IS DIALOGUE POSSIBLE IN THE POST-TRUTH ERA?
(MEDIA PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL AND COMMUNICATION STUDIES)

V. M. Slyusar,* G. V. Khrystokin,** A. O. Yastrebova***

The subject of the study is post-truth as a phenomenon of modern media and the possibility of dialogue in the context of semantic pluralism. The research methodology is based on the works of representatives of communicative and narrative philosophy, using the methodological principles of deconstruction and the methodology of analytical philosophy. The purpose of the study is to analyse the possibility of dialogue between media participants in the media discourse of the post-truth era. The article establishes that untruth in the post-truth era imitates the truth through formal correctness of statements. Under these conditions, the dialogical nature of communication is formalised. Dialogue in such conditions is not only a form of self-expression at the expense of the Other, but also a means of proclaiming and repeating narratives, which are often propagandistic, and of imitating reality.

In the era of post-truth, alternatives in media discourse appear as a component of information noise, a constant flow of information in addition to the main body of information, which often makes it difficult for people to access information. Participation in communication processes under these conditions is marked by a change in the direction of the communicator's behaviour, moving from stating the truth about a certain area of natural or social reality to seeking information for the sake of the procedural action itself. Conversely, under the influence of information noise, dialogues conducted to explore different points of view are not aimed at mutual enrichment of the

---

* Слюсар Вадим Миколайович, доктор філософських наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри філософсько-історичних студій та масових комунікацій (Державний університет "Житомирська політехніка", Україна) / Slyusar Vadym, Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophical and Historical Studies and Mass Communications (Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University, Ukraine)
email: kmvpm_svm@ztu.edu.ua
ORCID:0000-0002-5593-0622

** Христокін Геннадій Володимирович, доктор філософських наук, професор, професор кафедри реклами і зв'язків з громадськістю (Національний авіаційний університет, Україна) / Khrystokin Gennady, Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy), Professor, Professor of the Department of Advertising and Public Relations (National Aviation University, Ukraine)
e-mail: xristokingena@gmail.com
ORCID:0000-0002-2663-3055

*** Ястребова Аліна Олександрівна, асистент кафедри теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики (Державний університет "Житомирська політехніка", Україна) / Yastrebova Alina, Assistant of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University, Ukraine)
email: ktpl_jaao@ztu.edu.ua
ORCID:0000-0002-3546-5196

dialogue participants, but are based on the fact that "everyone has an opinion", even if it does not reflect objective reality. Such a dialogue appears as a simulacrum, reflecting a large number of opinions and positions, without their focus on understanding the subject and content of the communicative act.

Under these conditions, dialogic communication is manipulative, transforming from subject-subject relations to subject-object relations, where the object does not have freedom, perceiving information as a "quasi-truth". The answer to any query is based not on the search for truth, but on satisfaction with the "acquired" knowledge, its recognition as "quasi-truth", and obtaining additional arguments that will allow the latter to gain the status of an unquestioned belief in the truth.

Key words: *dialogue, post-truth, truth, verity, information society, symbolic exchange, communications, mass media, propaganda, media discourse, theories of mass communication.*

ЧИ МОЖЛИВИЙ ДІАЛОГ В ЕПОХУ ПОСТПРАВДИ? (МЕДІАФІЛОСОФСЬКІ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНО-КОМУНІКАТИВНІ СТУДІЇ)

В. М. Слюсар, Г. В. Христокін, А. О. Ястребова

Предметом дослідження є постправда як явище сучасних медіа та можливість діалогу в умовах семантичного плюралізму. Методологія роботи ґрунтується на роботах представників комунікативної та наративної філософії з використанням методологічних принципів деконструкції та методології аналітичної філософії. Мета дослідження полягає в аналізі можливості діалогу учасників медіа в медіадискурсі епохи постправди. У статті встановлено, що неправда в епоху постправди імітує правду за рахунок формальної правильності висловлювань. За цих умов діалогічність комунікації має формалізований характер. Діалог в таких умовах є не тільки формою самовираження за рахунок Іншого, а й для проголошення і повторення наративів, які часто мають пропагандистський характер, та для імітації реальності.

В епоху постправди у медійному дискурсі альтернативи постають як складова інформаційного шуму, невпинний потік інформації на додаток до основного масиву інформації, що часто ускладнює доступ людини до інформації. Участь у комунікативних процесах за цих умов позначається зміною напрямку поведінки комуніканта, руху від констатації істини щодо певної сфери природної або соціальної реальності до пошуку інформації заради самої процесуальної дії. І навпаки, під впливом інформаційного шуму діалоги, які ведуться з метою вивчення різних точок зору, спрямовані не для взаємозбагачення учасників діалогу, а ґрунтуються на тому, що "у кожного своя думка", навіть якщо вона не відображає об'єктивної реальності. Такий діалог постає як симулякр, у якому відбивається велика кількість думок і позицій, без їх спрямованості на розуміння предмета і змісту комунікативного акту.

Діалогічна комунікація за цих умов передбачає маніпулятивний характер, перетворюючись із суб'єкт-суб'єктних відносин на суб'єкт-об'єктні, де об'єкт не володіє свободою, сприймаючи інформацію як "квазі-правду". Відповідь на будь-який запит формується на установці не пошуку істини, а задоволення "набутими" знаннями, визнання їх у якості "квазі-правди", отримання додаткових аргументів, які дозволять останній здобути статус бездоказової переконаності у правді.

Ключові слова: *діалог, постправда, правда, істина, інформаційне суспільство, символічний обмін, комунікації, мас-медіа, пропаганда, медіадискурс, теорії масової комунікації.*

Introduction. The concept of "post-truth" to denote a qualitatively different characteristic of the development of social and communication processes, including international communication, which permeate various spheres of social life, is quite new. However, its comprehension is quite active in the

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

contemporary scientific discourse. Significant flows of information in which a modern person is exposed to create information noise, in which the information message does not reach the recipient. This makes it necessary for the addressee to search for other methods, channels, and forms of dissemination. At the same time, there is a tendency for communication to be carried out in a way that all participants in the interaction pay considerable attention to the practice of simultaneously appealing to the emotions and beliefs of the addressee. The situation of numerous attempts at communication aimed at establishing a dialogue between Ukrainians and Russians through media channels during Russia's large-scale invasion of Ukraine is unique in human history. Internet communication platforms in conjunction with streaming tools provide for the availability of appropriate markers of the truth of the information broadcast, avoiding the production of propaganda stereotypes. However, the peculiarity of this exchange of information is the lack of an established dialogue, the emphasis on expressing one's own position (proclaiming one's own (truth), and thus the loss of focus on achieving the truth. The typicality of this type of communication in the post-truth era poses the task for researchers to find out whether dialogue is possible in this era and what markers of prevention of this trend can be recorded in media discourse.

Degree of research development. The problem of "post-truth" in the modern information space is studied in various aspects and manifestations in the subject field of philosophy, political science, and social communications. Thus, in the national science, a meaningful analysis of post-truth in the context of the spread of media narratives and the establishment of modern technologies for producing fakes was carried out by M. Butyrina [2: 3]. Post-truth as an information and political

technology is studied by O. Vysotskyi, who focuses on the mixing of the true with the false, emotionalisation, and cognitive distortions of the mass consciousness as actual features of the media discourse of our time [5]. A detailed analysis of the phenomenon of post-truth using empirical material in the field of international relations and international journalism was carried out by K. Viner, director of The Guardian [22]. Domestic scholars M. Trebin and T. Chernyshova revealed the content and nature of post-truth as a source of pluralism of interpretations of reality, as well as a wide range of possibilities for creating frames [14]. A thorough analysis of the conceptual approaches to understanding the phenomenon of dialogicity within different research paradigms was carried out by Ukrainian researchers L. Shashkova and M. Zlochevska in their monograph "The Dialogical Dimension of Humanitarian Knowledge" [16]. Instead, Ukrainian philosophers L. Drotianko, M. Abysova, T. Poda, and S. Ordenov studied the introspection of dialogue in the philosophical concepts of the twentieth century, the socio-cultural context of communication practices of the twenty-first century, and quasi-dialogical forms of communication practices in the information society in their work "Philosophy of Dialogue in the Communication Practices of the Information Society" [15]. However, the problem of dialogue in the context of post-truth attitudes in the mass consciousness, which requires a more thorough analysis at the intersection of philosophy and social communications, has not been studied before.

The purpose of the article is to analyse the possibilities of establishing and implementing a dialogue between media participants in the discourse of the post-truth era.

Discussion and results. The establishment of the concept of "post-truth" in the scientific discourse is primarily associated with the work of the

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

American writer and media scholar Ralph Keyes "The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Modern Life" [20]. His research focuses on various aspects of mass culture and the expression of its states in optimal verbal forms. In particular, in this work, he denies the existence of the dichotomy "truth – lies" in the modern mass consciousness, since a third element should take an important place in this series. This is a category of peculiar and ambiguous statements that cannot be sufficiently labelled as true, because they are largely untrue. But at the same time, they are not defined as lies either. In such circumstances, the demarcation of the boundaries between truth and lies is becoming increasingly blurred and unclear. Ralph Keyes' work is written in an interdisciplinary framework, where, in addition to an attempt to offer a theoretical understanding of this phenomenon, there are also journalistic investigations and a conclusion that the art of telling lies has become an everyday component of the masses, acquiring signs of play and entering the plane of the familiar.

Traditionally, scholarly literature states that attention to post-truth as a social phenomenon began to grow in the second decade of the twenty-first century, which was directly influenced by Oxford University Press' recognition of the term as the Word of 2016. The analysts of this publication attributed the growth of readers' interest in post-truth primarily to the Brexit referendum and the presidential campaign in the United States during this period, as the term quickly changed its status from peripheral to basic in political commentary [23]. Paradoxically, it was the media that popularised the term "post-truth", using it in headlines to attract the attention of an audience that was focused on the form of the statement rather than the content, the interpretation and correctness of which was still under debate. In this context, it should be noted that in English,

according to the dictionary, this concept is an adjective and refers to messages "related to circumstances in which people respond more to feelings and beliefs than to facts", often used in the context of the "post-truth era" [21].

Further attempts to give the new term scientific content were made after 2016 by J. Ball, C. Wilber, M. D'Ancona, D. Levitin, and Lee McIntyre. They interpreted post-truth mainly as a socio-cultural phenomenon, the main feature of which is the emphasis on the emotional perception of information by the recipient. Currently, in the scientific discourse, this concept has acquired its own objectivity and denotes both the phenomenon of modern social communications and a peculiar state of mass consciousness. Domestic scholars M. Trebin and T. Chernysheva, analysing the increasing role of representational practices in the media, define post-truth as a kind of "reality game" in which a significant part of the participants (recipients) do not even know that they are involved in it, and the project of reality that is offered to them as part of media reality is perceived as true reality [14:155].

Methodological difficulties in understanding the concept of "post-truth" are also caused by the lack of distinction between "truth" and "verity" in some languages, such as English and German. It should be noted that in Ukrainian, they are sometimes used as synonyms. For example, the "Great Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Ukrainian Language" states that truth is "something that corresponds to reality, the verity" [4:1100], and verity is "the same as truth" [4:506]. Here, it is obvious that the interpretation is focused on the everyday and artistic use of these words. At the same time, the truth in this edition is understood as "reliable knowledge that correctly reflects the real reality in the minds of people" [4:506]. At the same time, the dictionary does not contain a

philosophical interpretation of the concept of "truth".

In this context, the question arises as to, firstly, their substantive distinction, secondly, the definition of the criteria of correctness/incorrectness of the reflection of reality, and thirdly, the relationship between the concepts of "justice" and "correctness", which are presented as interchangeable. This situation reveals the trap of inflation (which means that a certain scientific concept acquires the features of everyday life and replaces the substantive definition). It leads to a distinction between the interpretation of "truth" in everyday and media discourses, on the one hand, and philosophical discourse, on the other. Thus, S. Krymskyi in his "Philosophical Encyclopaedic Dictionary" gives the following definition: "a special form of combining verity with human life norms", i.e. "it is the verity that has become a principle of life" [9:506-507]. In this way, the concepts of "truth" and " verity" are not reduced to the level of identification, but, on the contrary, their basic differences are determined. Their distinctive features are the purpose and means of its comprehension. Verity needs to be proved, while truth confirms the position of verity through individual life experience.

Media discourse mostly refers to the truth as a kind of subjective reflection of specific information that should be consistent with objective knowledge about a particular event that becomes a media product, acting as a kind of transformer of true knowledge established by the methods of scientific knowledge into an ethically meaningful, defined as fair, assessment of information. In the post-truth era, untruth and lies mimic the truth by being correct. That is, the recipient evaluates the information received on the basis of a more or less close position to what he or she considers to be an accurate reflection of reality from his or her own point of view. Under these conditions, according to E. Bystrytskyi, as soon as the recipient of information finds himself in a situation where he testifies to more or less correctness, and sometimes directly testifies that "this is true, no doubt, it is the verity, it is the truth!", he departs from the classical theory of propositional truth [1, p. 55].

The postmodern era proclaimed the epistemological foundations of the destruction of the information field and contributed to the spread of cognitive scepticism and agnosticism, especially in the field of humanities. This ultimately led to the relativisation of scientific knowledge, and thus the ability to define reliable criteria of truth [17:118]. Dialogue can be an important factor in the subjectivisation of verity, as it helps to construct the integrity of disintegrated positions on the subject of communication. Dialogue helps to prevent the dogmatisation of knowledge that can categorically defend a position of verity, denying its relativity to new knowledge. But the question arises: to what extent is the ability to dialogue manifested in the context of pluralism of truths, the assertion of a multiverse of interpreted realities?

The philosophy of dialogism has gone through a long period of formation: from the conversations of the Sophists and the Socratic method to modern concepts. For example, L. Feuerbach, identifying dialogue and dialectic, drew attention to the relationship between the "I" and the "You" as an essential characteristic of a person. But it was in the twentieth century that dialogue began to be considered in the subject field of philosophical sciences as a means of communication, in the process of which relations of partnership, equality, openness, mutual respect are manifested as a means of communication, in the process of which the moral and spiritual attitude of both parties to communication is stimulated [16:20]. In particular, in the philosophical works of M. Bakhtin and E. Levinas, the understanding of "You"

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

as "Other" is deepened, emphasising the need for the existence of the Other as a condition for self- and mutual understanding [13:119]. Instead, the philosopher M. Buber, analysing the dialogic nature of human existence, shows how the dialogue between man and God, the dialogue between man and man, the dialogue between man and the world takes place, emphasising the active responsible position of the "I" in it. In addition to the presence of two participants in communication for dialogue, according to the German philologist H. Jauss, a necessary condition is a mutual willingness to know and recognise the Other in his or her otherness [18:379]. In the same context, P. Ricoeur draws attention to the readiness of each participant for dialogue, defining the self-affirmation of the "I" as a prerequisite for the further recognition of the "Other" for the purpose of interaction. When the "I" is replaced by the "Self", the latter seeks to express an assessment of itself as the "Other" [11]. The concept of "metanomics" by O. Rosenstock-Huessy is also interesting in the context of the formation of media discourse in the post-truth era, in which he analyses the role of language as an expression of the social function of speech, and also emphasises the importance of a live dialogue between a specialist scientist and a layman [7:33]. In essence, this idea emphasises the need for interpenetration and complementarity of scientific and media discourses.

The modern understanding of dialogue is complemented in J. Habermas' concept of communicative action by a departure from the need to conduct a clear and logical dialogue aimed at a common understanding of the subject of the dialogue, which appears as a problem for the participants [16:96]. Language only reflects a certain internal connection between meaning and reality, which does not allow us to make statements about the validity of truth itself. One of

the participants in the dialogue, who in a particular speech act acts as a listener (addressee), may reject the information message of the speaker (addressee), and the reason for this is neither the criterion of the message's compliance with the truth of the statement made, nor the criterion of the message's compliance with the correctness of speech acts in its normative dimension, nor the truthfulness of the intention expressed by the speaker, which is interpreted as the consistency of what is said with the subject of the conversation [6:305]. Therefore, in dialogue, the problem of formal and substantive speech interaction is actualised, during which the presence of signs of dialogue does not express its essence. The need to develop the ability to listen and speak was emphasised by K.-O. Apel. In particular, he attempts to substantiate the concept of an ideal communicative community, the content of which implies the intersubjective nature of interaction based on a normative and heuristic structure [16:106]. Intersubjective communication in K.-O. Apel's philosophy is not just objective informativeness, but also a coherent mutual understanding of meaning in an unlimited communicative community [12].

The polylogic nature of communication processes in the situation of their transformation into dialogicity implies the desire not only to receive information from the addressee and decode it, but also to comprehend it, perceive it as complementary to one's own system of evidence and beliefs, and send new, refined knowledge in order to comprehend the truth in the opposite direction, with the conviction that the other recipient will react identically. As noted by L. Kopets and V. Hordienko, dialogue-oriented practices contribute to the development of the knowledge base, the development of cognitive strategies (ways of using information in thinking, learning, problem solving) and the development of metacognition, and

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

ultimately this leads to the ability of an individual to understand and monitor the processes of self-knowledge and self-development [8:57].

However, in the post-truth era, the dialogic nature of communication is being formalised: it acquires only the signs of a formal dialogue (creation, design, construction, development of components), but the essential features (reaction of speakers to establishing the truth, understanding) are absent. In this case, streams as a form of mass communication are indicative, in which speakers declare their intention to engage in a long dialogue, to hear each other's position and to present relevant arguments and counterarguments. However, their main intention is to proclaim ideas to their own audience, turning the other participant in the dialogue into information noise or an object of hate speech or trolling.

In this regard, the question of the popularity of this form of mass communication is logical. Obviously, the popularity of this type of communication is explained by the nature of dialogue, which is that it is a universal way of being, whose nature is determined by the "I - Other" relationship, while being characterised by an organic interconnection and complementarity of external and internal intentionality [10:532]. In this sense, dialogue is a form of self-expression at the expense of the Other, the proclamation of narratives, often of a propagandistic nature, the establishment of a new distorted reality that only mimics the objective one.

Post-truth can be viewed either as ordered information flows, which are now used to manipulate mass consciousness by creating an alternative reality that resembles an objective one, or as information noise that does not allow the recipient to isolate and verify information and accept it as true. A striking example of this is the use of deepfake technology, whereby a certain fiction looks like a video in which a real character does something he or she did not do or says words he or she did not say, and then these fictions begin to spread on the Web, become viral memes, and become part of an illusory reality that qualitatively replaces the true reality [24]. Thus, the postmodern situation is focused not so much on establishing the verity as on its construction and suggestion, which, as O. Vysotskyi rightly notes, reveals the ability of truth to function in the media space, in the mass consciousness, depending on the narrator's ability to convince the recipients of the truth of the broadcast message [5:130]. If in previous eras, persuasion implied entry, in the post-truth era, only imitation of entry into dialogue remains.

A necessary component of a genuine dialogue is the presence of alternative views and approaches to solving a problem, which are transmitted by its participants. However, in the political sphere in the post-truth era, an alternative view of reality is denied by the constructivist potential of a powerful message, according to which those who disagree, opponents, are stigmatised as fools, as not meeting the criteria of reasonableness [5:130]. In fact, in the media discourse, the alternative appears as a component of information noise, which is a stream of messages that is additional to the main one and often makes it difficult to access the basic information. Inclusion in communication processes under these conditions is marked by a change in a person's pragmatic orientation from establishing the truth to a constant search for information for the sake of the procedural action itself. Under the influence of information noise, the establishment of a dialogue to explore alternative views no longer operates under the imperative of mutual enrichment, but rather the fact that "everyone has an opinion", even if it does not reflect objective reality. This form of communication often focuses on the desire of the interlocutor (at least one of

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

the two) to win their own point of view, mainly by means of psycho-emotional influence. In this case, it turns into a dispute, a discussion, but not a dialogue [15:26]. In other words, under these conditions, dialogue as such becomes a kind of simulacrum, which reflects the polyphony of ideas and opinions without focusing on comprehending the topic and content of the communicative act.

An important aspect of the simulation of dialogue in the post-truth era is the manipulative influence on public opinion that PR technologies imitate. The latter involve establishing interaction by studying the public's reaction to relevant messages and interpretation of PR texts. The totalisation of post-truth may involve imitation of PR activities, which involves creating a discourse that is easy to accept, focusing on what will satisfy the emotions and beliefs of the audience rather than on real facts. To a certain extent, this shift may be due to the introduction of new, cheaper mass communication channels, especially digital media, into various forms and types of PR activities. The uniqueness of the latter is, firstly, its focus on attracting as many audiences as possible, which becomes an object for potential advertisers. And secondly, the production of content focused on satisfying the desires and aspirations of this audience.

This, on the one hand, encourages them to research them using special algorithms and programmes that study the content and nature of consumer Internet activity. And on the other hand, in their media activities, they use algorithms that send news sources to search engines designed to offer the public what they want. In essence, according to the director of The Guardian, K. Viner, the version of the world that we as readers find every day when we open our personal portals or search on Google is offered, which has been filtered imperceptibly for the consumer to reinforce their own beliefs.

Such an analysis allowed K. Viner, as a practicing journalist, to conclude that every individual, when entering the modern media reality, finds himself in a series of confusing battles between opposing forces: between truth and lies, fact and rumour, kindness and cruelty... between the open platform of the Internet, as envisaged by its architects, and the barriers of Facebook and other social networks; between an informed public and a misguided group [22].

According to M. Camacho, this state of functioning of media discourse under the influence of electronic media has become the basis for the establishment of the post-truth era, as it is implemented through discrediting public discourse, i.e. the audience already expects that any information broadcast in the media space does not convey the whole truth, and the latter loses its value [19:58]. Freedom also loses its value, because, firstly, the choice of sources and channels of information (as its attribute) is complicated by their immensity for individual perception, and secondly, the impossibility of establishing the truth of the information received due to the oversaturation of information flows is positioned, and therefore, the responsibility of verification is transferred to "experts". In this sense, dialogic communication already implies a manipulative nature, transforming from subject-subject relations to subject-object relations, where the object does not have freedom, perceiving information as a "quasi-truth". The answer to any query is based not on the search for truth, but on satisfaction with the "acquired" knowledge, its recognition as "quasi-truth", and obtaining additional arguments that will allow the latter to gain the status of an unquestioned belief in the truth.

At the everyday level, words related to establishing the correspondence of information to the verity are increasingly used in the language. Dialogue loses its meaning when fakes are debunked,

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

when propaganda myths are found to be inconsistent with reality, when the unscientific nature of pseudo-historical claims is exposed, when appeals are made to universal values, common sense and international law. At this point, the dialogue participant internally rejects the points of view he or she does not like and proclaims a thesis: "Everyone lies!". This is a refusal to seek the truth and to be satisfied with one's "own truth", which may be an obvious lie disguised as truth. Of course, the Russian-Ukrainian war has become one of the extremes in which the principles of "post-truth" have become an instrument of the aggressor country's information warfare. And the idea of establishing a dialogue at the interpersonal level between representatives of both countries on various electronic media platforms is only a means of spreading narratives justifying aggression in the Russian media discourse itself.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Thus, untruth in the post-truth era imitates truth through correctness of expression, i.e. the recipient evaluates the information received from a position more or less close to what he or she considers an accurate reflection of reality. Dialogue helps prevent the dogmatisation of knowledge; it irrevocably defends the position of truth, denying its relevance to newly acquired knowledge. Instead, in the post-truth era, dialogic communication is formalised: it has the formal attributes of dialogue, but lacks the essential features of dialogicity. In the situation of the spread of post-truth, dialogue serves as a form of self-expression at the expense of the Other, to announce narratives that are often propagandistic, to establish new realities that only imitate objective reality. Such a dialogue appears as a simulacrum, reflecting the diversity of opinions, without any focus on understanding the subject and content of the communicative act. The answers in the dialogue are not based on the search for truth, but on the recipient's satisfaction with the "acquired" knowledge, recognition of it as "quasi-truth".

In this regard, it is extremely important for further research to study the peculiarities of political speech in the post-truth era.

LITERATURE

1. Бистрицький Є. Екзистенційна істина і постправда. *Філософська думка.* 2018. № 5. С. 54 – 71.

2. Бутиріна М. Медіафейки: замах на дійсність в епоху постправди. *Актуальні тренди сучасного комунікативного простору*: колективна монографія. Дніпро : Грані, 2020. С. 13 – 25.

3. Бутиріна М. Постправда: істиною володіє той, хто контролює наративи. *Медіанаративи*: колективна монографія. Дніпро : Ліра, 2022. С. 4 – 16.

4. Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови (з дод. і допов.); Уклад. і голов. ред. В. Т. Бусел. Київ; Ірпінь: ВТФ "Перун", 2005. 1728 с.

5. Висоцький О. Ю. Постправда: концептуальні та праксеологічні виміри. *Грані.* 2018. № 21 (10). С. 127 – 132. URL: https://doi.org/10.15421/1718138 (дата звернення: 21.02.2023).

6. Габермас Ю. Філософський дискурс Модерну; пер. з нім. та комент. В. М. Купліна. Київ : Четверта хвиля, 2001. 424 с.

7. Злочевська М. В. Концептуальний вимір філософії діалогізму. *Вісник НТУУ "КПІ". Філософія. Психологія. Педагогіка.* 2009. № 1 (25). С. 32 – 35.

8. Копець Л. В., Гордієнко В. І. Діалогічні комунікативні практики та їхній евристичний потенціал: результати дослідження. *Наукові записки НаУКМА. Педагогічні, психологічні науки та соціальна робота.* 2012. Т. 136. С. 53 – 58.

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

9. Кримський С. Б. Правда. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник* : енциклопедія; голов. ред. В. І. Шинкарук. Київ : Абрис, 2002. С. 506 – 507.

10. Куцепал С. В. Комунікація та діалог у контексті освітніх викликів сучасності. *Гілея.* 2012. № 66. С. 531 – 534.

11. Рікер П. Сам як інший. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2000. 458 с.

12. Слюсар В. М. Апель, Карл-Отто. *Велика українська енциклопедія.* URL: https://vue.gov.ua/Апель, Карл-Отто (дата звернення: 28.03.2023).

13. Стернічук В. Б. Теорія діалогізму: філософсько-емпіричний вимір. *Науковий вісник Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Літературознавство.* 2012. № 13 (238). С. 118 – 122.

14. Требін М. П., Чернишова Т. О. Боротьба за свідомість людей в епоху постправди. *Вісник НЮУ імені Ярослава Мудрого. Серія: Філософія, філософія права, політологія, соціологія.* 2021. № 3 (50). С. 153 – 171. URL: https://doi.org/10.21564/2663-5704.50.235224 (дата звернення: 09.03.2023).

15. Філософія діалогу в комунікативних практиках інформаційного суспільства / Дротянко Л. Г., Абисова М. А., Пода Т. А., Орденов С. С. *Соціальні комунікації інформаційного суспільства: теоретичні та прикладні аспекти*; Під заг. ред. А. Г. Гудманяна, С. М. Ягодзінського. Київ : Талком, 2020. С. 8 – 27.

16. Шашкова Л. О., Злочевська М. В. Діалогічний вимір гуманітарного знання. Монографія. Київ : Видавничий дім "Професіонал", 2011. 176 с.

17. Шоріна Т. Г. Постправда як реальність девальвованої культури в епоху кризи сучасної демократії. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університетуту. Серія: Філософія. Культурологія.* 2020. № 1. С. 114 – 121.

18. Яусс Г. Р. Естетичний досвід і літературна герменевтика. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс: Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки XXст.*; за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів : Літопис, 2002. С. 368 – 401.

19. Camacho J. M. M. La erade la posverdad,la posveracidady la charlatanería. *Palabra.* 2017. Febrero. № 648. P. 56 – 59.

20. Keyes R. The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life. New York : St. Martin's Press, 2004. 312 p.

21. Post-truth. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. 2023. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/post-truth?q=post-truth (дата звернення: 12.02.2023).

22. Viner K. How technology disrupted the truth. *The Guardian.* 12 Jul. 2016. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jul/12/how-technology-disrupted-the-truth (дата звернення: 28.03.2023).

23. Word of the Year. 2016. URL: https://languages.oup.com/word-of-the-year/2016/ (дата звернення: 11.01.2023).

24. Yakovleva O., Slyusar V., Kushnir O., Sabovchyk A. New trends in scientific and technological revolution (STR) and transformation of science and education systems in the paradigm of sustainable development. *E3S Web of Conferences.* 2021. № 277. URL: https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127706006 (дата звернення: 17.03.2023).

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Bystrytskyi Ye. (2018). Ekzystentsiina istyna i postpravda [*Existential truth and post-truth*]. *Filosofska dumka*, 2018, 5, 54-71. (In Ukrainian).

2. Butyrina M. (2020). *Mediafeiky: zamakh na diisnist v epokhu postpravdy.* In *Aktualni trendy suchasnoho komunikatyvnoho prostoru*: kolektyvna monohrafiia [Media fakes: an attack on reality in the post-truth era]. Dnipro: Hrani, 13-25. (In Ukrainian).

3. Butyrina M. (2022). *Postpravda: istynoiu volodiieiu toi, khto kontroliuie naratyvy.* In *Medianaratyvy*: kolektyvna monohrafiia [Post-truth: The truth belongs to whoever controls the narratives]. Dnipro: Lira, 4-16. (In Ukrainian).

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1 (93), 2023

Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1 (93), 2023

4. *Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy* (z dod. i dopov.) [A large explanatory dictionary of the modern Ukrainian language]. (2005). V. T. Busel (Ed.). Kyiv; Irpin: VTF "Perun". (In Ukrainian).

5. Vysotskyi O. Yu. (2018). Postpravda: kontseptualni ta prakseolohichni vymiry [Post-truth: conceptual and praxeological dimensions]. *Hrani*, 21 (10), 127-132. URL: https://doi.org/10.15421/1718138 (last accessed: 21.02.2023). (In Ukrainian).

6. Habermas Yu. (2001). *Filosofskyi dyskurs Modernu* [Philosophical discourse of Modern]. Kyiv : Chetverta khvylia. (In Ukrainian).

7. Zlochevska M. V. (2009). Kontseptualnyi vymir filosofii dialohizmu [Conceptual dimension of dialogism philosophy]. *Visnyk NTUU "KPI". Filosofiia. Psykholohiia. Pedahohika*, 1 (25), 32-35. (In Ukrainian).

8. Kopets L. V., Hordiienko V. I. (2012). Dialohichni komunikatyvni praktyky ta yikhnii evrystychnyi potentsial: rezultaty doslidzhennia [Dialogic communicative practices and their heuristic potential: research results]. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Pedahohichni, psykholohichni nauky ta sotsialna robota*, 136, 53-58. (In Ukrainian).

9. Krymskyi S. B. (2002). *Pravda [Truth]*. In *Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk: entsyklopediia*; V. I. Shynkaruk (Ed.). Kyiv : Abrys, 2002, 506-507. (In Ukrainian).

10. Kutsepal S. V. (2012). Komunikatsiia ta dialoh u konteksti osvitnikh vyklykiv suchasnosti [*Communication and dialogue in the context of modern educational challenges*]. *Hileia*, 66, 531-534.

11. Riker P. (2000). Sam yak inshyi [*Self as Other*]. Kyiv : Dukh i Litera. (In Ukrainian).

12. Sliusar V. M. *Apel, Karl-Otto* [*Apel, Karl-Otto*]. In *Velyka ukrainska entsyklopediia*. URL: https://vue.gov.ua/Apel, Karl-Otto (last accessed: 28.03.2023). (In Ukrainian).

13. Sternichuk V. B. (2012). Teoriia dialohizmu: filosofsko-empirychnyi vymir [*Theory of* dialogism*: philosophical and empirical dimension*]. *Naukovyi visnyk Volynskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Filolohichni nauky. Literaturoznavstvo*, 13 (238), 118-122. (In Ukrainian).

14. Trebin M. P., Chernyshova T. O. (2021). Borotba za svidomist liudei v epokhu postpravdy [*The struggle for people's consciousness in the post-truth era*]. *Visnyk NIuU imeni Yaroslava Mudroho. Seriia: Filosofiia, filosofiia prava, politolohiia, sotsiolohiia*, 3 (50), 153-171. URL: https://doi.org/10.21564/2663-5704.50.235224 last accessed:09.03.2023). (In Ukrainian).

15. Drotianko L. H., Abysova M. A., Poda T. A., Ordenov S. S. (2020). *Filosofiia dialohu v komunikatyvnykh praktykakh informatsiinoho suspilstva* [*Philosophy of dialogue in communicative practices of the information society*]. In *Sotsialni komunikatsii informatsiinoho suspilstva: teoretychni ta prykladni aspekty*; A. H. Hudmaniana, S. M. Yahodzinskoho. (Eds.). Kyiv: Talkom, 8-27. (In Ukrainian).

16. Shashkova L. O., Zlochevska M. V. (2011). Dialohichnyi vymir humanitarnoho znannia [*Dialogic dimension of humanitarian knowledge*]. Monohrafiia. Kyiv : Vydavnychyi dim "Profesional". (In Ukrainian).

17. Shoria T. H. (2020). Postpravda yak realnist devalvovanoi kultury v epokhu kryzy suchasnoi demokratii [*Post-truth as a reality of devalued culture in the era of crisis of modern democracy.*]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetutu. Seriia: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia*, 1, 114-121. (In Ukrainian).

18. Iauss H. R. (2002). *Estetychnyi dosvid i literaturna hermenevtyka.* [*Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics*]. In *Slovo. Znak. Dyskurs: Antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky XX st.*; M. Zubrytskoi (Ed.). Lviv : Litopys. 368-401. (In Ukrainian).

19. Camacho J. M. M. (2017). La erade la posverdad, la posveracidady la charlatanería [*The era of post-truth, post-truth and quackery*]. *Palabra*. Febrero. 648. 56-59. (In Spanish).

20. Keyes R. (2004). The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life. New York : St. Martin's Press.

21. *Post-truth.* (2023). Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/post-truth?q=post-truth (last accessed: 12.02.2023).

22. Viner K. (2016). How technology disrupted the truth. *The Guardian,* 12 Jul, 2016. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jul/12/how-technology-disrupted-the-truth (last accessed: 28.03.2023).

23. Word of the Year 2016. URL: https://languages.oup.com/word-of-the-year/2016/ (дата звернення: 11.01.2023).

24. Yakovleva O., Slyusar V., Kushnir O., Sabovchyk A. (2021). New trends in scientific and technological revolution (STR) and transformation of science and education systems in the paradigm of sustainable development. *E3S Web of Conferences.* 2021. № 277 URL: https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127706006 (last accessed: 17.03.2023).