ФІЛАСОФІЯ І САЦЫЯЛОГІЯ

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

Olga L. Poznjakova

Belarusian State Medical University, Minsk, Belarus

DRAMA PHILOSOPHY: FROM NOTION TO CONCEPT

Abstract. Contemporary European society, including the Belarusian state, is forced to adapt to the life in a constant crisis. Traditional themes of the philosophy of history such as the meaning and direction of the historical development of society, the driving forces of the historical process, the ultimate goals of human development, became especially relevant in the XXI century and permeate the entire field of modern philosophical research. The philosophical analysis of drama as a concept meets the criteria of scientific novelty and significance within the urgent necessity to identify productive strategies for understanding and resolving social conflicts of local and global scales. The aim of the article is to explicate the methodological potential of drama as a concept in the modern sociocultural knowledge. Tasks: a) to analyze the prerequisites for the transdisciplinary use of dramatic terminology in the system of philosophical knowledge; b) to show the essential difference between drama concept, metaphor and notion; c) to reveal the theoretical basis of drama concept; d) to make a reconstruction of the drama model as an algorithm for the development of a conflict; e) to substantiate a dramatic approach for the study of the laws of social development. Research methods: historical and logical method, comparative analysis method, theoretical reconstruction method, systemic method. Conclusions: the transdisciplinary use of dramatic terminology became possible due to the works of E. Goffmann, K. Burke, N. Howard, V. Turner and others. The drama concept is the theoretical content of the drama notion. Unlike the metaphor, the concept can act as a system-forming element of the dramatic approach in the study of the laws of social development. Drama concept reveals its philosophical, linguistic and dramaturgic theoretical basis. Drama as an algorithm for the conflict development reflects the main conflict stages; the dramatic approach is a set of techniques (theoretical reconstruction of a drama model and dramatic conflict modelling) in the study and explanation of society united by the principle of dramatizing social reality. The dramatic approach can help to analyze orchestrated social conflicts as well as to prevent social catastrophe by identifying or modelling the social conflicts of interests.

Keywords: drama, notion, metaphor, concept, social conflict, dramatic approach, E. Goffman, K. Burke, N. Howard, V. Turner

О. Л. Познякова

Белорусский государственный медицинский университет, Минск, Беларусь

ФИЛОСОФИЯ ДРАМЫ: ОТ ПОНЯТИЯ К КОНЦЕПТУ

Аннотация. Современное белорусское государство, как и европейское общество в целом, вынуждено приспосабливаться к жизни в условиях постоянного кризиса. Традиционные темы философии истории, такие как смысл и направленность исторического развития общества, движущие силы исторического процесса, конечные цели развития человечества, стали особо актуальными в XXI веке и пронизывают все поле современных философских исследований. Философский анализ драмы как концепта, фундирующего драматический подход в изучении закономерностей развития общества, соответствует критериям научной новизны и значимости в условиях выявления продуктивных стратегий осмысления и разрешения конфликтов локального и глобального масштабов как настоящего, так и будущего. Цель исследования – эксплицировать методологический потенциал драмы в современном социокультурном знании. Задачи исследования заключаются в следующем: а) проанализировать предпосылки трансдисциплинарного использования драматургической терминологии в системе философского знания; б) показать сущностное отличие между драмой, понятием, метафорой и концептом; в) раскрыть теоретические основания драмы концепта; г) произвести теоретическую реконструкцию модели драмы как алгоритма развития конфликта; д) обосновать драматический

подход в изучении закономерностей развития общества. В результате автор делает вывод, что трансдисциплинарное использование драматургической терминологии в системе философского знания стало возможным благодаря творчеству И. Гоффмана, К. Берка, Н. Ховарда, В. Теренра. Концепт драмы – это теоретическое наполнение понятия драмы, в отличие от метафоры концепт может выступать системообразующим элементом драматического подхода в изучении закономерностей развития общества; теоретические основания концепта драмы: философские, лингвистические и драматургические; драма как алгоритм развития конфликта отражает основные стадии развития конфликта, эксплицированные в классической теории драматургии; драматический подход – это совокупность приемов теоретической реконструкции модели драмы и драматического моделирования конфликта в исследовании и объяснении общества, объединенных принципом драматизации социальной действительности.

Ключевые слова: драма, понятие, метафора, концепт, социальный конфликт, драматический подход, И. Гоффман, К. Берк, Н. Ховард, В. Теренер

Introduction. In the contemporary society the word "drama" has acquired a specific polysemic meaning and is most often used in speech either as a metaphor, e. g. drama of human relations, or as a notion meaning a cultural phenomenon which function is to entertain the public. Unfortunately, the ignorance and misunderstanding of the conceptual and methodological basis of drama makes an ordinary person a helpless and blind participant of orchestrated social conflicts. While the idea of drama as a modelling principle of social dramatization makes it possible to predict the global direction of social development as well as in the Republic of Belarus, and to minimize risks in resolving social contradictions.

Traditionally, the notion of drama is represented in the aesthetic, cultural, philological, art, literature contexts with the aim of a more detailed study of its form, essence and contents at various historical stages. As a rule, researchers are interested in the problems of generic literary differences between drama, epic and lyric poetry, difficulties in identifying the content of tragedy, drama and comedy, the state of these problems in the history of the world aesthetic and literature thought, etc. [1–3]. Typically, that drama in Eastern European humanities has always been the object of research in applied, narrow-profile disciplines and has never become the subject of a metatheoretical analysis. In other words, drama was never used as a methodological tool for social macrostructural processes investigation.

In recent years, a growing interest to the "social drama", "social dramatization", "drama of social interaction" is observed in Scopus publications [4–6]. The analysis of these studies shows a purely metaphorical, intuitive interpretation of drama that has a direct connection with a theater or theatrical performance. In this regard, the author of the article proposes to consider the drama not so much as a metaphor for describing the microcosm of a human life but rather as a formula or as a concept that underpins the dramatic approach in the study of the social development laws. While exploring the specifics of ancient Greek drama as a cultural phenomenon Russian philosopher A. F. Losev drew attention to the fact that "drama itself reflects social reality in its contradictory development" [7, p. 157].

Dramaturgic terminology in the system of philosophical knowledge. In fact, the history of human thought shows the attempts to apply the theatrical terminology to the description of human relationships. Thus, Gaius Petronius, the Roman writer, reflected the specifics of social interactions in the following aphorism: "Mundus Universus exercet histrioniam", which literally means, "The whole world is engaged in acting". William Shakespeare uses the metaphor of a theater to describe a human's life: "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players: they have their exits and their entrances; and one man in his time plays many parts..." [8, p. 47]. It is necessary to stress, that both G. Petronius and W. Shakespeare directly related to the professional activities of the playwright that gave them the privilege to use theatrical terminology to express their world-view attitudes.

Further, the transdisciplinary use of dramaturgic terminology became possible in the works of practical sociologists by the middle of the XX century. Kenneth Burke (1897–1993) – the American journalist, philosopher, influenced the formation and the development of the dramaturgy perspective in sociology. Concerning the issues of the world political processes he studied the features of human motivation during the II World War. Drama as a method of his analysis tries to answer empirical questions about how people explain (rationalize) their actions to others and to themselves. In his trilogy "Grammar of Motives" (1945) [9], "Rhetoric of Motives" (1950), "Language as a symbolic action" (unpublished)

he interprets social interactions in terms of five elements: action, scene, actor, means, and end. According to K. Burke, most cases of social interaction and communication should be understood as a form of drama, the results of which are determined by the ratio of these five elements. This formula became known as the "dramatic pentad" and was entrenched in the dramatic method, according to which the relationship between life and theater is understood literally, and not metaphorically: the whole world is a stage.

The ideas of K. Burke's drama, which, in turn, are a reference to W. Shakespeare, influenced the development of the thought of Erving Goffman (1922–1982), an American sociologist of Canadian origin, a follower of the school of social philosophy of American pragmatism. Analyzing the "stage production" of human microinteractions, methods of theatricalization of one's own activities, etc., he developed a "dramaturgic" or "theatrical" approach in his work "The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life" [10]. According to E. Goffman, "if we imagine ourselves in the role of directors watching what happens on the stage of everyday life, then we conduct a dramatic analysis, the study of social interactions using the terminology of theatrical performance" [11, p. 133].

It should be emphasized that the adherents of this trend interpret social interaction mainly as a play of human imagination about each other. A person directly exists for another one only as an imaginary entity that affects his mind. Interaction occurs not so much between individuals as subjects, integral indivisible personalities, but between different social presentations of individuals, as if between the characters they portray. Moreover, there is no place for a moral action in the context of such an interpersonal interaction, since everything is aimed at solving pragmatic issues. In this regard, the contemporary American sociologist John Welch calls E. Goffman's theory "a consumer product" [12, p. 35]. In fact, the dramaturgical approach is used to describe, how social movements can broadcast power. It is also being used in a new, interdisciplinary scientific study known as Technoself, which studies human identity in a technological society.

Further, Nigel Howard (1934–2008), an American mathematician, a writer and the author of the theory of metagames, creates the next stage on the path of implementation of dramaturgic terminology in the system of sociocultural knowledge. His drama theory consists of two parts: the theory of metagames, which he developed in the 1960s of the XX century, and a confrontational strategy of a conflict analysis "Dramatech" which he developed in the 1990s of the XX century [13, p. 30]. It is important to note that N. Howard's theory of metagames differs from the classical mathematical game theory by modernizing the fundamental principle of constructing a positive theory, which could be applied to the real world. In contrast to the mathematical model with the matrix form of the game the researcher builds an extensive model of the game in the form of a tree. Each node of this tree designates a point of choice of a certain action for a certain player. The scenarios of the game arise from the individual strategies created by the choices of the players, as well as by the chance. The outcome as a rational solution to the original problem is called the equilibrium point. If some outcome represents a balance point for all players, it indicates a possible solution to the conflict.

In addition, N. Howard abstracts from the fact that theater is an artificial activity, in which people participate by their own free will. He is interested in the heroes of the drama, but not in the fact that on some stage the actors play their roles. This difference is significant because the actors read the text provided by the script, while the heroes in the drama have free will, or at least they act as if they were free. In this respect, the project of N. Howard differs from the dramaturgic approach of E. Goffman and K. Burke, who use the metaphor of drama but focus on the script and the roles of the heroes.

Moreover, N. Howard formulates a manifesto for a new direction in the theory of metagames – the theory of drama. According to the author, the drama is used here not as a concept, but "*as a generalizing metaphor for the analysis of conflict situations*" [13, p. 33]. Therefor, N. Howard's theory rejects drama's original meaning: it ignores the dialectical, linguistic, dramaturgical basis of a drama theory. In other words, N. Howard's theory is built on a literary metaphor, not a concept, which is the reason for the weak evidence base of the whole doctrine, and which was a fail in practice. Let us consider the phases of the development of a conflict according to N. Howard [14, p. 43]:

1) the beginning of the drama. Formation of the composition of the heroes of the drama, their actions, outcomes, preferences and ideas about each other, awareness of the original problem, development of possible ways to solve it;

2) drama development. Heroes inform each other about their positive and negative intentions;

3) a positive solution to the drama. If it is found that the heroes' intentions in the drama are compatible, then the action goes into the stage of positive resolution. If for the players all the outcomes are obviously worse and if there is no potentially guaranteed improvement, then this outcome is a strict and strong equilibrium point of the entire drama;

4) the climax of the drama. In case of non-compatible positions the heroes of the drama try to change the views and beliefs of each other on the issue under discussion in all possible ways. The outcome of this phase can be both a positive and negative resolution of the drama, that is, a return to the previous stage or a transition to the next one;

5) a confrontational phase. The heroes of the drama, having not reached a positive solution take incompatible positions in resolving the conflict and plan how to benefit in the inevitable struggle with each other;

6) an execution phase. The heroes of the drama realize the plans developed at the previous stages.

Speaking about the shortcomings of N. Howard's theory, it is necessary to point out that the drama is not considered here as a whole conflict, but only at a certain stage, which contradicts the dialectical essence of the drama. According to the American researcher, the drama may end at the stage of contradiction, which is fundamentally wrong, since contradiction, by definition, is the core of the conflict but not the drama. Hence there is obviously unreasonableness of the sequence of stages in the development of the conflict. It also looks dubious that N. Howard proclaims a statement about participants who can change the "rules of the game" at any time and make these rules as convenient and effective as possible to satisfy their own interests (the so-called "creative rationality") [14, p. 51]. The American researcher assumes that such a process can last indefinitely until both sides are satisfied with the resolution of the conflict. The danger of this reasoning logic hides in the possibility of violating all the principles and norms of International law, unleashing wars for the sake of military equipment trading, using nuclear weapons, etc. The conflict will indeed be resolved, but at the global human cemetery, as Immanuel Kant wrote about it in his treatise "Towards Eternal Peace" [15, p. 11].

Finally, Victor Turner (1920–1983), an English and American anthropologist, the author of the book "From ritual to theater. The human seriousness of play" [16], in which he developed his postmodern theory of social drama. Social drama, says V. Turner, is defined as "aharmonic or disharmonic social process, arising in conflict situations" [17, c. 37]. It is "an eruption from the level surface of ongoing social life, with its interactions, transactions, reciprocities, its customs making for regular, orderly sequences of behavior" [18, p. 196]. Turner's social drama theory has four phases of public action:

1) *breech* of norm-governed social relations that have liminal characteristics, a liminal between more or less stable social processes;

2) *crisis*, during which there is a tendency for the breach to widen and in public forums, representatives of order are dared to grapple with it;

3) *redressive action*, ranging from personal advice and informal mediation or arbitration to formal juridical and legal machinery, and to resolve certain kinds of crisis or legitimate other modes of resolution, to the performance of public ritual;

4) *reintegration of the disturbed* social group, or of the social recognition and legitimation of *irreparable schism* between the contesting parties.

According to V. Turner, there is a sequence of procedural actions and scenes in four phases of social drama with dynamic shifts in scenarios, characteristics, rhetoric, and symbolism. The crisis itself is characterized by more dynamic, rapid and powerful processes than the recovery phase.

Summing up, the author of this article proposes to go beyond E. Goffman's microsociological methodology, N. Howard's theory of drama, V. Turner's social drama and to consider drama as a concept that can become a tool for modeling social reality in the context of a dramatic approach. For this, it is necessary to make a conceptual analysis of the drama, to explicate the theoretical line between drama as a notion, a metaphor, and a concept.

Drama as a notion. A notion is a form of thinking that reflects objects (phenomena) in their essential features [19, p. 23]. In this regard, drama as a notion is qualified as a cultural phenomenon with its genre and generic characteristics. Philology classifies drama, along with epic and lyric poetry, as a kind of literature

that forms the root triad of a "family tree" [1]. A narrow meaning of drama as a notion is known as a genre of dramatic art and is perceived on a par with tragedy, comedy, vaudeville, farce, and other forms of theatrical plays [20, p. 78]. The essential features of drama as a kind of literature are:

designed for a stage production and belongs to both literature and theater at the same time;

the basis is the action revealed through the conflict, the heroes act and speak on the stage;

characters are revealed through actions and statements;

the main form of expression of events and states is dialogue and monologue;

presence of author's remarks;

division of monologues and dialogues of the characters into stage episodes – acts and scenes.

Drama as a genre differs from comedy, tragedy, farce, and vaudeville in the following ways:

it depicts a serious conflict between characters or between characters and society;

an intrigue, tense expectations of the audience: will the hero (s) be able to extricate themselves from the situation or not;

description of a real everyday life, articulation of "mortal" questions of human existence, deep disclosure of characters, the inner world of characters, etc.

Obviously, generic characteristics of drama include genre characteristics and are thus dominant. Therefore, the essential generic characteristics are of interest for a philosophical analysis and due to them drama can be assigned the universal status of an instrument for manipulating the consciousness of the masses.

Drama as a metaphor. Further, we use drama as a metaphor in a broad context (be it in philosophy, in various spheres of art, in everyday life, etc.), when it is necessary to demonstrate a human behavior in conflicting circumstances. There are examples when scientists, writers, philosophers, artists use this metaphor in a figurative sense: "Cognition of nature is a drama, a drama of ideas" (Albert Einstein) [21, p. 154]. "Would you like to know the great drama of my life? It is that I have put my genius into my life... I have put only my talent into my works" (Oscar Wilde) [22, p. 59]. "Her drama was a drama not of heaviness but of lightness. What fell to her lot was not the burden, but the unbearable lightness of being" (Milan Kundera) [23, p. 250], etc.

As can be seen, the word "drama" is used here in a figurative sense when a comparison of two objects based on their common feature(s) takes place. The American linguists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson qualified this phenomenon in "Metaphors We Live By" (1980) as a cognitive metaphor which is central to the development of a thought. The authors of this project emphasized that a cognitive metaphor is one of the most important cognitive mechanisms based on the establishment of connections between concepts related to different areas of knowledge. Due to this metaphor, it is possible to express the understanding and the experience of the essence of one class of objects (phenomena) in terms of the essence of another class of objects (phenomena). In particular, they argued: "Our everyday conceptual system, from the point of view of how we think and act, is metaphorical in nature. Non-metaphorical thought is possible only when we are talking about physical reality. The more the individual abstracts, the more metaphorical layers are required to express thoughts. However, people do not notice these metaphors. For example, one of the reasons is the fact that many metaphors have become "dead", and now we can no longer determine their origin" [24, p. 135].

After all, how far is it appropriate to use cognitive metaphors in philosophy? Obviously, it is quite normal to use a metaphor in a literary text relying on imagery in describing reality and thus presenting knowledge indirectly. Another thing is the language of philosophy with its categorical nature, which, reflecting the essential, universal properties and relations of the phenomena of reality, is in opposition to the metaphorical nature of thinking. A philosophical category is a means of ordering the universe. It becomes possible to classify various objects in a certain way due to it. In this regard, the implementation of the cognitive metaphor "drama" might seem inappropriate in the context of philosophical reflection.

Nevertheless, the analysis of the European historical and philosophical thought of the XIX–XX centuries shows the expanding of the conceptual possibilities of philosophy within the birth of existentialism on the basis of radical criticism of the rationalist tradition. The rejection of the belief in rationality, harmony, logical harmony of being, the denial of the attempt to create a universal philosophical system led to a reformatting of the categorical apparatus of philosophical knowledge. In other words, existentialism

focused on the emotional side of human consciousness developing the idea that the human essence is not so much rational but can be described by the notions of absurdity, fear, freedom, finitude, "borderline situation", etc. Due to this, drama as a cognitive metaphor came into use in philosophical discourse to explicate the meaning of the problem of human alienation, loneliness, abandonment, inner choice and the search for one's place in life.

The artistic or semi-artistic form that was inherent to the intellectual culture of the XX century also facilitated the metaphorical presentation of the philosophical concept. It is known that a number of existentialist thinkers expressed their views mainly in philosophical novels, short stories, theater plays, e. g., the works of Miguel de Unamuno (Spain), Robert Musil (Austria), Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre (France), Aldous Huxley (England), etc. Thus, a philosophical novel was characterized by a pronounced artistic convention, according to which the heroes are not self-developing characters but act as exponents of the author's ideas, as reasoners, and the plot and the very resolution of the conflict are subordinate to a certain philosophical concept. In this regard, the dramatization (conflict) of human existence in the philosophy of existentialism is born from:

a) the absurd opposition of life and death: "It is absurd that we are born, and it is absurd that we are dying" [25, p. 203];

b) a human's lack of trust in moral principles and norms that supported his belief in the ideal. This deprives him of the old values that gave meaning to his life, and leads to a feeling of being lost and tragic: "The trouble of our century is that bad deeds needed justification until recently, – now good deeds need an excuse" [25, p. 145];

c) the problem of isolation of people from each other: "The agony and drama of human existence largely depends on the isolation of people from each other, on the weakness of that synthesizing spirituality which leads to the unity of people" [26, p. 78];

d) a human's inner choice and the search for his place in life: "I want to leave, where I really will be in my place, in a place where I will come in just the right place ... But there is no such place anywhere, I am an outcast" [27, p. 164].

It is obvious that the notions of drama, dramatization in the philosophy of existentialism are used in the meaning of the common feature that underlies drama as a cultural phenomenon, on the one hand, and human existence, on the other. This common feature is a conflict, inherent to the absurdity of human existence which is based on the internal contradiction of the individual in a state of "borderline situation", the opposition of an individual to the whole world.

It should be emphasized that the dramatization of human existence in the philosophy of existentialism did not imply either the conceptualization of the phenomenon of drama, or its conceptual development, since for this type of philosophizing with its pronounced literary, artistic form, it was important to focus on the emotional side of human consciousness. Conceptualization of the phenomenon of drama would mean a move towards a strict logocentrism in existentialism, which fundamentally contradicted the predetermined nature of this philosophical trend.

Drama as a concept. Finally, when it comes to the dramatic approach in explaining and describing social reality, it is important to provide a theoretical basis for drama as a concept. Russian researcher V. Z. Demiankov describes a concept as a terminological culture element and proves that the concept differs from the notion by its theoretical content being a semantic fullness of a notion in abstraction from its concrete-linguistic form [28, p. 618]. Concepts rarely relate directly to the relevant domain for a given schema. On the contrary, they are the way of seeing the reality, means of organizing the reality in its integrity. In this sense, they have a certain ontological "fullness", which distinguishes them from constructs that are purely cognitive tools [29, p. 503–504]. Thus, the concept of drama is the theoretical content of drama notion; in contrast to the metaphor, it can act as a system-forming element of the dramatic approach for the study of the laws of social development. Let us consider the theoretical basis of the drama concept.

Philosophical basis. It is known that the fundamental principle of the construction and development of drama is the *dialectic of a conflict*. The theme developed in the drama is always based on some kind of contradiction (difference in interests, beliefs, views). Here is the following classification of the levels of contradictions (conflicts) in the model of classical drama: social conflicts at the level of large social groups (e. g., war and peace – people against people, aristocracy against demos, etc.); interpersonal

conflicts (fathers and children, husbands and wives, etc.); conflict within a person (conflict of personal choice) [30, p. 33].

G. W. F. Hegel highly appreciated drama as the best kind of art, because its nature reveals the dialectic of life which manifests itself in the emergence of contradictions, in their development, and in their resolution. According to the theory of the German thinker, a truly tragic collision is that "both sides of the opposition, taken separately, are justified" [31, p. 380]. Therefore, the drama in its development is subject to the basic laws of dialectics, namely:

the law of unity and struggle of opposites. The opposing principles are the protagonist (theme) and the antagonist (antitheme). The conflict of opinions, goals, beliefs of the heroes necessarily presupposes a struggle between them, as a result of which the main character with incredible efforts gets what he wants, and the viewer experiences catharsis through compassion and fear for the hero;

the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones. The collisions are built according to the principle of increasing action: the closer to the denouement, the more tension. And the number of collisions, that is, collisions experienced by the protagonist on the way to his goal, in the end lead him to the desired result contributing to the inner spiritual rebirth of the protagonist;

the law of denial of negation characterizes the most important side of the development of drama, and namely its direction, where each new collision denies the previous one and gives rise to the next one, larger and more powerful in its scale. This law determines the principle of strengthening the action increasing dramatic dynamism and tension.

If we try to present the dialectic of a dramatic conflict through the prism of the Hegelian dialectical triad, we get a substantive principle as well as a way of constructing the drama itself.

The protagonist acts as a thesis with a set of motives and beliefs that determine his actions. The antagonist acts as an antithesis: he is endowed with beliefs and goals that are opposite to the protagonist. As a result, the conflict between the protagonist and the antagonist leads to a new synthesized reality being a basis for the next stage of a conflict development or its denouement (final).

In other words, there must always be a contradiction between the protagonist and the antagonist which implies the existence of a conflict. The conflict itself presupposes the presence of an action, and the action carries the collision. In general, everything leads to the resolution of the conflict with the main rule and a tough requirement: the hero cannot remain the same, at any level he must change all the time.

Thus, the philosophical basis of the drama concept can be qualified as the dialectical principle of the construction and development of the conflict. The process of achieving the goal by the protagonist is in conflict with the antagonist on the path of twists and turns in a chain of increasing collisions. An action through the conflict creates the drama dynamics being the fundamental principle of its development. It is important to emphasize that this principle is relevant both for the classical (ancient Greek) model of drama, and for its historical forms. In the absence of at least one of the opposing sides in the drama, the development of a conflict, collisions and vicissitudes becomes impossible, which means that the drama itself loses all meaning.

Linguistic basis. Taken from the ancient Greek language, the etymology of the word "drama" means "action". Aristotle defines drama as "...imitation of action ... through action, not a narration" [32, p. 652]. According to M. Gorky, a famous Russian writer, "the drama must be strictly effective through the action" [1, p. 160]. Action as the defining drama beginning is also spoken of in a number of literature studies of the XX century. For example, a gifted American dramatist John Howard Lawson (1894–1977) describes an action as the basis for constructing a dramatic work in his "Theory and technic of playwriting" [33, p. 229]. N. Volkenshtein, S. Borisov, A. Astremskiy, E. Gorbunova and other researchers also describe an action as the dramaturgical basis of drama.

Thus, the linguistic conceptual justification of drama is explicated in an *action that occurs as a result of the conflict of motives, actions, interests, and views.*

Dramaturgy basis. Structural analysis of drama reveals the following components, which will simultaneously be stages in the algorithm for the development of a conflict:

1) *dramatic situation* is an event that reveals a contradiction of interests, goals of two potentially conflicting parties. This contradiction has not yet manifested itself in an open confrontation. One of the parties begins to make some efforts to overcome and smooth out the existing contradiction;

2) *the opening* is the first serious clash of the parties. Here they meet face to face, try to resolve the contradiction, and to level the dramatic situation in a peaceful way. But it turns out that their interests are clearly opposite, and everything goes into the stage of aggravation of confrontation;

3) *aggravation of confrontation* is characterized by an unsuccessful attempt to resolve the conflict by the usual methods, techniques and means. Since the conflict takes on an open form, and it becomes obvious that it is impossible to defeat the enemy by usual means, there is a reassessment, awareness, processing of information about the newly formed relationship. There is a determination of the opponent's weak points, the accumulation of forces, propaganda and agitation, the creation of a negative image of the enemy, the formation of antagonistic blocs, etc.;

4) *reassessment of the cause of the conflict.* Taking into account previously hidden factors the awareness of the true, deep cause of the conflict takes place. The real subject of the contradiction becomes obvious; the situation is rethought once again. After an open clash it becomes clear that the forces of the parties of the conflict are approximately equal, and that both sides do not have enough strength to resolve the conflict in one's favor. Here, reconciliation is still possible on unsatisfactory conditions for each of the participants, but as a rule, this does not happen, and the conflict passes into the next stage;

5) *escalation of the conflict.* The awareness of the true cause of the conflict at the previous stage leads to a crisis of the worldview both of the sides; the tactics and strategy of conducting an open clash are changing. As a variant of the events development, one of the parties collects all its resources and renounces its claims realizing that even if one of them win, the damage incurred will significantly exceed all the preferences that they could receive. However, as a rule, this does not happen, as in the conflict aggravation phase. At some point, the relationship between the parties is completely broken, and all the matter comes to a culmination;

6) *culmination.* A decisive clash of the opposing sides with the use of all available resources. In the result, the contradictions are ultimately resolved in one direction or another. As a rule, this is a war (political, economic, civil, etc.);

7) *outcome.* One side is victorious and the other is defeated. In most of the cases, the costs of the conflict or confrontation are disproportionately greater than the preferences on one side and on the other. Possible variants of the outcome: a constructive resolution of the conflict, a compromise of the interests of the parties; destructive resolution associated with the suppression and subordination of the will and interests of one of the parties of the conflict; the death both of the parties of the conflict.

Thus, the model of drama as an algorithm for the development of a conflict is theoretically reconstructed due to the dramaturgic basis of the drama-concept. The term "dramatization" is derived from the word "drama" and is characterized by the action that reflects contradictions and conflicts. To dramatize the process of social life means to give it an emphasized conflicting, contradictory framework with the clash of people's interests. In other words, social dramatization is a process of social modelling according to the invariant laws of drama.

As for the author's project of the *dramatic approach*, it is a set of techniques for dramatic modelling of the conflict based on the principle of dramatizing social reality. *The principle of dramatization of social reality* is based on the consideration of social processes through the prism of the drama model as an algorithm for the development of a conflict. *Dramatic conflict modelling* is a technique within a dramatic approach that allows to model a social conflict according to the principle of dramatizing social reality. *The theoretical reconstruction of the drama model* is a technique that reveals the methodological potential of the drama and its structure disclosing the stages in the conflict development algorithm. Overall, it becomes possible to correct the direction of social conflict and to manage social processes in the long term identifying or modelling the contradiction of interests in the society in accordance with the model of the drama.

Comparing the dramaturgy approach of E. Goffman and the dramatic approach developed by the author of this article it is necessary to point out a significant difference between the two projects. It is important to understand that E. Goffman did not strive to build a general social theory. He analyzed a special microreality that arises only in social situations, when participants are in the physical presence of each other and have a direct opportunity to react to the actions of others. Therefore, the dramaturgy approach does not contribute to an understanding of the laws in the functioning of society and does not meet the goals of theoretical sociology. The experience of E. Goffman undermines the hope of many researchers

to build a bridge between observations and generalizations at the level of everyday life situations and historical generalizations of macrosociology in the form of strict concepts within the general theoretical system.

It is also necessary to note the difference between the dramatic approach and N. Howard's theory of drama. The coincidence of the first two stages of the development of the conflict is obvious: the phase of the formation of the list of its participants, and the definition of the essence of the contradiction and open confrontation. However, it becomes clear that the two models differ from each other. Namely, the basis of the dramatic approach is the principle of social dramatization. Here, the conflict model is permeated with activities aimed at suppressing the will of the opponent in order to obtain a preferred result for one of the parties. As for N. Howard's model, it is based on the drama metaphor, and therefore, it is allegedly possible to resolve the conflict after the characters of the drama inform each other directly or through intermediaries about their positive and negative intentions. Although we know that a conflict is an open clash of two parties, and if an open clash does not occur, then there is no conflict, there is only a subjective discrepancy of ideas on any issue. Obviously, N. Howard's project was carried out without taking into account the defining features of drama, without referring to its theoretical basis, and also without attention to its dialectical essence.

It should be noted that N. Howard gained great fame and weight in the English-speaking scientific world as a specialist in the application of metagame theory and drama theory to solving the problems of war and peace. In 2007 N. Howard got a special award from the US Department of Defense for outstanding scientific contribution to the development of the concept of peacekeeping operations. If N. Howard implemented the project analyzed in this article, it becomes clear why the United States of America had some failures at the global politics arena for the past 30 years.

Conclusion. Summing up, it should be emphasized that the transdisciplinary use of dramatic terminology in the system of philosophical knowledge became possible due to the works of E. Goffmann, K. Burke, N. Howard, V. Turner. The study of the theory of Anglo-American researchers reveals the need to conduct a conceptual and methodological development of drama, to show a clear theoretical line between the notion, the metaphor and the concept of drama. The latter reflects the essential generic characteristics of the phenomenon of culture. Drama as a metaphor demonstrates human behavior in conflicting circumstances. It is used figuratively relying on a cognitive mechanism based on the connections between conceptual structures related to different areas of knowledge. The concept of drama is the theoretical (philosophical, linguistic, dramatic) contents of the notion of drama. In contrast to the metaphor, it can act as a system-forming element of the dramatic approach in the study of the laws of social development. Due to the concept, it becomes possible to explicate the model of drama as an algorithm for the development of a conflict and substantiate the dramatic approach as a set of techniques for theoretical reconstruction of the model of drama and dramatic modelling of a conflict for the study and explanation of society united by the principle of dramatizing social reality.

References

1. Mikhailov M. I. *Epic, drama, lyrics as a kind of literature (essence, features, interrelation).* Ph. D. Thesis. Moscow, 2006. 302 p. (in Russian).

2. Sazonova E. V. *History of drama and fundamentals of screenwriting: drama theory.* Barnaul, Publishing house of the Altai State Academy of Culture and Arts, 2012. 135 p. (in Russian).

3. Katysheva D. N. *Issues of the theory of drama: action, composition, genre: a study guide.* 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, Lan' Publ.; Planeta muzyki Publ., 2016. 256 p. (in Russian).

4. Ostertag S. F. A cultural sociology of social media: social drama, cultural affordances and blogging in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. *Cultural Sociology,* 2021, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975520946609

5. Liu J. From social drama to political performance: China's multi-front combat with the COVID-19 epidemic. *Critical Asian Studies,* 2020, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 473–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2020.1803094

6. Torresan A. Postcolonial social drama: the case of Brazilian dentists in Portugal. *Critique of Anthropology,* 2021, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 165–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275x211004713

7. Losev A. F., Sonkina G. A., Timofeeva N. A., Cheremukhina N. M. *Greek tragedy.* Moscow, Uchpedgiz Publ., 1958. 203 p. (in Russian).

8. Shakespeare W. *As you like it.* Moscow, Meshcheryakov Publ., 2017. 237 p. (in Russian).

9. Burke K. *A grammar of motives.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969. 554 p.

10. Goffman I. *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Moscow, Kanon-press Ts: Kuchkovo pole Publ., 2000. 304 p. (in Russian).

11. Macionis J. J., Gerber L. M. *Sociology.* 7th ed. Toronto, Pearson Canada, 2010. 688 p.

12. Welsh J. *Dramaturgical analysis and societal critique.* Piscataway, Transaction Press, 1990. 68 p.

13. Howard N. Theory of drama (selected texts). *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsial'noi antropologii = The Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology,* 2008, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 30–46 (in Russian).

14. Semenov V. A. "Drama Technology" – technology for analysis of the socio-political conflicts. *Upravlencheskoe konsul'tirovanie = Administrative Consulting,* 2012, no. 2 (46), pp. 48–67 (in Russian).

15. Kant I. To the eternal peace. *Collected works: in 8 volumes. Vol. 7.* Moscow, 1994, pp. 5–57 (in Russian).

16. Turner V. *From ritual to theatre. The human seriousness of play.* New York, PAJ, 1982. 127 p.

17. Turner V. *Dramas, fields, and metaphors: symbolic action in human society.* London, Cornell University Press, 1974. 312 p.

18. Turner V. *On the edge of the bush: anthropology as experience.* Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 1985. 328 p.

19. Voishvillo E. K. *Concept as a form of thinking: logical and epistemological analysis.* Moscow, Moscow State University Publishing House, 1989. 239 p. (in Russian).

20. Knigin I. A. *Dictionary of literary terms.* Saratov, Litsei Publ., 2006. 271 p. (in Russian).

21. Infeld L. My memories about Einstein. *Uspekhi fizicheskikh nauk = Physics-Uspekhi*, 1956, vol. 59, iss. 1, pp. 135–184 (in Russian).

22. Wilde O. *The picture of Dorian Grey. Plays. Fairy tales*. Moscow, Litres Publ., 2020. 691 p. (in Russian).

23. Kundera M. *The unbearable lightness of being.* Moscow, Azbuka Publ., 2018. 352 p. (in Russian).

24. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by.* Moscow, URSS Publ., 2004. 256 p. (in Russian).

25. Kamus A. *The Myth of Sisyphus, The Misunderstanding and Caligula.* Moscow, AST Publ., 2010. 320 p. (in Russian).

26. Berdyaev N. *The existential dialectic of the divine and the human.* Moscow, Litres Publ., 2009. 220 p. (in Russian).

27. Sartre J.-P. *The nausea.* Moscow, AST Publ., 2019. 320 p. (in Russian).

28. Dem'yankov V. Z. The term "concept" as an element of terminological culture. *Yazyk kak materiya smysla: sbornik statei k 90-letiyu akademika N. Yu. Shvedovoi* [Language as a matter of meaning: collection of articles for the 90th anniversary of academician N. Yu. Shvedova]. Moscow, 2007, pp. 606–622 (in Russian).

29. Gritsanov A. A. (ed.). *The newest philosophical dictionary.* 3nd ed. Minsk, Knizhnyi Dom Publ., 2003. 1279 p. (in Russian).

30. Poznyakova O. L. *Philosophy of drama: frustration vs. catharsis.* Minsk, Republican Institute of Higher Education, 2017. 102 p. (in Russian).

31. Hegel F. G. W. *Esthetics: in 4 volumes. Vol. 4.* Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ., 1973. 676 p. (in Russian).

32. Aristotel. Poetics. *Collected works: in 4 volumes. Vol. 4.* Moscow, 1983, pp. 645–681 (in Russian).

33. Lawson J. H. *Theory and technique of playwriting and screenwriting.* Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ., 1960. 562 p. (in Russian).

Information about the author

Olga L. Poznjakova – Ph. D. (Philos.), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Political Science of the Belarusian State Medical University (83 Dzerzhinskogo Ave., Bldg 1, Minsk 220116, Belarus). E-mail: primalira@mail.ru.

Информация об авторе

Познякова Ольга Леонидовна – кандидат философских наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой философии и политологии. Белорусский государственный медицинский университет (пр. Дзержинского, 83, корп. 1, 220116, Минск, Республика Беларусь). E-mail: primalira@mail.ru.