

**Philosophy**

UDC 165:316.3:1(091):17

DOI <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20033284>

**The limits of rationalism in the context of global challenges:  
philosophical analysis of cognitive and value-based determinants**

**Nataliia Morska,**

PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences,  
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University,  
Ternopil, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6533-2802>

**Victor Grushko,**

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences,  
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University,  
Ternopil, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5585-0588>

**Dmytro Demchuk,**

Assistant of the Department of Service,  
Technology and Occupational Safety,  
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University,  
Ternopil, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3216-3355>

**Accepted: 13.04.2026 | Published: 30.04.2026**

**Abstract.** *The article offers a comprehensive examination of rationalism as a leading intellectual paradigm that has enabled humanity to overcome dependence on natural forces and laws, contributed to the achievement of socially significant goals and facilitated the effective resolution of a number of acute social problems. The study analyses the specifics of the process of cognition of reality through the lens of rational thought. It also outlines heuristic potential and limits of applicability. Besides, it identifies the factors that have led to the opening of new opportunities for humanity, particularly the development of science, technology and social institutions, which ensured the transition of society to a qualitatively new level of civilizational development.*

*At the same time, the paper reveals the contradictory consequences of the dominance of the rationalist paradigm, including the tendencies to accumulate, scale up and exacerbate global problems, the origins of which coincide with the establishment of the rationalist modes of thinking. It is argued that that a number of such problems already pose a threat to the stability of modern civilization, humanity and the biosphere of the planet. The study demonstrates the limitations of rationally oriented mind in timely identification of potential risks and development of complex solutions without generating new complications in related areas of life.*

*Special attention is given to the analysis of the role of the emotional and effective domain, value system and intuition in the process of meaning-making, decision-making and the formation of strategies for responding to historical challenges. It substantiate the need to integrate rational and irrational principles as a prerequisite for achieving organic unity of society and ensuring a more balanced, safe and humanistic oriented development of human civilization.*

*This study is intended for philosophers and a wide range of scholars and researchers in the social sciences and humanities, including sociologists, cultural scientists, political scientists, psychologists who are interested in the problems of the ratio of rational and irrational in the processes of cognition and social*

development. The article may also be useful to teachers of higher education institutions, postgraduate students and students engaged in research in philosophy, epistemology, social philosophy and global studies.

**Keywords:** *rationalism, existential threats, irrationalism, globalization, values, cordocentrism.*

**Межі раціоналізму в умовах глобальних викликів: філософський аналіз  
когнітивних і ціннісних детермінант**

**Морська Наталія Львівна,**

кандидат філософських наук, доцент,

доцент кафедри філософії та суспільних наук,

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет

імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6533-2802>

**Грушко Віктор Сергійович**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент,

доцент кафедри філософії та суспільних наук,

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет

імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5585-0588>

**Демчук Дмитро Михайлович**

асистент кафедри сфери обслуговування,

технологій та охорони праці,

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет

імені Володимира Гнатюка, м. Тернопіль, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3216-3355>

***Анотація.** У роботі комплексно висвітлено роль раціоналізму як провідної інтелектуальної парадигми, що забезпечила подолання залежності людини від природних сил і закономірностей, сприяла досягненню суспільнозначущих цілей та ефективному розв'язанню низки гострих соціальних проблем. Проаналізовано специфіку процесу пізнання реальності за допомогою інструментарію раціоналізованого розуму, окреслено його евристичний потенціал і межі застосування. Розкрито чинники, які зумовили відкриття нових можливостей для людства, зокрема розвиток науки, техніки та соціальних інститутів, що забезпечили перехід суспільства на якісно новий рівень цивілізаційного поступу.*

*Водночас виявлено суперечливі наслідки домінування раціоналістичної парадигми, зокрема тенденції до накопичення, масштабування та загострення глобальних проблем, витоки яких збігаються з утвердженням раціоналістичного способу мислення. Обґрунтовано, що низка таких проблем уже становить загрозу для стабільності сучасної цивілізації, людства та біосфери планети. Показано обмеженість раціонально зорієнтованого розуму у своєчасному виявленні потенційних ризиків і виробленні комплексних рішень без породження нових ускладнень у суміжних сферах життєдіяльності.*

*Окрему увагу приділено аналізу ролі емоційно-почуттєвої сфери, системи цінностей та інтуїції у процесі смислотворення, прийняття рішень і формування стратегій відповіді на історичні виклики. Доведено необхідність інтеграції раціонального й ірраціонального начал як передумови досягнення органічної єдності суспільства та забезпечення більш збалансованого, безпечного й гуманістично орієнтованого розвитку людської цивілізації.*

*Дане дослідження розраховане на філософів та широке коло науковців і дослідників у галузях соціогуманітарного знання, зокрема соціологів,*

культурологів, політологів, психологів, які цікавляться проблемами співвідношення раціонального та ірраціонального у процесах пізнання і суспільного розвитку. Стаття також може бути корисною викладачам закладів вищої освіти, аспірантам і студентам, що здійснюють наукові пошуки у сфері філософії, теорії пізнання, соціальної філософії та глобалістики.

**Ключові слова:** раціоналізм, розум, екзистенційні загрози, ірраціоналізм, глобалізація, цінності, кордоцентризм, «серце».

**Problem statement.** Since the ideological revolution initiated by thinkers of the Enlightenment, humanity has identified the human mind as its most important resource, the key means of solving problems and the most effective tool for achieving significant goals. Over time, the mind has supplanted the human soul, and the priorities of material life have become more significant for people than moral. At the turn of the eras, religion as the principal authority in determining truth was replaced by science, within which rationalism assumed a central role by assigning a decisive function to reason. While in the natural sciences empiricism continued to compete with rationalism, in spheres shaping social consciousness the latter came to dominate almost completely. The remarkable successes of rationalism over the past centuries have largely obscured the limitations of its potential, allowing the problems generated by its dominance to accumulate steadily. At the present stage, these developments have brought humanity to a critical threshold, beyond which any possible course of action entails existential risks for humanity as a whole.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The limitations of rationalism and, in particular, of the capacities of human reason have been recognized since the period of its intellectual ascendancy in public consciousness. However, contemporary scholarly attention to the inadequacies of reason remains relatively limited, with only a narrow circle of researchers addressing this issue in a systematic

way. Among those who have contributed to this line of review are Ukrainian thinkers Serhiy Krymsky, Volodymyr Ilyin, and Andriy Baumeister; French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Jean-François Lyotard; as well as the Czech economist and scholar Tomáš Sedláček, and others.

**Highlighting previously unallocated parts of the overall problem.** Despite the absence of individual scientific studies, the issue of identifying the limitations of rationalism as a tool of cognition has not yet been the subject of comprehensive scholarly analysis. The problem of displacing moral and spiritual guidelines from public consciousness, which leads to an imbalance between the material and value dimensions of development, remains insufficiently explored. In addition, the influence of the dominance of rational thinking on society's ability to timely recognize existential threats and adequately respond to them remains without due attention, which exacerbates the crisis trends of modernity.

**Formulation of the aim and objectives of the article.** The aim of the article is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the influence of the rationalist paradigm on social development, to elucidate its productive potential, and to identify the problems and limitations arising from its dominance in the modern world.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives have been set: to examine the role of rationalism in attaining socially significant outcomes and transforming social reality; to identify the key problems caused by the dominance of the rationalist approach; to analyze the causes behind the growth of existential threats at the current stage of human development; to determine the limits of the effectiveness of reason as a primary tool of cognition and action; and to clarify the conditions under which rationalism either facilitates or impedes the timely recognition of and adequate response to contemporary challenges.

The theoretical and methodological framework of the study is based on hermeneutic, structuralist, and phenomenological approaches. The argumentation

draws on general scientific and philosophical principles, in particular systemacity, historicism, and cognitivism.

**Presentation of the Main Material of the Study.** From the earliest stages of their development, humans have distinguished themselves from other living beings through their orientation toward conscious knowledge of their own nature and surrounding reality, toward the accumulation of information, and toward the desire to understand themselves and their place in all the processes in which they have to participate. In contrast to other living beings, human reality is significantly more complex, even though all exist within the same physical world. The human mind has played a decisive role in expanding both the scope and complexity of this reality. In humans, the role of natural mechanisms regulating life is substantially reduced. Instead, culture imposes constraints on instinct-driven behavior while simultaneously equipping individuals with more effective tools for survival.

Culture limited and regulated the influence of instinctive nature on human behavior, while simultaneously opening new opportunities for people to master and create an internal reality of their own—a domain in which the mind began to play a key role. The material supporting this creative process became symbolic designations of everything people knew—signs and symbols—which allowed them to construct a model of reality in their imagination and, at the same time, to develop abstract thinking. Thanks to signs and symbols, people gained the opportunity to understand reality more effectively by assimilating new knowledge acquired not only through personal experience, but also theoretically from others. Moreover, this model of reality, formed with the help of signs and symbols, allowed humans, compared to other organisms, to navigate their environment much more effectively, while also enabling them to self-organize and develop highly specialized, complex social structures, such as civilizations. Ultimately, the invention of signs and symbols, whose primary function is to convey information, enabled human reason

to forge a path toward liberation from nature's deterministic dictates over human life [9, p. 21].

Over time, the prioritization of reason as the primary means of cognition came to be conceptualized as rationalism. In the large-scale transformation of social consciousness, which culminated in a shift in the paradigm of human development known as the Age of Enlightenment, rationalism came to occupy a prominent place in people's lives and in ensuring the progressive development of modern civilization [10, pp. 401–406]. Scientific rationalism, together with empiricism, has demonstrated its practical usefulness, the most obvious manifestation of which has been scientific and technological progress. This progress significantly improved living conditions, reduced mortality, extended life expectancy, and expanded well-being to a far broader segment of the population than was possible during the mythological or religious stages of societal development. At the same time, the successes of rationalism, manifested in a number of achievements across many fields of activity, cannot conceal the fact that it is limited in its capabilities. In particular, it faces difficulties in forming the organic integrity of both large societies and small social groups, such as families; in determining what is most important in people's lives; in reaching new levels of understanding the meanings of human existence; and in identifying qualitatively new and more promising horizons of self-realization. The latter is possible only under conditions of adopting a paradigm of cognition that is more adequate to the challenges of the time.

Rationalism asserts its validity through “corridor” causal thinking, limiting itself to a narrow track of logical argumentation, which appears as a kind of Procrustean bed that ignores (or does not take into account) “extraneous” factors of influence, thereby narrowing the “peripheral” scope of human consciousness in the perception of reality. The logical frameworks constructed by rationalism in fields such as physics, chemistry, and engineering, based on experiments with predetermined conditions, the functioning of closed systems, or the solving of highly

complex mathematical problems with fixed components, naturally ensure repeatability and, consequently, enable the practical application of research results for human benefit [11, p. 85]. However, in the living, dynamic reality of isolated processes with clearly defined factors of influence, which will also be limited by the framework of convenient for the work of the human mind branches of knowledge, do not exist. That is, reality is actually irrational and with rational approaches people are doomed to make fatal wrong decisions and receive corresponding unexpected and often extremely unacceptable results for themselves. In particular, the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer once concluded that society, with its unfounded belief in the omnipotence of its mind, changes mainly in form, and progress in content is not obvious. Practice shows that rationalism provides controlled results, achieving controllability in artificially created isolated systems and at the same time reveals its limited capabilities in effectively predicting the development of processes in complex, open, highly dynamic ones, in particular, such as human society [12, pp. 124-139].

Rationalism has clearly demonstrated its ability to provide results in the fight against hunger and deadly diseases as well as has shown its inability to balance the need to preserve nature and satisfy the virtually unlimited desires and aspirations of the rapidly growing population of the planet. It has shown itself best in the creation of high-speed computers, information networks, artificial intelligence, but it shows its inability to create safeguards against the use of their capabilities to the detriment of people, local societies and humanity as a whole by attackers. Rationalism often opposes natural instincts, as well as the freedom of human will, which will always be tightly contained within any rationalized, logically based doctrine. The existentialist philosopher Lev Shestov concludes that logically proven truths are often used as instruments of control and domination, limiting within their framework the freedom of individuals, particularly their capacity for creative self-realization. Narrowly focused ideas within complex systems, such as society and organizational

structures, function in a way that resembles mechanisms in which everything, including people, is regarded exclusively as either a resource or an obstacle to be eliminated. Other similar structures formed on the rational principles are likewise interpreted in binary terms, either as resources or obstacles. Thus, rationalism forms an extremely unattractive picture of reality in which it is possible to ensure people's satiety, but there are no guarantees that a rationalized system of organizing life will not turn into a threat to freedoms and security, both for individuals and for society as a whole, as well as the possibilities of full self-realization of individuals as unique personalities.

Rationalism can help unite humanity into a single globalized community, as is happening at the current stage of its development with the help of the information network, trade and financial resources, which are moving with increasing speed through the World Wide Web. However, it is obvious that in this system people are only an addition to it. They appear as cogs in a soulless mechanism, each of which reveals its value for the whole solely as its ability to provide one or another function necessary to maintain the existing dynamics.

At the same time, this globalized mechanism, formed on the basis of reason, acquires more and more obvious features of an informational and financial Maelstrom, like a giant whirlpool in the sea, vividly described by American writer Edgard Allan Poe in his work "The Maelstrom", whose force, once entering the abyss it creates, is almost impossible to resist. This global informational and financial abyss absorbs increasing amounts of natural resources, transforming them into toxic waste in the world of living beings, leading to population decline, depopulation, the extinction of entire species, and the expansion of uninhabitable deserts; it transforms the economy, shifting it from the production of essential goods toward a quasi-economic process of continuous multiplication of simulacra (financial assets), which function as instruments of power for those who accumulate them over those who lack access to basic necessities; and it undermines human

existence, eroding both natural bonds between people and the conditions of their lives.

Czech economist Tomáš Sedláček noted that rationalism led to the replacement of wisdom with precision, and humanity with mathematics [14, p. 476]. By focusing public attention on details, rationalism has contributed to a situation in society aptly characterized by the phrase “*not being able to see the forest for the trees.*” Behind these “trees” that is, a large number of fragmented informational details, lie the monopolization of power resources in the globalized world at one pole and a steady deterioration of living conditions and narrowing of freedoms at the other, both of which contribute to the rapid emergence of a historical period in which existential threats are significantly increasing. Obviously, if rationalism with its logical arguments has brought humanity to critical threshold, then its potential is unlikely to be enough to change the trajectory of development without creating no less large-scale problems in other areas important to people. For example, the implementation of the ideas of Marxism clearly demonstrated that solving the problem of income inequality has led to catastrophic consequences, totalitarian overregulation of people's lives, mass extermination of undesirables, paralysis of the ability to scientific, technological and cultural development, etc. Similarly, the practices of Nazism and various forms of pseudo-religious fundamentalism in the twentieth century proved to be profoundly destructive. At the same time, a range of problems has also accumulated within rationally justified liberalism.

The Turkish economist Dani Rodrik, based on systems analysis, concludes that nation-states, democracy, and economic globalization cannot coexist simultaneously, and that one of these three defining institutions of modernity will always be incompatible with the others. He describes this as the paradox of globalization, which can also be interpreted as the limitations of rationalism in ensuring the effective organization of highly complex systems [5]. The globally interconnected world shaped by cooperation, trade, and financial flows constitutes a

system of extreme complexity, in which a large number of subjects with different potential capacities and characteristics are involved. The motives of each subject may exist on different levels and are continuously changing under the influence of interactions among all participants.

It is therefore important to take into account that changes in some areas of life cause changes in the quality of the environment in other areas, where subjects guided by different motives and interests interact. Therefore, to ensure efficiency in each field of activity, all parties involved must constantly adjust the forms and methods by which they pursue their objectives. In particular, the economies of medieval cities in Western Europe, the period of early capitalism and the modern financialized stage of development are very different systems of social organization. With each successive transformation, however, the ability of individuals to rationally control all processes upon which their existence depends is constantly decreasing. Moreover, not only the economy but also other spheres of human activity are constantly changing, becoming increasingly complex with each stage of development. At the same time, each generation is guided by increasingly different motives compared to previous ones, trying to assert themselves in different ways in different spheres. In conditions where it is impossible to possess complete information and fully control existing dynamics, rationalism inevitably leads to misjudgments of reality and to decisions that are either incorrect or correct but belated. Furthermore, as dynamics increase and changes accumulate, the proportion of false responses is likely to increase. This means that the contemporary system of social organization, shaped by rationalized thinking and driven largely by self-interested monetary motives, may enter a phase of uncontrollable turbulence. Such a trajectory could ultimately lead to social chaos, a “war of all against all” for the remaining resources, and a struggle for access to depleted ecosystems.

In the modern information age, society has matured to recognize the value of information and, as a result, the pace of its accumulation is growing exponentially.

However, with this increase, the ability of people to adequately interact with the existing dynamics of reality, the properties of which are rapidly changing, is constantly decreasing [2]. Another problem is superimposed on this one – the same information, when perceived by different people, acquires a different semantic interpretation. The ancient sages noticed that things perceived by people as they are, and people themselves are all different. Both different individuals and nations can be identified through specific features of their languages, perceive the same phenomena, processes, objects, the same subjects in different ways [8, pp. 56-74]. The German philologist and philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt concluded that each language forms its own distinct channel of thought development, and that the names of objects in different linguistic communities are not merely different phonetic designations, but different conceptualizations of the same thing. As a result, rationalism appears not as something single, integral, but as a set of a large number of interpretative systems, each of which only within its own argumentative track justifies its local truths, while ignoring the arguments from alternative worldview concepts. Therefore, the efficiency promoted by Adam Smith within the framework of rationalism cannot be reconciled with the equality insisted on by Karl Marx. The same applies to national heroes among different peoples, who at the same time appear as antiheroes in neighboring countries.

Despite criticism of rationalism from competing ways of knowing reality, such as empiricism, instinctivism, intuitionism, voluntarism or existentialism, this system of thinking continues to dominate in vast majority of spheres of life in modern society. It does not seem possible to change the inertia of the existing dynamics, formed by rationalism, in which multi-billion humanity is involved, before it encounters catastrophic consequences of a global scale to which it is relentlessly approaching. However, contemporary awareness of threats should stimulate the search for more effective forms of human interaction with a complex reality that is rapidly changing not only in form but also in its fundamental

properties. This, in turn, requires a shift toward a higher level of understanding social reality and its meanings, beyond mere participation in the pursuit of material accumulation, wealth, and power.

Karl Jaspers discovered that throughout the history of mankind there have been many turning points when the development of a certain trend reached a kind of impasse, followed by radical shifts toward qualitatively new directions, in which societies formed new goals and priorities, which to achieve people began to make efforts to. Over time, new dominant paradigms emerged. There have been several such turning points in the history of mankind, and everything indicates that today humanity is steadily approaching the next one. The values and meanings introduced by the Enlightenment are increasingly undergoing devaluation, and the today's dominant symbolic system will begin to be perceived as a world of deception in a historically significant time. Many people in the post-socialist space have already experienced this after the collapse of the Marxist economy. The state of societal disbelief in the dying meanings, priorities, systems of knowledge, the sign system, the truths that the era that is exhausting itself affirms, Estonian semiotician Yuri Lotman described it as an asymantic-asyntactic type of culture. This is a state of systemic crisis and disintegration of society, which will cause an acute need to find an alternative [9, p. 29]. As representatives of cyclical theories, such as Giambattisto Vico, Peterim Sorokin, suggest, the next era should be religious, but specific content will emerge through a struggle among multiple competing alternatives, not limited to currently dominant belief systems.

Among the important tasks that humanity will have to address in the foreseeable future is the search for ways to ensure not mechanical, but organic integrity of humanity. The features of this integrity were revealed in the works of the French sociologist Émile Durkheim. The scientist drew attention to the important role of the integration of society into a single organized whole of such irrational factors as morality (based on sacrifice, not profit), ideals, religion (which aims to

base actions not on past experience or the results of experiments, but on future prospects, which also go beyond the framework of biological life). It is obvious that the ideas of cordocentrist thinkers, including the Ukrainian philosopher Pamfil Yurkevich, who argued that the truth can be understood not only through the work of the mind alone, but through the active participation of the “heart” (empathy). It will become increasingly relevant, and therefore an important role in this process should belong to morality, the basis of which is empathy [13, p. 12]. Power, monetary, property, consumer, hedonistic immoderation, stimulated by the promoted rationalistic mind, based on personal self-interest should establish permissible limits of the “heart”. Not only should individual freedom end where the freedom of other people begins, but also personal claims and desires should be limited in order to meet the needs of others and guarantee the safe existence of future generations in the long term. The development of the “heart” (empathy) can curb the mind in its focus on segmenting into ever smaller antagonistic opposites, and teach us to reveal the complementary unity in the diversity of the world. The Swiss psychologist and cultural philosopher Carl Gustav Jung, the Ukrainian writer and philosopher Panteleimon Kulish, the German-French thinker Albert Schweitzer, and others expressed similar ideas regarding the “heart”.

The human mind is not a self-sufficient factor; it functions as an instrumental tool. Without support for something, it itself has problems with building logical arguments and the ability to prove anything. The foundation for reason throughout history has been human desire, as William Shakespeare suggested through one of the characters in his play “Henry IV”. Desires, in turn, can be either egocentric, actively stimulated by the ideology of the modern competitive free market economy, or based on each person`s perception of themselves through the prism of organic unity with integrity – family, clan, people, humanity, God, etc. Heartless, rationalized egocentrism, the rigid opposition of individual desires to the needs of others, society, and the natural environment, forms a kind of pathological social

structure that already threatens the survival of humanity. From the earliest stages of human development, people have mastered new tools that nature has endowed them with in order to ensure their own survival and self-affirmation, each of which was later used to solve certain specific tasks. Natural instincts, which play a decisive role in animal life, have not disappeared in people, but have only begun to occupy a certain niche in their lives. At a certain stage, the human mind began to fulfill its important function, which, as practice has shown, has natural limits in the ability to solve problems of different quality, master unlimited amounts of information, process it with sufficient efficiency, identify meanings in a sea of facts and make effective decisions in time.

At the current stage of development, the systems in which people live and self-realize are becoming increasingly complex, accompanied by the intensification of global processes. Under these conditions, the need for the ability to respond promptly and adequately to emerging challenges, including unexpected events beyond rational anticipation, is steadily growing. The Lebanese–American risk analyst Nassim Nicholas Taleb figuratively refers to such unpredictable events as “black swans” [15]. At the same time, the usual rational tools, which are based on past experience, are increasingly showing their inability to predict in advance and effectively respond to force majeure, the frequency of which is constantly increasing due to the increase in the dynamics of all processes in society. Under such circumstances, there is a growing need to find a more reliable point of orientation, which could be found in the “heart” (emotional sphere). It allows individuals to perceive themselves not as isolated and vulnerable unit, which existence is threatened by the growing spontaneity of socio-economic and political dynamics that are uncontrolled by them. It also enables individuals to perceive themselves as integral parts of a large system whose total potential is commensurate with the scale of the challenges that need to be addressed. In addition, the “heart” (emotional

sphere), unlike the rational mind, has the ability to assess the qualitative (value) dimensions of information.

Without this dimension, the human mind, just like any information-processing system, faces difficulties in building a hierarchy of significance between the received data, identifying what is actually system-forming, and what is derivative. While the rationalized mind has helped and will continue to help people overcome negative consequences, the “heart” is able not to get lost in the flow of logical constructions, a large volume of segmented information, but to see the essence, a holistic picture behind the flow of arguments and facts, and to timely identify potential dangers in the very beginning.

It is obvious that the “heart” contains the potential for the development of intuition, which the outstanding scientist of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Albert Einstein considered the main means of new discoveries. Loving hearts of parents are able to reveal talents in their own children and help them to reveal themselves earlier than any super-powerful means of collecting and analyzing information. It reveals the ability of the sensory sphere to a more multifaceted, actually intuitive choice of actions under conditions of weak signals, a shortage of arguments and facts, in order to ensure the best possible result in the future. Love for knowledge opens the way to new discoveries, while voluntaristic coercion in the process of learning drives the mind of a trained person into the framework of old argumentative corridors that prevent them from perceiving reality from other angles, preserving not only inefficiency, but also often inhumane forms of organizing life. Love for the chosen professional activity is the most important prerequisite for becoming a good specialist and leader in the process of solving the most complex problems. In turn, the attitude towards the chosen work as a burdensome duty fills people`s lives with routine, mechanistic habits, becoming the cause of the accumulation of problems and the source of the development of many destructive processes. Modern rationalized reality, with all the problems and threats that it carries, clearly

demonstrates the lack of “heart” in the life of society, or sensitivity in ensuring a balance between the interacting parties, each of which is aimed at maximizing its own selfish benefit.

**Conclusions and Prospects for Further Exploration.** In the course of historical development, beginning in antiquity, two leading modes of knowing reality have been formed: the rational, based on logical thinking, consistent generalization of empirical facts and evidence, and intuitive, associated with direct comprehension of meanings, holistic perception and axiological reflection. The Age of Enlightenment laid the foundations for the dominance of the rationalist paradigm, which determined the priority of logical-instrumental approaches in the processes of cognition, decision-making and social development. Within the framework of this paradigm, humanity has achieved significant results, primarily in the field of scientific and technological progress, socio-institutional organization and increasing the efficiency of practical activity.

At the same time, the absolutization of rationality has generated a number of destructive tendencies, in particular, the strengthening of social alienation, the reduction of value -meaning dimensions of existence, as well as the aggravation of environmental problems. The growth of global risks and crisis phenomena testifies to the limitations of exclusively rational-instrumental approaches in ensuring sustainable development and overcoming modern challenges. In this regard, the need to transform the cognitive and worldview paradigm in the direction of integrating rational and intuitive-value dimensions is becoming more urgent. This is about reorienting from egocentric models to collectively-oriented (communal) forms of thinking, from fragmentation to a holistic vision, from short-term tactical decisions to strategically balanced approaches.

Prospects for further exploration lie in the study of mechanisms and practices of the transitioning from the dominance of rational-instrumental thinking to an

integrative, holistic-value approach, particularly in the context of educational, socio-cultural, and managerial transformations of modern society.

### List of sources used

1. Capra, F. *The turning point: science, society, and the rising culture*. New York: Bantam Books, 1982. 464 p.
2. Grushko, V. Role of information in functioning and development of human society. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (IJMET)*. 2018. Vol. 9, issue 11. P. 1822–1830.
3. Habermas, J. *The theory of communicative action. Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984. 465 p.
4. Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T. W. *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. 305 p.
5. Rodrik, D. *The globalization paradox: democracy and the future of the world economy*. New York; London: W. W. Norton, 2011. 368 p.
6. Sedláček, T. *Economics of good and evil: the quest for economic meaning from Gilgamesh to Wall Street*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 384 p.
7. Taylor, C. *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989. 601 p.
8. Бацевич, Ф. С. *Духовна синергетика рідної мови: лінгвофілософські нариси*. Київ: ВЦ «Академія», 2009. 192 с.
9. Грушко, В. В. *Пошуки сенсів в хаосмосі реальності*. Таллінн: GlobeEdit, 2020. 124 с.
10. Ільїн, В. В. *Фінансова цивілізація*. Київ: Книга, 2007. 528 с.
11. Каммінгс, С. *Реконструкція стратегії*. Харків: Гуманітарний Центр, 2010. 560 с.
12. Кримський, С. Б. *Під сигнатурою Софії*. Київ: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2008. 367 с.

13. Морська, Н. Л. Ірраціональне пізнання в філософській думці України: автореф. дис. ... канд. філос. наук: 09.00.05 / Н. Л. Морська. Львів, 2003. 20 с.
14. Седлачек, Т. *Економіка добра і зла*. Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2017. 520 с.
15. Талеб, Н. Н. *Чорний лебідь. Про (не)ймовірне у реальному житті*. Київ: Наш Формат, 2021. 392 с.