

Gender Existence: Correlation Between Equality and Identity

SVITLANA STOROZHUK — Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: sveta0101@ukr.net

IGOR GOIAN — Doctor of Philosophy, Professor
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
(Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)

E-mail: ivi1970@mail.ru

The article deals with the conceptual vision of gender content in its relation to sex taking into account the extremes to which researchers of gender issues and social movements have resorted to and considering the role and place of men and women in social and cultural life. On this background wrongfulness of such approaches is justified, according to which gender and sex are identified. It is shown in this article that these notions have different meanings and represent different dimensions of human existence. Thus, in contrast to sex, which reveals the physiological differences between men and women, gender is a socio cultural construct which sets the «matrix» of gender interaction at every historical stage of social and cultural life by offering their own vision of gender equality. Alongside with other ideas we substantiate the idea that gender equality is possible only in the social aspect.

Key Words: gender, sex, masculinity, femininity, equality, ancient society, mythological consciousness, medieval society, modern society, feminism.

Introduction

Interest in gender issues, which has been observed over the last few decades in Western European cultural space, is the ideological and normative foundation that actualizes the public activities aimed at ensuring gender equality in different regions of the world and particularly the post-Soviet cultural space [Danylova, 2013]. However, today there is no doubt as for inconsistency of the given process, because even in advanced Western countries in the minds of the general public images of femininity, real man, knight on a white horse are alive images, they usually determine the characteristics of gender interaction [Ilyin, 2010: 73]. However, in intellectual discourse main attention is focused on the issues related to the interpretation of the essence, purpose and possibilities of self-determination (i. e. “self” of Karl Jung [Jung, 2002] of a human or illusory nature of human existence [Lesevyskiy, 2012; Lektorskiy, 2001: 8] or issues caused by the development of new research strategies aimed at developing and strengthening the ideals of transhumanism [Bostrom, 2005].

However, attention is drawn to the fact that contemporary most researches study the characteristics and conditions of gender interaction, they disassociate themselves from outlining the meaningful loading of the concepts “sex” and “gender”, and treat them as

identical or substantially related [Udry, 1994: 561], causing the formation of worldview discord, which is usually biased in relation to gender issues. For example, despite the evidence of available physiological and related psychological characteristics of men and women, the movement at establishing sexual equality continues to gain momentum and is manifested in originality of education. Thus, Vladimir Lisovskiy remarks that "...today boys and girls watch the same movies at the cinemas and on TV, read the same books, teachers work with them on common programs, using the same methods of education". If we compare the attitude to a son and daughter in the family, there is unlikely to be a significant difference, which at least takes into account differences in their psyche. Moreover, the boys' system of education is often taken as the standard one. In other words, girls are brought up in a boyish way. We seem to be doing everything to bring up necessarily a "mannish" woman. The latest «achievements» in the field are judo and karate classes. However, the girl still will become a woman with characteristic to her genetic program — "a woman as mother", "a woman as the keeper of the fire", "a woman as wife". Unfortunately, she will not become a woman "in a pure form". The system of education manifests itself — there appears some kind of creature with dual origins: "half-woman — half-man". This personality is usually very strong, and in terms of psychology she needs a type of "man-nincompoop", i. e. a person who would be inferior to her in everything, would agree to everything and would not take independent decisions for the marriage to be successful. However, there is a sad paradox — it is boring, bad and difficult for her to be with such a partner! <...> Some working women began to forget that the equality with a man does not mean identity" [Lisovskiy, 1986: 80-82].

In our view, it is the idea underlined by Vladimir Lisovskiy in respect of gender that "equality does not mean identity" is a key to the interpretation and understanding of gender issues in general and gender equality in particular. Since it is clear that any system of education can fully neutralize neither the physiological differences of boys and girls or men and women, nor the generated by them psychological characteristics [Storozhuk & Goyan, 2016] of different sexes because consciousness, which reflects the perfect level of existence, and which the education is directed at, is in dialectical confrontation with the body, which reflects the level of material existence, and which is associated with genetic apparatus of a person. Moreover, such aspiration should be viewed as a form of social construction of personality, within which the above mentioned problem of self is completely ignored and therefore personal development is one-dimensional and may contravene the physiological nature of a person. This focus is clearly seen in the feminist movement aimed at forming the image of masculine women [Serov, 2001], who is usually able to lead an independent socio-cultural life, but is often unhappy in personal life. In this context, the behavior of a woman can be masculine, but genetic and psychological needs remain feminine.

Thus, taking into account the fact that gender equality does not mean equality, and therefore does not presuppose male equivalent role and functions for a woman, it seems logical to outline meaningful loading of the concept "gender" in its relation to the concept of "sex". In fact, as the contemporary intellectual discourse shows, these concepts are sometimes used as identical and interchangeable, and sometimes as ones with different meanings. For example, Roberto Unger believes that the concept of "sex" should be used when it comes to biological and physiological characteristics of a person, while the term "gender" refers to those aspects of sex, which have not been investigated yet [Unger & Crawford, 1993]. We can come across such content of the mentioned concepts in the works of Rodriguez Rust [Frieze, 2004]. Thus, analyzing the origins of non-traditional sexual orientation, the researcher clearly indicates that the reason for this phenomenon lies not so much in biological

or physiological characteristics of the human body but in related to them external factors [Frieze, 2004: 603]. The general intention of reflections of Western researchers about the distinction between the notions of sex and gender is observed in the intellectual discourse of the post-Soviet space. For example, in the works of Maria Sabunaeva and Julia Guseva there has been justified the presence of clear content differences between the concepts of “sex” and “gender” and emphasized the social nature of the latter [Sabunaeva & Guseva, 2003: 369-370]. A similar position is held by Alexander Duhin. He believes that in contrast to the term «sex» which is used in an extremely broad sense, the concept of «gender» is somewhat narrower and is used only to refer to “social sex” [Duhin, 2013]. In some cases, gender is interpreted as a kind of meaningful combination between social environment and biological characteristics of a person.

Without considering some meaningful diversity of these approaches, in our opinion, there is a clear intention to interpret sex as anatomical and physiological specificity of a human body. This originality can serve as a basis (in the terminology of Karl Marx) for the formation of “gender” or “social sex”. However, one cannot ignore the fact that the underlined relationship is not absolute, since in some cases [Frieze, 2004] the meaning of the physiological sex is completely marginalized, giving reason to believe that the actualization of predefined by physiology potentials is implemented due to the social factors under the influence of which the attitude to sex, gender and gender equality in general is formed. In other words, gender is a kind of social construct that is actualized in certain clearly defined socio-cultural circumstances as a kind of ideological narrative and determines the features of social interaction between representatives of different sexes.

Thus, if we consider gender as a kind of social construct, we also deny the absolute nature of the content of this phenomenon, as in different socio-cultural environments different axiological and philosophical ideas are formed, which determine the nature of gender issues. In other words, gender can be seen as a social fact that is revealed through thinking, actions and feelings that are beyond the individual and have binding force, due to which he is subject to them [Durkheim, 1895].

In its turn, this gives reason to believe that the concept of gender equality, widely declared by modern Western European discourse, may acquire an entirely different content in historically and ideologically different socio-cultural types. For example, if we take into account the most common today division of societies into traditional, industrial and postindustrial [Toffler, 2004; Bell, 2001], which historically correspond to traditional (pre-modern society), modern and post-modern types of the society, we have every reason to believe that different “matrices” of gender issues have been worked out within these societies. Accordingly, each of these “matrices” is actualized as the reception of historical forms of gender narrative in modern social and cultural conditions [Toffler, 2004].

Gender issues in ancient and medieval society

Objective and impartial coverage of ideological and axiological constants of gender matrix in ancient and medieval society has been undertaken.

Industrial relations, defining the identity of social consciousness, would naturally cause change of social gender projects, which in each case will be in direct proportion to the definition of the place and role of a person in the world. For example, regarding the origin of the early societies, Julian Bromley draws attention to the strict specifications of their members. Due to this, the original community appears to be a kind of biological super-organism, some members of which function not as separate individuals, but according to the model of organs of the

biological whole [Bromley, 1983: 294]. In other words, production relations in archaic society did not provide an individualization of the personality, so each individual existed and realized his potential only as an integral part of the social whole.

Due to clear determination, an archaic person distinguishes himself neither from the environment (and therefore nature is often thought in human terms, and humanity is thought in natural terms) nor from the society, which is seen not only as a relevant social environment, but also the potential one, that is includes the dead and unborn that exist determining the life of the primitive community [Lyppert, 2010: 242]. The concept of cyclical time which is typical of mythological thinking significantly contributes to the assertion of this belief within which the “eternal and temporal merge into one single day, at the same time they are not sacrificed to one another, but remain in their freedom and innocence. I would say that this is for the first time that time and eternity are not only separated, but both together become integral and indivisible relevant infinity”, Alexey Losev emphasized [Losev, 1991: 84].

In other words, in primeval consciousness there is no time in its modern sense of the word, and therefore a cyclical repetition of events plays a crucial role in understanding the world order. It is significant that in terms of the understanding of the events, the individual is seen as part of the “relevant infinity” (Alexey Losev) and therefore its birth and death occur not only during the course of the day and night, but also during rotation of life and death. As a result of such vision of the world the image of super individual human nature is formed, which is expanded not only horizontally (as a biological super-organism) but also vertically through direct unity with the ancestors. However, belief in the eternal rebirth of a person makes it possible to explain the asexual nature of a newborn child whose sexual differentiation is only in the process of initiation. That is, in the mythological world view of the archaic society, sexual differentiation of men and women is in the process of socialization of the individual, who in the course of acquiring social specification reflects the process of creation of the world [Elyade, 1999].

Therefore, in the mythological consciousness of the archaic society a person perceives himself in a close relationship with all the social and spiritual processes, explanations are usually found in the myth of the formation of the social world. Here, he is interpreted as a reflection of “a replica of the Universe” (Mircha Elyade), formed as a result of marriage of divine couple — Heaven as a symbol of active masculinity and the Earth as a symbol of fertility of the earth [Sumtsov, 1881: 36]. Thus, the “life-world” (Edmund Husserl) of a person is interpreted as an organic unity of male and female principles being equal, and at the same time multi-functional parts of the biological super-organism.

In other words, in a holistic society and mythological consciousness of an archaic person the preconditions for a clear gender differentiation have not been formed yet, therefore a woman and a man exist in an inseparable unity, due to which sexual differentiation is overcome. Perhaps, it is on this basis an idea of the mythological ancestors of androgynous has been formed [Plato, 1993: 98] which combined the male and female sexual characteristics, and therefore they were able to reproduce life. The revival of this ability and, consequently, a return to the original nature of a person becomes possible only in the process of acquiring social gender through initiation and sexual interaction, which acted as a guarantee of cycle life rotation.

As a result of these ideas the ideological and socio-cultural preconditions for establishing subordinate role of a woman are being gradually formed due to the natural abilities of the individual, clear specification of the archaic community members. This feature is fully manifested in the culture of ancient Greece, where a woman was completely devoid of powers and occupied a subordinate position in relation to a man, which is evidenced not only by scientific

research [Scott, 2009; Davidson, 2011], but historical texts as well, in our view, philosophy of Aristotle plays the leading role among them [Aristotle, 2000: 35]. Thus, in contrast to Plato, who was influenced by ideological changes caused by the Sophists [Buzeskul, 1905: p.9], and in particular by the thesis of Protagoras that “man is the measure of all things” (it formed the foundation for the gap between syncretic unity and the spiritual world, causing preconditions for the individual formation), Aristotle substantiated the idea of gender equality typical of early mythological thinking [Plato, 2000]. Aristotle can be considered to be the founder of pre-modern ideological and axiological gender narrative. Of course, in this case it deals not so much with a break with the previous ideological tradition and characteristic to it gender determinism, but with the loss of social status equivalence of a man and a woman.

According to Aristotle, gender inequality is due to differences in the “nature” of men and women, which manifests itself not only in the social but also natural dimension. Thus, the privileged importance of a man is preconditioned at least by the fact that he is a carrier of the divine nature, form, which is an impetus, a cause, the result of which is creation of a new life in a baby [Aristotle, 1940]. In other words, on the basis of works of physiologists [Ahutyn, 1988: 111, 120], Aristotle develops gender narrative characteristic of mythological worldview, at the same time expanding a human world to social coexistence. Thus, it is so as if a community lost its original “biological existence”, “drowsy apathy” (Jose Ortega y Gasset) and began to function not as a unity of men and women, but as *politeia* consisting of citizens [Ortega y Gasset, 1994]. Therefore, it is the transition of social life from “*domus*” to *politeia*, which determines the declared gender inequality in the ancient society. For example, according to Karl Marx, the Greeks “were barbarians in relation to the woman even in the heyday of their civilization; education of women was superficial, it was forbidden to them to communicate with the opposite sex, they were so stubbornly convinced of their imperfections, that eventually they accepted it as fact. The wife was not an equal friend to her husband, but was in a position of a daughter” [Marx and Engels, 1984: 251].

Without taking into consideration the correctness of the conclusions of Karl Marx when considering the number of issues of society existence, his conclusions concerning the “barbarism of Greeks in relation to women” seem to be somewhat exaggerated. In particular, if we take the example of the same gender narrative of Aristotle, it is worth paying attention to his remarks on functional purpose of both men and women.

In particular, in “*Politics*” Aristotle emphasizes that the duties of women were usually limited by spheres of household, while her husband implements his natural potential outside the house that is in public life [Aristotle, 2000]. The mentioned observations are extremely important, as Aristotle forms his own vision of gender interaction on the background of contemporary social and cultural realities and, above all, specific features of the ancient Greek “living space”. Thus, in contrast to the archaic individual Greeks live not only in the natural environment of biological super-organism that is implemented in a limited by home (biological community) world, but in a legislated urban space that extends beyond the world of their own, causing thus changes in understanding of gender interaction. Thus, according to the works of Aristotle, ancient society remains mythological idea of the natural character of the family unity of a man and a woman for the purpose of reproduction of life [Aristotle, 1940]. However, in contrast to “life-world” (Edmund Husserl) of an archaic person who was interpreted as a kind of “replica of the Universe” (Mircha Elyade), the world of the Greeks is not limited to the home, “life-world” of a Greek is a policy where coexistence rules are established by law and apply only to the world of their own, which is at the same time defined both by origin and legislation. In other words, the subordinate role of a woman and, in particular, restrictions of her civil self-

realization, is the natural result of the desire of the Greeks to keep their own space not only on the basis of legislative framework but also of kinship (biological) unity. Thus, the ancient Greek woman, despite her subordination to a man, is an essential element of the society, and therefore, occupying a niche in the household, she is hardly aware of her subordinate role.

Strange as it may seem, but there is the general worldview intention to restore primary, and to be more precise, androgynous human nature in early Christianized outlook. At this time, gender interaction is regulated primarily by Old Testament words about the creation of a human, “then God said: Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creatures that move along the ground. So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them” (Genesis 1:26, 27). The concept of human creation, borrowed from Jewish mythology, has become an important foundation for medieval discussions on initial human nature. On the one hand, the words “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them” appeal to the idea characteristic of all early myths that the ancestors were androgynous, and only the Fall led to the division of primary unity into two sexes. The remarks that the man who has flesh and soul created in the image and likeness of God [Lorhus, 2003] has no sexual certainty are primarily in favour of this assumption.

Accordingly, we have every reason to believe that the person, who was created in the image of God, should be also the creator of life. However, neither a man nor a woman is able to generate a new life separately, only a couple can do that overcoming sex, they rise to the image of God and give a new life. This idea is most fully represented in the works of Gregory of Nyssa, who substantiated the division of the sexes. He does not concern spiritual nature of a person but only the physical one, and therefore, according to the philosopher, the first people were able to non-sexual reproduction [Bryllyantov, 1998: 184, 185]. In our view, this idea became a cornerstone of the Christian marriage, including its intention to return original unity of sex, which is expressed with the words: “you made the two of them one body. For this reason, therefore, a man shall leave his father and mother and cling to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh, and whatsoever God has joined together let no man put asunder” [Order of Crowning].

Reproduction of the original unity of a human in marriage, which Christians treated with great respect, is generally substantiated by the fact that the first miracle of Christ was turning water into wine at the wedding at Cana in Galilee [Vorobiev, 1996]. Without taking it to consideration, the very interpretation of the original unity could vary significantly in different theological concepts. For example, St. Maximus the Confessor proved that after the resurrection from the dead human division into two sexes should disappear. This is confirmed not only by sinless conception of Christ [Bryllyantov, 1998: 207-215] but also by his resurrection. According to the theologian, after the resurrection Christ overcame sex, and appeared in front of his disciples in a male form only because otherwise they would not recognize him [Bryllyantov, 1998: 385]. We come across the same statement in anthropology of Anthony the Metropolitan of Surozh (Bloom). On this occasion he wrote, “If you want to know what a human is... look at the throne of God and you see one who is seated at the right hand of the throne, God’s glory, with Jesus standing at the right hand of God ... the only way we can know a magnificent human if he only becomes free...” [Anthony (Bloom)]. Obviously, if he perceived Christ as a male representative, it should be recognized that a woman is not considered to be a human in his theological conception.

Eastern Christian ceremonial tradition adheres to the opinion on the original androgynous nature of a human, which collapsed as a result of the Fall, the western tradition is based on the

teachings of St. Augustine. He considered that the image and likeness of God relates primarily to the spiritual nature of a person. Therefore, the presence of sex should be seen not as a result of the Fall, but the natural objective reality of the human race. Augustine proved that a person was created as a couple, so sex will be preserved after the resurrection of a human [Bryllyantov, 1998: 225-229].

In general, significant conceptual differences of eastern and western theology did not lead to the fundamental differences with respect to gender. Christian theology, which was based on the ancient biblical texts, preserved the idea of gender equality typical of mythological worldview. However, the same theology laid the foundations for the appearance of the ruling at that time gender inequality.

However, except ancient texts of the Old Testament the New Testament books, especially the Gospel, also played an important role in the process of Christian doctrine development. On the one hand, Gospel upholds respect for Christian women in general that is the most clearly shown in the story about meeting Christ and Mary Magdalene (Luke 7: 37-50), and the other hand the gender inequality that is based on the teachings of St. Paul about Church of Christ, “As in all the churches of the saints, women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church” (1 Corinthians 14:33-35). Such situation of a woman was caused by the formation of hierarchy expressed with the words, “Wives, be subject to your husbands as you are to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church, the body of which is the Saviour. Just as the church is subject to Christ, so also wives ought to be, in everything, to their husbands” (Ephesians 5:22-24).

Thus, in contrast to early Christianity, where the reception of mythological thinking was quite expressive, mature Canon Christianity, despite the teachings of Christ is not inclined to recognize the equality of a man and a woman, leaving the latter the area of household. On the contrary, Paul the Apostle speaks about the total obedience and subordination, thus forming the foundation not only of gender inequality, but also the hierarchy of heavenly and earthly power. In other words, gender inequality is fully seen only at the moment of the destruction of a holistic society and syncretic worldview of the ancient epoch. Rethinking of the story about the Fall, the cause of which was a woman greatly contributed to this.

The paradigm of gender in the modern age

Social and cultural changes that the modern age brought would lead to the transformation of the gender paradigm. However, in fact the situation appears to be somewhat different at the first glance. Except modernization and industrialization in the western society, strengthening of patriarchal position has been observed for some time that was probably caused by changes of the then ideological paradigm. Thus, in contrast to a human of the traditional society, who is considered to be a servant of God, she thinks herself as the model of passive femininity, and therefore a person is in a rigid hierarchy of power and self-evident ties, which do not involve any activity or independence. Within the framework of this ideological paradigm, a human is not capable of creating, as he imagines the world to be motionless. Instead, on the contrary a modernized personality understands poorly how to live without development. This idea was fully expressed by Johan Goethe, Faust said, “There are no benefits in what is known, we are in need what is unknown”. These words of the famous literary character fully reveal features of a modernized personality. First, a human of the modern age is active; he constantly strives for knowledge and transformation of the world [Travin & Marhanyya, 2004]. These processes

were stated in methodological program of Francis Bacon, which stated that ideological break with the passivity of the previous epistemological paradigm; a person of this time is not a passive observer, but an active subject, and therefore he gains knowledge not so much for the sake of knowledge, but to transform the world.

Activity as a key attribute of a modern human, in our opinion, was the major contribution to the rise of patriarchy. Our assumption is built on the basis of Michel Foucault comments on the symbolic relationship of sexual and social relationships which he analyzes in detail on the basis of the analysis of Artemidorus dreams [Foucault, 1996]. His "Interpretation of Dreams", according to Foucault, can serve as a guide that reveals characteristic mode of thinking of a certain epoch. Taking this into account we have every reason to believe that the establishment of a paradigm of an active subject was the main foundation of modernized gender paradigm. Within the framework of the latter, the dominant role of a man is clearly manifested; he was assigned priority in addressing the social, scientific and political affairs, etc. until the early nineteenth century. This idea is fully expressed in contemporary literature, thanks to the emergence of the novel as a literary genre. The latter, not only in the modern age, but in now has a well expressed intention to emphasize the active role of a man as a knight and woman as a weak, defenseless. This worldview paradigm was an important ideological foundation of establishing a subordinate role of a woman who required external protection because of her passivity and conservatism.

One should not forget that there was the general intention of society, secularization and liberation in early modern age. These processes cover all aspects of life, leading to a rethinking of the role of God. For example, development of deism contributes to desecration of the world and opens a human the right to work, manifested in all spheres of social and cultural life. Accordingly, a person (who is represented by a man in socio-cultural terms) as the active principle starts to be seen not only as the creator of the world, but he also as equal to God for the likeness of which he acts. If a person (which at this time is represented by a man), equals in potency to God, God by himself is useless and eventually dies. This is most fully expressed in "Faust" by Johan Goethe, the protagonist of which is guided by the axiological devilish principles and words of Friedrich Nietzsche "God is dead! God will not rise again and we have killed him!". Young Georg Hegel expressed a similar view earlier. He believed that all religions of modern time are based on a sense of "God is dead ..." [Heidegger, 1990]. Therefore, there is no reason to doubt that the modern society especially early nineteenth century loses sacredness of gender relations, which was characteristic to postmodern outlook. A human (personified by a man), who replaces the place of God, becomes or has to become (as for example a super-man by Nietzsche) God who will create a new world.

Strengthening of patriarchal position led not only to strengthening of subordinate place of a woman, but careful concealment of sexuality, which is gradually confiscated in favor of the family, and the function of reproduction is completely absorbed by seriousness. Sex is surrounded by silence. The legalized couple administers the law and gives rise to offspring. They impose themselves as an example, make value rules, they possess the truth and have the right to speak, reserving a principle of secrecy. In the social space, in the heart of every home there is a parental bedroom as the only place of recognized sexuality serving good and procreation. One should be ashamed of all the rest: decency of manners allows deftly avoiding body problems and decency of language whitens words [Foucault, 1996].

Despite a distinct discrimination against women and a kind of taboo on sexuality, which reaches its peak in the Victorian days, the intention to release a person from any coercion

is the most fully expressed at this time. On the one hand, there is a permanent process of secularization growth of the society, accompanied not only by sharp criticism of clericalism, but religion itself and by the idea of God. On the other hand, the projects aimed at the practical realization of the ideals of liberal democracy have appeared more often since the eighteenth century. Thus, electoral and other civil rights have gradually been ensured to all segments of the population [Storozhuk, 2013: 163], causing movement aimed at releasing a woman. The latter was fully manifested at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries in a suffragette manner, which led to the transformation of a women into a social person [Casciani, 2003].

Conclusions: or gender after liberation

Practical implementation of the ideals of liberal democracy in unity with the intention of secular humanism played an ambivalent role in the development of the Western society. On the one hand, during the twentieth century there was a permanent move to the liberation of a person from external coercion, which led to formal gender equality, and on the other hand it led to further rationalization of life and the approval of new forms of inequality and legitimization of totalitarian structures of the socialist type [Lektorskiy, 2001: 6]. The collapse of the last was accompanied by the approval of a new ideological paradigm within which the necessity to reject claims on the ideals content and implementation was formed. Denial of utopia and accordingly any meta-paradigm is preconditioned by their defamation, which however led to the rejection of the ideas of a personality. Therefore, the “death of a human” gradually replaced the “death of God”; this took place as a result of the loss of authority. Personality as an agent of action that provides the presence of certain values, ideas about the rights and responsibilities of individuals and is responsible for their actions loses the sense. From this perspective, we can speak about the sincerity, true existence, because no way of existence can be more or less true [Lektorskiy, 2001: 8].

The destruction of paradigmatic field of the human self-identification necessarily led to the need of change in relation to gender issues and gender interaction. Considering the disappearance of sex meta-paradigm in intellectual discourse there is clearly manifested the intention to replace sex by gender that has no substantial (biological) foundation, but then turns to be only as a social construct. This intention is most fully manifested in the course of transformation of liberal feminism to more radical “gender feminism”. Its representatives “on the basis of Marxist ideology demand the abolition of not only economic classes, but sex as a class, i.e. require the cancellation of division into men and women. Hence, there was a substitution of the words “sex” and “gender” ... According to [Gender Studies], male / female, masculinity / femininity are nothing more than cultural constructs and conviction of people that heterosexuality is a “natural” form of manifestation of sexual instinct is another example of social construction of “biological” [Babett, 2003: 22].

Overall, acknowledging the share of the rationality of these studies it still seems definitely inappropriate to neutralize sex differences. In our view, the social construction of gender appears as a kind of superstructure that defines axiological values of different sexes and features of gender interaction, acquiring in some cases a dominant role. That is why despite all the ideological and socio-cultural changes today the intention to reproduce patriarchal relations is manifested so clearly. In our view, it should not be seen as the reception of modern thinking, as the subordination of women in modern conditions is manifested in communion with the recognition of her legal, civil and personal equality, and therefore we have every reason to remind the humorous criticism of Descartes mechanic philosophy by Christina, Queen of Sweden (1626-1689), “I had never seen that a mechanical watch gave birth to small watch...”.

Transferring this joke to gender issues, we shall remark that we never had to see how the representatives of male with clearly marked femininity gave birth. However, until this happens, we consider it appropriate to recognize not only social but also biological sex and doubt as for the possibility of gender identity. We can rather talk about gender equality, which has socio-cultural, axiological, moral, and legal dimensions, because a woman has the same rights, opportunities and responsibilities as a man in the social space, not in biological one. Therefore, gender equality is only possible in the social aspect.



References

- Agutyn, Anatoly. *The Concept of "Nature" in Ancient History and in Modern Age ("Fyusys" and "Nature")*, Moscow: Nauka, 1988.
- Anthony (Bloom), the Metropolitan of Sourozh. *God and Man*. http://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Antonij_Surozhskij/.
- Aristotle. *On the Generation of Animals*, 1940, Book II. <http://simposium.ru/ru/node/978/>.
- Aristotle. *Politics*, Kiev: Osnovy, 2000. <http://litopys.org.ua/aristotle/arist.htm>.
- Babett, Fransyz. *Is Gender a Social Construct or a Biological Imperative?*, in *Practicum in Gender Psychology*, Saint Petersburg.: Peter, 2003.
- Bell, Deniel. *The Coming Post-industrial Society*. http://royallib.com/book/bell_daniel/gryadushchee_postindustrialnoe_obshchestvo_vvedenie.html.
- Bostrom, Nick. *A History of Transhumanist Thought*, in *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, Vol. 14, 2005. <http://jetpress.org/volume14/freitas.html>.
- Brilliantov, Aleksandr. *Influence of Eastern Theology on the West in the Works of John Scott Erigena*, Saint Petersburg: Martis, 1998.
- Bromley, Julian. *History of the Primitive Society: General Issues of Anthropological Sociogenesis History*, Moscow: Nauka, 1983.
- Buzeskul, Vladislav. *Female Question in Ancient Greece*, Kharkiv: Book shop. P.A Breytigama, 1905.
- Casciani, Dominic. *The History of the Suffragettes*, in *BBC News*, 2003. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/3153388.stm.
- Danylova, Tatyana. *Towards Gender Equality: Ukraine in the 21st Century*, in *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 2013, №4. <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/towards-gender-equality-ukraine-in-the-21st-century>.
- Davidson, Richard, J. *Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens*, in *Gender & History*, Vol. 23, 2011, pp. 597–614.
- Dugin, Aleksandr. *Structural Sociology*, 2013. <http://konservatizm.org/konservatizm/sociology/180509172730.xhtml>.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 1895. http://royallib.com/book/dyrkgeym_emil/metod_sotsiologii.html.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Secret Societies. Rites of Initiation and Devotions*, 1999. http://royallib.com/book/eliade_mircha/taynie_obshchestva_obryadi_initsiatsii_i_posvyashcheniya.html.
- Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality-III: Taking Care of Yourself*, 1984. http://royallib.com/book/fuko_mishel/istoriya_seksualnosti_III_zabota_o_sebe.html.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Will to Knowledge: Beyond the Knowledge, Power and Sexuality*, 1996. http://royallib.com/book/fuko_mishel/volya_k_istine_po_tu_storonu_znaniya_vlasti_i_seksualnosti.html.
- Frieze, Irene. *Hanson Annual Review of Sex Research*, in *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 33, No. 6, December 2004, pp. 603–604.

-
-
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche Words, "God is Dead" in Problems of Philosophy*, 1990, №7, pp. 143-176. <http://ec-dejavu.ru/g/God.html>.
- Ilyin, Eugene. *Sex and Gender*, Saint Petersburg: Peter, 2010.
- Jung, Karl. *On the Nature of the Psyche*, 2002. http://royallib.com/book/yung_karl/o_prirode_psihe.html].
- Lektorskiy, Vladislav. *Christian Values, Liberalism, Totalitarianism, Postmodernism*, in *Problems of Philosophy*, Moscow: Nauka, 2001, V. 4, pp. 6-9.
- Lesevitskiy, Aleksey *Image of a Person in the Future: the Transition to Post-modern*, in *Image of a Man in the Future*, Kiev: Skif, 2012, Vol. 2. pp. 180-183. http://samlib.ru/a/aw_lesewickij/q123-1.shtml].
- Lippert, Julius. *History of Culture*, Moscow: Librokom, 2010.
- Lisovskiy, Vladimir. *Love and morality*, Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1986.
- Lorgus, Andrey (St.). *Orthodox anthropology*, 2003. http://azbyka.ru/pravoslavnyaya-antropologiya#a_z30].
- Losev, Aleksey. *Philosophy. Mythology. Culture*, Moscow: Politizdat, 1991.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Essays*, issue 2, volume 43, Moscow: Progress, 1976.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Essays*, issue 2, volume 45, Moscow: Progress, 1984.
- Ortega-i-Gasset, Jose. *The Revolt of the Masses*, Kiev: Osnovy, 1994, pp. 15-139. http://www.ae-lib.org.ua/texts/ortega-y-gaset_masa_ua.htm.
- Plato. *The Feast* in *Collected Works* in 4 volumes, Moscow: Mysl', 1993, V. 2, p. 81-134.
- Plato. *The Republic*, Kiev: Osnovy, 2000. <http://litopys.org.ua/plato/plat.htm>.
- Sabunaeva, Maria, and Julia Guseva. *Gender Approach in Practice of a School Psychologist* in *Practicum on Gender Psychology*, Saint Petersburg: Peter, 2003, pp. 369-381.
- Scott, Michael. *The Rise of Women in Ancient Greece*, in *History Today*, November 2009, pp. 36-40. www.hlstorytoday.com.
- Serova, Elena. *Wild or Domestic? : Two Models of a Personal Life*, Saint Petersburg [Et al.]: Peter, 2001.
- Storozhuk, Svitlana, and Igor Goyan. *Impact of Virtual Reality on Self-actualization of Teenagers: Anthropological Dimension* in *Anthropological Dimensions of Philosophical Research*, 2016, vol. 9, pp. 17-28.
- Storozhuk, Svitlana. *Nation: History and Theory of the Issue (Historical and Philosophical Dimension)*, Kiev: Vadeks, 2013.
- Sumtsov Nicholay. *About Wedding Ceremonies, Mostly Russian Ones*, Kharkiv, 1881.
- Toffler, Alvin. *The Third Wave*, 2004. http://royallib.com/book/toffler_elvin/tretya_volna.html].
- Travin, Dmitry, and Otar Margania. *European Modernization*. 2004. http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Trav/01.php].
- Udry, J. Richard. *The Nature of Gender*, in *Demography*, Vol. 31, №. 4, 1994, pp. 561-573.
- Unger, John Ronald, and Michael Crawford. *Sex and Gender: The Troubled Relationship Between Sex and Gender*, in *Psychological Science*, 1993, N 4. pp. 122-124.
- Vorobiev, Vladimir (prot.). *Orthodox Teaching on Marriage* (Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Pastoral Seminar, 02.05.1996). <http://azbyka.ru/pravoslavnoe-uchenie-o-brake>].
- Wedding Ceremonies* <https://sites.google.com/site/mijmolytovnyk/prijdite-poklonimsa/taienstva/cin-vincanna>.
-
-