

The Art of Understanding and the Testing Cosmological Models

Vira Dubinina

Ph.D., Associate Professor, Ukrainian Medical Stomatological Academy
(Poltava, Ukraine)

E-mail: vera.dubinina777@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8024-9823>

In the proposed study, the author explored the modern meanings of the term “art of understanding”. The conducted research allowed: a) to explain the relevance of creating a “universal language”; b) to explore the art of understanding as an ontological orientation towards understanding the Other. It has been proven that understanding the Other is an innate quality inherent in man; c) to prove that understanding the Other as an innate quality needs to be developed. Education and educational technologies are a society-created environment in which “understanding of the Other” passes into a new qualitative state of “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”; d) prove that the “art of understanding” can be used as an indicator of the correspondence of cosmological models with criterion of falsifiability. The proposed study extends the existing boundaries of the use of art of understanding and opens up the additional possibility of testing cosmological models. As an example, the author tested the model “Evolving Matter”.

Keywords: art of understanding, universal language, interpretation, testing cosmological models, criterion of falsifiability, otherness, the Other, model “Evolving Matter”

Received: July 25, 2019; accepted: August 18, 2019

Philosophy and Cosmology, Volume 24, 2020: 83-90.

<https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/6>

Introduction

Modern conceptions of the cosmos expand the understanding of the nature and use of language. In our previous study “Hermeneutics as the Methodology of Interpretation of Languages and Texts of Extraterrestrial Intelligence” we answered two questions: “Is it appropriate to use hermeneutics to interpret the SETI signal?” and “Does hermeneutics have any ability to interpret the SETI signal?” (Dubinina & Tsybulco, 2019). In the proposed study, we consider the modern meanings of the term “art of understanding”. It will allow us:

1. to explain the relevance of creating a “universal language”. We use the methodology of the philosophy of language to prove the natural connection between the art of understanding and the continuous attempts of man to create the universal language that we observe in world history.

2. We will determine the origins of the meaning of the term “art of understanding”. We will consider the art of understanding as an ontological orientation toward understanding the Other. We will prove that understanding the Other is an innate quality inherent in man.
3. We will prove that understanding the Other as an innate quality needs to be developed. Society must create certain conditions so that it transfers to a new qualitative state “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”. These conditions are education and educational technology.
4. Thinking over the transition from the state of “understanding the Other” to “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”, as the ontological orientation of individual and collective self-realization, opens up new possibilities for using the meanings of the term “art of understanding”. We will prove that the “art of understanding” can be used as an indicator of the correspondence of cosmological models with criterion of falsifiability.

In general, our study expands the existing boundaries of the use of art of understanding and opens up the additional possibility of testing cosmological models.

The art of understanding in modern practices

In modern scientific literature, the term “art of understanding” is used widely. The art of understanding takes the key place in psychiatry and psychology. For example, Shawn Shea examines the art of understanding in a variety of professional disciplines from psychiatry to clinical psychology, social work, and counseling. For Shea, the potential of the art of understanding is concentrated in psychiatric interviewing (Shea, 2016). An important place is taken by the art of understanding in couple and family psychology. Researches by Sviytlana Storozhuk (Storozhuk & Goyan, 2017), Iryna Fatkhutdinova (Fatkhutdinova, 2015) and others reveal the important role of the art of understanding in the relationship between a man and a woman, between parents and children. In “Handbook of Family Therapy”, the editors of the book Thomas L. Sexton and Jay Lebow collected key studies in psychiatry and psychology that reveal, among other things, the contemporary understanding of the art of understanding in of couple and family relationships. The central theme of the handbook is “the integration of theory, clinical wisdom, and practical and meaningful research produce the best understanding of couple and family relationships, and the best treatment options” (Handbook, 2015).

The term “the art of understanding” is a key term in the art history. For example, Irina Costache considers “the art of understanding art” as new and meaningful ways of developing personal ideas and opinions about art and how to express them with confidence. According to Costache, the art of understanding is the only possible way to create and understand the Art World (Costache, 2012). For Hugh Moss “the art of understanding art” is “a theory that places art right at the centre of the evolution of human consciousness, as a key driver of the process”. This is an opportunity to “the art of any culture at any time” (Moss, 2016). Denys Svyrydenko and Wiktor Możgin investigate “the art of understanding art” more broadly. For them, this is understanding of culture, in particular, understanding the contemporary Ukrainian culture. It means “to create a common language code that will be accepted and understood by members of the whole society” (Svyrydenko & Możgin, 2019).

The art of understanding takes an important place in the social empathy, where it is seen as “the art of understanding others”. For example, Elizabeth Segal considers the art of

understanding others as a prerequisite for individual and collective security. It is not only to represent oneself in the place of another person, but also to take into account the social, economic, and political circumstances in which the “other” was formed (Segal, 2018). “The art of understanding others” defines the individual civic position and social policy of society. This is especially acute seen in the study of Ulrica Hörberg (Hörberg, 2018). Hörberg considers the art of understanding in forensic psychiatric care. At forensic psychiatric clinics, the staff have an initial negative attitude towards patients who have a severe mental disorder, for having committed a crime, and for being cared for against their will in an institutional environment with a high level of security. In this case, the art of understanding turns from a method into a caring supporting the carers to be open and sensitive in encounters with patients, for example, in doing risk assessments (Hörberg, 2018).

The art of understanding is considered also:

- a) as a way of bringing science and art closer together;
- b) as the only possible way of interdisciplinary research that ensures the quality of communication between scientists working in different fields of scientific knowledge;
- c) as a way of intercultural communication, excluding aggression and rejection of “foreign” culture, characterized by its values and ideals.

A brief review of the use of the term “the art of understanding” in modern practices is sufficient to reveal its basic meaning. This meaning is defined by the truth-conditional theories. We mean Frege’s intuition that we know the meaning of a word when we know the role it plays in a sentence and we know the meaning of a sentence when we know the conditions under which it would be true (Wolf, 2006). Following Frege’s intuition in the term “the art of understanding” the words “understanding” and “the art” reveal and mutually enrich a single meaning. They establish a specific ontological orientation, as well as a way of individual and collective self-realization. The “art of understanding” is an equivalent to “bring peace” to people, “live in peace” with people and even “unite for peace”. The “art of understanding” is *philanthropy* on a planetary scale. This is the basis of any communication in which the message of “peacefulness” is clearly traced.

Consideration of the art of understanding in such senses explains the relevance of the problem of “universal language”. The message of peacefulness and the desire for unity and peace should be understandable for a person of any culture. It is a bridge between ourselves and the Other that allows the otherness of the Other to be seen as “the intertwining of selfhood and otherness within our bodily experience” (Waldenfels, 2007). Bernhard Waldenfels showed how otherness penetrates the spatial structures of our lifeworld and how hospitality shapes our being in the world. However, “hospitality” must be formed. Otherwise, otherness causes rejection up to aggression. Therefore, the study of the art of understanding and universal language are ways of forming “hospitality”. It is a vital necessity that ensures the natural development of civilization.

Let us consider the peculiarities of the formation and development of universal language in the history of culture.

Prospects for the creation of a “universal language”

By a “universal language”, we traditionally understand the language that is spoken and understood by all or most of the world’s population. In the myths and legends that have survived to this day, it is stated that at the beginning of history, mankind spoke only one

language. The separation and confusion of languages occurred as a punishment from God. The contemporary ideas on universal languages originate in researches by Francis Bacon, Gottfried Leibniz, etc.

The idea of monogenesis is considered in historical linguistics as a key and reasoned one. It explains the origin of the existing diversity of spoken human languages from a single (“universal”) ancient great-language several thousand years ago. Currently, this idea has acquired an applied character. The possibility of creating an international auxiliary language, which provides close communication between groups that speak the main languages, is assumed.

Don Ringe’s book is one of the latest contemporary studies that explains the nature of human language and the sources of language changes, which are examined in historical linguistics. Ringe argues that the greatest success of traditional historical linguistics is the creation of comparative reconstruction, which explains the reasons for the emergence of language diversity, as well as the possibilities of new methods of comparing languages. Ringe argues that the greatest success of traditional historical linguistics is the creation of comparative reconstruction, which explains the reasons for the emergence of a variety of languages, as well as the possibility of new methods of comparing languages (Ringe, 2013).

Some researchers put into the term “universal language” meanings very close to the term “art of understanding”. For example, Leigh Booth considers “compassionate behaviors” as “universal language” (Booth, 2016). This approach to understanding the “universal language” is not much different from the meanings that are concentrated in the phrase “the art of understanding others” (Segal, 2018; Balinchenko, 2019).

We consider the traditional point of view, which is presented in the book by Don Ringe, more true and reasoned. The creation of a universal language is a derivative task that must be solved in accordance with the idea of monogenesis. This is a necessity dictated by the message of “peace”, concentrated in the art of understanding. Creating a universal language is a means of achieving the art of understanding.

Based on an analysis of research in the philosophy of language and historical linguistics, we can distinguish two main approaches in creating a universal language.

The first approach considers the universal language as the world language. The world language is formed historically and depends on three key characteristics: a) the number of native speakers; b) geographical distribution; c) use in international organizations and diplomatic relations. At the different periods of the world history, the world language was Ancient Greek, Latin, Classical Chinese, Persian, and other languages. Currently, English is the dominant language of international business and global communication. The main reason for using English as the world language is: a) the historical influence of the former British Empire that had established the use of English in regions around the world such as North America, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand; b) modern geopolitical influence of the USA and Great Britain. Both English-speaking states have a dominant influence on all spheres of activity of modern civilization: politics, economics, education, science, healthcare, etc. To date, over 1.1 billion use English as their first and second language of communication.

In United Nations, six languages are currently considered to be official and working languages. These are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. Official languages are the languages in which all official United Nations documents are provided. Working languages are used for internal communication between United Nations employees (Official Languages, 2019).

The second approach considers the universal language as the constructed language.

Constructed languages may also be referred to as artificial, planned, fictional or invented languages. Creation of the constructed language began at the end of the 19th century. At the beginning of the 20th century, the creation of the constructed language from the single attempts was transformed into the constructed language movement. Among the numerous constructed languages, the most popular and widespread are such languages as Latino sine flexione (1903), Ido (1907), Interlingue (1922), and Interlingua (1951).

A distinctive feature of constructed languages is that phonology, grammar, and vocabulary are created consciously by man. They are not formed historically within the boundaries of one culture, but are created as lightweight language constructs for intercultural communication, for availability of Web-based technologies, for experimentation in cognitive science, and for language games. Constructed languages are mostly distinguished by easy memorability, similarity with the basic constructions of world languages, accessible pronunciation, and some more features. For example, Interlingua is understood by hundreds of millions of people who speak Romance languages. Although the language itself is actively spoken by only a few hundred people.

The International Auxiliary Language Association (IALA) had a great influence on the creation of constructed languages. The IALA was created in the early 1920s and its projects at different periods of time were financed by the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. In the first decade of its creation, the International Auxiliary Language Association tackled three tasks: finding other organizations around the world with similar goals; building a library of books about languages and interlinguistics; and comparing extant IALs, including Esperanto, Esperanto II, Ido, Peano's Interlingua (Latino sine flexione), Novial, and Interlingue (Occidental). Since 1936, the members of the Association have started to develop their own language. They called it "Interlingua", which means "between languages". Currently, Interlingua along with Esperanto and Ido is considered the most common constructed language.

Thus, the idea of creating a universal language is purposefully embodied in everyday life. These are not experiments to investigate the possibilities of language that linguists conduct. It is an urgent need that forms the basis for understanding the otherness of the Other. The continuous desire to create a universal language reveals the organic need to learn the art of understanding.

The art of understanding of the Other as an ontological orientation

Mari Ruti in her book "Between Levinas and Lacan: Self, Other, Ethics" tried to establish the places where phenomenology of Levinas and the psychoanalytic theory of Lacan converge (Ruti, 2015). Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Lacan are two key researchers whose work has helped form the modern vision of "understanding the Other" as an innate quality.

Emmanuel Levinas focused his creative efforts on developing a first philosophy. As a result of an ongoing critical dialogue with Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger, Levinas created a meta-ethics. Levinas's philosophy is a description and interpretation of the event of encountering another person. This meeting develops at the level of foresight, as a spontaneous act of responsibility for others. Levinas designated this act by the term "sensitivity". "Sensitivity" is an innate human quality. It makes a person socially dependent. Human nature turns to the Other and to understanding the otherness.

Therefore, a phenomenology of intersubjective responsibility, developed by Levinas, is aimed at interpretatively reconstructing a level of experience precursive to both reflective

activity and practical interests. It is an appeal to ontology of man for the purpose of discovering or even *releasing* his “sensitivity”.

According to Lacan the Other refers to two additional types of otherness corresponding to the registers of the Symbolic and the Real. The Symbolic big Other is something that makes the opposing culture holistic and inclusive. This is its policy, economy, social and cultural values, education. This is a holistic perception of the otherness, which often helps abstract from particular manifestations or from the Real. The Real is love, psychosis, activity, i.e. everything in which the Other manifests itself and declares its otherness. For Lacan, “understanding the Other” is the basis of psychoanalysts. This is the key to understanding the self, which does not become the self outside the understanding of the Other. For Lacan, “understanding the Other” is the basis of psychoanalysts. This is the key to understanding the selfness, which does not become the selfness outside the understanding of the Other.

Based on the phenomenology of Levinas and the psychoanalytic theory of Lacan, we will formulate the following conclusions that are important for our study:

1. Understanding the Other, or, even deeper — understanding the otherness of the Other — is, in most cases, an innate quality of a person. This is what is inherent in man by nature and what ensures the *desire* of people to unite themselves in micro and macro-social groups.
2. In itself, understanding the otherness of the Other is an active action that has a clearly defined ontological orientation. It is not just talking about understanding the otherness of the Other. *Man wants to understand the Other. Man seeks* to “bring peace” to people and to “unite in the name of peace”. This confirms the clear ontological orientation of human self-realization.
3. Like any innate quality, understanding the Other needs to be developed. It needs to teach the younger generations, using the modern possibilities of educational technologies. For understanding the Other to become an art and become the art of understanding, society needs to make an effort. It is necessary to create appropriate conditions in which the innate quality of understanding the Other reaches its highest flowering — it becomes the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other.
4. The innate understanding of the Other and the socially formed art of understanding are two very different qualitative states of understanding. Only by reaching the last quality or *the art of understanding*, the modern civilization is able to transform itself into a cosmic civilization. В этом случае, мы можем рассматривать the art of understanding как индикатор the criterion of falsifiability. Cosmological models, where the transition from understanding the Other to the art of understanding of the Other are taken into account, are true. Cosmological models, in which this transition is not provided, are false. They contradict the ontological orientation of human self-realization.

We come to understanding of the importance and necessity of qualitative transformation of the state of understanding the Other into the state of “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”. This is equivalent to transforming the ontological orientation into a specific way of life. The transition between the two qualitative states of “understanding the Other” is possible only in a special environment created by society. This environment is called “education”. We consider education as a special environment in which “understanding of the Other” goes into the state of “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”. The

key features of this environment are revealed in many studies. From our point of view, they are the most fully revealed in activities of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). The AECT is a professional association of instructional designers, educators and professionals who provide leadership and advise policy makers in order to sustain a continuous effort to enrich teaching and learning (Association, 2019). The AECT was created in 1923 and since that time, it has become a world leader in promoting scholarship and best practices in the creation, use, and management of technologies for effective teaching and learning. AECT members work in colleges and universities, in the Armed Forces and industry, in museums, libraries, and hospitals, and in the many places where educational change is underway (Association, 2019). Such coverage of the fields of activity allows the AECT, on the one hand, to introduce new educational technologies around the world, on the other hand, to improve educational technologies and achieve their maximum effectiveness.

We believe that the capabilities of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology essentially determine the qualitative transition from the state of “understanding the Other” to “the art of understanding the otherness of the Other”. This is a clear example of a special environment created by society, in which any innate quality, including “understanding the Other” (or in Levinas’ terminology “sensitivity”) is revealed. It turns from an ontological orientation, i.e. potency, into a real way of life, i.e. into a quality inherent in individual and collective self-realization.

Testing the model “Evolving Matter”

Thus, the main conclusion of our study is the following. “Understanding the Other” is an innate human quality, which under the influence of educational technologies reaches the highest perfection — the state of “the art of understanding of the otherness of the Other”. We can use this established fact to determine whether cosmological models meet the criterion of falsifiability. Cosmological models meet the criterion of truth only if they provide for the integration of humanity into a single civilization, or the integration of terrestrial civilization with extraterrestrial civilizations. Cosmological models are false if they assume the death of the earth civilization from wars and conflicts, or claim that any communication of the earth civilization with extraterrestrial civilizations is impossible or dangerous. The criterion of truth in testing cosmological models is the ontological orientation of the “Intelligent Matter” (in Oleg Bazaluk’s terminology) towards peacefulness.

Let us test the model “Evolving Matter” as an example (Bazaluk, 2015; Bazaluk, 2016). In this model, humanity is considered as a structure of Intelligent Matter, which arose naturally in a certain part of the Universe. The rational matter of the Earth is at the first stages of its development, therefore it cannot be considered yet as a full-fledged cosmic civilization. The model assumes the emergence of a certain number of foci in the Universe, in which the Intelligent Matter is at different stages of its development. The model “Evolving Matter” provides for the integration of Intelligent Matter from different “centers”, as a result of which the Universe reaches a new qualitative level of development. The use of the fact of ontological orientation of neuroevolution on “understanding the Other” as an indicator of criterion of falsifiability asserts this model as a true one. The model corresponds to the criterion of falsifiability, as it provides for the integration of humanity into a space civilization with the prospect of integration with other “Intelligent Matter systems” (in Bazaluk’s terminology).

 References

- Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). (2019). <https://aect.org/>
- Balinchenko, Svitlana. (2019) Mythologeme-Related Crisis of Identity: Reality and Fictional Markers of Alienation. *Future Human Image*, Volume 11, 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/11/1>
- Bazaluk, Oleg. (2015) The Basic Postulates of the Universal Evolution Model “Evolving Matter”. *Philosophy and Cosmology* 2015 (Vol. 14), 11-20.
- Bazaluk, Oleg. (2016) *The Theory of Evolution: From a Space Vacuum to Neural Ensembles and Moving Forward*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Booth, Leigh. (2016) Compassion: a universal language. *Contemporary Nurse*, Volume 52, 366-368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10376178.2016.1221325>
- Costache, Irina D. (2012) *The Art of Understanding Art: A Behind the Scenes Story*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dubinina, Vira, and Olga Tsybulco. (2019) Hermeneutics as the Methodology of Interpretation of Languages and Texts of Extraterrestrial Intelligence. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 22, 101-108. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/22/8>
- Fatkhutdinova, Iryna. (2015) The Influence of the Ideological Apparatus of Coercion on the Ukrainian Women’s Role in the Family and Marital Relations During the Social and Political Upheavals. *Future Human Image*, 2 (5). <http://www.fhijournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/2-5-2015-05-Fathutdinova.pdf>
- Handbook of Family Therapy. The Science and Practice of Working with Families and Couples*. (2015) Edited by Thomas L. Sexton, Jay Lebow. Routledge.
- Hörberg, Ulrica. (2018) ‘The Art of Understanding in Forensic Psychiatric Care’ — From a Caring Science Perspective Based on a Lifeworld Approach. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, Volume 39, 802-809. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2018.1496499>
- Moss, Hugh. (2016) *The Art of Understanding Art: A New Perspective*. Profile Books.
- Official Languages*. (2019) United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/official-languages/>
- Ringe, Don. (2013) *Historical Linguistics: Toward a Twenty-First Century Reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ruti, Mari. (2015) *Between Levinas and Lacan: Self, Other, Ethics*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Segal, Elizabeth. (2018) *Social Empathy: The Art of Understanding Others*. Columbia University Press.
- Shea, Shawn. (2016) *Psychiatric Interviewing: The Art of Understanding: A Practical Guide for Psychiatrists, Psychologists, Counselors, Social Workers, Nurses, and Other Mental Health Professionals, with online video modules*. Elsevier.
- Storozhuk, Sviytlana, and Ihor Goyan. (2017) Socio-Cultural and Ideological Preconditions of Gender Equality. *Future Human Image*. Volume 8, 149-159.
- Svyrydenko, Denys, and Wiktory Mozhgin. (2019) The Condition of Contemporary Ukrainian Culture: The Postcolonial Retrospective and Perspective. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 4, 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/4/7>
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. (2007) *The Question of the Other*. SUNY Press.
- Wolf, Michael P. (2006) Philosophy of Language. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.