



---

**UDK 111.1**

**DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.2(92).2022.103-114**

## **PHILOSOPHICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL CONTENT OF PRINCIPLES OF HIERARCHY AND EQUALITY**

**V. O. SABADUKHA\*, O. V. SABADUKHA\*\***

*The article analyzes the principles of equality and hierarchy in historical-philosophical, philosophical-anthropological aspects as well as in the context of modern problems. It was revealed that the principle of hierarchy in medieval philosophy meant the growth of person's spiritual potential, his ability to control bodily needs and was the basis for understanding the human essence and being in general. The reasons for the rejection of the principle of hierarchy during the Enlightenment and during the Great French Revolution and the establishment of the principle of equality in philosophical and social consciousness have been analyzed. Based on the principle of equality, the concept "every person is an individual" was formulated, which became the philosophical basis for the fact that the average person received priority and power in the society. It is proved that the establishment of the principle of equality is connected with the influence of the collective unconscious on the consciousness of philosophers. The absolutization of the principle of equality is the cause of the modern paradigmatic crisis. The reasons that cause intellectual and socio-psychological misunderstanding regarding the principle of hierarchy have been revealed. It is proved that the principle of hierarchy has a universal character: it explains the development of forms of movement of matter, the structure of social life, the hierarchy of human values, etc. Ignoring the principle of hierarchy in society leads to chaos and degradation. Ontological, socio-psychological, philosophical-anthropological and moral approaches to analysis of the principle of hierarchy have been distinguished. The conditions of an open and justified hierarchy have been revealed. It has been proved that a real hierarchy does not mean discrimination but, on the contrary, it is oriented towards the spiritual development of a person: bringing the passive majority to the level of the active minority. It has been proved that equality is not only equality of rights but equality of rights to participate in general activities. The problem of equality and hierarchy is removed by the principle of service which should be ontological basis of the existence. It is substantiated that the principle of hierarchy was the constitutive basis of human qualities that Plato, Dionysius the Areopagite, R. Guenon, S. Frank, and M. Sheller had realized. It is proved that the content of the principles of freedom, equality and justice depends on the interpretation of the principle of hierarchy.*

---

\* Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy), Associate Professor  
(Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)  
ukrainian\_idea@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9208-2661

\*\* Candidate of Philosophical Sciences,

Chairman of the Ukrainians association of psychosomatic therapy, Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

Ov\_sabadukha@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-7227-1278

**Keywords:** hierarchy, equality, degrees of spiritual development of a man, personality, freedom, justice.

## ФІЛОСОФСЬКИЙ, ПСИХОЛОГІЧНИЙ І СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ ЗМІСТ ПРИНЦИПІВ ІЄРАРХІЇ ТА РІВНОСТІ

В. О. Сабадуха, О. В. Сабадуха

У статті здійснено аналіз принципів рівності та ієрархії у історико-філософському, філософсько-антропологічному аспектах, а також у контексті сучасних проблем. Виявлено, що принцип ієрархії у середньовічній філософії означав наростання духовного потенціалу людини, її здатності до контролю над тілесними потребами і був підґрунтям розуміння людської сутності та буття взагалі. Проаналізовано причини відмови від принципу ієрархії в епоху Просвітництва та під час Великої французької революції і утвердження у філософській та суспільній свідомості принципу рівності. На основі принципу рівності був сформульований концепт «кожна людина – особистість», що стало філософською основою того, що посередня людина отримала пріоритет і владу в суспільстві. Доведено, що утвердження принципу рівності пов'язано з впливом колективного несвідомого на свідомість філософів. Абсолютизація принципу рівності є причиною сучасної парадигмальної кризи. Виявлено причини, які викликають інтелектуальне й соціально-психологічне непорозуміння щодо принципу ієрархії. Доведено, що принцип ієрархії має універсальний характер: пояснює розвиток форм руху матерії, структурність суспільного буття, ієрархію людських цінностей тощо. Ігнорування принципу ієрархії у суспільстві веде до хаосу й деградації. Виокремлено онтологічний, соціально-психологічний, філософсько-антропологічний та моральний підходи до аналізу принципу ієрархії. Встановлено умови відкритої й обґрунтованої ієрархії. Доведено, що справжня ієрархія не означає дискримінації, а навпаки орієнтована на духовний розвиток людини: підтягування пасивної більшості до рівня активної меншості. Доведено, що рівність – це не лише рівність прав, а рівність прав на участь у загальній діяльності. Проблему рівності та ієрархії знімає принцип служіння, який має бути онтологічною основою буття. Обґрунтовано, що принцип ієрархії був конститутивною основою людських якостей, що усвідомлювали Платон, Діонісій Ареопагіт, Р. Генон, С. Франк, М. Шелер. Доведено, що зміст принципів свободи, рівності й справедливості залежить від тлумачення принципу ієрархії.

**Ключові слова:** ієрархія, рівність, ступені духовного розвитку людини, особистість, свобода, справедливість.

### **Raising of the problem and the degree of scientific development.**

The XX century, after the conclusions of the French philosopher A. Badiou, developed under the slogan of equality [2: 122], and that is why the principle of hierarchy found itself on the margins of public and philosophical consciousness. Principle of hierarchy is often groundlessly associated with anti-humanism and that is why it frightens off philosophers because of its complication. Connection of the principle of hierarchy with human capabilities, principle of equality and social life of man has not been studied yet. The problem of hierarchy for modern philosophy appeared on other

side of its possibilities. However, ancient philosophy exactly on the basis of this principle interpreted human essence. Still Confucius, Plato, Aristotle, neoplatoniki distinguished different types of man. Medieval philosophy used this principle for the justification of the degrees of man's spiritual development: corporal, external and spiritual man. Principle of hierarchy plays an important role for the German mystics, romanticisms, German classic philosophy and F. Nietzsche [11: 161–221].

The protest against principle of hierarchy began at the age of Renaissance and Enlightenment. The principle of equality seizes

philosophical and public consciousness. In the Newest time the problem of hierarchy was the subject of the research by the known philosophers: N. Hartman, R. Guenon, M. Berdyaev, P. Tillich, S. Franc, M. of Sheller. Without regard to separate achievements, in the comprehension of the principle of hierarchy, philosophical approach of its interpretation was absent. Such situation is non-random. M. Rozov distinguishes seven problems which are on the periphery of philosophical consciousness. Four of them are closely connected with the problem of hierarchy, namely: how to connect life oriented to satisfaction and clever life; what relations of different classes and layers must be in society; what an ideal spiritual hierarchy must be; whether it is possible a combination of will and grace in human vital activity [10: 590].

**Purpose:** to formulate philosophical approach in relation to the research of the principle of hierarchy which foresees solving of such objectives: firstly, to analyze genesis of the principle of hierarchy in the history of philosophy; secondly, to prove its structural influence on understanding of the human essence; thirdly, to substantiate the necessity of the revival of the principle of spiritual hierarchy.

**Presenting the main material.** Evolution of the principle of hierarchy in ancient and medieval philosophy was partly investigated in the monograph "Metaphysics of public and personal life" (2019) [11: 110–145]. The theoretical source of this principle are reflections of Dionysius Areopagita who, on the basis of Plato's idea about purification, defined three degrees of man's spiritual development. First –

those, who purify, these are individuals who remain at corporal level of the existence (an external man). Second – purified ones who have already an experience of overcoming corporal needs. Third are saints, monks who attained the cleared purification [8: 695–697], got secret knowledge [8: 577] and got to know the truth [8: 583]. Dionysius's principle of hierarchy has ontological character and embraces both earthly and celestial life. Thomas Aquinas summarized hierarchical approach to understanding of human qualities in the utterance: "Some creations are named highest in accordance with that they are more perfect in goodness" [1: 183–184], that is, spiritually they are more perfect and that is why lower creations must obey to higher ones.

Therefore, medieval philosophers continued the tradition of ancient philosophy and proved that man's essence is hierarchical that imposed an imprint both on the vital activities of a separate man and society. The principle of hierarchy meant growth of man's spiritual potential, ability to control his corporal needs and also was the basis of medieval legitimacy that was moral and spiritual basis of claims of priests on power.

Before the Enlightenment age the principle of hierarchy played the role of methodological background of understanding a man and life but philosophers-enlighteners criticized it. Gradually this principle does not withstand a competition and at the age of Enlightenment and during the Great French revolution it becomes the embodiment of inhumane attitude toward a man. The denial of the principle of hierarchy took place on the basis of absolutizing of the principle of equality by which the concept

"everybody is a personality" was formed that became worldview-philosophical background of coming a mediocre man to power. The principle of equality did not resolve contradictions of human life but generated new ones that resulted in distribution of Marxism (absolutizing of the role of folk masses), domination of liberalism (absolutizing of freedom, formal equality). An attractiveness of the concept "everybody – personality" is defined in the following regulations: firstly, it denies difficulties of psychological perception of the principle of hierarchy and forms the illusion of equality; secondly, abolishes the demand of a man to himself, ignores morality; thirdly, it proclaims "ideals" achieving of which does not need efforts, mediocrity became an "ideal"; fourthly, it gives advantages to impertinent, ordinary and amoral persons. Due to the concept "everybody – personality" legitimation of a mediocre man took place, who on the basis of such worldview change got the right to power.

Rejection of the principle of spiritual hierarchy meant the denial of the idea of a personality as a perfect man. Philosophy, destroying hieratical approach to understanding of a man, began to develop sterile direction ("everybody is a personality"), lost priority and, on the one hand, found itself depending on natural sciences, and on the other hand – a mediocre man became the subject in philosophy. Under the pressure of this concept, humanities and society got the depersonalized direction of the development.

Principle of hierarchy is used by philosophers for explanation of ontological problems of the world order and structures of life. Still F. Engels used this principle for

classification of forms of the motion of matter: mechanical, physical, chemical, biological, social [17: 67–71]. N. Hartman continued to develop this idea. Analyzing the structure of life, he asserts that it has hierarchical character: a lower degree of life is in a matter, and the highest – in a spirit. Each of degrees has its own laws and principles [5: 322] which are autonomous enough as they have their own determination. Highest levels cannot exist without the lowest ones, while the latter are apt at independent existence. Life according to N. Hartman appears as hierarchical integrity of lowest and highest forms and it can be stored only through an equilibrium between its different structural levels. The philosopher comes to the conclusion that all present pictures of the world are erroneous both as "metaphysics from below" and "metaphysics from above" [5: 322].

On the basis of the principle of hierarchy N. Hartman comprehends the structure of human and public life. Among the combination of all values the philosopher gives priority to ethic ones. Moral values are the highest. Renunciation from them for the benefit of one's own personal interest is a moral decline [6: 293]. Principle of hierarchy partly regenerates at the beginning of the XX century when the masses, guided by a mediocre man, go out on the arena of history which results in psychological, socio-political chaos. The October revolution burst out in Russia. Watching the negative displays of domination of masses, M. Berdyaev comes to the conclusion that the fight of the chaotic beginning against hierarchical one always takes place in society [4: 483–491]. M. Berdyaev, as nobody other, realized the role of hierarchy in

constituting of society but he distinguished spiritual and social hierarchy, however he gave much priority to the spiritual one [3: 83].

In the situation of the beginning of folk masses domination some European philosophers during 20-th years of the XX century began to see the light. R. Guenon proved: firstly, hierarchy is a normal state of life and he criticizes "profane philosophy" which destroyed this principle [7: 115]; secondly, denial of hierarchy is the result of domination of unconsciousness [7: 137] of a mediocre man and materialistic worldview [7: 142]. The philosopher shares Plato's opinion and asserts: "Opinion of the majority can only be the indicator of incompetence..." [7: 140].

R. Guenon considers the principle of hierarchy as the sign of "normal order", and the content of hierarchy is the unity [7: 143]. Egalitarizm is the denial of any hierarchy, but in society there is a secret top-level hierarchy. Absence of hierarchy leads to chaos. "The way out from chaos, – the philosopher believes, – can be only one: renewal of true intellectuality and formation of the new elite." [7: 147]. It is necessary to acknowledge the urgency of these reflections. Humanity until now did not find arguments for a structural denial of simplified approach to understanding of the principle of equality.

S. Frank deduced the problem of hierarchy from the nature of society which functions as a living system due to the hierarchical beginning of dominion and submission. Hierarchical structure of society is the condition of its unity. In order the society to be integral "unity must appear as hierarchically higher sovereign authority..." [14: 119]. The philosopher examines the principle of

hierarchy as an appropriate necessity of public organization, condition of its unity, sources of which are in the principle of *service* which the philosopher considered one of beginnings of spiritual life. Personification of this principle, according to S. Frank, is spiritual aristocracy. Society, acknowledging the power of spiritual aristocracy, reproduces its values, vital principles, way of life consciously and subconsciously. Public and state establishment is always a spiritual guidance on the basis of ideas which emerge "above". "Ideas morally determined and formed proceed, as all ideas, from above downward, from spiritual tops to spiritual bottoms" [14: 121].

Watching the process of realization of the idea of distributive equality in the Soviet Russia, S. Frank realized its tragic consequences and that is why he had the right to say: "It is necessary to distribute members of society after different stages of public hierarchy in accordance with <...> their fitness and proficiency of divine human business of public establishment, and an ideal here is not the minimum but maximum of differentiation and hierarchy" [14: 122]. Therefore S. Frank develops Plato's and M. Berdyaev's views in relation to isomorphism between the structure of internal man's qualities and the structure of society. Distributing citizens after different stages of public hierarchy has to take place in accordance with their spiritual qualities.

S. Frank was concerned by the problem: if priority must belong to the principle of spiritual hierarchy, then what place must belong to equality as another principle. The philosopher substantiated another understanding of equality fundamentally. Principle of

equality is meant as equality of duties in relation to other citizens which is the result of the principle of "noblesse oblige" (position obligates) [14: 123]. Such equality is the ontological sign of life which brings and ennobles all members of society. S. Frank names such approach to equality *aristocratic* (everybody realizes himself as a free participant of common business) that leads to solidarity in society and corresponds to Christian ideas. According to philosopher's point of view equality in an ontological sense is "generality of service" [14: 124]. All have to serve on the benefit of the society equally free and that is why they have equal rights on participation in general business. Therefore, the essence of equality and spiritual hierarchy is service. Summarizing S. Frank's views, we'll mark that the problem of spiritual hierarchy and equality has been solved on the basis of service as ontological beginning of life.

S. Frank's conclusions correlate with reflections of German-American theologian and philosopher P. Tillich about public life which appears as a pyramid of "levels of life" [13: 19]. Representatives of higher levels, though they have perfect qualities, but their amount is less, and the representatives of lower levels are not such perfect but they are more in number. Hidden or opened struggle proceeds in all spheres of public life from economic to the world view between them.

M. Sheller's philosophy is permeated with the idea of hierarchy which embraces both knowledge and human qualities. Metaphysics is knowledge about methods of human life - essential knowledge. Its subject is the life of a man in the world. Another level is knowledge for the sake of man's domination above

nature [15: 7]. The philosopher also defines the hierarchy of man's spiritual functions: firstly, unselfish love of a man to the world, secondly, the ability to distinguish essence from the present life [15: 29]. In the context of our research we will notice that the principle of spiritual hierarchy shows up exactly in the ability to distinguish essence from existence.

On the basis of these functions M. Sheller carries out determinative definition of a man. "A man is an *elevated* creature and such, who is *elevated* in himself and above all life and his values <.> the creature in whom the psychical is *get rid of service* to life and ennobled, transformed into a «spirit», into that spirit, to which now and in the objective, and in the subjective psychological sense «life» serves itself" [15: 30]. Education and knowledge must work on realization of such content of human essence. The philosopher determines higher aims to which knowledge must be subordinated: firstly, to the integral development of a personality; secondly, to the development of the world; thirdly, knowledge for the sake of domination, for the sake of achievements [15: 41–42]. The philosopher notices that the western world concentrated its attention on knowledge for the sake of domination above nature that resulted in oblivion of the necessity of man's spiritual perfection.

M. Sheller considered creation of philosophical anthropology as the main philosophical objective of his modern epoch. In this context he distinguishes five basic directions of understanding of human essence: religious; homo sapiens (which set differences between a man and animals proclaiming good sense by

the constitutive principle of the world); homo faber (a man, essence of whom is determined by emotions, senses, subconscious); a man as the dead end direction of human evolution which is doomed to the extinction (Theodore Lessing) [15: 74–93]. M. Sheller rethinks these views and initiates his own concept. A man must lean on *personality's randomness*. The philosopher sees the examples of such approach in the acts of heroes and geni. "History on subsoil of this anthropology becomes itself the monumental statue of «spiritual image» of heroes and geni or, speaking out on the language of F. Nietzsche, «higher copies» of human family" [15: 96]. Therefore, personalities and geni appear in M. Sheller as embodiments of spiritual hierarchy as personifications of their own causality.

The logical result of M. Sheller's reflections are his ideas about rescue. Love of his own rescue must appear in a man that the philosopher names "*real self-love*" [16: 349]. The philosopher explains the difference between egoism and self-love. Self-love begins when a man begins to look at himself through the eyes of God, and from philosophical – from the position of universum [16: 349]. It must result in spiritual birth of man, he must hate his egoism and generate love to the world in himself. Love according to the philosopher's point of view has a *personal* content [16: 355]. "Ordo amoris is the core of the world order" [16: 352], therefore it appears to be the constitutive beginning of life.

In spite of the efforts of M. Berdyaev, M. Hartman, R. Guenon, S. Franc, M. Sheller, the idea of spiritual hierarchy in the epochs of modernism and postmodernism seems to be archaic.

A question arises: Why did not the principle of spiritual hierarchy get the logical development? We find the answer in Ye. Malaniuk – the Ukrainian philosopher: the principle of hierarchy takes a man in intellectually psychological prisoner and requires determination [9: 76]. In spite of the fact that this principle existed in ancient times and in the Middle ages as an axiom, there is an attempt to annihilate it in the modern time. It means that in every epoch it is necessary to prove it again [9: 72]. We consider that the idea of spiritual hierarchy has no alternatives and its recognition will create conditions for realization of other principles of life.

Therefore, the prominent European, Russian and Ukrainian philosophers defended the objective content of the principle of hierarchy. They realized the destructive character which was conditioned by the simplified understanding of the principle of equality under the influence of which the XX century developed. Summarizing genesis of the principle of hierarchy, we will notice that it is the focus of problems: axiological and ontological (M. Hartman), social-philosophical (M. Berdyaev, R. Guenon, S. Franc), philosophical-anthropological (M. Sheller). Therefore, the principle of spiritual hierarchy is impossible to abolish because it is the ontological condition of life.

The resulted reflections require to acknowledge the principle of spiritual hierarchy as a constitutive beginning of the human essence. Its connection with the human essence was realized by prominent philosophers. In spite of specific features of historical epochs and evolution of philosophical outlooks on a man from Confucius to contemporaneity, a number of philosophers distinguished three or

four degrees of man's spiritual development between which there is a content correlation that allowed to create metaphysical theory of a personality. During his life a man can have four degrees of the spiritual development: dependent personality, mediocre personality, mature personality and genius. Dependence on the undeveloped needs and external conditions of life is characteristic for the man of the lower degree, he remains under the influence of individual and collective unconscious. For the man of a mediocre degree of the development the characteristic feature is adaptation to the current socio-political conditions, scientific paradigms, world view looks with the purpose of receiving benefits. The individual of this degree tries to manipulate consciousness of other people, although he often surrenders oneself over to the influence of his own and collective unconscious. The essence of a mature personality consists in the fact that he is able to solve problems within the limits of current socio-political, technological, scientific paradigm, he has the clear system of moral values and lives in accordance with them in spite of everything. He does not dissociate his life from society executing any obligations. For the mature personality truth is duty, morality, blessing of other persons. The substantial feature of a genius consists in the fact that he is able to commence a new high-quality paradigm in science and public life. Vital functions of a genius can be described through the concept "self-life" as he does not need additional conditions for his existence but vice versa, he creates the world by his own way of life [11: 297–328].

Metaphysical theory of a personality is built on the unity of principles of subordination (spiritual hierarchy) and co-ordination (social legal equality). Personality denies not only the slavery system but also any class society in general, maximally resists natural existence of a man and shows his aspiration to all-general life. The offered theory of a personality combines in itself principles of hierarchy and equality and orients a man to use his mind, control the body needs, have motive to activity and strive for spiritual perfection.

The bases of public life, which underlie a new European paradigm of thought and life at present, have been depleted. Proofs: existential vacuum, growth of social-psychological chaos, anthropological global catastrophe. The only way out from a paradigmatic crisis is a change of initially life and strategy of the development. M. Rozov marked on this issue: "Any society which is in a considerable strategic crisis through exhaustion of dominant dynamic strategy and is unable to form a new dynamic strategy will be ruined [10:630]. We will notice that this conclusion has not only local but also global character. On the one hand, principles and strategies are obsolete, and on the other, – democracy transforms into populist, boor democracy. A mediocre man has learned to manipulate the masses for the sake of his own benefit.

It is necessary to acknowledge that principle of spiritual hierarchy was the basis of understanding of human essence and life. We will limit ourselves to the idea that it is related to the class structure of society, but this will be the simplified approach. Undoubtedly, the principle of



spiritual hierarchy was used by dominating classes and church for strengthening their power but the general purpose of the principle of hierarchy for all times and peoples is overcoming chaos in society.

The complexity of the problem of spiritual hierarchy consists in the fact that it generates not only cognitive dissonance between basic concepts of the epochs of modernism and postmodernism (equality, freedom, justice), but also a new number of contradictions: metaphysical (requires rethinking of mutual relations between material and spiritual), philosophical-anthropological (demands the refusal from current man's philosophical conceptions), social (induces to rethink views on social hierarchy and relations between classes and layers), psychological (demands to rethink relations between conscious and unconscious and to search the ways of submission of unconscious to conscious), legal (combination of equality and hierarchy).

From the standpoint of metaphysical theory of a personality and C. Jung's idea about collective unconscious, philosophers were influenced by collective unconscious, namely: valued judgement "everybody is a personality". A paradox consists in that in history of philosophy there is no such a work and such a philosopher who would prove that everybody is a personality by his essence. It is necessary to treat everybody as a personality which is an absolute moral law. Therefore, the reason of ignoring the principle of hierarchy by philosophers is dependence on his own and collective unconscious, the presence of unidimensional thought and domination of materialistic world view. Principle of spiritual hierarchy,

in particular, requires refusal from current world view, social-philosophical, philosophical-anthropological views.

Let's generalize different interpretations of the principle of hierarchy. The principle of hierarchy has a universal character because it represents the degree of structure of the Universe, (structure of forms of motion of matter) society, consciousness, values, activity and human psyche. The latter found its reflection in S. Freud's psycho-analytical theory: unconscious (Id), Ego, Superego and neuro-psychology: scientists distinguish structured systems of neuron networks [12]. Psychological meaningfulness of the principle of hierarchy consists in that it establishes a connection between corporal and spiritual life of man, as far as he is able to control his own corporal needs with his mind and moral law.

Let's highlight such aspects of the principle of hierarchy. *Psychological*: increasing of the conscious component of man's activity and decreasing of unconscious, overcoming the dependence from collective unconscious. *Social-philosophical*: man's ability to put under control corporal needs and act for the sake of public interest as general one which subordinates itself specific one (corporal, Ego). General in such approach appears to be a step for mastering spiritual life. The content of this approach consists in that without such understanding it is impossible to overcome general anthropological global catastrophe. *Intellectual*: finds a reflection in thought: one man thinks only with everyday words, another one – with scientific concepts, the third one – with philosophical categories, and the fourth one with characters. The scale

of thought grows from the degree to degree: from everyday problems to global ones [11: 313–315].

The resulted reflections allow to formulate the following approaches to determination of the principle of hierarchy. *Ontological*: decrease of material (socio-economic) determinants in the development of man and society and increase of spiritual ones that lead to the change of determination. At present materialistic determinism is exhausted. Orientation to spiritual one requires teleological determinism which must become the principle of life of the humanity in the conditions of the globalized world. *Metaphysical*: orients on the necessity of world view spiritual priority (mind, consciousness, self-consciousness) above material. *Social-philosophical*: priority of a personality in all spheres of public life which found the reflection in the law: "Personality is the principle of life". *Philosophical-anthropological*: personal causality as a constitutive beginning of human life. *Moral*: from group moral to the categorical imperative and also in the growth of scale of the responsibility from the everyday to global one.

Why is the principle of spiritual hierarchy causes intellectual misunderstanding, psychological, social and scientific resistance? In the conditions of the depersonalized society the principle of spiritual hierarchy got the misrepresented content, and that is why the idea of equality appears to be the "opponent" of the principle of hierarchy. The requirement of equality is objecting against misrepresented hierarchy which is realized by a mediocre man. Hierarchy must be honest (substantiated and opened) that needs a combination with the principle of equality and must be

supported with the proper intellectual and moral qualities. Let's formulate conditions of such a combination. For realization of the honest hierarchy it is necessary to fulfill certain conditions. *First*. Presence of the theory of personality which would combine in itself the principle of hierarchy and the principle of equality. Legitimation of this conception is in public consciousness. *Second*. Introduction of public and state practice "Who is who". All know everything about everybody that touches public persons. It will contribute in forming new communicative reality, priority which will belong to a personality that is possible only at presence of critical mass of personalities. *Third*. Social hierarchy must be the reflection of personal normality (legitimation of the principle of hierarchy, competitions on holding office, a collective management connected with the principle of hierarchy). *Fourth*. Growth of the level of consciousness of folk masses. The concept "every man is a personality" placed the people into the cave of unconscious existence. A man sees only visible and does not see the essence. New communicative reality and personal normality must generate teleological determination.

**Conclusions.** Principle of spiritual hierarchy is a metaphysical principle of life. All other principles of public life (equality, freedom, justice) are derivatives from the principle of hierarchy. It is clearly that the principle of hierarchy touches human qualities first of all. The real hierarchy does not mean discrimination. On the contrary, it orients to man's spiritual development, brings closer passive majority to the level of active minority. Combination of the

principle of hierarchy with the conditions for the development of  
principle of equality creates new man and society.

#### LITERATURE

1. Аквінський Т. Компендіум теології / пер. з лат. В. Котусенко, І. Піговської, А. Поляк. Київ: Ін-т реліг. наук св. Томи Аквінського, 2011. 423 с.
2. Бадью А. Століття / пер. з фр. А. Репа. Львів: Кальварія, 2014. 304 с.
3. Бердяев М. О назначении человека. Москва : Республика, 1983. 383 с.
4. Бердяев Н. А. Философия неравенства. *Философия свободы*. Москва : АСТ, 2007. С. 449–699.
5. Гартман Н. Старая и новая онтология. *Ист.-филос. Ежегодник 88*. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 320–324.
6. Гартман Н. Этика / пер. с нем. А. Б. Глаголева; под ред. Ю. С. Медведева и Д. В. Складнева. Санкт-Петербург: Владимир Даль, 2002. 707 с.
7. Генон Р. Криза сучасного світу / пер. з фр. І. Калюга; під наук. ред. Ю. Завгороднього. Київ: Видавець Анна Клокун, 2020. 212 с.
8. Дионисий. Ареопагит. Сочинения. Толкования Максима Исповедника. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2003. 864 с.
9. Маланюк Є. Ієрархія. *Український націоналізм: В 2 т. Т. 2. Антологія*. 2-е вид. / упоряд. В. Рог. Київ : Укр. вид. спілка ім. Ю. Липи, 2011. С. 69– 80.
10. Розов Н. С. Философия и теория истории. *Кн. 1. Прологомены*. Москва : Логос, 2002. 656 с.
11. Сабадуха В. О. Метафізика суспільного та особистісного буття: монографія. Івано-Франківськ: ІФНТУНГ, 2019. 647 с.
12. Соловьев О. В. О естественных предпосылках человеческой свободы и свободе как атрибуте существования «человеческого Я». *Мир психологии*. 2007. №3. С. 81–90.
13. Тиллих П. Систематическая теология. Санкт-Петербург: Унив. кн., 2000. Т. 3. 415 с.
14. Франк С. Л. Духовные основы общества. Москва: Республика, 1992. С. 13–146.
15. Шелер М. Философское мировоззрение. *Шелер М. Избранные произведения* / пер. с нем. А. В. Денежкина, А. Н. Малинкина, А. Ф. Филиппова; под ред. Денежкина А. В. Москва: Гнозис, 1994. С. 3–14.
16. Шелер М. ORDOAMORIS. *Шелер М. Избранные произведения* / пер. с нем. А. В. Денежкина, А. Н. Малинкина, А. Ф. Филиппова; под ред. Денежкина А. В. Москва: Гнозис, 1994. С. 339–377.
17. Энгельс Ф. – Марксу К. 30 мая 1873 года. *К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс. Сочинения*. Изд. 2-е. Москва : 1961. Т. 33. С. 67–71.

#### REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Akvinskyi, T. (2011). *Kompndium teolohii [Compendium of theology]*. Kyiv : In-t relih. nauksv. Tomy Akvinskoho (in Ukrainian).
2. Badiu, A. (2014). *Stolittia [Century]*. Lviv : Kalvariia (in Ukrainian).
3. Berdiaev, M. (1983). *O naznachenyyu cheloveka [About the appointment of a person]*. Moskva : Respublyka (in Russian).
4. Berdiaev, N. A. (2007). *Fylosofyia neravenstva. Fylosofyia svobody [Philosophy of inequality. Philosophy of freedom]*. Moskva : AST (in Russian).
5. Hartman, N. (1988). *Staraiia y novaia ontolohyia [Old and new ontology]*. Moskva : Nauka (in Russian).
6. Hartman, N. (2002). *Etyka [Ethics]*. Sankt-Peterburh: Vladymyr Dal (in Russian).
7. Genon, R. (2020). *Kryza suchasnoho svitu [The crisis of the modern world]*. Kyiv : Vydavets Anna Klokun (in Ukrainian).

8. Dyonysyi. (2003). Areopahyt. Sochynenyia. Tolkovanyia Maksyma Yspovednyka [Areopagite. Works. Interpretations of Maximus the Confessor]. Sankt-Peterburh: Aleteiia (in Russian).
9. Malaniuk, Ye. (2011). Hierarkhiia. Ukrainskyi natsionalizm [Hierarchy. Ukrainian nationalism]. Kyiv: Ukr. vyd. spilkaim. Yu. Lypy (in Ukrainian).
10. Rozov, N. S. (2002). Fylosofyia y teoryiaystoryy [Philosophy and theory of history]. Moskva: Lohos (in Russian).
11. Sabadukha, V. O. (2019). Metafyzyka suspilnoho ta osobystisnoho buttia [Metaphysics of Suspicious and Special Butt]: monohrafiya. Ivano-Frankivsk : IFNTUNH (in Ukrainian).
12. Solovev, O. V. (2007). O estestvennonauchnykh predposylkakh chelovecheskoi svobody y svobode kak atrybutesush chestvovanyia «chelovecheskoho Ya» [About the natural-scientific prerequisites for human freedom and freedom as an attribute of the existence of the "human self"]. Myrpsykholohyy. № 3. (in Russian).
13. Tyllykh, P. (2000). Systematycheskaia teolohyia [Systematic theology]. Sankt-Peterburh: Unyv. kn (in Russian).
14. Frank, S. L. (1992). Dukhovnye osnovy obshchestva [Spiritual foundations of society]. Moskva: Respublyka (in Russian).
15. Sheler, M. (1994). Fylosofskoe myrovozzrenye [Philosophical outlook]. Moskva: Hnozys (in Russian).
16. Sheler, M. (1994). ORDO AMORIS [ORDO AMORIS]. Moskva: Hnozys (in Russian).
17. Marks, K., Enhels, F. (1961). Sochynenyia. Enhels F. – Marksu K. 30 maia 1873 hoda [Works. Engels F. – Marx K. May 30, 1873]. Moskva (in Russian).

Receive: September 10, 2022

Accepted: October 28, 2022