

## PROBLEMS OF HUMANITARIAN DISCOURSE IN MODERN PHILOSOPHIES

<sup>a</sup>NELYA FILYANINA, <sup>b</sup>OLGA RUPTASH, <sup>c</sup>VIKTORIYA CHITISHVILI, <sup>d</sup>OLGA RUDENKO, <sup>e</sup>VALENTYNA SINELNIKOVA

<sup>a,c</sup>National University of Pharmacy, Kharkiv, Ukraine,

<sup>b</sup>Yuriy Fedkovych National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine,

<sup>d</sup>Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine,

<sup>e</sup>Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

email: <sup>a</sup>nellya-filyanina@hotmail.com,

<sup>b</sup>o.ruptash@chnu.edu.ua, <sup>c</sup>viktoriacitishvili@gmail.com,

<sup>d</sup>rov@univ.kiev.ua, <sup>e</sup>valentinasinelnikova@ukr.net

**Abstract.** The urgency of intelligence involves understanding the importance of the concept of modern philosophy of science and the problems of humanitarian discourse in terms of their internal correlation, also focused on social problems. On this basis, modern philosophy of science and the problems of humanitarian discourse require detailed study, as they describe a comprehensive view of the nature of scientific knowledge, the development of which created our current civilization and had a huge impact on the formation of modern culture. The article identifies the components of modern philosophy of science (historical and philosophical section, ontology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology (theory of knowledge) and social philosophy).

**Keywords:** Humanitarian Discourse, Mode of Scientific Cognition, Philosophy of Science, Problems of Cognition.

### 1 Introduction

The challenges of modernity have led to the importance of understanding the process of neglecting the problems of the humanities. Shifting the focus of philosophical interest in science) in the twentieth century led to the fact that at the end of the century, humanitarian discourse, which partly did without philosophical reflection on "truth and method", began to have a powerful reverse effect, "displacing" the philosophy of science from discursive space. Against the background of impressive advances in the humanities, the emergence of interdisciplinary fields of knowledge that seek to comprehensively study intelligence, cognition, language, and many new methodological programs that would prove their heuristics and effectiveness, epistemological inductive philosophy of science began to seem either hopelessly outdated or obsolete, uninteresting and original.

Therefore, firstly, epistemology was obstructed as a rudiment of the fundamentalist claims of the philosophy of science. In addition, the lack of significant constructivist projects (in postmodern terms) within the philosophy of science itself has significantly undermined its authority and called into question.

On this basis, it must be understood that in terms of correlation with the system of philosophical knowledge, the guidelines and problems of humanitarian discourse set worldviews, quite clearly representing (respectively the internal structure of the worldview) the most general ontological characteristics of reality, axiological, epistemological and praxiological principles. They do not include the whole system of philosophical knowledge, where, along with worldviews and principles contains a number of specific information, quite obviously related to the subject of specific scientific disciplines. These worldviews and principles can be distinguished in their connection with the main sections of philosophical knowledge, which in accordance with its dominant structure include historical and philosophical section, ontology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology (theory of knowledge) and social philosophy.

This problem should be especially relevant in the content of each of these sections. There are thematic lines that connect their issues with the problems of philosophy of science at the ideological level. In the first section, it is primarily the interaction of science with philosophy and other forms of spiritual development of reality in the general context of the process of formation and evolution of the subject of philosophy. In the second – issues related to understanding the processes of

development in inanimate and animate nature, the emergence of life. In the third – an idea of the ontological and anthropological foundations of the genesis of consciousness and the formation of human cognitive abilities, in particular, in connection with the anthropic principle. In the fourth – the general prerequisites and opportunities, ways and forms of cognition, the relationship of knowledge to the cognizable reality and the criteria of its reliability, substantiation of the special epistemological status of science. In the fifth – the influence of forms of social organization of people on the dynamics of science, justification of its social value, a holistic system of ideas about the social existence of science.

The need to identify the content of the connection between modern philosophy of science and the problems of humanitarian discourse that arise in its spheres needs continuous improvement in order to identify concepts of scientific development.

On this basis, it is necessary to identify the key concepts of the proposed links in the philosophy of science.

### 2 Literature review

Philosophy of science is a universal, informative mode (Bunge, 2017). Philosophy of science today is an inclusive academic field and one of the most dynamic branches of philosophy. However, for the most part, the philosophy of science has been taught historically by retelling and tracking discussions from the beginning to the end of the twentieth century. Large texts of positivism, instrumentalism, delimitation, falsification, paradigm shifts, realism, observation, etc. are distributed to students and evaluated critically. There is something quite mysterious in this way of teaching the philosophy of science, as modern philosophy of science has advanced significantly and certainly differs from the historical theme, just as modern science has many features different from the science of Kuhn and Popper (MacLeod, 2015).

The branch of philosophy consists of direct and indirect discourses. In the first case, the best way to express discourse is a deductive, definite argument. In the second case, there are three ways of expression: reduction to the absurd, inductive logic and abductive logic (Boylan, 2018). The philosophy of education is between the discourses and problems of philosophy, on the one hand, and education itself, on the other. Preservation of authority in both areas poses certain dilemmas to the philosophy of education. Three ways to minimize these dilemmas are proposed: the development of non-ideal theories, the philosophy of education as a situational practice, and the use of case-based methods (Burbules, 2018).

The philosophy of education contributes to the formation of educational policy. However, education policymakers need to recognize the extent to which the content and context of their work is saturated with philosophical assumptions, concepts, beliefs, values, and commitments. In the absence of this understanding, the process of shaping educational policy based on the philosophy of education can have a negative result (McLaughlin, 2021). Modern humanitarian discourse comprehends the universal status of rights and freedoms in such a way that it distinguishes the universal human identity associated with it in the international social dimension. Applying a post-structuralist approach to the analysis of political practice, the author demonstrates that modern humanism, claiming universalist status, nevertheless contributes to building communities of "friends" and "enemies". It is this contradiction that allows the use of humanitarian discourse in the practice of securitization, as well as the legitimization of violence and emergency measures (Iokhim, 2019).

In some scientific works, the authors analyze philosophical views on the phenomenon of education from the standpoint of social and personal components. Analysis of the interdependence

of the ideological basis of education and the state of social development highlights the problems of the globalization of humanity, and in some cases – the danger of stagnation of human development (Lepeshev, 2019). According to scientists (Martin, 2021), all learning is indoctrination, and education makes an undeniable contribution to human capital.

Today, the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union seek not only political and economic completeness, but also philosophical semantic value. This situation requires a new almost revolutionary philosophy. The past centuries, which dominated almost the planetary analytical philosophy, should give philosophy the advantage of worldview, philosophy of culture, because global world principles from the standpoint of integrity and multipolarity should be based on the worldview and philosophy of all participants in earthly life (Sadykov et al., 2015).

The History of Nature Orientations (NOS) in Science Education notes some differences in the way NOS is defined, the arguments used to substantiate consensus on the diversity of approaches in different subdisciplines of modern philosophy of science, and humanities discourse. Key issues regarding philosophical adequacy different social joints (Hodson, 2014). For the concepts of “modern philosophy of science” and “problems of humanitarian discourse”, it is also important to determine the semantic meanings that can be added to some “line” of typical modes (Burlina, Bokuradze, 2020; Molek-Kozakowska, 2018).

They are fully consistent with the understanding of sociological discourses, which allows expanding the design of the discourse of the deepest understanding for the modern philosophy of science. Ethics of scientific discourse is interpreted as a critical theory of society and a critic of modern morality. I. Kant was one of the first to suggest the possibility of generalizing the norms of morality and the perception of ethics as a transcendent critique of morality. Neo-Kantianism develops ethics as the most important part of the philosophical system and fixes its sphere with the idealistic theory of morality (Tetyuev, 2019). The modern program of discourse ethics receives significant justification as the logic of moral argumentation in the social. The ethics of discourse arises from the real need to justify moral requirements and norms. Ethics as a critique of moral arguments is associated with the pre-reflexive horizon of the living world, which is why it is a deontological, formalistic and universal ethics. Two important projects of discourse ethics, presented in the article as an analysis,

The formation of scientific discourse in the context of humanitarian understanding of the problems of social relations systems can actualize the study of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of crisis situations in modern society (Popov, 2020). The connection between modern philosophy of science and the problem of humanitarian discourse emphasizes the relevance and interdisciplinary essence of this problem, which can be considered in the following contexts:

- attachment to a certain place (locus);
- terrain is at the same time a fragment of the world, space and the whole micro world, which lives by its own laws;
- spatiality and temporality, chronotopicity;
- dynamic and historical;
- anthropological, centered around a person or group of people;
- symbolism (Borodenko, 2021).

The central principle of modern philosophy is the discussion between two opposing camps, which are united in adopting a deeper false premise: the inconsistency and simultaneous similarity of concepts of modern philosophy of science and problems of humanitarian discourse (Harman, 2020; Vardin, Sigachev, 2019).

Over the past three decades, humanitarianism has expanded significantly. Humanitarian aid agencies are increasingly going beyond the traditionally narrow concerns. Humanitarian

arguments have also become central to legitimizing policy in a number of contexts outside the humanitarian aid sector. It is the different time registers of the two discourses - development and the humanities - that help explain this transition from the first to the second (Molland, 2018). Critical studies of humanitarian discourses include the study of arguments, assertions, and evidence used to justify interference or non-interference in key local, regional, national, or international contexts. These discourses can take the form of controversy (Hasian, 2021). The purpose of the study is to identify the content of the connection between modern philosophy of science and the problems of humanitarian discourse that arise in its fields.

Research tasks:

- consider the relationship between the concepts of “philosophy of science” and “problems of humanitarian discourse”;
- mark a number current characteristics of modern philosophy of science (historical and philosophical section, ontology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology (theory of knowledge) and social philosophy) in the context of humanitarian discourse can be distinguished;
- identify areas relevant concepts of development of philosophy of science.

### 3 Materials and research methods

The methodological basis of the study consists of the following methods:

- scientific (closely related to the classical problem of demarcation of the philosophy of science and with the philosophical analysis of the social dimension of scientific knowledge and the role of science in society);
- comparative analysis (shows that the philosophical understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge (philosophy of science) is formed on the basis of certain preconditions of worldview, ontological, epistemological, axiological, praxiological and methodological order);
- system of categorical schematism (categorical schematism can be analyzed at different levels of abstraction. Correlations of the nature of culture and mode of production can be described in terms of nonlinearity, the theory of self-organization. Science in general is understood in the culture of manufactured world based on the value of innovation, which, like culture itself, are phenomena of the world of formation. Features of scientific knowledge are understood based on structural characteristics of human activity. subject world, based on the means of activity and appropriate actions and projects through the formation of objective scientific knowledge about the material world of our experience);
- discourse analysis (showing the concept of philosophy of science hermeneutic, its thinking archetypal, and research methodologically and problem-oriented).

### 4 Results

Philosophy of science (as well as philosophy of history, philosophy of art, philosophy of language or something) is the self-consciousness of the general subject in a special sphere of its self-realization. This area - scientific knowledge (as for the philosophy of history - historical events, for the philosophy of art - art and others). Hence the clear division between science and philosophy of science: the first carries out cognitive activity in special cultural and historical forms, the second acts as a philosophical reflection of this activity.

Philosophy of science in its own way answers the basic question of philosophy in its specific form: it considers the conditions, content and forms of human freedom in the field of scientific knowledge.

The reference to the scientific method is used to argue the scientific nature and special status of the analyzed relationships.

Philosophical positions that defend a simple and unique scientific method as a criterion for demarcation, arguing that the internal hierarchy of discipline (in our version - the philosophy of education) and the field of knowledge (humanitarian discourse).

The results of the comparative analysis confirmed that today it is expedient to study the specific philosophical beginnings of the concepts and problems of the philosophy of science. Based on the analysis of classical and modern approaches, the concepts of philosophy of science are formed; the necessary but indirect connection of the objectivity of human activity with the conditions of the possibility of knowledge formation is shown: the objectivity of activity determines the objectivity of knowledge and knowledge, including scientific knowledge. The system of categorical schematism allowed describing the results of the analysis of some of the most relevant concepts of philosophy of science (historical-philosophical section, ontology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology (theory of knowledge) and social philosophy) through the prism of humanitarian discourse. Development of the philosophy of science, its critique, as well as other concepts of development, considered in terms of their prospects for solving social and humanitarian problems of development.

Discourse analysis shows that interpretations of modern philosophy of science are rooted in a number of autonomous philosophical and epistemological foundations, which set certain prospects for research in the use of certain methodological resources. Among these grounds are cognitive communication, ideology, discursive practices, the dominance of a certain power, and others. In addition to the concept of sustainable development, it is recommended to consider the concept of developmental stress, the concept of environmentally oriented development, which involves both reducing excessive consumption and environmental sustainability, as well as the idea of development without economic growth in history and philosophy, ontology, anthropology, epistemology and social philosophy. A promising alternative to traditional approaches is the innovative concept of responsible development, which is based on the choice of priorities on moral and ethical motivation, a culture of dialogue and a caring attitude to nature.

The deepest problems of the philosophy of science arise in the imposition of dynamic effects in all these areas. This is most often represented as a reaction to events occurring in one or more aspects of science.

According to the aspect approach, among the actual characteristics of modern philosophy of science (historical-philosophical section, ontology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology (theory of knowledge) and social philosophy) in the context of humanitarian discourse can be distinguished:

- characteristics of the representation, structural organization, reliability and completeness (in particular, overcoming disciplined one-sidedness) of knowledge in the first of them (science as a system of knowledge);
- characteristics of the special epistemological status of science, instrumental dimension and rational goal-setting in the second aspect (science as a specific activity);
- characteristics of the social status of science and the mechanisms of its connection with the contact spheres and systems of society - in the third (science as a social institution);
- characteristics associated with the general direction of technical and technological development of society, in particular, the innovation complex, and the social consequences of these processes - in the fourth (science as a productive force);
- characteristics of the possibility of science in the spiritual development of reality - in the fifth (science as a form of social consciousness).

However, despite the fact that the current way of fragmentation of the problem field of philosophy of science from the point of

view of humanitarian discourse is informative, it, however, does not indicate the accentuated priority problem aspects.

## 5 Discussion

Reasonable acquaintance with the philosophical content, skills and attitudes can contribute to the fact that society will receive new knowledge. Recently, however, philosophy and other basic courses have lost their status in many educators' training programs – philosophy courses are often accused of not being important, unnecessarily obscured, or simply an old-fashioned decorative addition to culture. This criticism can be refuted by discussing many important issues that philosophy can bring to human development. However, some works (Couló, 2018) do not focus on the philosophical content taught, but on the way this content is explained (how it is taught). Such different approaches to teaching philosophy should be discussed so that they aim to address the problems of humanitarian discourse and suggest several ways in which a philosophy course can be geared towards becoming a more meaningful experience for acquiring knowledge.

Consideration of the methodological problem of modern scientific humanitarian discourse in Ukraine (Bolotova et al., 2020) is based on the relationship between the concepts of “Ukrainian philosophy” / “philosophy in Ukraine”. Despite the fact that the issue of “Ukrainian philosophy” / “philosophy in Ukraine” is in some way stated and resolved even at the level of philosophy textbooks, it still remains open. Regarding the search for criteria for inclusion of a certain phenomenon in Ukrainian philosophy, it should certainly be continued, taking into account the principle of correlation of a number of criteria that will assess a certain philosophical phenomenon in educational contexts and problems of humanitarian discourse (Grabovska, 2020).

The relationship between the two fields (scientific education and philosophy of education) needs to be established so that philosophy can better contribute to the improvement of the scientific program, teaching and learning. It must be acknowledged that philosophy has for some time been an area of limited and disparate interest of researchers in scientific education, but philosophy of education is little studied and remains an underdeveloped area. To help bring science education closer to the figure of educational philosophy and to theorize the historical development of science, education and philosophy of education, it is necessary to identify their common roots, interests and problems. To do this, scientists (Schulz, 2014) propose the outlines of a new philosophy of science education (as the integration of three academic fields). Such integration can suggest future directions and possible contributions to reforms (scientific literacy, educational goals, educational theory, pedagogical knowledge, science teacher and curriculum epistemology).

The interest of researchers in identifying and studying the codes of interrelation of modern philosophy of science and problems of humanitarian discourse and the lack of their final list determine the need to analyze the main approaches to interpreting the concept of “cultural code” in a number of humanities, identify their common and distinctive features. Defining the code of culture in semiotics, which considers culture as a sign system, helps to analyze some definitions of this concept and its classification in order to consider it in the context of cultural linguistics and ethnolinguistics. The multidimensionality and functional mobility of this conditional concept is determined precisely by the relationship between modern philosophy of science and the problems of humanitarian discourse, as the main characteristics of the cultural code are communicative capabilities, the ability to capture and convey meaning and values in a concentrated form (Izotova, 2021).

The current problem of understanding these connections, directly related to the development of modern society, which is the formation of humanitarian discourse in science in the XXI century, makes it clear that globalization is a catalyst for

communication processes in modern philosophy of science and problems of human discourse. Today in the humanities there is a question about the prospects for the development of globalization. In the modern era, due to the acceleration of technological progress, based on the formation of global information networks, the space for dialogue between peoples and cultures is expanding. This allows us to conclude about the increasing role and importance of the humanities in modern society. The humanities are designed to study and predict the course of general trends in society and man. The social sciences and humanities decide to find ways out of the crisis of civilization. The results are based on the principles of historicism; methods of systematic and structural-functional analysis show the development of the humanities and, under its influence, the main trends in education, are the key to further successful development of science and society (Shapovalova, 2020).

It is also necessary to focus on multidisciplinary studies of socio-technological development of the world and life as one of the main factors of contradictory course of human life processes and the emergence of the most acute problems of human existence (Dergachev, Trifankov, 2019) in the context of paradigms of modern philosophy of science and humanities. Another key concept of understanding the problem is humanitarian logistics, which allows performing response and recovery phases of the risk management cycle, and its effectiveness depends on strategies developed in the preparedness phase (Kundak et al., 2017; Storey, 2019).

## 6 Conclusion

However, not all of the above means that the philosophy of science should distance itself from the humanities, focusing on solving their internal problems. Today, the philosophy of science is experiencing the strongest influence from the now humanities, in contrast to the crisis that was associated with the emergence and spread of positivist ideas in the middle of the XIX century. This is due to their significant success in not only the field of purely scientific research, but also in efforts to form new paradigmatic foundations, the synthesis of pre-scientific, non-scientific and scientific forms of knowledge. Therefore, the search for a place in the space between the "philosophy of science and the humanities" will inevitably be associated with an in-depth analysis of the foundations of modern humanities knowledge. Moreover, the internal development of modern philosophical plots leads to the need to solve the above problems. In our opinion, the boundaries of the space of philosophical discourse are those key problems, the development of which takes place from different angles and directions and the solution of which requires a comprehensive concerted effort. Every work in the philosophy of science must be guided in detail by the concept of the fundamental determinant. The parallel development of the philosophy of science and the humanities, gradually converging, led to a junction at those points (or at those borders) that require joint efforts, joint intellectual work.

An important area of further research is the development of concepts for the development of these characteristics. The practical significance of the study was to determine the areas of application of aspects of discourse in the philosophy of science.

## Literature:

1. Grabovska, I. (2020). *Ukrainian philosophy / philosophy in Ukraine in the time of Ukrainian SSR as a problem of modern humanitarian discourse*. Almanac of Ukrainian Studies, 1(1), 5-7. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2520-2626/2020.27.10>
2. Bolotova, U. V., Bondarenko, N. G., Martynenko, M. V., Yanukyan, M. B., Kryukova L. V. (2020). *Sources and influence of modern philosophy*. Perspectives of Science and Education, 1, 62 – 67. <https://doi.org/10.29013/VII-Conf-USA-7-62-67>
3. Bardin, A., Sigachev, M. (2019). *Discourses of development: social and humanitarian aspects (Analysis and Forecasting)*. IMEMO Journal, 4, 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.20542/afij-2019-4-24-41>

4. Borodenko, O. V. (2021). *The problem of the local in philosophical tradition and in modern philosophy of culture*. Current issues of philosophy and sociology, 5, 3-7. <https://doi.org/10.32837/apfs.v0i27.911>
5. Boylan, M. (2018). *When should we use fictive narrative philosophy and when direct discourse philosophy?* Fictive Narrative Philosophy, 199-214. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429429842-8>
6. Bunge, M. (2017). *Philosophy of science: from problem to theory*. Philosophy of Science, 1, 124-227. DOI:10.4324/978131512637
7. Burbules, N.C. (2018). *Philosophy of Education*. International Handbook of Philosophy of Education, 1417-1427. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-72761-5\_98
8. Burlina, E.Ya., Bokuradze, D.S. (2020). *Humanitarian discourses of modernity: the need for the present and the future*. Social, Humanities, Biomedical Sciences, 22 (71), 58-61. <https://doi.org/10.37313/2413-9645-2020-22-71-58-61>
9. Martin, Ch. (2021). *Analytic Philosophy of Education*. A History of Western Philosophy of Education in the Contemporary Landscape, 85-106. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350074606.ch-003>
10. Couló, A. C. (2018). *Philosophy of Science in Science Teacher Education: Meeting Some of the Challenges: Historical, Philosophical, and Sociological Approaches*. Teaching Science with Context, 1, 389-404. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74036-2\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74036-2_24)
11. Dergachev, K.V., Trifankov, Y.T. (2019) *Modern Philosophy in the Context of Interdisciplinary Studies of Human and Nature*. Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies, 139, 9-11. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18553-4\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18553-4_29)
12. Fry, R. (2018). *The problem of universals in early modern philosophy*. British Journal for the History of Philosophy, 27(1), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09608788.2018.1510370>
13. Harman, G. (2020). *The only exit from modern philosophy*. Open Philosophy, 3(1), 132-146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opphil-2020-0009>
14. Hasian, Jr. M. (2021). *Critical Perspectives on Humanitarian Discourses*. Humanitarian Discourses, 1, 28-31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.151>
15. Hodson, D. (2014). *Nature of science in the science curriculum: origin, development, implications and shifting emphases*. International Handbook of Research in History, Philosophy and Science Teaching, 970-972. [https://doi.org/10.1079/978-94-007-7654-8\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1079/978-94-007-7654-8_28)
16. Iokhim A. N. *Universal rights are not for all: paradox of modern humanitarian discourse*. In: Iokhim, A. N. (2019). Universal rights are not for all: paradox of modern humanitarian discourse. Bulletin of Moscow Region State University (e-journal), 3, 1-5. DOI:10.18384/2224-0209-2019-3-963
17. Izotova, N. (2021). *Culture code in humanitarian discourse: socio-cultural aspect*. Laplage em Revista (International), 7 (2), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.24115/S2446-6220202172681p.33-41>
18. Kundak, S., Beyazit, E., Baypinar, M. B., Celik, H. M. (2017). *Discourses on Humanitarian Logistics*. Spatial Hierarchical Organization of Humanitarian Logistics (TUBITAK 1001), 2, 19-21. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325618490\\_Discourses\\_on\\_Humanitarian\\_Logistics](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325618490_Discourses_on_Humanitarian_Logistics)
19. Lepeshev, D. V. (2019). *Analysis of philosophy of education in the system of social and humanitarian sciences*. Alma Mater, 6, 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.20339/AM.06-19.035>
20. MacLeod, M. (2015). *Modernizing philosophy of science for the philosopher and student alike*. Metascience, 24(3), 3-5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11016-015-9986-z>
21. McLaughlin, T. H. (2021). *Philosophy and Educational Policy*. The Routledge Falmer Reader in Philosophy of Education, 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003209317-3>
22. Molek-Kozakowska, K. (2018). *Distance crossing and alignment in online humanitarian discourse*. Journal of Pragmatics, 124, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.11.010>
23. Molland, S. (2018). *'Humanitarianized' Development? Anti-trafficking Reconfigured*. Development and Change, 50 (9), 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12459>
24. Popov, E. (2020). *Social security in the context of public relations: the specifics of humanitarian discourse*. Humanities of

---

the south of Russia, 9(5), 108-114. <https://doi.org/10.1852/2/2227-8656.2020.5.8>

25. Sadykov, K.A., Aubakirova, Zh. T., Berestenov, Zh., Asembai, E. (2015). *The Modern Philosophy Problems*. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 185, 428-431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.356>

26. Schulz, R.M. (2014). *Philosophy of Education and Science Education: A Vital but Underdeveloped Relationship*. Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht, 39, 1259-1316. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7654-8\\_39](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7654-8_39)

27. Shapovalova, E. (2020). *Development of scientific and humanitarian discourse in the context of development trends of globalization*. Humanities and Social Sciences, 83(6), 74-84. <https://doi.org/10.18522/2070-1403-2020-83-6-74-84>

28. Storey, K. (2019). *Settler anxiety at the outposts of empire: colonial relations, humanitarian discourses, and the imperial press*. Journal of British Studies, 58(01), 246-248. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.228>

29. Tetyuev, L. I. (2019). *Reception of ethics of discourse in modern philosophy*. RUDN Journal of Philosophy, 23(2), 240-252. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2019-23-2-240-252>

**Primary Paper Section: A**

**Secondary Paper Section: AA**