes, the consequences of which contain many contradictions, but at the same time, open up new perspectives in another way to consider the idea of the world, society, man, and its natural and social opportunities.

The rejection of universalism and idealization of a single universal mind gives ground not to equate the universal with men's values, but to consider it as a harmonious unity of the non-identical, that is, the male and female attitude to the world. Each facet of this unity is self-sufficient and necessary for the universe. In recent years, Ukraine has signed a number of documents, both international and local, to promote the creation of a gender equality in society. However, the gender component in them is aimed more at achieving the traditional goal of improving the status of women. In Ukraine, public discourse on environmental and gender issues remains more desirable than actual.

The existing theoretical reflection of ecological communication as a social phenomenon does not distinguish its gender dimension, and therefore generates a number of interpretive problematisations.

First, this situation is one of the essential aspects of the difference between actual and counter-factual (ideal) ecological communication. Existing semantic and thematic differences give rise to the need to study the internal contradictions of the gender dimension of real ecological communication in order to bring it closer to the ideal, which in turn enriches the adequate understanding of the latter.

Secondly, the gender dimension of environmental communication is problematic due to the lack of necessary identification practices that ensure the identification of its subjects and objects.

Thirdly, the problem exists between the philosophical constructions and socio-cultural representations of gender relations in society. Philosophical constructions are built predominantly within the imperative-normative modality, which reaches its roots in the modern and even pre-modern culture. At the same time, socio-cultural reality gained postmodern qualities. It lost its absolute grounding in its initial principles, traditional foundations and mechanisms of formation and became pluralistic and extremely dynamic. Hence the demand for a contextual study of the new mechanisms for the formation, functioning and development of gender identities appears, and their conceptualization as a measure of ecological communication provides convincing arguments for this.

Articulation of the gender dimension of ecological communication increases the heuristic possibilities of philosophical discourse. It has practical value, because the dynamics of public discourse is determined by the existing symbolic entities and systems of representations that set the horizons of self-determination and self-development of the individual, providing a wider space of mutual understanding in society. That is why the gender dimension of ecological communication is an important factor in the moral renewal of the world.

The heuristic potential of a gender dimension is manifested in the fact that society gradually accepts the idea that men and women are equal and free: gender roles divide people not for the purpose of domination but for the equal partnership. The mass consciousness in this situation, developing in accordance with the laws of its own internal logic, is also gradually changing, demonstrating that the organic part in the strategy and tactics of a modern post-industrial or informational society is not a struggle, but a real equality and cooperation between men and women.

To study the gender dimension of environmental communication, it is important to introduce the methodology of discourse analysis, which in the domestic philosophy is developed by such scholars as E. Andros, E. Bystritsky, V. Lukyanets, O. Sobol and others. Discourse is the unity of speech and practice (dialogue, polylogue, interaction between its participants), of the context (environment, place, topos) of its deployment, meeting and interaction of its participants – members of a certain (professional, ideological, creative, confessional, etc.) language community.

The discourse analysis focuses on the “deconstruction” of scientific and everyday stereotypes, which are based on the understanding of both ecological communication as a whole, and its gender dimension. This takes into account their new “reading”, the interpretation taking into account the existing philosophical and sociocultural prerequisites for this, the discovery of new discourses, which consist in the context of the gender dimension of ecological communication, to find out their “intersections”, “meetings”, differences.

Moreover, such an orientation focuses on the constructive attitude to positive metaphysical achievements of previous times and to the achievements of a new post-modern project, which can offer the interpretative models for the better understanding of the gender dimension of ecological communication.

Discourse analysis also actualizes the task of comparing representations of ideal (counter-factual) and real (actual) environmental communication. The ideal ecological communication appears, on the one hand, as counter-factual, and therefore only formal (its main definition is the symmetrical ratio of individuals in language-communicative acts on nature), and it acts as a regulatory principle. On the other hand, it is realized only in the real, factual communication. In order to ensure the coincidence of the horizons of women’s and men’s attitude to nature, the attitude of women to the environmental problem must shake the zone of silence. In the end, discourse analysis imposes a special responsibility on its members for educational and socio-cultural influences which they have initiated by constructions of the gender dimension of ecological communication.

Literature:

1. *Колізії* антропологічного розмислу // В.Г. Табачковський, Г. І.Шалашенко, А.М. Дондюк, Н.В. Хамітов, Г.П. Ковадло, Є.І. Андрос. – К.: Видавець ПАРАПАН, 2002. – 156 с.