

UDC 130.2:37.013.3

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2023.47.21>

DEHUMANIZATION IN THE DIGITAL EDUCATIONAL PROCESS: THE EXPERIENCE OF SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL REFLECTION

Svitlana Shyroka, Natalia Bilchuk, Heorhii Piven

*National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institut",
Faculty of Humanities and Law, Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences
Chkalova Str., 17, 61070, Kharkiv, Ukraine*

The work is based on the practical experience and philosophical reflection of the participants of the educational process regarding learning in the conditions of total digitalization, caused first by the Covid-19 pandemic, and then by the full-scale war in Ukraine. The research carries out a socio-philosophical analysis of the features of the educational process in higher education, which are related to the spread of information technologies, distance learning, and further dehumanization of all levels of social space. Philosophical analysis of the essence and basis of the process of dehumanization of higher education aims to further determine possible risks and ways to overcome them. A general theoretical study of the problem of digital dehumanization of education in the context of the development and introduction of information technologies is presented. The authors of the article consider the dehumanization of education not only as a reduction in the role of humanitarian knowledge in the process of professional training. The replacement of a purely human way of understanding reality by technical models, namely the "mechanization" and "computerization" of participants in the educational process, leads to the displacement of the human existential way of communication from the educational space, the loss of the humanistic content of education and its transformation into an instrumental category of production-market relations, the goal of which is the utilitarian assimilation of a narrow circle of professional knowledge and skills.

Dehumanization is considered as a general process of eliminating the "human factor" from social and individual practice: loss and inability to create new spiritual and moral values, devaluation of human characteristics, "breaking" of a holistic worldview. The authors show that the modern educational process demonstrates the use of a large number of purely technical terms, such as "academic mobility", "educational technologies", "innovations", "human resources", "network of higher education institutions", "information processing", "mechanisms of feedback, evaluation, interaction", "educational trajectory", "intellectual product", "quality indicators", etc. In this thesaurus, a person is supposedly considered a functional unit, a carrier of "creative thinking", a producer of "new knowledge" and a participant in "innovation". But it is impossible to hide that instead of creating new knowledge, the ideal and goal of higher education is repetition, compilation and reproduction, and the traditional goals of higher education, such as the formation of a scientific and philosophical outlook, self-improvement, creative thinking, the ability to identify and pose problems, create new knowledge, degenerate into procedures that describe the "machine learning" algorithm in the technical field. In this sense, the dehumanization of education can lead to a global anthropological crisis, the result of which will be the destruction of the cultural space in which humanity existed. Understanding and discussing this risk will allow universities to review and improve their educational strategies, taking into account the cognitive, ethical and social issues highlighted.

Key words: education, dehumanization, digitalization, digital educational process, deontologization.

The processes that are taking place today in the field of education, in particular, higher education, fully reflect the phenomena that have covered the area of human and society existence. In addition, the current situation, in particular the spread of the global Covid-19 pandemic and full-scale war in Ukraine, has exacerbated in practice those processes of transformation of society about which theoretical battles have not subsided for more than half a century.

Intensive information processes lead to consequences that are not only diverse but also contradictory, and which cannot be ignored in the socio-philosophical analysis of modern social phenomena.

All these reasons raise a number of questions about changes in value and axiological foundations, conditions and prospects for the existence of education, in particular, its humanistic aspect. The information society is radically transforming the socio-cultural and, in particular, educational space. Changes related to the development of the information society affect all socio-cultural institutions and affirm a fundamentally new way of life for each person, to which educational institutions must prepare: primary, secondary and higher. The often mentioned, but conceptually unclear dehumanization of education is a common and constantly voiced problem of any society that has entered the phase of post-industrial development and in which the paradigm of radical modernism and technicism has become entrenched. It is clear that something is happening, but what exactly? We can say with confidence that the ideological foundation of this process is connected with the crisis of the humanistic worldview, which took place in the 20th century. This crisis has called into question a large complex of existential, cognitive, moral, sensory guidelines of mankind.

In addition, it is important to note that Ukraine became a litmus test for global moral (in) sensitivity at the beginning of the 21st century. Adiaiphorization (this concept comes from the Greek “*adiaphoron*” – unimportant thing) gives rise to instrumental rationality, mass society, absorption of the individual by the crowd, as well as a worldview as if we are enveloped by an unknown force, thanks to which no one can identify or shame us. That is why it is important to look at all life processes from a different angle, to change attitudes or the way of life itself, so to speak, to “overestimate values” [1, p. 124]. Therefore exactly the philosophical analysis of modern, technical and, finally, digital dehumanization (as a cutting edge) in the modern educational process is relevant.

In addition, philosophical reflection is the quintessence of thinking, because, going beyond common sense and habitual beliefs, it can offer many opportunities to increase our knowledge of the nature and phenomena of things, but not only what they are, but also what they can be.

Based on this, the purpose of the article is a philosophical investigation of the roots, essence and forms of dehumanization in the modern educational environment. The research was performed using general scientific methods of deduction, induction, analysis, synthesis and classification. In forming the conceptual position, the results of research in related fields of socio-humanitarian knowledge were used: history of philosophy, philosophical anthropology, sociology, psychology, culturology, etc. A phenomenological approach and a method of structural-functional analysis were used to study the phenomenon of dehumanization in the modern educational process. The theoretical basis of the study consists of well-known works of thinkers, which in various aspects considers the phenomenon of dehumanization: J. Ortega y Gasset, E. Fromm, M. Foucault and others [2; 3; 4].

There is a certain amount of research devoted to identifying the negative aspects of the modern educational process associated with its technicalization and modernization. Thus, L. Vasylieva, S. Chmuhyn, and O. Prochenko consider modern society as IT-dependent one, which forms a discourse of excessive technogenicity, information-communicative overload, and obsessive prestigious symbolism [5, p. 453]. N. Lyutko believes that digitalization standardizes the behavior, interests, inclinations of people, which increases the negative consequences of excessive human fascination with the power of information and the difference between individual and group value orientations [6, p. 99]. R. Laura and F. Hannam investigate a growing crisis of depersonalisation and dehumanisation which has emerged from the computotechnological

texturing of contemporary society and show that the primary mode of electronic communication is characterised by the covert depersonalisation of human relations [7, p. 3]. The dialogue between Zygmunt Bauman and the Lithuanian political scientist and philosopher Leonidas Donskis is relevant and interesting. This conversation is devoted to the loss of sensitivity caused by such features of modern life as atomization, fragmentation, loneliness, uncertainty [1, p. 82]. L. Ryzhak carried out an in-depth analysis of the factors and consequences of the general process of dehumanization of life [8, p. 92]. S. Posokhov reflects on the dehumanization of modern society and the crisis of humanitarianism, and analyses the attempts to replace the regulating and goal-setting role of education with a system of manipulation of consciousness [9, p. 24]. O. Kovalevska, A. Kopina, S. Shyroka emphasize the importance of the existence of creative educational and intellectual space as a necessary condition for the formation of critical thinking skills, socialization of the individual, as a basis for the formation of adequate self-perception [10, p. 55].

However, despite the fact that these risks and concerns are widely expressed and debated in academia, where they have become a battleground for grand ideological controversy, we find little evidence that these reflections led to any notable and decisive action. Especially since we are dealing with the spread of the practical implementation of all the mentioned risks during the war.

Despite all its basic status and prevalence, the concept of “dehumanization” has not acquired in the socio-humanitarian cognition the proper theoretical elaboration, semantic and categorical definiteness. The task of theoretical clarification of the semantic content of basic concepts requires philosophical analysis and understanding. In a general sense, we are talking about “deontologization” and “destructurazation”, ie the replacement of stable fundamentals with new ones. Such a process usually accompanies marginal societies, ie societies that are transforming. As mentioned above, the current state of society is the formation and intensive development of a non-industrial, information society, which brings fundamental changes in all areas of society, including higher university education. Therefore, the theoretical analysis of the basic concept of “dehumanization” in the context of digital transformation is a necessary part of any study that has as its subject modern social phenomena. It seems appropriate to focus on the problem of the spread of digital technologies, namely digital dehumanization as a process of displacing the human existential way of life in the educational space and replacing it with technical models and machine technologies. To paraphrase Martin Heidegger's landmark and, as it turned out, still relevant statement, let's say that no epoch has been as ignorant of seemingly the most traditional issues as the modern one [4, p. 28–34]. Such substantive and structural uncertainty concerns both fundamental questions about the universe and ideas about various phenomena of the existence of the individual and humanity in it. Proclaimed in the nineteenth century, the philosopheme “there is no being, there is only becoming” required a fundamental change in the principles and concepts of philosophical reflection. Thus, in addition to anthropologism as a basic principle of worldview, the concepts of “deconstruction” and “deontologization” were put forward as basic concepts.

Recently, the concept of “dehumanization” has been increasingly used to analyze the social and anthropological spheres of life, and today it has become as common as “deontologization” was before. But despite the widespread use, either the term “dehumanization” or the processes denoted by this concept remain as vague as “deontologization”. A similar situation usually consists of such new words that are introduced into the scientific vocabulary and transformed into concepts. It should be noted that the terms “deontologization” and “dehumanization” are conceptual in nature. Both concepts are closely related and form the methodological and terminological-categorical basis for philosophical reflection on various spheres of life. The term “dehumanization” is most often used in research on racism, slavery, genocide, humiliation, and

so on. But philosophical discourse presupposes the limit or even transboundary expansion of the traditional field of interpretation, therefore, it seems reasonable to consider dehumanization as a general process of eliminating the “human factor” from social and individual practice: loss of spiritual and moral values, devaluation of human characteristics, “breaking” the holistic worldview, and so on. Modern times, as the era of the destruction of classical thinking, began with the “death of God” and proclaimed the “deconstruction of the individual” and “death of the subject”, thus scattering man into many phenomena, forms of manifestation, or, in the words of J. Derrida, turning human into “a set of language practices”. Describing the phenomena of human existence, researchers today increasingly use metaphorical images of imitation games, echoes, monkeys, revealing them either as simulacra that hide the truth that does not exist or as “zombies” that only imitate the life of what is actually dead.

For more than half a century, there have not ceased discussions about the prospects for the further development of man in a world of “groundlessness”, in a world that has lost its definiteness, in which “all identities are only simulated”, and which with the “death of God” has lost its order, fundamentality, solidity, beauty, harmony, mystery.

These issues in the context of the problems of modern society are analyzed in different perspectives – value-semantic aspects, humanistic paradigms, socio-spiritual vectors, cultural and existential criteria and more. For more than half a century, discussions have been going on about the prospects for further human development in a world of “groundlessness”. According to this theory the world has lost its clearness, in the new conditions “all identities are only simulated”, and with the “death of God” the world had lost order, fundamentality, beauty, harmony, mystery... Researchers loudly proclaim that the main global problem of the modern world is the collapse of its anthropological foundations, the crisis of spirituality [11, p. 15].

The start of the third millennium marked the beginning of a new era not only in chronological sense but as mark of the beginning of a new era of social development. The rapid spread of information technology, the spread of the global Internet system, the general digitalization of all activities radically changes all social processes. These processes dictate new requirements for their participants, anticipating the formation of skills which is the main task of the educational process. Therefore, the changes taking place in society primarily concern the learning process, in particular higher, university education. As Bartlett Giamatti, president of Yale University, aptly points out, “a university is a statement of culture created by our consciousness that has value and can transmit values”. University education is the concentration of the cultural environment in which the axiological principles of existence and activity of all spheres of society are formed and which ensures its functioning on the basis of these principles. Each time a new system of communications appears, it accelerates the transformation of society and is reflected primarily in the university learning environment.

In recent decades, in Europe, in particular in Ukraine, we can see an increase in higher education institutions and the number of students seeking to enter and study there. In addition, most technical institutes are being transformed into universities. These processes lead to changes in attitudes towards higher education institutions and understanding of their goals and objectives. University education is turning out “mass” and like secondary education is becoming almost compulsory. This tendency leads to a decrease in the quality and requirements for education, which undermines the value and prestige of higher education. But does it destroy the very idea of university education? Does it indicate its degradation? In other words, is there a threat of losing the existential and target certainty of higher education?

“Deontologization”, in a general sense, is the process of violating or changing the structures, principles and conditions of existence of any social institution. In modern higher education, this

process is primarily associated with intensive computerization and implementation of digital technologies.

Let us turn to the Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2021–2031 [12]. The reader of this document is faced with a large number of purely technical terms, such as: “academic mobility”, “education technology”, “innovation”, “educational centers”, “personnel certification”, “human resources”, “network of higher education institutions”, “Information processing”, “feedback mechanisms, evaluation, interaction”, “educational trajectory”, “intellectual product”, etc. Of course, there is nothing unusual in this terminology. All these expressions entered the “flesh and blood” of our language. We use them, literally, unconsciously, that is, without realizing that we are using them to describe reality that has the world of electronics as a model. A reference to any documents regulating the educational process demonstrates the use of a large number of purely technical terms (“academic mobility”, “educational technologies”, “innovations”, “staff certification”, “human resources”, “network of higher education institutions”, “information processing”, “mechanisms of feedback, assessment, interaction”, “educational trajectory”, “intellectual product”, etc.). According to this approach, a person is considered as a functional unit, a carrier of “creative thinking”, a producer of “new knowledge” and a participant in “innovation”. Instead of creating new knowledge, the ideal and goal of higher education becomes repetition, compilation, and reproduction, and the traditional goals of higher education, such as the formation of a scientific and philosophical outlook, self-improvement, creative thinking, the ability to identify and pose problems, create new knowledge, degenerate into procedures that describe the “machine learning” algorithm in the technical field.

Mechanistic images of the New Age have become part of history as well as the disciplinary model created within the framework of mechanism, which was analyzed in detail and thoroughly by Michel Foucault. But the principle of mechanization in its new embodiment – computer – continues its development in our time. This new model, like the previous one, is based on the principles of economic efficiency and total control.

The list of requirements for future specialists is very peculiar. As stated in this document, “the rapid changes that are taking place in society, technology, knowledge, will require in the future from specialists the ability to adapt, master new skills, professions, creativity. In future structures of educational programs the most relevant is the acquisition of universal competencies: the ability to learn, process information, quickly master new technologies, the ability to think critically and creative approach to tasks. The skills of system thinking, programming, intersectoral communication, the ability to work in conditions of uncertainty, multiculturalism and multilingualism, environmental thinking, multifunctionality are also gaining relevance. The high complexity of the tasks of the future requires from specialists the ability to concentrate, manage their own emotions, maintain mental and physical performance, plan workload. Thus, the task of combining the development of such abilities in students and at the same time providing them with specialized knowledge and skills within the chosen profession”. In the future, according to the authors of the document, this will contribute to the permanent education of future generations [12].

But here we are faced with an approach in which the traditional goals of higher education, such as the formation of scientific and philosophical worldview, self-improvement, creative thinking, the ability to identify and pose problems, create new knowledge degenerate into procedures that describe the algorithm of “machine learning” in technical sphere. According to this approach, a person is seen as a functional unit, a carrier of “creative thinking”, a producer of “new knowledge” and a participant in “innovation”. Instead of creating new knowledge, repetition, compilation and reproduction become the ideal and goal of higher education. The “educational process” itself is a certain idealized structure that works according to mechanistic laws.

Of course, it can be argued that the example taken illustrates only the peculiarities of bureaucratic terminology and cannot serve as a justification for the general trend. But such a restriction seems too optimistic. It is no secret that in the so-called information society, knowledge is one of the most valuable resources, and the education system is becoming one of the most important government agencies. The concept of the information society is based on the extreme informatization of society, its transformation into a computer network. And, if the ideal of the education system in the Enlightenment was a well-established mechanism that produces normal members of society who can benefit the state, that the ideal of the modern education system is a well-designed computer.

The authors of the strategy are also interested in the fact that education is currently lagging behind digitalization, and more needs to be done to take advantage of the tools and strengths of new technologies, while addressing possible abuses such as cyber intrusion and confidentiality. But, unfortunately, nothing is said about the threat of digital dehumanization and deontologization of the educational process.

Most often, the dehumanization of education is understood as the reduction of the role of humanitarian knowledge in the process of professional training and the formation and development of the personality of the future specialist [10, p. 53]. However, the other side becomes more fundamental: the inconspicuous process of replacing a person with a technical substitute, ie a machine, and “mechanization” or “computerization” of the person himself. Digitalization begins to invade the space of the noosphere and relentlessly change it. Dehumanization consists primarily in the transformation of education into an instrumental category of industrial and market relations, in the loss of the humanistic meaning of education, as a result of which it turns into a utilitarian assimilation of a narrow range of professional knowledge and skills.

But, as Ortega y Gasset notes, “to move in the thickets of life, you must be experienced”, ie you need to understand the conditions and principles of existence, you need to have an idea of time and environment in which man exists, to enter a certain spiritual and cultural space [2, p. 99].

Education, in particular university education, not is simply learning, broadcasting, transferring a certain amount of knowledge and acquiring professional skills and competencies. Its humanistic meaning is the formation and education of man in general, his spirituality, morality, universal qualities that allow him to create and define the world around you and himself. This is achieved by joining the spiritual heritage of mankind, as well as gaining skills to identify, understand, analyze the essence, preconditions and consequences, the processes that take place [11, p. 17]. As J. Mill notes in a landmark speech on university education, “People who dedicate themselves to a well-known profession should bring out of the university not professional knowledge, but knowledge that would guide the use of their professional knowledge, and which would illuminate the technical details of a special subject with the light of general education. People can be competent lawyers without a general education, but only a general education can make them lawyers-philosophers: who want and who are able to understand the principles, instead of just cluttering their memory with details. And the same happens in all other useful activities, including mechanical. Upbringing makes a man a smarter shoemaker if he is engaged in the shoemaking trade, but it does not do so by teaching him to sew boots; it makes it the mental exercise it gives and the habits it communicates” [13]. In this sense, the dehumanization of education can be the destruction of the cultural space in which only humanity can exist.

So, digital dehumanization as a general process of removing “human” from social and individual practice, which manifested itself at the beginning of the introduction of digital technologies in the education system and intensified in the era of “widespread” distancing, threatens traditional principles, conditions and prospects of education. This study, of course, cannot be exhaustive and definitive. In order to provide specific recommendations for improving

the educational process in the context of digitalization in future studies, it is planned to diversify research: at first, to conceptualize the forms of presence of dehumanization in the educational process, at second, to implement surveys of students of different educational institutions, surveys of teachers, in-depth interviews, expert surveys, comparison of results and investigating the international experience of digitalization of education.

Of course, the authors of the article are not opponents of digitalization and do not call for abandoning its implementation in the educational process. The main thing in this study is to clarify the dangers to humans that lie in digital education. It may seem that in order to draw attention to the problem and think about preventing dehumanization, researchers are dramatizing some points, but the speed and catastrophic nature of changes sometimes outstrip any forecasts. Therefore, it is necessary to think as early and broadly and deeply as possible about potential situations in the face of current and future challenges which education system will inevitably collide with.

References

1. Бауман З. Донскіс Л. Моральна сліпота. Втрата чутливості у плинній сучасності. Київ : Дух і літера, 2014. 280 с.
2. Ortega y Gasset, J.: *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Essays on Art, Culture, and Literature*. NJ Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2019. 224 p.
3. Foucault, M.: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London : Penguin Books, Limited, 2020. 352 p.
4. Heidegger. M.: *Country path conversations*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2016. 208 p.
5. Vasylieva L., Chmyhun S., Procenko O.: *Problems and Solutions for an IT-Dependent Information Society: Essence, Development and Prospects: The 11th International IEEE Conference Dependable Systems, Services and Technologies, DESSERT'2020 (Kiev, 20–22 may 2020), Kiev, p. 451–455.*
6. Лютко Н. В. Інформаційне суспільство та ціннісні орієнтації особистості. *Наукові праці Чорноморського державного університету імені Петра Могили. Серія: Політологія*. 2012. Т. 182, Вип. 170, с. 98–101.
7. Laura, R., Hannam, F.: *The Technologisation of Education and the Pathway to Depersonalisation and Dehumanisation. Asian Journal of Social Science Studies; Vol. 2, No. 2; 2017, p. 1–9.*
8. Рижак Л. :Дегуманізація життя: соціально-технологічні виклики сучасності. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філос.-політолог. студії*. 2019. Випуск 22. С. 89–95.
9. Посохов С. И. Дегуманізація суспільства чи криза гуманітаристики: що первинне з точки зору ризиків? *Новий Колегіум*. 2018. № 2. С. 22–25.
10. Ковалевська О., Копіна А., Широка С. : Феномен критичного мислення в контексті глобальних викликів сучасного суспільства. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філос.-політолог. студії*. 2021. Випуск 34. С. 50–57.
11. Bilchuk, N., Kolotova, L.: “Heart” as a basis formation of spirituality. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія Філо.-політолог. студії*. 2021. Випуск 34. С. 15–20.
12. Міністерство освіти і науки України. Стратегія розвитку вищої освіти в Україні на 2021–2031 роки. Режим доступу: <https://mon.gov.ua/storage/app/media/rizne/2020/09/25/rozvitku-vishchoi-osviti-v-ukraini-02-10-2020.pdf>
13. Совсун І. Ідея університету та її історичні метаморфози. Режим доступу: <https://medium.com/@inna.sovsun>

ДЕГУМАНІЗАЦІЯ В ЦИФРОВОМУ ОСВІТНЬОМУ ПРОЦЕСІ: ДОСВІД СОЦІАЛЬНО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ РЕФЛЕКСІЇ

Світлана Широка, Наталя Більчук, Георгій Півень

*Національний аерокосмічний університет імені М.С. Жуковського,
гуманітарно-правовий факультет, кафедра філософії та суспільних наук
вул. Чкалова, 17, 61070, м. Харків, Україна*

Стаття базується на досвіді та філософській рефлексії учасників освітнього процесу щодо навчання в умовах тотальної цифровізації, спричиненої спочатку пандемією Covid-19, а потім повномасштабною війною в Україні. Дослідження присвячене соціально-філософському аналізу особливостей освітнього процесу у вищій школі, пов'язаних з поширенням інформаційних технологій, дистанційної форми навчання, та подальшою дегуманізацією усіх рівнів соціального простору. Надається філософський аналіз сутності та підґрунтя процесу дегуманізації вищої освіти, що має на меті в подальшому визначення можливих ризиків та шляхів їх подолання. Представлено загальнотеоретичне дослідження проблеми цифрової дегуманізації освіти в контексті розвитку та впровадження інформаційних технологій. Автори статті розглядають дегуманізацію освіти не тільки як зменшення ролі гуманітарних знань у процесі професійної підготовки. Заміна людського способу досягнення дійсності технічними моделями, а саме «механізація» та «комп'ютеризація» учасників освітнього процесу, призводить до витіснення людського екзистенційного способу комунікації з освітнього простору, втрати гуманістичного змісту освіти та перетворення її на інструментальну категорію виробничо-ринкових відносин, метою якої стає утилітарне засвоєння вузького кола професійних знань і умінь.

Дегуманізація розглядається як загальний процес усунення «людського фактору» із суспільної та індивідуальної практики: втрату та неспроможність до створення нових духовних і моральних цінностей, девальвацію характеристик людини, «ламання» цілісного світогляду. Авторами показано, що сучасний освітній процес демонструє використання великої кількості суто технічних термінів, таких як «академічна мобільність», «освітні технології», «інновації», «людські ресурси», «мережа вищих навчальних закладів», «обробка інформації», «механізми зворотного зв'язку, оцінювання, взаємодія», «освітня траєкторія», «інтелектуальний продукт», «якісні показники» тощо. Людина в цьому тезаурусі нібито розглядається як функціональна одиниця, носій «творчого мислення», виробник «нового знання» та учасник «інновації». Але неможливо приховати, що замість створення нових знань ідеалом і метою вищої освіти стає повторення, копіювання та відтворення, а традиційні цілі вищої освіти, такі як формування науково-філософського світогляду, самовдосконалення, креативне мислення, вміння виявляти й ставити проблеми, створювати нове знання, вироджуються в процедури, що описують алгоритм «машинного навчання» в технічній сфері. У цьому сенсі дегуманізація освіти може призвести до глобальної антропологічної кризи, результатом якої стане руйнування культурного простору, в якому існувало людство. Розуміння та обговорення цього ризику дозволить університетам переглянути та вдосконалити свої освітні стратегії з урахуванням висвітлених когнітивних, етичних та соціальних проблем.

Ключові слова: освіта, дегуманізація, діджиталізація, цифровий освітній процес, деонтологізація.