

Socio-Cultural and Ideological Preconditions of Gender Equality

Sviytlana Storozhuk — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: sveta0101@ukr.net

Ihor Goian — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
(Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)

E-mail: ivi1970@mail.ru

The article examines the factors that have led to the contradiction between a legislated principle of gender equality and, broadcast from pre-modern by a number of social institutions a social differentiation by gender and discrimination generated by it, existing in modern outlook and socio-cultural life. The article shows that the concepts of natural equality of people and social consensus together with the process of secularization and desecration, developed during the modern period, transformed a social reality, but they usually do not apply to a person who is still viewed through the prism of axiological and ideological premodern paradigm. Thus, the concept of natural equality has extrapolated only to men who were considered carriers of social activity in premodern culture. It is emphasized that despite the radical changes of socio-cultural and political life of European society that occurred as a result of implementation of social modern program, a family, remaining a decentralized nucleus, was living by premodern values that gained social significance at a time when a woman acquired her social activity.

Key Words: gender equality, desecration, patriarchy, social agreement, natural equity, secularization

Introduction

Since the mid-20th century the problem of gender equality as one of the key aspects of social justice, has become the alpha and omega of civil policy of the leading European countries, and one of the major topics of intellectual discourse. Meanwhile, emphasizing the fundamental differences of people on gender grounds is manifested in a number of public institutions, forming the foundation for social and legislative provisions of differential attitude to people. This is significantly supported by the historical patriarchal stereotypes that, despite the legislative strengthening of gender equality, have been broadening through language, which clearly shows the patriarchal intention to identify man and person, which is clearly demonstrated in French (*homme*), English (*man*), Italian (*uomo*) and other languages. Against this background, the social consciousness was forming a peculiar satirical bias like the mention

© Storozhuk, Sviytlana, 2017

© Goian, Ihor, 2017

of female logic opposed to human logic, more precisely that of males, inherent to the post-Soviet countries. This prejudice and many others, historically rooted in the language against women, have become reason of their distinct discrimination in social sphere.

Historically caused social differentiation based on gender, even on the assumption of legislated gender equality both in Ukraine, and throughout the world, is becoming a foundation of social rooting of gender inequality and discrimination. As an example, we can mention that conventional gender differentiation in labor market, which is brightly manifested till now in most countries of the former Soviet Union. For example, there are professional spheres — education, medicine, nutrition sphere, sphere of culture, service sector, etc., within which there are professions mainly destined for women — teacher, educator, nurse, seamstress, etc. In social mind, each of these professions is associated with the functions which, in traditional society, are generally performed by a woman, focused on her family hearth. Instead, the functions of man since ancient times have been associated with the space outside his home, external world, and thus, the scope of his activities was defense and conquest.

Significant changes in the functional orientation of men and women did not occur after radical social and cultural transformations caused by the second wave of the civilizational changes, either. Woman, as Alvin Toffler rightly observed, still remained in the conservative and decentralized house zone while a man was focused on public life [Toffler, 2004]. It is significant, as the philosopher states, it was the time when a biased assessment of women's social role was formed, giving rise not only to ideological prejudice to her abilities, but also a clear discrimination, which was manifested in underestimation of her social status, and, hence, her wage in the professional areas where the women were in majority [Toffler, 2004]. In other words, in modern society there is a clear contradiction between legislated gender equality and real social processes, characterized by the persistence of gender disparities in almost all spheres of social life.

It is obvious, that significant changes in the vision of social potential of women did not occur in the second half of 20th century, i.e. the period when woman becomes a full political entity. This clearly demonstrates the then burst of the feminist movement, whose representatives focused on the issues a woman encountered as an equal participant in the political and social life. In this context, it is worth mentioning the work of Shulamith Firestone “The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution” (1970) [Firestone, 2015], in which the researcher, based on the philosophical legacy of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Sigmund Freud, was trying not only to highlight the causes of gender inequality, but also to show the factors that intensified feminist movement in 20th century. Equally important for defining the cause of gender inequality were the works “Sexual Politics” (1970) [Millett, 2005; Millett, 2016] by Kate Millett, “Against our Will: Men, Women and Rape” (1979) by Susan Brownmiller, [Brownmiller, 1993], “Sexual Harassment of working women: A Case of Sex Discrimination” by Catherine MacKinnon (1979) [MacKinnon, 1979] and others. In these and many other writings special emphasis was given, on the one hand, to socio-cultural and philosophical sources of existing gender inequality, and on the other — to the problems faced by women who were confirming their right to personal identity.

Activation of the feminist movement in the United States and Europe, which took place in the late 60's — early 70's of 20th century, was of utmost importance for the establishment of radically new system of Western values, which became fully apparent in the 80's. Since that time, feminism as a movement for upholding the equality between men and women has become an integral part of civic and social policy in most developed countries. Nevertheless, the issue

of gender equality cannot be considered resolved, because the movement towards establishing the egalitarian values is accompanied by a number of problems, including the leading role played by conserved gender stereotypes and overall social inequality. Significant difficulties to address gender issues are caused by the fact that not all the countries are developing along a joint ideological vector with European values, and therefore they not only develop, but also cultivate traditional gender stereotypes, considering them a basis for the “normal” functioning of society. Thus, the reviewing of philosophical and socio-cultural factors that contributed to the realization of the fact that gender equality is an important prerequisite for ensuring social equality for the sake of “justice and peace” seems quite logical [Statute of the Council of Europe, 1949].

Equality without equality

Today no one doubts the fact that gender equality comes out as one of the forms of (certain type of) social equality, which is eventually brought up to date in the intellectual discourse at a time when hierarchical social relations of pre-modern culture break down. Of course, this statement can be considered somewhat exaggerated because, how much paradoxically it sounds the philosophical preconditions of the idea of social and gender equality were embedded in the Christian world view, including a statement that all people are “servants of God” (or “Lord’s servants”).

Initiated by the Christian tradition, the concept of common equality was completely neutralized at the time of formation of the institutionalized church, which, as Hegel emphasized, was considered not only as a “religion as opposed to another religion, but at the same time, secular existence along with secular determinate being” [Hegel, 1935: 313]. It follows from this belief that the spiritual life in Christ begins in the present earthly incarnation with its arbitrariness inherent of individuals, and hence the kingdom of God had to be organized in a special way, because mere human’s knowledge of the truth is enough only for his/her voluntary rejection of ill will, but the human will has not attended to the divinity and therefore “understanding is not independent yet, but exists only in the spirit of alien authority” [Hegel, 1935: 313]. In other words, within institutionalized teaching of Christian doctrine the teaching is developing that in the earthly sinful life a human alone cannot realize his/her own freedom, and therefore the Christian community needed leaders and a secular organization through which the truth is established and joining it is provided.

Do not forget that despite the general recognition that the alpha and omega of the Christian faith is the figure and teachings of Christ, the Christian religion was forming not only on the ideas brought by Him into the European outlook, as preaching of apostles [Hegel, 1935: 310]. So, guided by the words of Christ “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God” (1 Corinthians 11:3) recorded in the first Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians, the Christian church laid the foundations of social hierarchy within which woman occupied a secondary, subordinate place. Obviously, the consolidation of patriarchal principle in the Christian worldview was stipulated by a close philosophical relationship of early Christian culture with the ancient world view, their norms having been reviewed by the then leading philosophers (Tertullian, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and others [Magomedova, 2014]) in a new way, and as a result, the image of “female” was symbolically identified with sin, which was manifested in the perverse sensuality. In other words, the devaluation of women, and particularly their subordinate status in the family and

society, was explained by the fact, that a woman was first to succumb to the temptation — she was seen as the cause of the fall.

Of course, some manifestations of intent to establish gender equality in the pre-modern era are seen in the activity of contemporary religious writers, among them the creative work of *Bl. Juliana of Norwich* being of special importance. Her creative work was rightly substantiating woman's right to interpretation of the teachings of Christ, Whom she regarded as divine essence devoid of sex determination. So, for example in the "Revelation of divine love" [Noridzhskaya, 2015], the writer says that the Lord can be interpreted through the "Fatherhood property, property of Maternity and property of Reign" [Noridzhskaya, 2015]. It is significant, that with the property of divine motherhood, the writer was associating the wisdom, whose carriers in premodern culture were men.

Single, situational attempts of women of premodern culture to justify their own right to social significance, and, consequently, gender equality, do not give any reason yet to talk about the birth of feministic ideas at that time. On the contrary, they are evidence of the fact that in premodern culture patriarchal relationships dominate, absorbing woman and closing any possibility for her social realization because of prevailing hierarchical social structures at the time. Their destruction occurs with the first seeds of secularization, as a result of which, according to Vyacheslav Blikhar religion was gradually forced out of the family, society and politics [Blikhar, 2013: 117]. A similar opinion is met in Melissa Butler's, who proves that the patriarchal worldview in 17th century exhausted itself, as in "its place a new understanding of human nature and social and political organization of society came... Sydney Tirrel and Locke — the researcher emphasizes, — explained the origin of political power by making a contract between freeborn individuals. Contract and individual choice ousted the origin and divine order as critical factors of social and political analysis. These changes have raised the issues related to social position of women in a new order" [Butler, 2005: 110].

In philosophical and socio-cultural transformations of the Art Nouveau Simone de Beauvoir also sees preconditions for establishing intentions to establish gender equality. Substantiating this view, the researcher appeals to manifestations of women's emancipation in modern European culture, manifested primarily in sexual liberties of women typical of the higher social strata, that in some cases, was giving the grounds to speak about the influence of women, especially royal favorites, in social processes. Equally good example of intention to establish gender equality may be a phenomenon of Joan of Arc, whose life and work had been of extreme importance in the history of European culture [Beauvoir].

The examples rendered by the researcher, in our view, should not be seen as the socio-cultural conditions for developing the movement for establishing gender equality. On the contrary, the given examples as none of any other evidences, clearly demonstrate the strengthening of patriarchal tendencies which in this case is manifested in the women attempting to extrapolate on themselves some specific features of masculinity.

The tendency to strengthen the patriarchal depending of woman is most fully manifested in the works of contemporary philosophers who, on the one hand, were developing the idea of a social contract to be concluded by all naturally free individuals, on the other — justifying the idea of natural inequality of women. Illustrative example in this case may be the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who argued that social contract "not only destroys the natural equality of people, but rather replaces by the equality as individuals before the law, as well, all that inequality, which the nature has brought in their physical nature; and although people may be unequal in strength or ability, they become all equal as a result of consensus and by their right"

[Rousseau, 1998]. Oddly, but on this philosophical background, the philosopher justifies the subordinate position of women, who, in line with the “secrets” given by nature to her, cannot be equal personality before the law. Therefore, Jean-Jacques Rousseau argues that women should focus on her family and the man whom she completes with her “otherness”, thereby disclosing his potential to build a just society, which is interpreted by him as an association of persons equal by nature [Rousseau, 1981]. In other words, Jean-Jacques Rousseau in relation to gender problem, remains in light of the traditional patriarchal values and therefore does not believe that a woman can be a full person and have social and political rights and freedoms equal with men [Tukachova, 2011: 1].

Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s teaching on women from patriarchal viewpoint, about the natural equality of people, is a bit later met in Immanuel Kant’s anthropology. The philosopher proves that all people should consider themselves as citizens of the world, “destined to communicate with other people, and in this dialogue through art and science, to develop their culture, civilization and morality, and that any of their animal tendencies to passively submit to the impulses of comfort and prosperity, which they call happiness, could become, through waging an active struggle against the obstacles imposed by rudeness of their nature, worthy of mankind” [Kant]. Meanwhile, the very idea of world citizenship, which consists of an equal nature of individuals considered by the German philosopher from the patriarchal position, because on the one hand, he argues that women are born with the same mental capacity as men, but on the other hand, — focuses on the fact that when men are guided by the masculine values they completely lose their feminine appeal [Kant, 1994]. In other words, the philosopher, revealing the image of “femininity”, inherent in that world view, is not trying to devalue it, but on the contrary — he focuses on the issue of “masculinization” of women in their struggle for equal rights with men, who were forced to abandon their own femininity, as a result to obtain total congeniality or relationship with men, they were lacking “nothing but beard” [Kant, 1994].

The above circumstance was stipulated by the fact that secularization, which freed humans from the divine order, turning them into equal individuals, did not usually concern a woman who, in contradiction to all philosophical and socio-cultural shifts, continued to be seen as “different” which Jean-Jacques Rousseau showed in a perfect way. Accordingly, the developed and widely popularized at that time the idea of natural equality of people usually concerned male representatives alone, which strongly patriarchal motto of the French Revolution “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” clearly showed. The content of these concepts, as well as the social program of modernism, founded in 1789, were proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen [Declaration, 1789]. For example, freedom, as the Article 4 runs, at that time was interpreted as a possibility to “do anything that does not harm any other: thus, exercising the natural rights of every individual is limited only by the boundaries that provide other members of society using the same rights”. In its turn, the equity was postulated primarily as equality of opportunities, which was recorded in Article 6, which stated that all “citizens are equal before it [the law — clarification is ours] and therefore have equal access to all posts, public positions and occupations according to their abilities and without any distinction other than those caused by their virtues and abilities” [Declaration, 1789]. Somewhat controversial, in our opinion, is the concept of “fraternity”, interpreted as strengthening the political unity, with its aim being “provision of natural and inalienable human rights” [Declaration, 1789].

Despite a substantial uncertainty of the “fraternity” concept, it was it through which the patriarchal nature of modern society and its inherent gender inequality were demonstrated. Of course, our assumptions may seem somewhat contradictory, because at that time in

philosophical thought, the idea of equality between men and women was repeatedly stated. For instance, even during the birth of the modern world, François Poullain de la Barre in his famous treatise “On gender equality” (1673), argued for giving women equal rights with men, and social opportunities. The above requirement was lined up against the background of the concept, prevailing at that time, of natural human equality, which men and women are equally sharing. Moreover, the idea of gender equality was manifested in the works of English pamphlet writer of 17th century Mary Astell, who, responding to demographic changes in that period and, first of all, to “surplus number of women” in society, raised the issue that patriarchal social life was depriving unmarried women the opportunities to provide decent life for themselves. This, in its turn, was opening up the opportunity to question the legitimacy of patriarchal relations both in the state and family life [Kharitonova, 2013].

Situational, usually chronologically and conceptually disparate attempts to fight for gender equality, in our view, in the period of modernism, did not receive significant publicity. Calls for equality and freedom did not extend to women whose social status did not change significantly. Moreover, the women most likely were not usually aware of their secondary, subordinate position that was clearly demonstrated by the attempt of Olympe de Gouges to awaken the consciousness of women in the “Declaration of the rights of women and the citizen”: “Woman, wake up! — She writes — Alarm of reason is spreading throughout the Universe; present your rights. The powerful kingdom of nature is not limited any more to prejudices, fanaticism, superstition and lies. The flame of Truth has dispelled the darkness of madness and usurpation” [Declaration, 1791].

Calls of Olympe de Gouges are a significant evidence that in some social circles in the minds of women, there was awareness of their humiliating position. Meanwhile, the originality of the writer’s rhetoric gives reason to believe that the majority of contemporary women considered their status natural and, therefore, did not ask questions about its change or radical transformation. Our assumption is quite in unison with the comments by Mary Wollstonecraft, who, studying the then reality, emphasized that most women still remained silly and superficial (“spaniels” and “toys”), but not because of an innate lack of intelligence, but rather because men closed them access to education. The writer notes that woman since her childhood absorbed the idea that “beauty is woman’s scepter, mind adapts to body and wandering around her gilded cage, she only seeks to decorate her jail”. Meanwhile, the researcher continues her thought, that if from an early age woman’s attention had not been drawn to the problem of external beauty and gloss, she would have achieved much better results [Wollstonecraft, 1792]. As we can see the recognition of secondary, subordinate and disempowered position of women as natural was due to the peculiarity of female education, which usually was focused on marriage in which woman had every reason to develop her own potential.

Perhaps, it is educational peculiarity oriented on reproductive function and the subordinate position of women that results in the fact that women remained very passive participants in the political, social and cultural transformations that occurred in the 19th century. The growth of social activity jointly with a gradual democratization of social relations is accompanied by the dominance of patriarchal values in family life. The long-lasting uncertainty in priorities of legitimizing political power contributed to their rooting, along with poor female education. In particular, after the national unrest, Europe of that time, as rightly Dieter Langewiesche observed “split into two major camps, grouped around two poles in the debate on the shape of the nation future. Demarcation line was clearly and unambiguously made between those seeking to arrange the state on the principles of sovereignty, and those willing to keep it on

the basis of monarchical legitimacy” [Langewiesche, 2008: 187]. This fact was important for keeping the principle of patriarchy that in the countries, where the monarchical principle was preserved, was extrapolated to all aspects of life. On the other hand, it was that time, when the second wave of civilizational changes, thoroughly analyzed by Alvin Toffler, was clearly manifested, as well as a sexual split, generated by it, which led to strengthening inequality between representatives of different sexes and forming, at the same time, ideological and social foundations for discrimination against women [Toffler, 2004].

Saving patriarchal values in family life of the European society, on the one hand, and the fundamental political, social and economic transformation, on the other hand, were playing an outstanding role in the formation of the new basic values of secular Europe. Democracy, social justice, political and legal equality of people and legal support of their natural rights [Langewiesche, 2008, 187] were gradually attracted to political programs and became the key standards of the social life. Paradoxically, but none of the principles mentioned apply to women who still remain in the patriarchal subordination, its economic basis being gradually undermined by an explosive growth of industrial development and the involvement of women’s work in social production.

In Olga Kharitonova’s mind, the involvement of women’s work in social production was of great importance for the development of civic consciousness, because now women were the original social group with their own economic and social interests that by all means undermined the traditional hierarchy of genders. Of course, the above changes resulted in a clear sexual antagonism, as women being forced to work in manufacturing, were entering the space of the competitive fight, which has generated discrimination and sexism, repeatedly mentioned by us. In addition, mass women’s work has led to over-exploitation of woman, because she still continued to perform her duties of mother, wife and hostess. However, the researcher notes, the working days remained long, and wages of women were significantly lower than of men who did the same work at the same enterprise. In addition, women were not allowed to join any trade unions that undoubtedly generated considerable resentment and formed the foundation for creating women’s organizations that defend the interests and rights of women [Kharitonova, 2013].

Despite the discontent and protests that resulted in a wave of feminist movement that shook the European society at the turn of 19th-20th centuries, yet there is no evidence to suggest that at that time there was a radical transformation of social relations. The latter were still adorned with patriarchal character, its level significantly increasing as a result of transferring the relational roles into the sphere of social production. As a result, the representatives of early feminism begin to struggle not only for equality between women and men but are seeking permission to spread the features of “masculinity” onto biological woman, thereby further developing the patriarchal values. Thus, there are reasons to believe that the modern does not undermine patriarchal character, but deepens it, turning it into a kind of ideal that is implemented at all levels of social and cultural life. It is significant, that this process proceeds in unity with a common ideological intention aimed at a kind of “dying” femininity.

Collision in the ideals

Saving and even a peculiar consolidation of patriarchy in social life of the Modern era, at first glance, was part of a specific contradiction with the concept of natural human equality, social contract and the overall democratization of public life, postulated at that time. Moreover,

patriarchal principles and the intention, launched at that time, to discriminate femininity, contradicted the general direction of the social project of modernism — liberation of person from external coercion to divinity defined in advance through the desecration of the world. In other words, modern as a paradigm of social dimension manifested itself as a destructive program that was destroying the social and cultural values and philosophical outlook of the pre-modern epoch. The above feature was first manifested in the works of the philosophers of the Renaissance, which reinterpret Christian doctrine of creation, giving people a new social significance. For example, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola in his speech “On human dignity” interprets the Christian doctrine of creation as follows: “We do not give you, Adam, either particular place or your own image, or special duty, that the place, and image and duty you could have at your own request, according to your will and decision... I am putting you in the center of the world, so that from here you could easily observe everything that is in the world. I made you neither heavenly, nor earthly, neither mortal nor immortal, so that you yourself, free and glorious master, could shape yourself...” [Mirandola].

As you can see, already during the birth of a new world the attempt to rethink the place and rights in the world was clearly manifested. Meanwhile, at that time, according to the observations of the Italian philosopher, a strong ideological link with Christian doctrine, which was reconsidered without rejection of patriarchal rhetoric, was still manifested. Speaking of changing social destiny of a human being, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola emphasizes that the right to choose one’s place in the world had been given to Adam, while Eve, and with her the entire female part of society remained in the space of predetermined social roles.

Let us note that a radical rethinking of the role of women in socio-cultural and political existence of the modern society did not happen later, either. The movement to secularization, launched by the Renaissance worldview, and thus desecration of social life got its conceptual shaping, on the one hand, in the deism of Rene Descartes and Isaac Newton, and, on the other — through the development of concepts of natural human equality and social consensus that were grounded under various worldview positions, by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Charles Montesquieu, Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Their ideas and teachings were of great ideological significance for destroying the faith in the divine anointing of the monarchy, inherent in the premodern paradigm, and laid the foundations for the development of a democratic society in which all people, who could be called Adam in general, had to receive equal rights and opportunities to realize their social and political rights. In other words, the modern sought to create a new, just society, in which the natural rights and basic freedoms of every person would be implemented, but for woman, meanwhile, the door to a new society remained closed.

Paradoxically, but the people’s natural equality concept not only led to a change in women’s social status, but rather contributed to strengthening patriarchal tendencies and the emergence of gender discrimination. Significantly, the latter was fully manifested at the time when modernist social program was fully implemented. So, following the logic of historical and philosophical development and observations of Martin Heidegger, we have every reason to believe that desecration of the world took place at a time when the European society realized the “death of the Christian God”, Whose general idea and image simultaneously serve to indicate the “transcendental” in general and its various interpretations, for “ideals” and “norms”, for “principles” and “rules”, for “purposes” and “values”, established “over” the existent to provide the existing the overall goal, order and — a kind of “meaning” [Heidegger]. In other words, Friedrich Nietzsche, proclaiming his famous thesis: “God is dead! God won’t

rise from the dead! And we have killed Him! How will we console ourselves, killers of killers!” [Nietzsche] states the depreciation of premodern values, as he regards the fact that already happened. Indeed, his writings do not contain the intention of impairing religion, inherent in Ludwig Feuerbach or Karl Marx; he clearly states that the premodern values are debunked.

The validity of Friedrich Nietzsche’s findings is undoubted, because it was a period of his life and creative process that accounted for the origin of new ideals of secular Europe [Langewiesche, 2008: 184]. Its core values are democracy, social justice, political and legal equality of all people. In other words, the modern program was aimed at transforming social life, its desecration having led to the establishment of equal rights for those who could acquire the status of “persona” in the premodern society. In turn, the woman in premodern society was actualized through a man whose name she was having (as an example, we can mention the tradition, inherent of some countries, to identify a woman through belonging to a man — Mrs. Robert Smith), and therefore was deprived of any social significance. Accordingly, the social transformations that have occurred in modern society as a result of desecration of society, could not relate to women, since changing her social role demanded not only the destruction of the social system, but also new approaches to the interpretation of the individual. Thus, analyzing the social changes occurring in European society, Friedrich Nietzsche notes, “I do not like people. Human is too imperfect for me. Love for human would kill me” [Nietzsche, 1990]. It is from here that the idea of the advent of Superman, who will considerably surpass human potential, derives its ideological roots.

Friedrich Nietzsche deprives the image of Superman of any meaningful intention to achieve gender equality, as the philosopher quite in the spirit of his time believed that a woman is not capable of human behavior, the woman, according to him, can be compared with a cat, a bird, or “at best, with a cow...” [Nietzsche, 1990]. Meanwhile, intention to reassess values, initiated by him, gives every reason to believe that Friedrich Nietzsche believes that in the future a woman would become an individual, and eventually her actions will “get focused not on the serenity of the moment, but on the long-lasting well-being” and her behavior will demonstrate “free rule of reason”, through which she would start “acting on the principle of honor” and will start “living and acting as a collective individual” [Nietzsche, 1878]. That is, at the moment of “God’s death” transformation of a woman in an individual is nothing more but a would-be project, while the reality directs her on the closed space of her house, which, as Alvin Toffler rightly observes in the epoch of modern “remained a decentralized nucleus, where she was engaged in biological reproduction, education of children and passing the cultural values” [Toffler, 2004]. In other words, reevaluation of social life has not led to that of the social purpose of a woman who, despite his social activity, is being identified, first of all, with her fitness to reproductive function.

Conclusions

Despite the changes that took place in the economic and socio-cultural life in the era of modern, the ideological foundation for strengthening gender equality formed at that time, but social changes did not occur. The modern era not only denies, but deepens the patriarchal principles as well, turning it into a kind of ideal that is embodied in life through discrimination of femininity, and, hence, the acquiring the status of human by a woman is accompanied by extrapolation of the masculinity features on her. The above feature was due to the fact that desecration as the main philosophical program of the modernism paradigm concerned only

society, and, therefore, the idea of natural human equality extended only to men who were the carriers of social activity in the culture of the premodern.

References

- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex. Volume 1: Facts and Myths*. http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Psihol/Bovuar/07.php
- Blikhar, Vyacheslav, *Church-state relations as explication of dichotomy of power and society in European philosophy*, Lviv : LvSUUA, 2013.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, New York: Ballantine Books; Reprinted edition, 1993.
- Butler, Melissa A. *Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy*. (Feminist criticism and revision of the history of political philosophy), Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2005: 110–136.
- Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen (*author Olympe de Gouges*) (1791). <http://megasite.in.ua/118088-deklaraciya-prav-zhinki-i-gromadyanki.html>
- Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York, Verso Books.
- Friedrich Nietzsche. *Human, all too Human*, 1878. <http://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=41879>
- Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Gay Science*. <http://www.nietzsche.ru/works/main-works/svasian/?curPos=1>
- Friedrich Nietzsche. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. 1990. <http://www.psylib.org.ua/books/nitzf01/index.htm>
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History* (Works in 14 volumes), V. 8., Moscow, Leningrad, Sotsekgiz, 1935.
- Heidegger, Martin. *European Nihilism*. http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/Heidegg/EvrNig_02.php
- Kant, Immanuel. *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*. <http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000507/>
- Kant, Immanuel. *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime* (Works in six volumes), 1994. V. 2. http://krotov.info/library/11_k/an/t_2_125.htm
- Kharitonova, Olgerta. *The first wave of feminism*. 2013. <http://womention.org/first-wave-of-feminism/>
- Langewiesche, Dieter. *Nation, nationalism, nation state in Germany and Europe*. Kyiv: K.I.S., 2008.
- MacKinnon Catharine A. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*, Yale University Press, 1979.
- Magomedova, Nataliya. *From Atheism to Truth. My Way*, 2014. <https://www.litres.ru/static/trials/22/48/52/22485291.a6.pdf>
- Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Millett, Kate. *Theory of Sexual Politics* // Cudd, Ann E.; Andreasen, Robin O., *Feminist theory: a philosophical anthology*. Oxford, Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2005: 37–59.

- Mirandola, Pico G. *Oration on the Dignity of Man*. http://psylib.org.ua/books/_pikodel.htm
- Noridzhskaya, Yuliana (bl.). *Bl. Juliana of Norwich. Revelations of Divine Love* (fragment). 2015. <http://xn--80aqecdrilg.xn--p1ai/otkroveniya-bozhestvennoy-lyubvi/>
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Reflections on the Pedagogy*. http://korolev.msk.ru/books/TOR/doc/Novaya_Russo_Emil.txt
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*. 1998. http://lib.ru/FILOSOF/RUSSO/prawo.txt_with-big-pictures.html#18
- Statute of the Council of Europe*. London, May 5, 1949. http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/994_001
- The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen* (adopted by the Deputies of the States-General on August 24, 1789). <http://www.agitclub.ru/museum/revolution1/1789/declaration.htm>
- Toffler, Alvin. *The Third Wave*, 2004. http://royallib.com/read/toffler_elvin/tretya_volna.html#246738
- Tukachova, Yuliia Sergeevna. *Historical and philosophical interpretation of gender. Society: Philosophy, History, Culture*, 2011: 1-2.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/wollstonecraft1792.pdf>