Dialogue as an Educational Principle in the "Philosophy of History" Course to Overcome Conflicts of Historical Memory in the Context of Ukraine's Humanitarian Security

Olena Aleksandrova (ORCID 0000-0003-0030-1367)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

Yurii Omelchenko (ORCID 0000-0001-8502-6573)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

The article examines the essence of dialogue and its potential application for mitigating and/or overcoming conflicts of historical memory. Recognizing education as the foundation for social cohesion in Ukraine, the practical dimension demonstrates how Philosophy of History can be taught through dialogue and applied as a principle of social unity in addressing complex issues of historical memory and overcoming historical traumas. Such dialogue should entail: prior rational processing of historical memory content; mechanisms for overcoming opposing viewpoints; the establishment of a communicative space for discussing historical memory; re-evaluation of one's own "Self" and the critical analysis of personal views and beliefs, as well as one's historical memory; concessions and self-restraint in the perception of differing positions among communication participants; and the creation of consensus through the re-evaluation of alternative perspectives on historical events. Conflicts of historical memory unfold across various dimensions and can be classified as: interstate; intrastate; between different social groups; and between specific social groups and the academic community. In the context of ensuring humanitarian security in Ukraine and addressing conflicts of historical memory, it is important to consider that after the war, three primary variants of social dialogue are likely to be observed within Ukrainian society: consensus as voluntary favorable attitude towards realities; inclusion as the opportunity for free expression of opinions; and participation as the realization of one's own ideas by interested social actors. The dominant variant form of dialogue regarding historical memory will depend on the monopoly of the current power structure, the strength of civil society, and the specifics of the social dialogue between them.

Introduction

Questions of historical memory have always been highly sensitive, as they can both unite and divide entire generations, nations, and states. The issue of overcoming conflicts of historical memory has acquired particular relevance in the context of the Russia-Ukraine war. Different generations within society hold varying perspectives on certain historical events. Even from the gender perspective, one can observe different opinions on some historical events and contrasting views on Ukrainian culture and history as a whole.

Based on this, several questions arise: how to ensure effective communication among diverse social groups and generations in the post-war reconstruction of Ukrainian society? How will effective/ineffective communication within Ukrainian society regarding issues of historical memory impact the country's humanitarian security? What factors can unite contemporary Ukrainian society against the backdrop of wars of historical memory? While it is impossible to answer all these questions within the scope of a single article, it is important to highlight their significance and to make an initial search for those factors that can help overcome social contradictions and conflicts.

In the context of the country's humanitarian security, education serves as the foundation that can ensure the "gluing" of cracks in contemporary Ukrainian society caused by the war (including forced refugees, internally discpaced persons (IDPs), servicemen of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, and those on the home front, etc.). Furthermore, a key component of the modern education of historians and philosophers is the *Philosophy of History* course, which explores various dialogical strategies to overcome social contradictions and conflicts of historical memory in contemporary Ukrainian society.

Literature review

This study consists of two components: clarifying the essence of dialogue and its features in modern society, and specifying the nature of conflicts of historical memory. The methodological basis for understanding the essence of dialogue was drawn from the classical works of M. Buber (*1970*), who conceptualized dialogue as crystallizing in the situation of "Between" – a space of "among someone." equivalence of "I" and "Thou," "I" and "Other" being, for E. Levinas "I" and "Thou" are not equivalent. "Thou" is an instance of obligation and responsibility. "The encounter with the Other is immediate responsibility for Him" (*Levinas, 1999: 119*) Levinas, in contrast, offered a more ethical perspective, emphasizing the asymmetry of dialogue, where the "Other" represents an instance of obligation and responsibility. According to Levinas (1999), "the encounter with the Other is immediate responsibility for Him" (*Levinas, 1999: 119*). Unlike Buber, who insisted on the equivalence of "I" and "Thou" in dialogue, Levinas posited that the "Thou" carries greater ethical weight. To define the features of intersubjective and intrasubjective dialogue, this study also draws on the works of K.-O. Apel (*2009*), H.-G. Gadamer (*1996*), R. Rorty (*1989*), J.-F. Lyotard (*1979*), and M. Foucault (*2003*).

Regarding the analysis of conflicts of historical memories, the works of A. Kyrydon (*2013a, 2013b, 2016*) are undoubtedly significant. Additionally, the monograph summarizing the all-Ukrainian project on the culture of reconciliation (2014-2015), for which the first author of this study was a Kyiv partner, Culture of Reconciliation: New Historical Consciousness in Ukraine, offers important insights (*Dovgopolova, 2015*).

On the topic of memory politics, the edited volume by G. Grinchenko & E. Narvselius (eds.) (*2018*) and the monograph edited by H. Mylonas & S. Radnitz (*2022*), which explores the specifics of politics concerning internal enemies in various countries, should be highlighted. In the context of teaching the Philosophy of History, the analysis of the Soviet era, Ukraine's independence, the Orange Revolution, the Revolution of Dignity, the conflict in Eastern Ukraine, and the Russian-Ukrainian war is crucial. The scholarly works of Mark Andryczyk (*2023*), Marci Shore (*2024*), Serhii Plokhy (*2016*; *2023*), Yaroslav Hrytsak (*2024*), and Timothy Snyder (*2015*) serve as a starting point for a deeper analysis of the evolving perceptions of memory conflicts in Ukrainian society.

The **aim of the study** is to deepen the understanding of the essence of dialogue as a factor in overcoming conflicts of historical memory and avoiding social contradictions to ensure the humanitarian security of Ukrainian society.

Research objectives: 1) to examine the essence of dialogue as a factor in overcoming conflicts of historical memory; 2) to analyze the specifics of implementing a dialogical approach in the educational process as a socio-cultural mechanism for transmitting historical memory and ensuring the security of social development.

Research Methodology

The focus on issues of historical memory is driven by the spread of postmodern methodology in the analysis of historical processes. This approach has revealed the possibilities inherent in the fundamental and universal function of memory as a means of forming identity and life orientation, "through which the study of historical memory has gone beyond the boundaries of historical science", (*Complex Issues, 2019: 9*), i.e., acquiring an interdisciplinary character. This interdisciplinarity broadens methodological approaches and sources, as in the learning process there is an opportunity to turn to the history of philosophy as the history of ideas, social philosophy, political philosophy, and historiography. Additionally, contemporary tools, such as the analysis of manipulative practices in the field of historical memory through modern social networks, can be incorporated.

At the same time, teaching of any history courses in the context of the country's humanitarian security, including the *Philosophy of History* course, requires addressing the conflicts of historical memory. This process involves a form of "therapy" that promotes philosophical reflection on historical processes, both as the past and as historical reality. To address these complex tasks, dialogue should serve as the core principle – specifically, as a deep interaction between participants aimed at achieving consensus and compromise.

Results and Discussion

In the course of this research, dialogue is identified as the most effective strategy for overcoming conflicts of historical memory. This dialogical approach should involve the following components:

- Prior rational processing of the content of historical memory. Rational dialogue encourages critical thinking and becomes a promising method for resolving long-standing disputes between actors of conflict of historical memory;

- Dialogue includes mechanisms for overcoming opposing viewpoints based on tolerance, respect, and recognition of the "Other";

- The essence of dialogue is the establishment of a space for communication regarding the content of historical memory;

- In the process of dialogue, one's own "Self" is rethought, which is based not only on understanding the "Other" but also on critical analysis of one's own views and beliefs, as well as one's historical memory. This process promotes the formation of respect for the diversity of historical memory;

- Dialogue is the cooperation of all participants in the communication process to establish ways for mutual understanding and the search for common solutions to complex issues of historical memory. Achieving this requires concessions from all sides and a degree of self-restraint in how participants perceive opposing positions;

- Through dialogue, its participants create a language of consensus, abandoning subjective assessments of the past in favor of reinterpreting alternative perspectives on historical events.

The authors of the collective monograph *Complex Issues of Historical Memory in the Paradigm of Dialogicality of Cultures* distinguish two models of dialogue – cooperative and conflictual (*Complex Issues, 2019: 51*). Cooperative dialogue, also referred to as dialogue-collaboration, creates the preconditions for the formation of a new discourse under the condition of adhering to certain requirements: mutual consideration of interests and the desire of participants to achieve a common goal; equality – the right to one's own opinion and respect for it; discussion nature – communication should take place in a discussion format, where everyone can freely express their point of view and argue it; shared means of communication – participants should use language and terminology understandable to all; competence of participants.

Dialogue as a Teaching Principle in the "Philosophy of History" Course …
Діалог як принцип викладання курсу «Філософія історії»….

71

The conflict model, also referred to as dialogue-confrontation, makes productive dialogue impossible. The dialogical situation in conflict mode was once described by V. Tabachkovsky as: a) "inability to consider one's own prejudgment"; b) misunderstanding of the other (often – hidden by the illusion of understanding); c) conflict between one's own and the other's; d) conflictual dialogue, and as a result, e) its conflict-situational consensus and the corresponding tolerance. (Tabachkovsky, 2001: 21).

However, in certain cases, such a model can be temporarily justified. Specifically, during the period of martial law in Ukraine, the mechanisms of state memory policy are intensified. Some of these mechanisms can provoke internal conflicts between individual historical memory and official ideology-memory, and over time lead to the formation of oppositional counter-memory. Therefore, the ideological monopolism and monologism of the state in memory politics should not be prolonged, as the absence of dialogism will only intensify conflicts of historical memory. Furthermore, the free exchange of information in network society fosters freedom of self-expression within both local and broader communities, while the increasing influence of social networks in shaping or altering historical memory directly challenges the monopolistic control of modern states.

Dialogicality unfolds at several levels: ontological, existential, cultural, and institutional. (*Aleksandrova, 2009: 98-103*). In the process of dialogue, there are no enemies, only opponents. Opponents, in turn, can evoke a sense of reliability in the participants of the dialogue, which subsequently breeds trust. It is trust, born from the reliability of the parties, that is a necessary condition for dialogue.

In his work *Trust and Power*, N. Luhmann argues that trust is a necessary condition for social development, addressing the growing uncertainty people face about the future due to the increasing complexity and opacity of modern societies. (*Luhman, 1979: 48*). The phenomenon of trust, as O. Kozhemyakina (*2017: 20*) explains, arises in the context of relationships with related categories such as faith, credibility, responsibility, authority, solidarity, justice, and the common good. Conversely, it also manifests in opposition to concepts such as suspicion, distrust, social destruction, resentment, and cynicism. The issue of trust, and consequently social dialogue—particularly on complex matters such as historical memory—is exacerbated by the rising social risks and increasing societal differentiation, a trend that is clearly evident in contemporary Ukrainian society. Moreover, social uncertainty in general is a characteristic feature of modern Ukrainian society (*Yereskova et al., 2020*). This environment prevents any single entity from claiming a monopoly on truth. Instead, dialogue necessitates the recognition of diverse perspectives. Its ultimate goal should be the unification of society around shared values that do not provoke confrontational rejection. Implementing such a dialogical approach is particularly significant in the educational process, which serves as one of the most important socio-cultural mechanisms for transmitting historical memory.

Historical memory is primarily shaped during history lessons in schools and, at the university level, through courses in the social sciences and humanities. This occurs via textbooks, curricula, lecture courses, source materials as well as through the commemoration of prominent historical figures, anniversaries, and scientific conferences dedicated to significant events or individuals. Scholars such as Volyaniuk, Mykhailova, and Dichek emphasize the importance of personification as a strategy in memory politics, arguing that the personalization of historical events through figures and narratives makes memory politics more relatable and accessible to students (*Dichek, 2023: 136*).

However, this approach also has its critics. In the educational process, especially in schools, the state's official memory policy is predominantly implemented, which often avoids or deliberately bypasses complex issues of historical memory. It is positive when a lively, rather than a rigid, dialogue takes place during scientific and practical conferences or in classes of the *Philosophy of History* course. Otherwise, education risks falling into the trap of canonizing and dogmatizing the official interpretation of history. This process transforms it into an ideology-based memory embedded within educational programs, often eliciting controversial responses.

In the process of implementing memory policy in the educational process, it is necessary to adhere to the golden mean, applying dialogicality so as not to strengthen counter-memory. A strong point of the latter is its direct connection with the individual fate of the narrator, their family, religious community, settlement, etc. Counter-memory will provoke conflicts of historical memories, as its bearers will face a lack of understanding of their experience as the experience of the "Other."

Furthermore, historical memory acts as the background of the educational process itself. The way and order in which curricula are formed, the manner in which certain material is taught, depends on the prior experience of the community in which the learning takes place, and on the course of history itself. The *Philosophy of History* course, therefore, should not be taught as a static subject. Instead, deep assimilation of knowledge requires continuous dialogue between the teacher and students, as well as the contextualization of historiosophical concepts in relation to contemporary events.

Another critical aspect that cannot be overlooked is the influence of geographical and social factors on the educational process. This includes the location of educational institutions, the territorial concentration or dispersion of the student community, and the educational mobility of students. Education becomes an influential tool for transmitting historical memory if the version of memory transmitted by the educational institution reflects the lived experience of the community. Otherwise, when the educational process imposes a version of history that contradicts family and local memory narratives, and when there is no dialogue fostering a consensus of memories, education ceases to be an effective tool. Instead, it risks alienating students and promoting the forgetting, rather than the preservation, of the externally imposed model of historical memory.

As A. Naichuk and S. Hanaba observe, "the search for the meaning of history is dialogical: it presupposes an endless polemic with various ways of its vision by people who lived in the past and currently exist in different socio-cultural situations and interpret historical experience differently" (*Naichuk, 2020: 100*). Different interpretations cause conflicts of historical memories (or often "memory wars" or "memorial wars"). The specifics of this phenomenon were aptly defined by the Dutch scholar J. van der Steen: "The term 'memory war'... refers to conflicts that are not, in themselves, conflicts about the past, but in which, nevertheless, the past is invoked to support arguments in the present" (*Van der Steen, 2013: 46*).

In essence, conflicts of historical memories go beyond mere academic debates about different visions of the past.

Instead, they are often used as instruments of manipulation, aimed at securing political "victory" over an "enemy" or at glorifying a particular national historical narrative. The target of such manipulation is the issue of historical memory, particularly those aspects where there is no societal consensus or where such consensus is fragile.

Conflicts of historical memory are common in Eastern Europe, where states—after gaining independence or being liberated from Soviet occupation—have constructed historical narratives that prioritize a national "historical truth." Such constructs allow certain political forces to speculate on complex issues of shared history. A striking example is the long-standing discussion between Ukraine and Poland regarding the commemoration of the victims of the Volhynia tragedy of 1943-44. This conflict stems from divergent interpretations by Ukrainian and Polish historians regarding the causes of the event. As a result, the tragedy is viewed through competing lenses: either as mutual ethnic cleansing or as an atrocity solely attributed to the Ukrainian population of the region. The term "frozen" can be applied to the mentioned conflict. A constant dialogue is being conducted around it between scholars and politicians of Ukraine and Poland, but it periodically shifts from dialogicality to monologicality of one of the sides. This type of conflict can be attributed to the level of interstate discussions regarding the interpretation of the common past. To further explore the complexities of historical memory conflicts, this study adopts the classification proposed by German scholar S. Popp (*2012: 147*), which identifies several levels of memory-related conflicts.

Another dimension of historical memory conflict is the internal conflict within a society's own historical narratives. Such conflicts arise in all societies, particularly around the dilemma of defining "who is a hero and who is a criminal in history." For example, in Ukraine, divergent interpretations of World War II history have persisted for decades. While such conflicts can be addressed through dialogue between historians, politicians, and public figures, even the achievement of consensus does not necessarily resolve disputes. Debates over commemoration and historical forgetting often persist. Thus, in Ukraine, before the full-scale Russian invasion, the issues of decommunization, in particular, the renaming of settlements and streets, remained controversial.

It will probably be impossible to avoid conflicts of historical memories between different social groups even after the end of hostilities. Therefore, it is important to talk about the need to minimize the destructive consequences of such a conflict for Ukrainian society, as the viability of society is largely determined by the ability of social groups to adequately respond to social changes. In such cases, the only adequate response is dialogue based on trust, but it should be taken into account that it takes different forms. The dominant form within a society determines the nature, dynamics, and direction of social interaction.

After the war, ***three main variations of social dialogue*** are likely to be observed in Ukrainian society: ***consensus*** (voluntary and favorable acceptance of the new realities); ***inclusion*** (the possibility of freely expressing opinions, which, however, will largely be perceived as part of the "social background"); and ***participation*** (the implementation of one's own ideas by engaged social actors). (*Aleksandrova, 2023*).

The specificity of ***consensus*** lies in the fact that in certain socially oriented processes, members of society actively, albeit unconsciously, act in accordance with the interests of others, sacrificing themselves in the realization of their own interests based on the principle of "my problems are nothing compared to the problems of other social groups." This form of social dialogue contributes to the minimization of social tension.

Minimization can occur in various ways. For example, certain groups may be relegated to "disenfranchised" from expressing themselves on socially important issues. This method has a negative side – consensus is based on the so-called "spiral of silence" (a term introduced by *Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, 1974*). According to this theory, most individuals tend to avoid social isolation. Consequently, when they perceive their views to diverge from the majority, they typically refrain from expressing their opinions publicly.

As a result, when some groups dominate public discourse while others remain silent, a spiral-like process of marginalization occurs. This can lead to the monopolization of historical memory by a single perspective. To avoid such manipulative practices, Ukraine must ensure that all perspectives are heard, even if they represent a minority view. The activation of the "spiral of silence" around sensitive historical issues could threaten social harmony.

The specificity of inclusion as a form of social dialogue suggests that social communities affected by certain events should be provided with the opportunity to openly discuss these issues and express their perspectives and attitudes toward them. This includes the right to participate in decision-making processes, such as voting. This practice of social dialogue aims to offer "problematic" or potentially conflict-prone social groups the chance to "blow off steam"—to articulate their desires, propose alternative solutions, and present their own perspectives on particular issues.

However, inclusion also has its limitations. When marginalized groups recognize that their views are not meaningfully considered, they may develop distrust, apathy, or even aggression toward broader society.

The specificity of participation as a form of social dialogue involves a process of social interaction in which all groups committed to social cohesion collectively agree on the conditions for influencing the course of social events and openly make joint decisions. Social responsibility and social control are formed on these principles. Participation is based on fostering social interaction not through confrontation, mutual accusations, or the shifting of responsibility, but through a shared desire to negotiate, a common vision for the social future, and a commitment to an effective and constructive path for the development of society and the state. In post-war Ukraine, the restoration of the country as a collective endeavor could serve as a unifying theme for participation. However, it is important to acknowledge that egoism and self-interest may hinder the effectiveness of participatory dialogue.

The third level of historical memory conflict arises between specific social groups seeking to dominate the historical narrative and the academic community. A recent example is the clash between over 60 German and Austrian academic organizations and the social network X (formerly Twitter), owned by billionaire Elon Musk. These organizations accused the platform of promoting right-wing populist content through its algorithms and restricting access to alternative viewpoints. Musk's alignment with right-wing parties – such as his support of the Alternative for Germany party during the German election campaign – intensified the conflict. The academic community, which largely rejects the historical revisionism promoted by Musk's political allies, strongly opposed his portrayal of the past.

Dialogue as a Teaching Principle in the "Philosophy of History" Course …
Діалог як принцип викладання курсу «Філософія історії»….

73

In addition to external (interstate) and internal (domestic) conflicts, as well as those occurring among specific groups and scholars, there exists a fourth conflict—one of historical memories. This conflict emerged from the discrepancy between the traditional model of history education and the demands of the information age. As noted by A. Fischer-Dardai, J. Kaposi, and S. Popp, the past three decades have witnessed the emergence of new trends in the field of world history education, driven by the challenges of the globalized world. These trends include the development of the knowledge economy, the paradigm of lifelong learning, and the rapid expansion of digitalization. Under new conditions, the traditional model of teaching history does not adequately equip students with knowledge to withstand the diversity and complexity of modern democratic society or the major global challenges of our era. (*Fischer, 2023: 461*).

As a result, it has become increasingly evident that the teaching of history should be adapted not only to the study of historical events but also to the realities students encounter in their daily lives. The study of history extends beyond the formal university environment and is embedded in everyday cultural experiences. The authors advocate for a revision of didactic approaches, particularly in the teaching of world history. They also highlight a contemporary issue linked to the conflict of historical memories—the growing disputes among activist groups over monuments dedicated to controversial historical figures. These disputes reflect divergent visions of the future held by these groups.

For instance, in June 2020, the United States experienced a wave of "monument wars," during which several statues, including those of H. Columbus and the founding fathers, J. Washington and T. Jefferson, were damaged or toppled. Activists accused Columbus of racism and genocide, while Washington and Jefferson were criticized for their association with slavery.

These acts of vandalism reflected a superficial understanding of history. For instance, Thomas Jefferson, one of the authors of the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence, played an active role in drafting the Bill of Rights. To address the unacceptability of the war on monuments, a model for analyzing controversial issues of commemoration is proposed, in which historical events or figures are examined within the context of their specific time periods. In other words, their actions and contributions to history should be evaluated not from the perspective of people of the 21st century, but according to the historical moment when this person lived and acted.

The proposed approaches are compelling. For instance, the focus on national narratives in the teaching of European history impedes the deepening of dialogue among the peoples of the European Union on complex issues of historical memory. Given that Ukraine's potential membership in the European Union is anticipated by 2030, it is crucial to strengthen dialogue, at least with our European neighbors, to address the issue of mutual historical claims. The role of historians and philosophers is vital in this process.

Particular attention is drawn to the proposal to review didactic approaches to the teaching of history. The Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities of the Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University has experience in implementing the dialogical principle in teaching the *Philosophy of History* course for students majoring in Philosophy as well as History and Archeology. This new approach, introduced during the ongoing full-scale Russian invasion, aims to foster critical thinking and cultivate respect for the diversity of historical memories among students.

In 2023, the encyclopedic reference dictionary *Philosophy of History* was published by the Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University Publishing House, under the editorial leadership of V. Ogneviuk. The editorial board included V. Ogneviuk (Editor-in-Chief), O. S. Aleksandrova, R. O. Dodonov, and Y. V. Omelchenko. The publication, which took several years to complete, involved contributions from both the academic and educational communities of the faculty, as well as invited scholars. The decision to present the work in the form of a dictionary was deliberate, as the encyclopedia, containing articles from numerous authors, serves as a dialogue between them. Unlike traditional textbooks that often present fixed narratives, this reference book encourages readers to engage with multiple perspectives.

Based on the reference tool provided by the aforementioned publication, a working curriculum has been developed that addresses problematic and controversial issues, with a mandatory emphasis on the modern context. For instance, students demonstrated significant interest in cyclical models of history, particularly the historical cycle model. During classroom discussions, they drew parallels between contemporary events and those from approximately 100 years ago, such as the rise of radical political movements, the emergence of authoritarian leaders, and the intensification of economic conflicts. Through dialogue, several tangential yet important topics emerged, including the driving forces of history, the role of individuals in historical developments, and the laws governing historical progression. By analyzing contemporary world processes, they collaboratively evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of historical cycle theories.

Another topic that sparked discussion was historical memory and memory politics. During practical classes, students engaged in discussions on the issues of commemoration and forgetting, drawing on personal examples. One of the most frequently discussed topics was the manipulation of historical memory on social networks, including concepts such as post-truth, timelessness, polarization, and the distortion or forgetting of historical narratives. In general, such manipulations of historical memory, particularly through social media and the broader media landscape, have been effectively employed in information hybrid warfare. A notable example of this information warfare was Russia's actions in Donbas since 2014, which eventually escalated into military aggression. Regarding the Baltic states, Russia employs non-military instruments of hybrid warfare, as these countries are EU and NATO members (see more: *S. Murinska, 2018; R. Dodonov, 2019*).

The authors emphasize that the dialogical educational approach to the *Philosophy of History* course has a unique feature – it unfolds in real-time, addressing current events. This enhances students' engagement and deepens their interest in the philosophical interpretation of history. The experience demonstrates that dialogue is an effective tool for resolving conflicts of historical memories, ultimately contributing to the humanitarian security of contemporary Ukrainian society.

Conclusion

Different ways of viewing history can lead not only to polemics about historical events but also to conflicts of his-

torical memories, especially if the dialogical search for historical meanings is disrupted. In modern conditions, the conflict of historical memories is an effective tool of historical manipulation, which in turn threatens the humanitarian security of society. Conflicts over historical memory manifest in various dimensions: 1) interstate conflicts concerning the interpretation of shared history; 2) intrastate conflicts, particularly those arising from differing generational perceptions of historical events, with a central focus on ensuring intergenerational continuity and adherence to gender principles; 3) conflicts between different social groups, which would be especially relevant in Ukraine following the conclusion of hostilities; and 4) conflicts between specific social groups and the academic community, which raises questions about the role of intellectuals in shaping history and the alignment of history education with the demands of the information age and virtual communities.

In addressing humanitarian security in Ukraine and resolving conflicts over historical memory, it is important to recognize that, following the war, three main forms of social dialogue are likely to emerge within Ukrainian society: consensus, characterized by a voluntary and favorable attitude towards the prevailing realities; inclusion, which allows for the free expression of opinions, though these will often be viewed as part of the 'social background'; and participation, which involves the active realization of ideas by engaged social actors. The dominant model of dialogue will be shaped by the political regime's monopoly, the strength of horizontal civil society networks, and the nature of social dialogue between these forces.

REFERENCES

Aleksandrova, Olena (2023). Report: Trends in the formation of social interaction in Ukrainian society after the war: illusory agreement or real social dialogue? Session 3: Community-building for an inclusive post-war society. The OECD-GIZ Workshop. *The Role of return in Ukraine's post war recovery and reconstruction*. June 13, 2023, Brussels.

Aleksandrova, O. S. (2009). Vzaiemodiia konkurentsii ta partnerstva yak faktor rozvytku serednioho klasu v Ukraini: filosofskyi analiz. Kyiv, PARAPAN Publishing. (In Ukrainian)

Andryczyk, Mark M. (2023). *Ukraine 22: Ukrainian Writers Respond to War*. London, Penguin Books.

Apel, K.-O. (2009). *Dyskurs i vidpovidalnist: problema perekhodu do postkonventsionalnoi morali* (V. Kuplina, Trans.). Kyiv, Dukh i Litera. (In Ukrainian)

Buber, Martin (1970). *I and Thou*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dichek, N. N. (2023). Dialohy z mynulym, abo stratehiia formuvannia v molodi istorychnoi pamiati. In: *Natsionalno-patriotychne vykhovannia ditei ta molodi v umovakh voiennoho stanu ta povoiennoho vidnovlennia Ukrainy: stratehii i zavdannia*. Conference Paper (s. 134-138). NAIR. (In Ukrainian)

Dodonov, R., Aleksandrova, O. (2019). Discourse Techniques for constructing secessions: the experience of Donbass and Latgale. *Ideology and Politics Journal*. 1 (12), 99–115. https://www.ideopol.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/___ENG.%201.6.%20Dodonov%20Alexandrova%20FIN.pdf

Dovhopolova, O. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Kultura prymyrennia: nova istorychna svidomist v Ukraini*. Kyiv, Feniks. (In Ukrainian)

Fischer-Dárdai A., Kaposi J., Popp S. (2023). The constantly changing discipline of history didactics – An introduction. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal,* 13 (4), 461–469.

Fuko, M. (2003). *Arkheolohiia znannia*. Kyiv, Vyd-vo Solomii Pavlychko "Osnovy". (In Ukrainian)

Gadamer, H.-G. (1993). *Istyna i metod* (fragmenty). In Chytanka z istorii filosofii. Knyha 6. Zarubizhna filosofiia XX st. (pp. 196-201). Kyiv.http://www.philsci.univ.kiev.ua/biblio/gadamer.html (In Ukrainian)

Grinchenko, G. & Narvselius, E. (eds.) (2018) *Traitors, Collaborators and Deserters in Contemporary European Politics of Memory: Formulas of Betrayal*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hrytsak, Yaroslav Y. (2024). *Ukraine. The Forging of a Nation*. Little, Brown Book Group, 448 p.

Kozhemiakina, O. (2017). Henealohiia fenomena doviry: istoryko-filosofskyi ekskurs. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia filosofski nauky*, 19, 19–26.

Kyrydon, A. (2016). *Heterotopii pamiati: Teoretyko-metodolohichni problemy studii pamiati*. Kyiv, Nika-Tsentr. (In Ukrainian)

Kyrydon, A. M. (Ed.). (2013). Natsionalna ta istorychna pamiat: slovnyk kliuchovykh terminiv. Kyiv, DP NVTs "Priorytety". (In Ukrainian)

Levinas, E. (1999). *Mizh namy. Doslidzhennia. Dumky – pro – Inshoho*. Kyiv, Dukh i Litera. (In Ukrainian)

Luhman N. (1979). *Trust and power*. N. Y., J. Wiley, 1979, 208 p.

Lyotard, Jean-François (1979). *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Minuit.

Murinska, Sandra S., Aleksandrova, Olena O. & Dodonov, Roman R. (2018). Information Warfare: Future Challenges of Latvia and Ukraine. *Skhid, No 5* (157), 66–72. https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2018.5(157).-148661

Mylonas, H. & Radnitz, S. (2022). *Enemies Within: The Global Politics of Fifth Columns*. Oxford University Press.

Naichuk, A. V., & Hanaba, S. O. (2020). *Filosofiia istorii*. Kamyanets-Podilskyy, Zvoleiko D. H. (In Ukrainian)

Noelle-Neumann, ElisabethE. (1974). The Spiral of Silence. A Theory of Public Opinion. *Journal of Communication*, Spring 1974. Pp. 43-51. https://vnecas.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/spiral_of_silence.pdf

Ogneviuk, V. O. (Editor-in-Chief); editorial board: Ogneviuk, V. O. (Editor-in-Chief), Aleksandrova O. S., Dodonov R. O., Omelchenko Y. V. (2023). Filosofiia istorii: entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk-dovidnyk. Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University.

Plokhy, Serhii S. (2016). *The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine*. Penguin Random House UK, 432 p.

Plokhy, Serhii S. (2023). *The Russo-Ukrainian War*. Penguin Random House UK, 416 p.

Popp, S. (2012). Memory Wars. In M. Anheier & L. Juergensmeyer (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Global Studies*, *3*, 1147– 1148.

Rorty, R. (1989). Review of Interpreting Accross Boundaries: New Essays in Comparative Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, 39(3), 332–337.

Shore, Marci M. (2024). *The Ukrainian Night: An Intimate History of Revolution*. Yale University Press, 340 p.

Dialogue as a Teaching Principle in the "Philosophy of History" Course ...
Діалог як принцип викладання курсу «Філософія історії»....

75

Skladni pytannia istorychnoi pamiati u paradyhmi dialo-hichnosti kultur (2019). Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University & Belarusian Historical Society. (In Ukrainian)

Snyder, Timothy T. (2015). *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin.* Vintage Publishing. 544 p.

Tabachkovskyi, V. (2001). Humanizm ta problema dialohu kultur. *Filosofska dumka*, 1, 6-25.

Van der Steen J. A. (2013). Contested Past. Memory Wars during the Twelve Years Truce (1609—21). In *Memory before modernity: practices of memory in early modern Europe.* Leiden-Boston.

Viiny pamiatei i modeli prymyrennia: interpretatsiia poniat (2013). In: Viiny pamiatei ta polityka prymyrennia: Zb. nauk. prats (s. 27-37). DP "NVTs "Priorytety" (In Ukrainian).

Yereskova, Tetyana T. V., Mazuryk, Oleg O.V., Aleksandrova, Olena O.S., Tymofieieva, Halyna H.V., Zavadskyi, Vitaliy V.N. (2020).: Uncertainty as a Regular Feature of Modern Ukrainian Society. In: *Teorija in praksa*, *3,* 928–946. https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/en/journals/science-journals/teorija-in-praksa/about-journal/teorija-in-praksa-3-2020

Діалог як принцип викладання курсу «Філософія історії» для подолання конфліктів історичних пам'ятей в контексті гуманітарної безпеки України

Олена Александрова (ORCID 0000-0003-0030-1367)
Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Юрій Омельченко (ORCID 0000-0001-8502-6573)
Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

У статті розглядається сутність діалогу та можливості його застосування для пом'якшення та/або подолання конфліктів історичних пам'ятей. Оскільки освіта є основою, що забезпечує «склеювання» тріщин в українському суспільстві, то в практичній площині демонструється, як і яким чином можна вивчати «Філософію історії» за допомогою діалогу, використовуючи його як принцип соціальної єдності з приводу вирішення складних питань історичної пам'яті та подолання історичних травм. Такий діалог має передбачати: попереднє раціональне опрацювання змісту історичної пам'яті; механізми подолання протилежних точок зору; встановлення простору для комунікацій щодо змісту історичної пам'яті; переосмислення власного «Я» та критичний аналіз власних поглядів та переконань, своєї історичної пам'яті; поступки і самообмеження у сприйнятті відмінних позицій учасників комунікацій; створення консенсусу на користь переосмислення альтернативних поглядів на історичні події. У різних площинах розгортаються конфлікти історичних пам'ятей, їх можна класифікувати як: міждержавні; внутрішньодержавні; між різними соціальними групами; між окремими соціальними групами та академічною спільнотою.

Стосовно забезпечення гуманітарної безпеки України та подолання конфліктів історичних пам'ятей, слід враховувати, що після війни в українському суспільстві скоріш за все будуть спостерігатися три основні варіанти соціального діалогу: згода як добровільне прихильне ставлення до реалій; інклюзія як можливість вільного висловлення думок; участь як реалізація власних ідей зацікавленими соціальними суб'єктами. Який з варіантів діалогу щодо історичної пам'яті стане домінуючим, буде залежати від монополії сучасної вертикалі влади, сили громадянського суспільства та специфіки соціального діалогу між ними.

Ключові слова: філософія історії, історична пам'ять, політика пам'яті, конфлікти історичних пам'ятей, діалог, соціальні мережі, українське суспільство, соціальні протиріччя і конфлікти, суспільна згода.