

# Public Morality as a Mental, Social and Determinative Phenomenon: Neuroethical Aspects

Nadiia SKRYPNYK<sup>1</sup>,  
Valentina SINELNIKOVA<sup>2</sup>,  
Sviatoslav OVCHARENKO<sup>3</sup>,  
Tetyana SHNURENKO<sup>4</sup>,  
Andriy IVANISH<sup>5</sup>,  
Pelaheia PAVLIUCHENKO<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Communal Higher Education Institution «Vinnytsia Humanities Pedagogical College», Ukraine, [Nadiyvnuia@gmail.com](mailto:Nadiyvnuia@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6847-200X>

<sup>2</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine, [valentinasinelnikova@ukr.net](mailto:valentinasinelnikova@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9488-270X>

<sup>3</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine, [ovcharenko-svyatoslav@ukr.net](mailto:ovcharenko-svyatoslav@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1855-9358>

<sup>4</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine, [shnurenkotanya@ukr.net](mailto:shnurenkotanya@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7468-1465>

<sup>5</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine, [ivanishandriy@ukr.net](mailto:ivanishandriy@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5814-7855>

<sup>6</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine, [pgpavliuchenko@gmail.com](mailto:pgpavliuchenko@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5519-5234>

**Abstract:** *Under the conditions of a rich transformation of the Ukrainian society the national morality's problem acquires contradictions in today's information society, therefore interaction researches of its aspects in social regulation have always been and are important. Present-day neuroethics is formed as an academic disciplinary, asserting to be a variety of overlay ethical issues, apologetic and morality by the natural models established on new neurobiology's notes and cognizable sciences.*

*The aim of the article is to explore the essence of folk morality as a mental, social and determinative phenomenon, its neuroethical aspects particularly.*

*In previous eras, education aimed to instill personal virtues and shape character, so ideas about moral life are in all cultures over time.*

*In centuries-old religious teaching, the commandments have been used as the basis for moral behavior. They were given by God Moses himself on Mount Sinai after a forty-day conversation.*

*In today's philosophy, where the ideals of democracy, for example, embrace the fundamental concepts of freedom, equality, respect and dignity for all, people have the right to determine for themselves what moral life is. Such a conversation covers different points of view among observers and scholars who think deeply about these issues. Therefore, folk morality has become the subject of our study, because it is not just a basic model to follow, but fundamental.*

**Keywords:** *Morality; neuroethics; human excellence; ontology; neuroscience.*

**How to cite:** Skrypnyk, N., Sinelnikova, V., Ovcharenko, S., Shnurenko, T., Ivanish, A., & Pavliuchenko, P. (2022). Public Morality as a Mental, Social and Determinative Phenomenon: Neuroethical Aspects. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 13(3), 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/13.3/362>

## Introduction

Cognitive improvement is a key concept for neuroscience in neuromorality, so science uses not only neurological explanations of behavioral instruments, on the other hand the facility to spread the mindfulness' capabilities including the mind-changing stuff' cure and more high-tech fighting chance hit by neuroscience (Berbets et al., 2021; Demchenko et al., 2021; Karasievych et al., 2021; Kosholap et al. 2021; Prots et al., 2021; Sarancha et al., 2021). This approach also applies to popular morality. Its main factors are the ideal of humanity, kindness, mercy, and such categories as dignity, honor, diligence. The traditional understanding of these concepts in the subject of popular morality is always appropriate to gender, age, social status. True-life redictions in the way to understand the morals makes an individual sensitive in his right to identificate himself or herself, initiate the procedure for check over the individual.

It is generally accepted that morality (lat. mores – customs) is a system of worldly attitudes, principles and norms of behaviour. They teach the concept of good and evil, focus people's attention on the proper and improper, fair and unfair. The neural centres of the brain take part in making decisions, accordingly a neuromoral is formed.

It is customary to distinguish between individual and group morality. The individual is the bearer of individual morality. As to the observance of moral standards, it is ensured by the individual's conscience. The bearer of group morality is a certain group of people. This can be a particular society, professional corporation, religious denomination, etc., at which time adherence to standards of morality is ensured not only by the moral awareness of the individual, or it can be the public spirit of the people. We can speak of universal morality which is based on universal values. In our case, we are concerned with public morality, which takes as its basis not only general human values but also spiritual and moral conjugation. It includes spiritual foundations, a christian and religious worldview and cultural tradition.

Scientific ethics rethinks the morality's nature on the basis of new experimental data. Rethinking people's morality in the perspective of innovative technologies is to create a new tool of consciousness. An ontological conflict is formed. The fact is that neuroethics is developing a view of a new neuroimproved society. An example is the concept of Metzinger (2017), who proposes to use neuroscience data to set up an

original thinking of sensibility and consult neuroethic as a mechanism for making a new “sensibility’s ethics”.

Practically, it is a request to arouse the interest of modern society in issues directly related to morality, popular morality, to demonstrate to the modern society the general necessity and importance of the development of individual’s spiritual sphere, to help people to define their own position in life, drawing on both popular morality and national spiritual traditions.

In the last decade there has been a boom in applied ethics, and ethical regulation of various spheres of human activity is topical. Neuroethics is a form of applied ethics, which in the process of its research considered in a few angles. Besides, it is granted as a bioethics’ variety, addaped ethics, neuroscience ethics and neuroscience ethics. In other words, its indications as a technoscience’s piece and a anthropological transformations’ supporter, which in the epoch of biotechnologies have received the name “mprovement of people” in the optics of critical analysis of biotechnological improvement of people, The authors consider people's morality as a social and determinative phenomenon, focusing on its neuroethical aspects. The intrigue lies in the fact that this scientific discipline tries to clarify what role morality plays in society, where it is going to become cognitively enhanced and where it is a piecemeal intellec, because morality is a part of the psychological structure of a person.

As an alternative to naturalistic reductionism in the understanding of morality, the approach to neuroethics who believes that morality should be part of the philosophy of the brain, is chosen. But where is then the notion of calm people's morality? From this position one can conclude that neuroethics consistently develops bioethics, remaining within the framework of the inclusive model. It announces in the bioethical debate new measures of moral choice due to the new scientific data. The question remains relevant: where is the place of public morality?

### **Neuroethics as an inclusive model**

Scientists have revealed the neural basis of the mechanism of searching for signs on the subject of morality, its popular perception. Since the neurons of the cerebral cortex react differently to stimuli associated with certain spatial orientation (vertical, horizontal, bent under the couture), further researches of scientists show different stages of perception of morality, its adherents, people's morality and it is connected with different activity of neurons of the cerebral cortex. One activity corresponds to the

early stages of stimulus processing. Signs that indicate stoneliness, passive activity, correspond to the later stages of perception, which is characterized by respect, synthesis and integration of the signs. The reticular formation is a system of neurons that plays an important role in the processes of personal intelligence. The reticular formation ensures that the individual recognizes his or her own existence, isolated from external stimuli. Morality, people's morality is not excluded here. It concerns its psychological, social and determinative aspects. Brain research in this way reveals an even greater intricacy in the people's morality growth together with humanity, chiefly in ethically cases, and affects the self-recognition and person's self-testimony.

Devide Brooks admits, "We have words and emotional instincts about what is right or wrong," but questions the criteria we use to "help us think, negotiate and decide. Larissa McFarquhar (New York) describes the many good philosophers whose deep-seated, even extraordinary moral acumen is as often criticised as they are applauded. Columbia philosophy professor Michelle Moody Adams believes that morality is the best way to earnestly reinvent ourselves and continually control ourselves. And Stanford political philosopher Rob Reich is encouraging all of us to take an in-depth look at these issues", Brooks (2017).

Every moral question is a question of how one person (often "I in philosophy" or often someone else in the field) can and must relate to others in the world. In the abstract, however, moral living is living a life in which people are committed to a certain philosophy of interdependence. It is interesting how neuromoralism reveals itself on such an interval, what criteria it considers. The problem is that such a notion as moral life, even in a family, is absent. Everyone chooses their own way, you just do your job, that's what democracy is all about. We should pay attention to the fact that by conception morality is formed spontaneously in the course of social life, it has an informal character and is not universally binding. The sphere of regulation, Maksimov (2019, p. 4) morality concerns all spheres of human life, including interpersonal communication (love, friendship). The relationship between friendship and love is also seen in the light of honesty of folk morality. The solidity of the basis and grounding of these understandings in this case is manifested in the greatest extent. Friendship, like love, creates a truly personal, spiritual bond between people. The unity attained in friendship is the unity of the different, the unity of the two, where the individual does not disappear. Like spiritual love, friendship is a virtuous choice, built on integrity, loyalty and sacrifice, on faith and hope.

Friendship, like love, is a type of transcendence in which the self enters into a connection not simply with another self, but with another absolute. The highest level of the spiritual vision of the person, a sample of ideal popular morality, while the ideal is always far from engineering and projection. It can be identified with the truth if it is conceived within the Christian staff paradigm.

### **People's morality as a revival of national ethical norms and principles**

The study of people's morality is essential for the development of ethical norms and principles. This is real because of their scrupulous comprehension, the establishment of a moral ideal that has survived the passage of time and is most in keeping with the psychology and mentality of the nation. Popular morality at this stage contributes to a deep awareness of the gravity of the forefathers' ethical ideals, contributes to the cementing of social structures, spiritual foundations the people's life and state-creative activities.

In the form of expression, folk morality is expressed in folk traditions, rituals, customs, folklore, religious precepts, etc. There are sometimes several moral systems in society. In this case the focus on neuromoral becomes more important, as many factors in a given vector need to be studied. This is neuromoral on the level of detailedization, that is, precise, detailed rules of behavior, while the general mode of action (e.g., the “golden rule of morality”, applies to most ancient and modern ethical systems, so it requires ordinary treatment of other people the way you want people to treat you, without disclosing the specific forms of such treatment. Another criterion of people's neuromoralism concerns its genesis, Maksimov (2019, p. 5). Behind the means of ensuring that morality is fulfilled, it is ensured by the internal perekonaniye of the people as to whether their behaviour and public opinion is correct or not. Also relevant in this vector are sanctions for breach of moral precepts, such as censure and public condemnation. So, morality is a separate social regulator, which contributes to the achievement of people's goals, Maksimov (2019, p. 5).

The notion of humanity in public morality is topical, therefore the work examines the ethical principle of humanism in both normative and behavioural spheres of public morality. One of the leading norms of popular morality is the need for humane relations between parents and siblings, friends, fathers and children, fellow villagers and members of neighbouring communities. The norm is being updated in both family and

community life. The humanistic principles of Christian morality have a great influence on the humane nature of family and community interactions.

On a societal level, moral principles are equivalent to morality. Therefore, this concept is viewed from several angles: national archetype, correlation with values, perceptions, perception, compliance with the status and social status of people. Traditionally, the “cell” of morality is the human cause. The basis of moral principle is a conscientious choice or voluntary assertion of specific moral values. The manifestation of the will of the dissolved person is a manifestation of the principle. This is an example of the high moral sense. The meaning of popular morality is considerably broader. It ethnization begins from the early period of life in the family, from the mother's story or grandmother's tale, from participation in folk ceremonies, customs, from folk wisdom. The sphere of morality characterizes the value attitude of the individual to the world as a whole. It determines human behavior, the moral quality of the person, prepares people to do their righteous deeds in case of need. Value incentives structure people's self-consciousness, influence their entire psyche and mindset, affect their senses, and influence their behaviour and conduct. Moral demand selects the cause that is derived from the values that people accept. Initiatives based on popular morality are tired even in conditions of global transformations. They are based on norms of moral behaviour, categories, values and ideals. Everything is very individual. The ideal demonstrates thoroughness, reflects people's aspiration or beliefs about high moral standards. Popular morality characterizes the system of people's views, practically directs people in everyday life.

The people's morality as a psychic, social and determinative phenomenon and, in particular, its neuroethical aspects are effectively fulfilled if the philosophical conceptualisation of ethics and morality in their biometrical projection is given its basic place in the understanding of the discipline. Its form the regulative tasks of neuroethics as a social norm of social relations. Morality determines the boundaries of individual behaviour, folk morality is not an exception. The basic principles, categories of people's morality are not independent of their ethical and natural value, which manifests itself in the organic integrity of morality and beauty of personal values, not only in relations with people, but also in the attitude to nature.

The methodological situation of the dual understanding of ethics as a synonym of morality and as knowledge about morality through the prism of neuroethics gets a new focus: apart from searches for the good and the

proper and their normative basis, the ontological foundation of morality itself is put into question. The point is that everything depends on the choice of ontological position in the discussion of moral problems, which is the focus of neuroethics. Will the discussions on neuroethics have a consistently transdisciplinary character, and will they not end up in a narrow expert group? In this case, it is necessary not only to appeal to profane discourse and evaluate the practical relevance of neurotechnologies, but also to bear in mind the consequent implementation of the humanistic goals of preserving humanity and humanity, which have respect for life, identity and integrity. At the same time, cognitive neuroscience is re-examining the nature of consciousness and all of its phenomena. Neuroethics, in essence, becomes a natural science – neuroscience ethics – and gains the ability to technologize its findings, transforming them into recommendations for improving human behavior and interrelationships in society. Popular morality through the prism of neuroethics preserves its ideals, categories and values.

The relevance of clarifying the limits and possibilities of neuroethics lies not only in the number of neuroscience studies and the development of neurotechnologies, which are prompting new insights and raising new ethical questions, but also in the fact that in the neural network there is a clear desire to form the morality of a new society. Here is where the conflict with popular morality takes shape, with the ideals, values and categories of which are intrinsic. Neuroethics can develop its own principles and norms, which define the limits of what is permissible in research practice. This is certainly a vital argument for accepting and developing neuroethics as an applied ethics. However, according to Sidorova (2018), the question whether we are not in a vicious circle, establishing rules for neurotechnical transformation of consciousness for the purpose of a vigorous desire for self-improvement, remains relevant. The consequences of this drive, in the form of a worldwide nudge against the high criteria of creativity and sophistication, is the challenge to communicate the amount of information to the public. Society is struggling with depression, which it itself creates the conditions for. Nature and life's indivisibility cannot be constructed by replacing them with apparent, complete worlds, so neuroethics, in order to preserve morality in itself, must protect these unchangeable values. This concerns public morality, in particular its main factors. Calmly, the ideals of humanity, goodness and mercy. This does not exclude such categories as generosity, honour, loyalty and a feeling of love for one's parents. The final ethical command is in harmony with God's commandment “Shun your child and your mother....”. God's commandments impose a moral verdict on self-

worth and determine a remedy for it. In this folk wisdom is a manifestation of the ethical imperative that is in accordance with God's commandment.

A striking example of popular morality is condemnation. The meaning of human judgment is given an axiological scale, which characterises the subject as a moral person. Implementation of the right of the court, first of all, is addressed to oneself, and then it concerns another person. Thus, popular morality condemns domestic thievery. The native life is based on the love for the family, humanity, beauty of interrelations, principles of good friendship. The well-known statement in the Gospel according to St. Matthew "By the way you judge, you will be judged; and in the way you measure it, you will be rewarded" (Bible, Matthew 7:2) demonstrates the essence which prohibits the judgment of men one against another, as there is a judgment of God. The New Testament presents divine judgment and not human or civil judgment. The Bible specifically emphasizes the responsibility of human beings before God's judgment, focusing on the relationship of judgment to God's commandments. The unequivocal Christian morality of condemnation by one person over another brings with it God's deserved condemnation. The meaning of divine judgment is an ideological mechanism for establishing and maintaining a socio-cultural order that is based on recognition of the hierarchy between divine and human will, which requires people to willingly commit their own will to the will of God the Creator. In one of the epistles of the apostle Peter is reinforced the thought that "those who cooperate with Him as the faithful Creator, let them give their souls in charity to Him as the faithful Creator" (Bible, 1 Pet. 4:19). This thought prompts the following reflection. First, the phrase "out of God's will they sin against Him" (cf. 1 Pet. 4:19) gives a strong emotional charge to the biblical imperative of the prophet (4:19) gives a strong emotional charge to the biblical imperative to do God's will, which legally encourages not only adherence to the established order, but also forms a strong inner desire, a zeal for the divine will with the willingness to take control of it in one's own life. Second, the creation of good deeds by man or of the Gospel as a genuine moral requirement for human beings is seen from the standpoint of spiritual discernment as fulfilling the will of God the Creator (serving Him as the Supreme Creator, may they give their souls in kindness to Him as the Supreme Creator). (Bible, 1 Pet. 4:19).



## **Christian and folk morality: an analysis of moral and psychological attitude**

The fact that we live in a modern society – a “spectacle society” (a society of deceit and deception) adds a special piquancy to the historical situation on the subject of people's morality. All public life is a “production of shows” and any representation becomes a simulation. What kind of public morality can we talk about here? Simulations pervade all spheres of social activity. The social scene of today is most often characterized by “shameful performances” described in the works of I. Hoffmann, Guy Debord and J. Baudrillard, in which inauthenticity, hypocrisy and social falsity “reign”, Bataeva (2011, pp. 60-62). What, then, should neuroethics be, able to adapt the moral and social innovations that come into society together with neuroscience and modern neurotechnologies? The same question can be asked about public morality and how it relates to neuroethics.

In the foreground there should be a truly ethical meta, the meaning of which is set transdiscursively, rather than a simple regulation of the decision-making process. For popular morality, it is calm. The purpose of neuroethics is often understood functionally – as ensuring the possibility of action rather than achieving the moral goal itself. This is inconsistent with popular morality. The excessiveness of applied ethics could be the source of its development on the condition that the complexity and richness of ethical analysis of situations where the position of people is problematic is taken into account. Neuroethics in the aspect of applied ethics is entirely possible as a regulative system, for which principles of a bioethical nature can be used, These can be found in bioethical texts such as the European Convention on Human Rights in Biomedicine (1997), the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (2005) and others. The same cannot be said of popular morality. Modern neuroethics develops its own principles and norms, which define the limits of what is acceptable in research practice. Popular morality has its own tired principles and categories. This is, certainly, a vital argument for accepting and developing neuroethics as applied ethics, and for accepting people's morals as narrow. Therefore the issue of theoretical foundations of neuroethics, namely its theoretical foundations and, respectively, its methodology, remains open. Just recently it was written about “solid neuroethics,” “pointing out that” contemporary neuroethics is not able to explain the moral normativity

in principle, and therefore can not be called a ethics in the strict sense of the word” (Lazurenko & Kyroi, 2012, p. 93). Neurophysiological determinism, which is the basis of the reductionist approach in neuroscience and transmitted in neuroethics, in fact, undermines the basis of humanistic principles of bioethics: autonomy, which requires freedom of choice; diversity, which recognizes the uniqueness and criticality of human existence; and the principle of respect for wholeness, which regards the human being as an ontological wholeness throughout her entire life, protecting the identity of the human being.

Popular morality always offers a choice – a tired garb. If neuroethics is philosophically oriented towards considering issues which involve a multiplicity of positions, and searching for humanist frames of reference for their synthesis, then it could be regarded as a kind of biometrics. However, if the problems are viewed in the light of biological reductionism, neuroethics pretends to be disciplined and isolated. The theory of neuroethics as an application is distinguished by the fact that it considers the meaning of ethics to be normative-regulative. Philosophical integration is relevant in the search for solutions to moral dilemmas, as it is a dynamic phenomenon. It transforms depending on many factors: cultural, economic, informational, spiritual development of the society or individuals, which mirror the ontological aspect.

Christian morality and people's morality are not the same. The study of the moral and psychological attitude to the subject of people's morality, the study of the system of education, the analysis of labour activity of the individual are grounds to assert that any morality is only a norm, but also a behavioural reality. Man is endowed with freedom of will. There is freedom of choice, freedom of thought, freedom of desire, freedom of creativity. At the same time, with the presence of freedom, the individual exists in society, and living in society regulates the system of rules, regulations, patterns of behavior, which people are guided by. Neuroethics is developing along the lines of neuroscience ethics, at the same time reassessing the nature of morality on the basis of new experimental data, which generates a new “euroscience ethics” (Lazurenko, & Kyroi, 2012, p. 74). Neuroethics involves at least three aspects in the study of morality: the creation of evolutionary ethics on the basis of cognitive science data, the explanation of moral phenomena by the activity of neural connections (investigating the neurological level of decision-making – the ideal and idol are not excluded), and on this basis the examination of the problem of freedom of will. This is

how existential freedom is crystallized in social crises, alienation and borderline situations. It creates a sociocultural situation with very limited horizons. In this way, neurological reductionism (the human sciences argument) is formed, which many researchers dismiss as a one-sided paradigm. Such an interpretation has had little precedent in the history of philosophy and science (struggle against vulgar materialism, criticism of naturalism and sociobiology). But naturalism is relevant again. The scientific mind is not immune to naturalistic ideas, so the humanistic sciences use natural-science methods, for example experimental psychology often falls under their influence. Thus, one of the representatives of evolutionary ethics A. Goldman states that moral psychology is to replace ethics, the outgrowths of which are in human biology, Novikova (2017, p. 119). Experiments of neurophysiologists and cognitive psychologists have generated a debate on the subject of neurological determinism in the process of explaining the essence and origin of morality, the freedom of will and moral acts. Popular morality was also the subject of their research. Authors demonstrated that there is an hour-long gap between brain reaction, which is registered by EEG, and decision making (the test taker has to press the keyboard). In neurology it is called the “potency of readiness”. Despite the fact that the authors of the experiment and other scientists conducted similar studies, have carried out similar research, they did not consider the in-depth explanation of the origin of the actions, which were previously attributed to the power of the will, but these data began to be used in the discussions, Novikova (2017, p. 119).

Thus in the book “The Justification of Good” V. Solovyov defined honesty as “an inner disposition of the will to good by itself”, analyzing it as spiritual good, Solovyov (1988, p. 455), while the Gospel subordinates morality to the divine law, in this way placing morality higher in relation to the natural and written law. God's judgment correlates with the spiritual dimension of people's moral choice and is seen as an extrinsic echatological sanction. The apostle Peter reminds Christians of this on several occasions. In this trial, reprobates and sinners who have not obeyed the law of God's gospel are condemned (Bible, 1 Pet. 4: 17 – 18).

Thus in the book “The Justification of Good” V. Solovyov defined honesty as “an inner disposition of the will to good by itself”, analyzing it as spiritual good, Solovyov (1988, p. 455), while the Gospel subordinates morality to the divine law, in this way placing morality higher in relation to the natural and written law. God's judgment correlates with the spiritual dimension of people's moral choice and is seen as an extrinsic echatological

sanction. The apostle Peter reminds Christians of this on several occasions. In this trial, reprobates and sinners who have not obeyed the law of God's gospel are condemned (Bible, 1 Pet. 4: 17 – 18).

In “Critique of Pure Reason” Kant focused on two historical meanings of eschatology - in the aspects of obituary and threat. The obituary ordains man's knowledge of the eschatological good as a reward for honesty, while the bane is a condemnation to the torment of hell. This is the divine judgment, the mechanism of which reveals the culture of man. It is regarded as the supreme arbiter of the condemnation of the moral wrongs of man and the exercise of his natural right and freedom to condemn others. By means of the vicarious work, the judgment of God upon the sinner is carried out during the life of the person, and not only after death. This means that the idea of divine judgment is not reduced solely to eschatological discourse, but also has a genetic meaning. In this discourse the search for the normal is being pursued and a new moral and social experience is being normalized, which is coming into society together with the use of new technologies. The essence of neuroethics in this aspect uses morality as an instrument of power, and the posed problem points at the context of the natural right to judge others and the society through the prism of morality. Ethics regulates the right through morality and makes it dependent on it, while New Testament ethics turns to the spiritual world of people, demanding from them a Christian duty and attitude in the spirit and truth. Taking into account Christ's manifestation, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (Bible, John 14:6), the Christological context of the New Testament ethic becomes clear: a call to the spiritual world of a person is equivalent to a call to Christ.

The subsequent course in this direction leads us to the variant of understanding neuroethics as a sphere of regulation of specific areas of neurosciences, where neuroethics becomes a part of research ethics or, alternatively, a part of a specific neuroscience. Generally speaking, everything depends on the choice of ontological position in discussing the moral issues that neuroethics focuses on. Will the discussion of neuroethics have a consistently transdisciplinary character or will it end up in a narrow expert group, because public morality is a broader notion and its understanding is deeper? In this case, it is necessary to not only appeal to profane discourse and evaluate the practical effectiveness of neurotechnologies, but also to take into account the consequent realisation of the humanistic goals of protecting people and humanity, which include respect for life, personal identity and wholeness. Today we have a more in-

depth and grounded knowledge of how the dynamic link between the material and ideal aspects of morality and, more broadly, the conscious psychological life of the individual is made. With regard to the neuroethical approach, namely the impact of current neuroscience on human self-awareness, it reveals its psychological, socio-cultural and deterministic aspects, while self-awareness integrates and informs the whole being. Practically, this is the result of the state of the world. When the subject of neuroethics is no longer the regulation of research, but morality itself, it is at a worldview level (in popular morality they reflect the worldview of the people), and this very version is close to the philosophical and thus to the bioethical context. Neuroethics itself is a problem of bioethics, because in its naturalization of morality the question of the improvement of human qualities is actualized. If the source of moral action is directly or indirectly located in the neural correlates, the discovery of this connection in scientific research is followed by a technologically formalized desire to influence it. Initially, the impact is dictated by the desire to help people with neuropsychiatric disorders, and later by the desire to improve the healthy, to improve their cognitive, The development of cognitive abilities leads simultaneously to moral progress, and freedom is the gateway to morality.

## **Conclusion**

The article describes the basic principles of popular morality, reveals its psychological, social and determinative specificities, and analyses its neuroethical aspects.

The human being is a whole person. Therefore the moral mind is not something external, mechanically integrated with the emotions. It is nothing else than the result of the crystallization of the same primal creative energy which manifests itself in its living, hot state through emotion. The interrelationship between what gives morality through reason and love, which is a deep and active source of moral action, is vividly and figuratively described by P. Yurkevich, the Russian philosopher. Turning to the evangelic metaphorical language, P. Yurkevich likens the mind to a light, and love to an elixir. The philosopher writes that “a luminary and an ellipse are necessary for living – not only for a stated morality”. “As the love's elite becomes depleted in people's hearts, the light goes out: moral principles and ideas darken and, finally, disappear from the mind”, Yurkevich (1990). Love remains, without a doubt, the ideal of the moral and ethical elevation of the individual, the ideal of the enigmatic human community.

Also, morality is a category that mirrors the level of conscience. It repeatedly demonstrates the human attitude as appropriate. The criteria of human perception - truth, justice, good and evil, orderliness, honesty.... Morality is formed by an individual under the influence of such factors as education, education, environment in the form of principles, norms, values, ideals. A practical act that purposefully establishes certain moral principles in a situation where values are in doubt or are rejected altogether. The underlying causes of action are human conscience, risk and fear. Is this something we can learn or is it still easier to accept people's morality with its calm ideals, on which we can rely in life?

People's morality is guided by calm ideals – goodness, goodness, charity, loyalty, honesty, goodness and other values. The ideal is a far cry from projects oriented towards so-called social engineering. It does not include any specifics concerning the future social structure. Although this very specificity, individual and private decisions are not indifferent to the absolute moral ideal by which public morality is lived. Only in the light of such an ideal do all long- and short-term social projects take on their significance. Love is not an exception. That is why people always say: “May everything be with love”. Love is the foundation of morality and the ideal of human solidarity. The force that animates the moral sense is rooted in the principle of life itself, in the creative energy of love, which manifests itself as an inner, automatically acting force, infra-intellective instinctive impulse and as a superintellective creative and emotionally charged drive for the integrity of life, Yurkevich (1990, pp. 48-49, 74, 204-205). Militant in the Christian staffist paradigm, the ideal of love has nothing in common with socialcentrism, about the dangers of which Solovyov (1990, p. 309) warned at his time. The work of the human community, presented from the position of such an ideal, finds its fulfillment in service. Practically speaking, it is an ideal that requires, first and foremost, spiritual and moral strength. As an absolute good, love offers criteria for varying the degree of quality of this or other forms of relative earthly justice depending on the degree of its closeness or remoteness to the moral ideal of love.

---

## References

---

- UNESCO. (2005). Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights.  
<https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/bioethics-and-human-rights>

- Council of Europe. (1997). Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/bioethics/oviedo-convention>
- Bataeva, E. V. (2011). “Obshchestvo spektaklia” y “spektakl obshchestva”: Sovremennyye kontseptsyyi sotsyalnoi teatralyzatsyyi. [“Society of the spectacle” and “spectacle of society”: Modern concepts of social theatricalization]. *Visnyk im. V. N. Karazyna. Seryia: Filosofskei Perypetii*, 952, 58 – 63. [http://philosophy.karazin.ua/ua/kafedra/staff\\_tpf/visnyk/visnyk\\_952.pdf](http://philosophy.karazin.ua/ua/kafedra/staff_tpf/visnyk/visnyk_952.pdf)
- Berbets, T., Berbets, V., Babii, I., Chyrva, O., Malykhin, A., Sushentseva, L., Medynskii, S., Riaboshapka, O., Matviichuk, T., Solovyov, V., Maksymchuk, I., & Maksymchuk, B. (2021). Developing independent creativity in pupils: Neuroscientific discourse and ukraine’s experience. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(4), 314-328. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.4/252>
- Brooks, D. (2017). *How to live a moral life*. <https://www.aspenideas.org/sessions/how-to-live-a-moral-life>
- Bible (1992). *Knyhy Sviashchenoho Pysania Vetkhoho y Novoho Zaveta*. [Bible. Books of Scripture of the Old and New Testaments]. Khrystyanskoe yzdatelstvo.
- Demchenko, I., Maksymchuk, B., Bilan, V., Maksymchuk, I., & Kalynovska, I. (2021). Training future physical education teachers for professional activities under the conditions of inclusive education. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(3), 191-213. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.3/227>
- Karasievych, S., Maksymchuk, B., Kuzmenko, V., Slyusarenko, N., Romanyshyna, O., Syvokhop, E., Kolomitseva, O., Romanishyna, L., Marionda, I., Vykhruhshch, V., Oliinyk, M., Kovalchuk, A., Halaidiuk, M., & Maksymchuk, I. (2021). Training future physical education teachers for physical and sports activities: Neuropedagogical approach. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(4), 543-564. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.4/264>
- Kosholap, A., Maksymchuk, B., Branitska, T., Martynets, L., Boichenko, A., Stoliarenko, O., Matsuk, L., Surovov, O., Stoliarenko, O., & Maksymchuk, I. (2021). Neuropsychological bases of self-improvement of own physical health of future teachers in the course of university education. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(3), 171-190. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.3/226>
- Lazurenko, D. M., & Kyroi, V. N. (2012). Sovremennyye problemy neuroetyky. [Current problems of neuroethics]. *Valeolohyia*, 4, 74-80. <http://www.journal.valeo.sfedu.ru/journal/201204.pdf#page=74>

- Maksimov, S. I. (2019). *Transformatsii moralnoi i pravovoi kultury v suchasnomu ukrainskomu* [Transformations of moral and legal culture in modern Ukrainian]. Kharkiv: Pravo.
- Metzinger, T. (2017). *Nauka o mozgbe y myf o svoem Ya. Tonnel eho*. [The brain's science and the myth of the self. Ego's tunnel]. Moscow: AST.
- Novikova, O. V. (2017). *Obosnovanye moral'y v sovremennoi fylosofskoi kohnytnyestyke: dys.* [Justification of morality in modern philosophical cognitive science]. Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburhskiy Hosudarstvennyi Unyversytet.
- Prots, R., Yakovliv, V., Medynskiy, S., Kharchenko, R., Hryb, T., Klymenchenko, T., Ihnatenko, S., Buzhyina, I., & Maksymchuk, B. (2021). Psychophysical training of young people for homeland defence using means of physical culture and sports. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(3), 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.3/225>
- Sarancha, I., Maksymchuk, B., Gordiichuk, G., Berbets, T., Berbets, V., Chepurna, L., Golub, V., Chernichenko, L., Behas, L., Roienko, S., Bezliudna, N., Rasskazova, O., & Maksymchuk, I. (2021). Neuroscientific principles in labour adaptation of people with musculoskeletal disorders. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(4), 206-223. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.4/245>
- Sidorova, T. (2018). Neyroetika mezhdru etikoy i moral'yu [Neuroethics: Between ethics and morality], pp. 75 – 99. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/neyroetika-mezhdru-etikoy-i-moral'yu/viewer>
- Solovyov, V. S. (1988). *Opravdanye dobra*. Nravstvennaia fylosofyia [Justification of good. Moral philosophy: in 2 Vol. Vol. 1. Moscow: Mysl, pp. 47 – 580. <http://www.vehi.net/soloviev/oprav/index.html>
- Yurkevich, P. D. (1990). *Serd'tse y eho znachenye v dukhovnoi zhlyzhy cheloveka* [The heart and its meaning in the spiritual life of a person]. <https://studfile.net/preview/7202735/page:23/>