

**INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF
PHILOSOPHY AND COSMOLOGY**

PHILOSOPHY & COSMOLOGY

Volume 30



Kyiv, 2023

Philosophy and Cosmology, Volume 30

Academic Journal

ISSN 2518-1866 (Online), ISSN 2307-3705 (Print)

The State Registration Certificate of the print media KB No. 20780-10580P, June 25, 2014.

<http://ispcjournal.org/>

E-mail: bazaluk@ispcjournal.org

It was printed in the manner of scientific-theoretical digest "Philosophy & Cosmology" since 2004.

It was printed as the Academic Yearbook of Philosophy and Science "Философия и космология/Philosophy & Cosmology" since 2011.

It was printed as the Academic Journal "Philosophy & Cosmology" since Volume 12, 2014.

Printed according to the resolution of the Scientific Board of the International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology (Minutes of meeting No 4 from January 25, 2023)

Editor-in-Chief

Oleg Bazaluk, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Editorial Board

Gennadii Aliaiev, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
(Deputy Editor-in-Chief, Ukraine)

Anna Brodsky, Ph.D., Professor (USA)

Javier Collado-Ruano, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (Brazil)

Kevin Crotty, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (USA)

Leonid Djakhaia, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Georgia)

Panos Eliopoulos, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (Greece)

Georgi Gladyshev, Doctor of Chemical Sciences, Professor (USA)

Oleksandr Horban, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Vitalii Nitsenko, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Viktor Okorokov, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Sergii Rudenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Roman Sapeńko, Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor (Poland)

Denys Svyrydenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

The journal is abstracted and indexed in the following international databases:

Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL); Citefactor; Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ); Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR); Directory of Research Journals Indexing (DRJI); EBSCO; ERIH PLUS; Index Copernicus; Open Academic Journals Index (OAJI); Polish Scholarly Bibliography; Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR); ResearchBib; The Philosopher's Index; Science Index; Web of Science; WorldCat; Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology <http://www.bazaluk.com/>

Table of Contents

Part I:

PHILOSOPHY OF THE COSMOS

Oleg Bazaluk	4
What is the Passing Through (<i>Dierkhomai</i>) into <i>Alēthēs</i> (Unconcealed)?	

Part II:

NATURE AND CIVILIZATION

Valerii Akopian and Viktoriya Timashova	24
The Discourse of Humanism in the Context of the Civilizational Process in the 21 st century	

Kseniia Fedorova	33
World Philosophy Day 2022: The Human of the Future (Based on the materials of the symposium “The Human of the Future,” November 16-18, 2022, UNESCO, Paris)	

Oleg Rafalskyi	42
The Civilizational Choice of Ukraine: Questioning the Conceptual Roadmap	

Zoreslav Samchuk and Lesya Panchenko	53
Cosmological Methodological Prism of the Conceptual Demarcation of Culture and Civilization	

Larysa Soroka	64
Modern Views on Criminal Liability for Crimes in Outer Space	

Denys Svyrydenko, Nataliia Krokhmal and Lesya Chervona	77
Social Responsibility as a Basis for Implementing the Goals of Sustainable Development in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic	

Shishi Xu	88
The Phenomenon of Active Citizenship: the Dialectics of Global and National Discourses	

Part III:

COSMOS AND HISTORY

Igor Gudyma	97
Divine Immanence in the Panentheistic Cosmology of Arthur Peacock	

Iryna Liashenko	105
Wilhelm Dilthey’s Rethinking of Hegelianism	

Sergii Rudenko	116
The Concept of <i>Zhonghua</i> in Modern Chinese Philosophy and its Cosmological Implications	

Yaroslav Sobolievskyi	124
The Phenomenon of Cosmological Ideas in Early American Puritan Philosophy	

Authors	133
----------------------	-----

Part I: PHILOSOPHY OF THE COSMOS

What is the Passing Through (*Dierkhomai*) into *Alēthēs* (Unconcealed)?

Oleg Bazaluk

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Guangdong University of Petrochemical
Technology (Maoming, China)

E-mail: bazaluk@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1623-419X>

Bazaluk, Oleg (2023) What is the Passing Through (*Dierkhomai*) into *Alēthēs* (Unconcealed)? *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 4-23. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/1>

The author examines a basic ontological dichotomy stated in Plato's Timaeus. The goal is to harmonise it with the Big Bang Theory and the expansion of the Universe argumentation. Using Plato's Vocabulary helps to combine the modern understanding of fundamental physical phenomena with Platonic philosophy. Moreover, the use of Platonic philosophy as an authoritative beginning and Platonic philosophy as the way to follow (méthodos) exhibits a new quality of the Big Bang theory. Specifically, the ability to combine physical (primary) and existential (secondary) meanings to define critical phenomena "come to be," "cease to be," and "to be." The author considers the formulated questions "What is alētheia?", "What is there in alēthēs?", "What is the phúsis of the form as the dúnamis?" and "What is dianoia of the hominin form?" as the sources of the "turning round of the psukhē" to the main question: "What is meaningful phúsis?" The issue inquiry guarantees humanity the fundamental competitive advantage in the expanding kósmos and being among the forms that come to be (gígnomai) and always is purely (ón).

Keywords: Platonic philosophy, ontological dichotomy, alētheia, come to be, cease to be, to be, the Big Bang theory, phúsis of the expanding kósmos, meaningful phúsis.

Received: 2 November 2022 / Accepted: 5 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction¹

τί τὸ ὄν ἀεί, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, καὶ τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν (ἀεί), ὄν δὲ οὐδέποτε²
What is that which always is (όν) and has no *genesis*, and what is that which (always)
comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?³

The question posed by Socrates indicates the path of our exploratory ascent, *méthodos*.⁴ The summit and, accordingly, the target destination is the clarification of a basic ontological dichotomy formulated in Plato's *Timaeus*. The ascent beginning, *arkhē*, is the dialogues of Plato and their comprehension in the Platonic corpus.

The article does not aim at the victorious summit ascent and establishing a new dichotomy as a fait accompli. The author proposes a dialogue that focuses on purification of the sources of the upward path⁵ to a new formulation. The critical questions in the article are those that motivate "an ongoing, unending exploration of possibilities"⁶ of an ascent.

1. What is *alētheia*?

We will start the ascent to the dichotomy "What is that which always is (όν) and has no *genesis*, and what is that which (always) comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?" with the passing to the question "What is *alētheia*?" for "Of all the *agathón*, for gods and men alike, *alētheia* stands first."⁷

The meanings development of the term *alētheia* in the ancient philosophical tradition, with their subsequent rethinking in terms of *verum* ("reality/realness") and "truth," hid the main Platonic message that cannot be conveyed with the word "true". The *alētheia* and the *lēthē* have a standard beginning, in which the opposition between them is eliminated. Plato

¹ I am sincerely grateful to the organisers of the Perseus Digital Library (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>) and the Center for Hellenic Studies (<https://chs.harvard.edu/>) for free access to the dialogues of Plato and selected studies of the Platonic corpus.

² (*Timaeus* 27d6-28a1). The Greek text is cited according to (Burnet, 1901; 1903; 1978; 1907; Duke et al., 1995). The author follows the translation (unless otherwise indicated) of *Plato in twelve volumes*, 1967-1979.

³ (Ademollo, 2018: 63) with modification. ἀεί (always) is in brackets due to its controversial use in Plato's original presentation (Ademollo, 2018: 63-66).

⁴ All Greek words are in italics and are compiled in the Glossary at the end of the article. The author uses Greek words as the technical terms and does not stick to a grammatical case except for direct quotations. The meanings of the words in the Glossary are based on Plato's dialogues, the Platonic corpus, and Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon. However, in the text, the author rethinks them and puts his understanding into them. Plato's Vocabulary helps the author to establish an ancestral connection with Platonic philosophy and use it as an authoritative beginning.

⁵ The upward path (anō hodon), the ascent in Plato's dialogues, see (Carone, 2007: 221; Fierro, 2003; Gerson, 2007: 48-63; Gill, 2010: 172; Gonzalez, 2009: 151-152, 244-245; Hadot, 1999; McPherran, 2000: 105-106; McPherran, 2007: 92; Schur, 2015; Sheffield, 2007: 24).

⁶ (Schur, 2015).

⁷ ἀλήθεια δὴ πάντων μὲν ἀγαθῶν θεοῖς ἡγεῖται, πάντων δὲ ἀνθρώποις (*Laws* 5.730c1-2). Translated by R.G. Bury.

called it “unconditioned *arkhē*.”⁸

The author calls “unconditioned *arkhē*” the unity of *gígnomai* and *phtheirō*. The above Greek verbs and their inflection define two fundamental physical phenomena. The verb *gígnomai* represents the phenomenon of “come to be,” which is complete on its own. Namely, as Myles Fredric Burnyeat concludes: “to come to be is to come to be (predicatively) a being/something that is.”⁹ Hence, *gígnomai* conveys the essential idea of Burnyeat: “is that of a verb which is complete on its own, but which is further completable without change of meaning.”¹⁰ The verb *gígnomai* expresses the formula: “Everything that comes to be comes to be (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.”¹¹

The verb *phtheirō* defines the opposite physical phenomenon “cease to be.” The author also uses the *phtheirō* as a technical term. It allows us to extend Burnyeat’s idea to this verb as well.¹² Guided by the law of conservation of energy and Noether’s theorem, I state that the “cease to be” phenomenon is complete on its own, so “cease to be is cease to be (predicatively) a being/something that is.” The author allows the use of *phtheirō* as a formula: “Everything that ceases to be ceases to be (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.” Moreover, the author expands the use of the verb: (2a) “*x* cease to be,” (2b) “*x* cease to be *F*,” similar to (1a) “*x* come to be,” (1b) “*x* come to be *F*,” where *x* is a subject and *F* – some predicate.

A wide range of meanings of the adjective “true”¹³ is not suitable for describing the “unconditioned *arkhē*,” and the interactions between the “come to be” and “cease to be” physical phenomena. Both phenomena are the physical environment in which existential meaning is secondary.

Plato explored the “unconditioned *arkhē*” by “composing myths”¹⁴ and mathematics.¹⁵ According to Plato, a mortal could not gaze (θεωρέω)¹⁶ at it. However, if the opposite is

⁸ ἀρχὴν ἀνυπόθετον (*Republic* 6.510b6). The “unconditioned *arkhē*” is understood from Plato’s dialogues or (1) conceptually as the *agathou* idea (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ιδέαν) (*Republic* 6.505a-6.509c; 6.510a-6.511d; 7.518a-7.518d; 7.532c-7.532c; 7.534c; 10.621c-d; *Timaetus* 29a), or (2) mathematically as one (one, εἷς) (*Republic* 7.524e-7.525a). “Some of the names for the principles – one, many, indefinite dyad – show that Plato frequently thought of the highest, immaterial world in numerical terms. This is no surprise because he treated the entire universe, not just its immaterial component, as a chain of numbers” (Kalvesmaki, 2013).

⁹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 23). Burnyeat relied on γενέσθαι ποτὲ ὄν (*Sophist* 245d1).

¹⁰ (Burnyeat, 2003: 10). Therefore, *gígnomai* “is used sometimes with, sometimes without a complement: (1a) “*x* γίγνεται,” (1b) “*x* γίγνεται *F*”” (Burnyeat, 2003: 9). γίγνεται is the third-person singular present mediopassive indicative of *gígnomai*.

¹¹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 18; 22- 23).

¹² In fact, “in ordinary Greek, you do not say ‘*X* φθείρεται *F*’ to mean ‘*X* ceases to be *F*’” (Ademollo, 2018: 63).

¹³ See Cambridge Dictionary (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/true>).

¹⁴ ποιεῖν μύθους (*Phaedo* 61b3). These are (*Gorgias* 522d-527b; *Phaedo* 107c-114c; *Republic* 10.614a-621b; *Phaedrus* 245c-249d). See the review by Alexey Losev (Plato, Volume 1, 1990: 810-813).

¹⁵ “Plato greatly advanced mathematics in general and geometry in particular because of his zeal for these studies.” Translated by Paul Kalligas and Voula Tsouna (Philodemus’ History, 2020: 283). According to Vlastos, “the most important point of disagreement between Plato and Aristotle” is that “Aristotle wants to provide an explanation of nature that is based on ordinary language, whereas Plato wants to leave such an explanation up to mathematics, which, in ever-changing sensible things, represents the traces of intelligible stability” (Vlastos, 2005: xviii). For mathematics in Plato’s dialogues, see (Kalvesmaki, 2013; Fierro, 2003; Philodemus’ History, 2020: 282-283).

Adverb from *alēthēs* (ἀληθής) +[-ως (-ōs)].

¹⁶ (*Phaedo* 109e).

assumed, then “he (mortal) would recognize that that one is (*eimí*) the *alēthōs*¹⁷ heaven and the *alēthinon* light and thus *hōs alēthōs* the earth.”¹⁸ From the “unconditioned *arkhē*,” the upward path began,¹⁹ “the path that is always underway from the underworld to the upper world, from concealment to unconcealment.”²⁰

Modern cosmology defines the “unconditioned *arkhē*” as “the initial singularity”, which has contained all the energy and spacetime of the Universe.²¹ It was followed by the “part of the Planck epoch,” or “the first second of the chronology of the universe.”²² According to the Big Bang theory, singularity is an active principle²³ that causes “the chronology of the Universe.”²⁴

The author will denote the symmetry breaking of the “unconditioned *arkhē*” and, accordingly, the first manifestations of the confrontation between the “come to be” and “cease to be” symmetries by the noun *genesis*.²⁵ This decision is due to the symmetry violation in favour of the “come to be” phenomenon.²⁶

Thus, *genesis* is the formation of apparent opposition between the phenomena “come to be” and “cease to be” and the apparent dominance of the first phenomenon over the second. The result of the confrontation between two physical phenomena²⁷ and the prevalence of “come to be” over “cease to be” is the formation of the third phenomenon – “to be.” The Greeks referred to it with the verb *eimí*, to be, exist and its inflections: participle *óntos* (ὄντος), participle and noun *ón* (ὄν), noun *ousiā* (οὐσίᾳ),²⁸ etc. The third physical phenomenon is a regulatory compromise between the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. It exhibits, on the one hand, the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena in themselves, on the other hand, the rivalry between them. According to Burnyeat, “to be is to be (predicatively) a being/ something that is (εἶναι ὄν).”²⁹ That is why everything exhibited in the “to be” phenomenon cannot be “come to be”³⁰ and/or “cease to be” itself. The physical meaning of the “to be”

¹⁷ Adverb from *alēthēs* (ἀληθής) + *-ως* (-ōs).

¹⁸ γῶναι ἄν ὅτι ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθὺς οὐρανὸς καὶ τὸ ἀληθινὸν φῶς καὶ ἡ ὥς ἀληθὺς γῆ (*Phaedo* 109e5-110a1). Translated by Gwenda-lin Grewal.

¹⁹ The upward path (*Republic* 2.364d) and the path above (*Republic* 7.514b). See (Schur, 2015; Gill, 2010: 172; Gonzalez, 2009: 244-245).

²⁰ (Gonzalez, 2009: 244).

²¹ (Sagan, 2013).

²² The Lambda-CDM Cosmological Model currently represents this period’s most authoritative argument (Sagan, 2013).

²³ “dark energy, in the form of a cosmological constant, makes up 71.4% of the universe, causing the expansion rate of the universe to speed up” See <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

²⁴ <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

²⁵ *Génesis* is derived from the verb *gígnomai*. *Gígnomai* and *génesis*, as well as words derived from them, are used as key terms in the presenting cosmogony and cosmology in Plato’s *Timaeus*. According to A.F. Losev, “Only sometimes, instead of γίγνομαι, Plato uses the verb γεννάω, which means “to beget”, and in Greek, this term is primarily connected with the descent from the father (24d, 28b-c, 37c, 38c, 41a-b, 41d)” (Plato, V-3, 1994: 599).

²⁶ On the cosmology of Plato and Empedocles, which share a “fundamental structure of a symmetrical movement back and forth between opposed situations” (Coates, 2018: 422) see (Vlastos, 2005; Coates, 2018).

²⁷ φορᾶν καὶ γένεσιν (*Philebus* 55a).

²⁸ From ὄν, οὐσᾶ, ὄν (“being”), the present participle of *eimí* (“to be”), + *-iā* (-iā, abstract noun suffix).

²⁹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 23).

³⁰ See (*Phaedrus* 245d) and the discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 23).

phenomenon is already something that is (εἶναι ὄν) in a specific combination between “come to be” and “cease to be.” From this combination, that is, from “something that is”, a return to the original physical state, namely the “come to be purely” physical phenomenon, and/or “cease to be purely” is impossible.

Thus, the physical meaning of the “to be” phenomenon is the *alēthēs* (not hidden, unconcealed) combination between “come to be” and “cease to be.” It is the exhibit of a compromise symmetry that allows a phenomenon to demonstrate a specific range of physical meanings that emphasise its (i) certain self-sufficiency (being something) and the contrast with the (ii) “come to be”³¹ and (iii) “cease to be” phenomena.³² The main feature of the newly formed symmetry is *alētheia*, or the exhibit of unity and opposition between three fundamental physical phenomena: “come to be”, “cease to be”, and “to be.”

It follows the definition of the *alētheia*. We refer to *alētheia* as the commensurability of three physical phenomena, which we designate with the verbs *gígnomai*, *phtheirō*, and *eimí*. This commensurability is the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) for itself, but the *lēthē* is for each phenomenon separately. The only way to the *alētheia* “passes through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *genesis*, where the phenomena and their meaningfulness are formed.

2. What is there in *alēthēs*?

The intuition guide to *genesis* through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon is the question, “What is there in *alēthēs*?” We will investigate the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon with the help of the *Platone philosophandi ratio triplex*.³³

The phenomena “come to be” and “cease to be” are energy and spacetime, or *dúnamis*. The Romans translated *dúnamis* as *potentia*, which has formed the root of the English word “potential.” Hence, “to be” as a regulatory compromise between “come to be” and “cease to be” is the *dúnamis*, “it as the realm of the things that are ‘never in the same state.’”³⁴ “For I put (τίθεμαι) a boundary (ὄρος) which defines (ὀρίζω) being (όντα), that it is (*estin*) nothing else but *dúnamis*.”³⁵

The examining the “to be” phenomenon as the *dúnamis* defines it not as “a capability of merely being present-with, but rather a capability of acting and being-acted upon.”³⁶

³¹ Francesco Ademollo notes that Plato’s “contrast between ‘coming to be’ and ‘being’” (γένεσις and οὐσία: e.g. *Republic* 7.525b-c, 7.526e, 7.534a), sometimes as a contrast between “what comes into being” and “what is” (τὸ γιγνόμενον and τὸ ὄν: e.g. *Republic* 6.518c, 6.521d) and sometimes as a contrast between “what comes and goes” and “what always is” or simply “what is” (τὸ γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλύμενον ὄν and just τὸ ὄν: e.g. *Republic* 6.508d, 7.521e, 7.527b).” (Ademollo, 2018: 59).

³² For “the contrast between the realm of being (*eimí*) and that of coming to be (*gígnomai*) and passing away (*phtheirō*)” in the *Republic*, see (Ademollo, 2018: 62-64).

³³ Fuit ergo iam accepta a Platone philosophandi ratio triplex, una de vita et moribus, altera de natura et rebus occultis, tertia de disserendo et quid verum quid falsum quid rectum in oratione pravumve quid consentiens quid repugnet iudicando. [p. 9] (Cicero, *Academica*: 1.19). O. Plasberg, Ed. (<http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474.phi045.perseus-lat1:1.19>). “There already existed, then, a threefold scheme of philosophy inherited from Plato: one division dealt with conduct and morals, the second with the secrets of nature, the third with dialectic and with the judgement of truth and falsehood, correctness and incorrectness, consistency and inconsistency, in rhetorical discourse.” Translated by H. Rackham (1933). See also (Horky, 2020: 171-181).

³⁴ (Phaedo 78c6-8, 79a9-10, 79c6-7). For discussion, see (Ademollo, 2018: 36-40).

³⁵ τίθεμαι γὰρ ὄρον ὀρίζειν τὰ ὄντα ὥς ἔστιν οὐκ ἄλλο τι πλὴν δύναμις (*Sophist* 247e3). Translated by Harold N. Fowler with modification.

³⁶ (Gonzalez, 2009: 324; *Phaedrus* 247d-e).

The investigation of the *dúnamis* discovers the *phúsis*, which establishes the *kósmos*.³⁷ According to modern concepts, the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon is based on the metric expansion or the FLRW metric.³⁸

Phúsis (not “nature”³⁹) causes the *kósmos* as the combination of *anankē* and *nóos*.⁴⁰ The noun *anankē* denotes force,⁴¹ concentrated in *dúnamis*. *Anankē* is represented by well-known fundamental forces,⁴² introducing constraint and necessity, or focus of interactions specified in the *kósmos*. In *anankē*, the superiority of the physical meaning of the “come to be” phenomenon over “cease to be” is exhibited. In turn, the noun *nóos* denotes the ability of self-organisation (self-assembly).⁴³ These are the limitations embedded in the *dúnamis* by the physical meaning of the “cease to be” phenomenon. In this physical meaning, the meanings of *nóos* are cognate with the meanings of νόμοι (laws),⁴⁴ in a way that *nóos* determines laws.

The *phúsis* of the *kósmos* is the *arkhē* of the “to be” phenomenon. Let us pay attention to the essential connotation of the noun *arkhē*, which is transmitted to it from the verb *árkhō* (ἄρχω).⁴⁵ This “beginning,” “origin,” leads, rules, governs and commands.⁴⁶ *Arkhē* is the *phúsis* of the *kósmos*, which obliges to “being something or other, being something definite. There is no concept of existence (εἶναι τι,⁴⁷ to exist) as such, for subjects of an indeterminate nature.”⁴⁸ “To be” something or whole (ὅλον) is an action that is always completed on its own, which corresponds to the formula: “Everything that exists,⁴⁹ exists (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.”⁵⁰ Moreover, it appears true: (3a) “x exists,” and (3b) “x is F.”⁵¹

³⁷ “That *physis* is even more basic than *kosmos* is evident from the fact that the discoverers of the *cosmos* came to be called *physiologoi*, not *kosmologoi*, and that “nature” occurs much more frequently in tides of their treatises than does “cosmos” (Vlastos, 2005: 18).

³⁸ The Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metric (the FLRW metric) underlies the Big Bang cosmology.

³⁹ “Christian interpreters (and not only they!) ought to remember that this Greek concept of nature is not identical with naturalism in our modern sense, but almost the opposite of it.” (Jaeger, 1961: 18).

⁴⁰ οὗν ἡ τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις ἐξ ἀνάγκης τε καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως ἐγεννήθη (*Timaeus* 48a1-2).

⁴¹ (Liddell & Scott, 1940).

⁴² There are four fundamental interactions, also known as fundamental interactions, also known as fundamental forces: the gravitational and electromagnetic interactions, and the strong and weak interactions.

⁴³ Examples of self-organisation are crystallisation, thermal convection of fluids, chemical oscillation, animal swarming, neural circuits, etc. In recent decades, related modelling- emergence – has been developed along with the self-organisation (self-assembly) models.

⁴⁴ “For the “law” which we recognise in the regularity of the celestial motions is, for Plato, a proof of their rationality (νόος and νόμος being akin).” (Bury, 1937: 315).

⁴⁵ *Arkhē* is derived from ἄρχω (*árkhō*, “to begin”) + ἥ (-ē, verbal noun suffix).

⁴⁶ (Liddell & Scott, 1940). See especially (*Statesman* 260e8-9; 275a3-6; 304b11-304c1) and discussion (Gill, 2010: 186).

⁴⁷ Present infinitive of *eimi*.

⁴⁸ (Burnyeat, 2003: 16).

⁴⁹ Pay attention that in English “to exist” was a late-comer, in 1602 (Burnyeat, 2003: 21).

⁵⁰ (Burnyeat, 2003: 18).

⁵¹ See (Burnyeat, 2003; Ademollo, 2018).

Thus, the investigation of the question “What is there in *alēthēs*?” leads us to the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon. The *phúsis* of the *kósmos* is (3a) “*x* exists,”⁵² which exposes the combination between (1a) “*x* come to be” and (2a) “*x* cease to be,” where *x* is the subject or equals to something. The metric (3a) “*x* exists” is independent and does not correspond to the metrics (1a) and (2a) separately. The main difference of the metric (3a) “*x* exists,” is the meaningfulness of the physical characteristics of something that is (εἶναι ὄν). It is the meaningful *phúsis* of any “something that is” that is its defining characteristic, which allows it to be “what is purely (όντος)” and not “what is not (not óntos).”⁵³

Thus, the “passing through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards the *genesis* has led us to define the critical dichotomy of the *phúsis* of the *kósmos*:

What is that which comes to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν) and what is that which comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?⁵⁴

3. What is the *phúsis* of a form as *dúnamis*?

The formulated dichotomy⁵⁵ is based on the Big Bang theory and the argumentation of the expansion of the Universe. A critical clarification follows from it. Namely, we examine the *phúsis*, which causes the expanding *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon.

The concept of “expanding *kósmos*” presents the physical environment of the “to be” phenomenon as a *paradigm* (*parádeigma*),⁵⁶ which compares (παράδεικνυμι) the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* with the *agōn*.⁵⁷ The forms “come into being and are generated”⁵⁸ in the *agon* (*agōn*).⁵⁹ The *agōn* selects and legitimises the competitive advantage of their *phúsis* in real-time. Each form is an image (εἰκών) of a *parádeigma*⁶⁰ and differs only by the characteristics of its *phúsis*.

Modern science has been clear about the expanding *kósmos* formed by non-material (dark energy) and material⁶¹ forms. All of them are formed by the combination of *anankē* and *nóos*.

⁵² According to Burnyeat, Frege’s logic, in particular, the logical notation (3x)(Fx A Gx), means “the way one language or another expresses (what we call) existence” (Burnyeat, 2003: 21).

⁵³ τε μὴ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ὄντος εἰλικρινῶς (*Republic* 5.479d4). See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 12-16; Ademollo, 2018: 61-62).

⁵⁴ The author changed a basic ontological dichotomy to fit the Big Bang theory. See (*Timaeus* 27d6-28a1).

⁵⁵ “Dichotomous division plays a major role in Plato’s search for definitions in the late dialogues, but not the comprehensive role often attributed to it” (Gill, 2010: 197-198).

⁵⁶ The noun *parádeigma* is derived from the verb *παράδεικνυμι*, “to make comparisons, to exhibit.” A *parádeigma* “indicates how to go on, how to begin an enquiry or how to get beyond an impasse” (Gill, 2010: 176). The *parádeigma* facilitates the passage through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon in the direction of *genesis*. The modern meanings of the word “paradigm” differ from the meanings of the *parádeigma*.

⁵⁷ For the *agōn* and the agonistic tradition, see (Tell, 2011; Daqing, 2010).

⁵⁸ γιγνόμενα καὶ γεννητὰ (*Timaeus* 28c2).

⁵⁹ Plato imagined it as a *chōra* (χώρα), “an *eidos* invisible and unshaped, all-receptive” (*Timaeus* 51a). Translated by W.R.M. Lamb. See (Ademollo, 2018, Zeyl & Sattler, 2022).

⁶⁰ According to Plato, forms were the images (*eikōn*) for the demiurge (God), who created the *kalós kósmos*. (*Timaeus* 51a-52a; *Phaedo* 109a-111c; *Cratylus* 439c-440d; *Symposium* 211b; *Republic* 10.596a-10.598d).

⁶¹ “...completed a census of the universe and finds that dark matter (matter not made up of atoms) is 24.0%”, whereas “ordinary atoms (also called baryons) make up only 4.6% of the universe.” <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

This combination exposes each form as a potency (*dúnamis*) of the presence,⁶² capable of acting and being-acted upon. The forms which come to be, come to be always is pure. Hence, we need “to go through” the question:

What is the *phúsis* of a form as *dúnamis*?

The previously made conclusion facilitates investigation of the forms that potentially “come to be (*gignomai*) and always is purely (*ón*).” Namely, any form comes to be as an image of a *parádeigma*. It means that the basic structure of the forms is the same. Any form which comes to be consists of *arkhē*, *anankē* and *nóos*, where:

(1) *Arkhē* is a directive physical meaning of any (non-material and material) form formed by a particular combination of the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. The *arkhē* of the forms is the image of the “unconditioned *arkhē*”, but it has a fundamental difference. Namely, it is based on the FLRW metric⁶³ and the magnitude of the appropriated energy. As a result, *arkhē* is the providential and directive beginning of any form. Moreover, it exhibits the physical characteristics of the form as a certain rightness (*dikaíosunē*).⁶⁴ Accordingly, the “comes to be” form is as *dikaíos* (righteous) *phúsis*, always focused on being pure. Thanks to the *arkhē*, the expanding *kósmos* is represented as a hierarchy of *dikaíos* forms or as the chronology of the Universe.

(2) *Anankē* is the force of the “come to be” phenomenon, which forms the constraints and necessity of each form. *Anankē* guarantees that the form will always be “an open system,”⁶⁵ but, at the same time, its existence will be a constraint and limited by the magnitude of the appropriated force. Thanks to *anankē*, the competing variety of forms in the *kósmos* have a common focus or *dikaíosunē* (rightness) of the interactions. *Anankē* represents the competition between forms as an opposition between *dikaíos* (righteous) and unrighteous (*ἄδικος*) interactions (forces).

(3) *Nóos* is the form’s ability of self-organisation (self-assembly). *Nóos* causes the ordering of the components that come to be into an organised structure – form. Moreover, it is the “intending and perceiving”⁶⁶ of “always to be purely,” by which the components that come to be are organised into the form without external direction. In this physical aspect, the meanings of *nóos* and laws (*vóμoι*) demonstrate their affinity. Coming to be components use innate, local interactions (*anankē*) for self-organisation (self-assembly) into a specific form (system) with certain physical characteristics. The defining ones are (i) magnitude of appropriated energy, (ii) order (structure) and (iii) ability to act, interact (function). *Nóos* exhibits the competition between the forms as the competition between *dikaíos* and unright (*ἄδικος*) self-organisation (self-assembly).

The combination of the three above basic characteristics forms the *phúsis* of the form as *dúnamis*. The form “comes to be” into *agōn* and competes for the reward of “always be purely” solely as a physical phenomenon or *phúsis*. The quality of *phúsis*, which guarantees the pass through the form into “to be” with the goal of “always be purely,” the author will denote by the verb *dierkhomai*. All forms that “come to be” into the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon have a *phúsis* equivalent to *dierkhomai*.

⁶² The discussion of “the “δύναμις of presence” (or co-presence)” (Gonzalez, 2009: 325).

⁶³ It has been established that the FLRW metric itself changed over time.

⁶⁴ The author uses the connotation “right” rather than “justice” when translating the adjective *δίκαιος* and the nouns *δίκη* and *δικαιοσύνη*. He presents the argument in the text.

⁶⁵ Modern open systems models link the organismic, thermodynamics and evolutionary models.

⁶⁶ The author used the result of the discussion (Gonzalez, 2009: 29).

The quality of *dierkhomai* is the *phúsis* of the forms that “come to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν).” Moreover, the *phúsis* of forms, which “come to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)” has this quality. Therefore, *dierkhomai* is a qualitative characteristic of the form, leading it into *agōn*. To win or lose in the *agōn*, that is, to come to be in the *agōn*, so that later “always is purely (όν) or not ever is (όν),”⁶⁷ is determined by a different quality of *phúsis*. Denote it by the noun *dianoia*. *Dianoia* are specific physical characteristics that allow the form to win *agōn* and always be purely (όν). It is the fundamental competitive advantage of the form, which guarantees its existence in the expanding *kósmos* as something that is (3a) “x exists” and (3b) “x is F.”

Analysis of *dianoia* is possible only on the example of a specific form. Therefore, an investigation of the question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?”⁶⁸ will lead us to understand, “What is a meaningful *phúsis*?”

4. What is *dianoia* of the hominin form?

Modern man defines *arkhē* of the form as neuroevolution, which, approximately 7 million years ago, caused the formation of the phylogeny of hominin species.⁶⁹ That is, about seven million years ago, the hominin form won the *agōn* and was rewarded the opportunity to “always is purely (όν)” in the expanding *kósmos*. What competitive advantage does the *phúsis* of hominin form have?

The first investigations of the meaningful *physis* of the hominin form, which have come down to our times, are found in Plato’s *Meno*.⁷⁰ Beginning with *Meno*, Plato focused on three important problems that exhibit the fundamental competitive advantage of hominin.⁷¹ “The first concerns what counts as a good definition, the second what is to be defined, the third the variety of permissible definitions.”⁷² The study of these problems is turning round hominin to the question “What is x?” in (3a) “x exists”⁷³ and reveals the significance of this turning around. “For when he says that, he makes a statement about that which is (όντων⁷⁴) or is becoming (γιγνομένων⁷⁵) or has become (γεγονότων⁷⁶) or is to be (μελλόντων); he does not merely give names (ονομάζω), but he concludes by combining verbs with nouns.”⁷⁷

⁶⁷ *Agon* follows the “first-only rule”, i.e. one event, one winner. It corresponds to the famous saying at that time: “either the wreath or death”) (Daqing, 2010: 6806).

⁶⁸ What the author refers to as “the hominin form” in this dialogue is the current stage of the form that I refer to as the “Intelligent Matter.” The “Intelligent Matter” form is explored in the second dialogue. The question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?” changes the focal length to a meaningful *phúsis* of the “Intelligent Matter” form and narrows the angle of view.

⁶⁹ See (McNulty, 2016).

⁷⁰ (*Meno* 72c).

⁷¹ Especially see *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles (2010).

⁷² (Charles, 2010: 3).

⁷³ “Socrates’ most significant philosophical innovation, in Aristotle’s view, was to focus on the search for definitions, raising and attempting to answer his famous ‘What is it?’ question” (*Metaphysics* 1078b22ff). (Charles, 2010: 1).

⁷⁴ Inflection of *eimi*.

⁷⁵ Inflection of *gígnomai*.

⁷⁶ Inflection of *gígnomai*.

⁷⁷ δηλοῖ γὰρ ἥδη που τότε περὶ τῶν ὄντων ἢ γιγνομένων ἢ γεγονότων ἢ μελλόντων, καὶ οὐκ ὀνομάζει μόνον ἀλλὰ τι περαίνει, συμπλέκων τὰ ῥήματα τοῖς ὀνόμασι (*Sophist* 262d4-6). Translated by Harold N. Fowler. For discussion, see (Burnyeat, 2010: 183-184).

The examination of the question “What is x ?” exposes the hominin essential ability. Namely, the hominin “comes to be and always are purely” *due to* and *through* the “turning round” to that “which comes to be and always is purely.” The quality of the *phūsīs* of the hominin form guarantees not only the passage into “to be”, i.e., the *dierkhomai*, but also the passage through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *gēnesis*, i.e., *dianoia*. The hominin demonstrate the ability to examine x in (3a) “ x exists” and in founding it (1a) “ x come to be”, and (2a) “ x ceases to be”. As a result, they define and use x as F , where F is more than “some” predicate.⁷⁸ F is the result of *dianoia*. The hominin “use the *noūs*” as a physical characteristic and examine (3a) to reach balanced conclusions about it and its combination (1a) and (2a).⁷⁹

Thus, the ability to examine “What is x ?”⁸⁰ is a demonstration of the fundamental competitive advantage of the *phūsīs* of the hominin in the *agōn*, thanks to which they can define that one something in (3a) in which all cases of F are F .⁸¹ Hominin does not examine “What is there in *alēthēs*?” They grasp concrete x ,⁸² something, in all three phenomena, denoted by us by the verbs *gígnomai*, *phtheirō* and *eimí*. The hominin form wins the *agōn* by being able to grasp the *phūsīs* of the *kósmos* as *alēthēs* (not hidden, unconcealed) F , which is subsequently used to multiply one’s *phūsīs*.

Understanding the ability to examine “What is x ?” is equivalent to understanding the hominin form’s meaningful *phūsīs*. The reflection compares and defines the three key characteristics of meaningful *phūsīs*. These characteristics provide the fundamental advantage of the hominin form in the *agōn* and guarantee victory. The author has labelled the identified attributes in related terms: the *agathós*, the *agathou dúnamis* and the *aretē*. Let us consider them.

(1) The adjective *agathós*⁸³ denotes the first and main characteristic.⁸⁴ According to Plato, the *kállistos* of all that has come into being (*gígnomai*) or *kósmos*)⁸⁵ is nothing but the

⁷⁸ The fact that a verb usually forms the predicate is explained by Aristotle (*Arist. Int. 16b6*) (Liddell & Scott, 1940).

⁷⁹ (*Timaeus* 52a-b). Especially see (Ademollo, 2018: 67-69; Zeyl & Sattler, 2022). “According to Plato, “there is, indeed, continuous change in the sensible world, but there is also some stability, and there are patterns and regularities in the change. He thinks that he is in a position to recognise these elements of stability because he, unlike his opponents, admits in his ontology the universal properties of the changing things, namely the forms, by participating in which the changing things are whatever they are” (Ademollo, 2018: 77-78).

⁸⁰ Moreover, as we will specify later, to examine precisely as a *dialégesthai* (διαλέγεσθαι) and a *dialégō* (διαλέγω), that is, in a particular way, in the meanings: “to practice dialectikē,” “to reveal results in discussion,” or “to think discursively.”

⁸¹ See (*Meno* 72c7ff.; Charles, 2010; Brown, 2010; Gill, 2010). “A good definition of F must give that one thing which is common to all and only F s, and which is that through which all the F s are F . A definition must give the ‘what it is’, the essence of F , i.e. that which explains why all the F s are F ” (Brown, 2010: 151-152).

⁸² ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς ἀληθείας ἄπτεται (“the *psukhē* grasp the *alētheia*”) (*Phaedo* 65b7). Translated by Gwenda-lin Grewal (2018).

⁸³ See (*Euthydemus* 278e-281e). In Ancient Greece, the term *agathós* concentrated in itself the whole set of concepts that have covered and still cover all man’s moral, intellectual and spiritual virtues. All of them are their derivatives. The whole hierarchy of being and knowledge is based on *agathós* (Hadot, 1999).

⁸⁴ Sometimes it is called the One. See (Plotinus, 1952).

⁸⁵ ὁ μὲν γὰρ κάλλιστος τῶν γεγόνότων (*Timaeus* 29a4).

agathou offspring,⁸⁶ which the *agathós* begot (γεννάω) in a proportion with itself.⁸⁷ *Agathós* hand over (παρέχω)⁸⁸ *alētheia* for (τοῖς) objects perceived (γινώσκομένοις) and give back (ἀποδίδωμι)⁸⁹ the *dúnamis* for perceivers (γινώσκοντι).⁹⁰ *Agathós* is the cause of epistēmē of the singular “to be” (οὔσαν) and singular *alētheia* (ἀληθείας).⁹¹ Plato identified three forms of the *agathón*:⁹² “*psūkhēi*,⁹³ the body, and external.”⁹⁴ They sequentially formed (i) the “rightness (*dikaíosunē*), phrónēsis, courage (*andreíā*), and *sōphrosúnē*”⁹⁵ into *psūkhēi*; (ii) the “beauty (*kállos*), wellness, health, and strength in the body”;⁹⁶ and (iii) “friends, the eudaimōnia of fatherland and wealth among the external.”⁹⁷

Agathós, as a characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin, examines “What is *x*?” in such a way as to define (3a) “*x* exists” as (3b) “*x* is *F*”. In this case, *F* is one *F*, which the “to be” phenomenon represents as the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) combination between the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. *Agathós* compares *x* in (1a), (2a) and (3a) and defines it as the one *F*, moreover, as a global something that is both (i) a whole and expanding *kósmos* and (ii) causes a meaningful *phúsis* of hominin and any other form.

Thanks to the *agathós*, the hominin perceive the *phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos* as an intelligible complexity. Each new intelligible account of this complexity advances the hominin towards *génesis*. As a result, hominin acquire the physical meanings that provide: (i) passing into *agōn* but losing, that is, the quality of *phúsis* equivalent to *dierkhomai*, and (ii) a fundamental competitive advantage that allows the forms to win *agōn* and “always to be purely.” The fundamental advantage of hominin is their ability to define the meaningful *phúsis* of the existing forms, grasp physical meanings and use them to win *agōn*.

The hominin form examines the “to be” phenomenon as the *agathós*, embracing it by the *lógos* and the *phrónēsis*.⁹⁸ At the same time, hominin recognise the limitations of their capabilities.⁹⁹ Therefore, they are examining “What is *x*?” in (3a)¹⁰⁰ in such a way as to define

⁸⁶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔκγονον (*Republic* 6.508b11).

⁸⁷ ὃν τὰγαθὸν ἐγέννησεν ἀνάλογον ἑαυτῷ (*Republic* 6.508b11-12).

⁸⁸ Properly, have close beside, i.e. give (offer) in a “up-close-and-personal” way. <https://biblehub.com/greek/3930.htm>

⁸⁹ Properly, give from, i.e. to return (especially as a payment), in relation to the source of the giving back. <https://biblehub.com/greek/591.htm>

⁹⁰ τὸ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παρέχον τοῖς γινώσκομένοις καὶ τῷ γινώσκοντι τὴν δύναμιν ἀποδιδόν (*Republic* 6.508e1-2).

⁹¹ αἰτίαν δ' ἐπιστήμης οὔσαν καὶ ἀληθείας (*Republic* 6.508e2-3). “The good (*agathón*) makes beings manifest as beings, thereby at the same time letting them be. The good (*agathón*) is the cause of the beingknown of beings and of their being (509b). In other words, it provides the light of ἀλήθεια in which they can first come into presence and be” (Gonzalez, 2009: 312).

⁹² Masculine/feminine/neuter genitive plural of *agathós*.

⁹³ Dative singular of *psukhē*.

⁹⁴ Τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄρα τρία εἶδη ἐστί: τὰ μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, τὰ δὲ ἐν σώματι, τὰ δὲ ἐκτός (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.81). Edited by Robert Hicks (1972).

⁹⁵ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ φρόνησις καὶ ἡ ἀνδρεία καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁶ τὸ δὲ κάλλος καὶ ἡ εὐεξία καὶ ἡ ὑγεία καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς ἐν σώματι (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁷ οἱ δὲ φίλοι καὶ ἡ τῆς πατρίδος εὐδαιμονία καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος ἐν τοῖς ἐκτός (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁸ τὸ λόγῳ καὶ φρονήσει περιληπτὸν (*Timaeus* 29a5-6).

⁹⁹ Due to the varying quality of the *lógos* (*Sophist* 262e-264a) and the difficulty with the “to conceive and bring forth” the *phronesis* (*phrónēsis*) (*Symposium* 209a).

¹⁰⁰ (3a) “*x* exists.”

x not as *agathós* itself but as *F*, an *agathou* idea (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέαν)¹⁰¹ or, equivalently, an *agathou* form.¹⁰² The *agathós* is the ideal characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis*, while the *agathou* form is its accurate understanding and use. Hominin use the *agathou* form primarily for (i) imitation, where “imitation” (*mīmēsis*) is understood in two meanings: “identification” and “reproduction,”¹⁰³ (ii) and/or assimilation (*homoiōsis*) so far as this is possible.¹⁰⁴ *Mīmēsis* and/or *homoiōsis* convert the hominin form into image (3a) “x exists” and helps to win *agōn*.

(2) The phrase the *agathou dúnamis* denotes the second characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin. The *agathou dúnamis* is that one something, which is always the answer to the question “What is to be Defined?”¹⁰⁵ What is to be Defined? It is always the *agathou dúnamis*, which [A] is that one something in (3b) “x is *F*,” which [B] is graspable without specialised knowledge; [C] is such that if one does not know it, one cannot know any other feature of *F*; and [D] is such that if one does know it, one will be able to distinguish on its basis any case of *F* from any case which is not *F*.¹⁰⁶

The *agathou dúnamis*, as a characteristic of the hominin’s meaningful *phúsis*, is exhibit by “the acts or actions of the agent.”¹⁰⁷ Moreover, this does not happen in any manner, for example, the “action for the sake of action,”¹⁰⁸ but with a specific focus and limits of collective and individual self-realisation: *agathós* and *aretē*, respectively.¹⁰⁹ The meanings of the *agathou dúnamis* are equivalent to the combination of the *anankē* and *nóos* meanings, which present the *phúsis* of hominin as the image of the *phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos*. In this sense, the *agathou dúnamis* defines the hominin form as a potency capable of acting and being acted upon. The hominin are compared (παράδεικνυμι) by actions (interactions) focused on procreation (τίκτειν) “in a biological and/or cultural sense”¹¹⁰ and self-organisation (self-assembly) into a technologically advanced space civilisation¹¹¹ based on the agonistic tradition.

¹⁰¹ See (*Republic* 6.505a–6.509c; 6.510a–6.511d; 7.518a–7.518d; 7.532a–7.532c; 7.534c; 10.621c–d; *Timaeus* 29a). For the “turning round” discussion towards the *agathou* idea, see (Capra, 2015; Fierro, 2003: 215–220; Gonzalez, 2009: 330–332).

¹⁰² For the synonymy of εἶδος and ἰδέα to refer to forms in Plato’s dialogues and discussion, see (Gonzalez, 2009: 85–127).

¹⁰³ The author follows Plato. Discussion of *mīmēsis* see (Capra, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ (*Symposium* 207d; *Theaetetus* 176b; *Republic* 10.619a). Discussion see (Fierro, 2003; Torri, 2017).

¹⁰⁵ The author follows David Charles, “In the *Meno*, when Socrates seeks an account which will answer his ‘What is *F*?’ question, his target is described in the following terms:

[A] it is that one thing in virtue (*aretē*) of which all cases of *F* are *F* (72c7ff.);

[B] it is graspable without specialised knowledge by intelligent interlocutors (75d2–7);

[C] it is such that if one does not know it, one cannot know any other feature of *F* (71b3–7);

[D] it is such that if one does know it, one will be able to distinguish on its basis any case of *F* from any case which is not *F* (72c8–d1) (Charles, 2010: 5–6).

¹⁰⁶ See (Charles, 2010: 5–6).

¹⁰⁷ See (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

¹⁰⁸ “Act! act! it is to that end we are here.” Johann Gottlieb Fichte formulated this imperative at the end of the 18th century. (The Christian Pioneer, 1842: 182).

¹⁰⁹ In the Middle Ages, the potency (*dynamis*), which gives the intention of collective and individual self-realisation, was denoted by the terms “God” and “soul” in modern history – “the Universe” and “mind.” The agreement between the meanings of *agathós* and *aretē* in Plato’s dialogues is primary and unprecedented. The author uses it as the basis of a new paradigm.

¹¹⁰ (Fierro, 2003: 67).

¹¹¹ See (Bazaluk, 2022).

A comparative analysis of the actions of the hominin allows us to distinguish three qualities of the meaningful *phúsis*. I define them as (i) *dierkhomai* or the ability to “pass through” the *lēthē* into the *alēthēs*; (ii) “turning round” towards *arkhē*, and (iii) the *dianoia* or the ability to examine *arkhē*. We shall run through them briefly.

(i) The quality of *dierkhomai* or the ability to “pass through” *lēthē* into *alēthēs* is a direct manifestation of the magnitude of the appropriated *agathou dúnamis*, which forms the active principle or the *arkhē* of the hominin form. On the one hand, *dierkhomai* has a providential and directive influence on the actions (interactions) of all hominins. On the other hand, this magnitude creates a contrast “between the things that merely *happen* to people – the events they undergo – and the various things they genuinely *do*.”¹¹²

(ii) The “turning round of the *psukhē*”¹¹³ towards the *aretē* and *agathós* is assumed but not ensured by the *agathou dúnamis*. The “turning round” does not mean “to turn or turn around” in its “passing through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *genesis*. The “turning round”¹¹⁴ to *arkhē* is “a fundamental change in orientation.”¹¹⁵ It is a new quality of deeds and actions involving complex preparation¹¹⁶ and inspiration to win the *agōn*.

The “turning round” is caused by understanding the *agathou dúnamis* as the physical characteristics of one’s form and the cause of the acts and actions. The “turning round of the *psukhē*” expands the individual nature possibilities at the expense of the intelligible external. The *psukhē* learns to examine its nature and, subsequently, the *phúsis* of its form and *kósmos* in order to discover the *agathou* form. Moreover, it learns to manage *dierkhomai* to independently “pass through” the *lēthē* into *alēthēs*, grasp *x* in (3a) as *alēthēs F*, and use all cases of *F* to expand the possibilities of self-propulsion. The ability to govern the *dierkhomai* is equivalent to the “What is *x*?” examination. The examination purifies the *psukhē* from the evil of ignorance¹¹⁷ and reveals to it new capacities to act in something that is (εἶναι ὄν).

(iii) The quality of *dianoia* or the ability to question *arkhē* is the independent “passage” of the *psukhē* from the “turning round” to the place of the unity of collective and individual actions. It is an examination of the *phúsis* of the hominin form, with the prospect of determining the *alēthēs phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos*. Following Plato, the results of *dianoia* we will call *sophiā* and *aretē* alithiní.¹¹⁸ The adjective *alithiní* (ἀληθινή) is translated as “agreeable to *alētheia*,” and the phrase “*aretē alithiní*” (ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή) means literally “*arete* that is agreeable to the *alētheia*. Hence, *dianoia* (the “guiding perspective”) ¹¹⁹ is defined as the upward path¹²⁰ to the source of the significant presence, to the *agathós*, which can be used as *sophiā* and *aretē alithiní* to increase one’s meaningful *phúsis*. The quality of *dianoia* provides the “governance of one’s own actions,”¹²¹ and individual imitation (*mīmēsis*) and/or assimilation (*homoíōsis*) of the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) *F*, revealed by the examination of “What is *x*?” in (3a) “*x* exists.”

¹¹² (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

¹¹³ ψυχῆς περιαγωγή (*Republic* 7.521c5).

¹¹⁴ “the metaphorical expression of “turning round” (περιστροφή and περιαγωγή, *Republic* 7.521c) the *psukhē* “upwards” (ἐπάνωδος)” (Fierro, 2003: 215).

¹¹⁵ (Gonzalez, 2009: 330).

¹¹⁶ “I must beware lest I might undergo (paskhein) the very thing which those undergo (paskhein) who behold (theōrein) and examine the sun during an eclipse” (*Phaedo* 99d). Translated by Gwendalin Grewal.

¹¹⁷ Plato called ignorance the worst of evils (*Gorgias* 527e).

¹¹⁸ ἡ μὲν γὰρ τούτου γνώσις σοφία καὶ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή (*Theaetetus* 176c3-4).

¹¹⁹ (Gonzalez, 2009: 69, 73).

¹²⁰ See (Hadot, 1999; Schur, 2015; Gonzalez, 2009: 244-245)

¹²¹ See (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

(3) The noun *aretē* denotes the third most significant feature of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin. According to Plato, the *agathou dúnamis* manifested itself in *kalós* and *aretē*.¹²² The word *aretē* comes from the adjective *áristos*, the superlative degree of *agathós*. It means the personal quality of being *agathou*.¹²³ The *agathós* man¹²⁴ was the person who purified the *aretē* and guaranteed its unconcealment with the spells.¹²⁵ The *agathós* man was able to “give birth to the unconcealed *aretē* and to nurture it.”¹²⁶ As a result, he attained the quality of meaningful *phúsis*, allowing him to multiply the *phúsis* of hominin and contribute to the victory in the *agōn*.¹²⁷ The *agathós* man contemplates the *alēthēs* of the form in and by itself,¹²⁸ which is equivalent to using the *agathós dúnamis* “so far as this is possible.”

The *aretē* is the magnitude of the appropriated *agathou dúnamis*. The magnitude is always individual. The factor of hereditary transmission is essential but not decisive for hominin. Thanks to *aretē* and *mnēmē*,¹²⁹ each hominin “felt such a friendly affection for the *agathón*,”¹³⁰ and experiences “the reason to pursue an *aretē*.”¹³¹

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing, we can draw the following conclusion. The question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?” helps us to define three qualities of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin: the *agathós*, the *agathou dúnamis* and the *aretē*. We have called the ideal combination of these qualities the *agathós* man. The *agathós* man is a person who perfectly knows *anamimnēskō* (ἀναμνήσκω) and/or *dialégesthai* (διαλέγεσθαι),¹³² which allows to examine “What is *x*?” in a particular way. As a result, he singles out and defines that one something in (3a) in which all cases of *F* are *F*.

The *agathós* man grasps the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* as *alēthēs F* and fixes it as *sophiā* and *aretē* alithiní in the norms (νόμματα) about *kalón*, *dikaíon* and *agathón*.¹³³ The *agathós* man demonstrates how to correctly (*dikē*) use “the best and most excellent,”¹³⁴ the *agathón*,

¹²² (*Philebus* 64e).

¹²³ See (Robinson, 1995; Burnyeat, 2003). “(In Apology (Socrates# defence speech), Crito, and Gorgias) We have seen that virtue (*aretē*) is not just one good thing (*agathós*) for me to have, something that might be measured against other good things (*agathós*), such as wealth or security. Rather, virtue (*aretē*) is a “divine” good (*agathós*) – it is either the only unconditional good (*agathós*), or the only thing which is good (*agathós*) at all” (Annas, 2002: 55).

¹²⁴ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ. See (*Laws* 2.660e). According to Plato, the *agathós* man is an example to *mīmēsis* (*Republic* 6.500c; 9.590e-9.591).

¹²⁵ For discussion, see (Annas, 2002; Capra, 2015; Fierro, 2003; Hadot, 1999).

¹²⁶ τεκόντι δὲ ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θρεψαμένῳ (*Symposium* 212a).

¹²⁷ “Thus *aretē* amounts to “success, supremacy, being better” than others (Griffith, 1990: 188).

¹²⁸ For the discussion on Plato’s vision on the possibility of considering the unconcealed form, see (Carone, 2007: 216-221; Fierro, 2003: 218-221; Hadot, 1999: 99-101; McPherran, 2007: 93-94; Sheffield, 2007: 37).

¹²⁹ *Mnēmē* is the collective memory of the *phúsis* of the form and its existence as a whole. Otherwise, these are the archetypes, the universal basic innate mental structures that form the content of the collective unconscious. See (Jung, 1981).

¹³⁰ (*Lysis* 220d).

¹³¹ ἀρετὴν δὲ διώκειν (*Theaetetus* 176b-c).

¹³² The meanings of the verbs “to recollect” and “to practice *dialektikē*” are understood by me as complimentary. The author is guided by (Capra, 2015).

¹³³ νόμματα καλῶν τε πέρι καὶ δικαίων καὶ ἀγαθῶν (*Republic* 6.484d2-3).

¹³⁴ τὸ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ βέλτιστον (*Phaedo* 97d3). See (Gonzalez, 2009: 328-330).

therefore it is his life that is called the *eudaimōn* life (βίον εὐδαιμόνα).¹³⁵ “If one is *agathōús* (ἀγαθοῦς),¹³⁶ one is at the same time necessarily *eudaimōnas* (εὐδαιμόνας).”¹³⁷ ¹³⁸

The definition of the *agathós* man specifies *dianoia* as the top quality of the form that comes to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν).

Glossary¹³⁹

Agathós (ἀγαθός, adjective); **Agathou** (ἀγαθοῦ, masculine/neuter genitive singular); **Agathón** (ἀγαθόν, neuter nominative/accusative/vocative singular), good. “In like manner, then, you are to say that the objects of knowledge not only receive from the presence of the *agathou* their being known, but their very existence and essence is derived to them from it, though the *agathou* itself is not essence but still transcends essence in dignity (πρεσβεία) and surpassing *dunámei* (δυνάμει).”¹⁴⁰

Agōn (ἄγών, noun, from verb ἄγω, I lead, bring (a person, or animal), guide), “means that many people assemble in some place to have a contest.”¹⁴¹ *Agōn* “was an unique creation of the Greeks in the ancient world. In the all kinds of *agōn* of Greece, they showed an unflinching spirit of antagonism, the Greeks made it legalization, rationalization and formalization. It is from this kind of spirit that the western thinking tradition of binary opposition was formed,”¹⁴² including *dialektikē*.

Alētheia (ἀλήθεια, noun), unconcealment, non-oblivion.¹⁴³ **Alēthēs** (ἀληθής, adjective) unconcealed; opposite *lēthē*.

Anankē (ἀνάγκη, noun), force, constraint, necessity.

Aretē (ἀρετή, noun), the personal quality of being *agathou*. “...but from *aretē* money and other things come to be *agathá*”¹⁴⁴ for human beings – yes, all other things, both in private and in public life [= in the *dēmos*].”¹⁴⁵ Plato considered *aretē* as the essence of *psukhē*,¹⁴⁶ “the flow of *agathes psychis*.”¹⁴⁷

Arkhē (ἀρχή, noun) beginning, origin.

Dianoia (διάνοια, noun, from διά, “thoroughly, from side-to-side,” which intensifies *noióō*, “to use the *noús*”), “movement from one side (of an issue) to the other to reach balanced-conclusions; full-orbed reasoning (= critical thinking), i.e., dialectical thinking that literally reaches “across to the other side” (of a matter).”¹⁴⁸

¹³⁵ (*Timaeus* 42b).

¹³⁶ Accusative plural masculine form of *agathós*.

¹³⁷ Literally “blessed with the *daimōn*,” happy.

¹³⁸ It is an interpretation σχεδόν μὲν γὰρ εὐδαιμόνας ἅμα καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἀνάγκη γίγνεσθαι (*Laws* 5.742e4-5). “That *eudaimōnas* (happiness) and *agathōús* (goodness) should go together is well-nigh inevitable.” Translated by R.G. Bury.

¹³⁹ The author focuses on Plato’s dialogues, the Platonic corpus, and Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English lexicon.

¹⁴⁰ (*Republic* 6.509b). Translated by Paul Shorey.

¹⁴¹ (Daqing, 2010: 6805). For the meaning and features of the agonistic tradition, see (Daqing, 2010; Tell, 2011).

¹⁴² (Daqing, 2010: 6809).

¹⁴³ I distinguish between *alētheia* and truth, so I consciously avoid using the latter word.

¹⁴⁴ Feminine nominative/accusative/vocative dual of *agathós*.

¹⁴⁵ (*Apology* 30b). Translated by Myles Fredric Burnyeat (Burnyeat, 2003: 24).

¹⁴⁶ For example, (*Symposium* 209a).

¹⁴⁷ ῥοήν τῆς ἀγαθῆς ψυχῆς (*Cratylus* 415d).

¹⁴⁸ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1271.htm>

Dierkhomai (διέρχομαι, verb), to go through, pass through.¹⁴⁹

Dikaïos (δίκαιος, adjective, derived from *dikē*), right, righteous; opposite *ádikos*

Dikē (δίκη, noun), custom, right (as self-evident), especially a judicial verdict which declares something that is approved or disapproved;¹⁵⁰ as a **Dikaïosúnē** (δικαιοσύνη, noun). From *δίκαιος* (*dikaïos*) + *-σύνη* (*-súnē*), rightness, righteousness) it refers to a person; as an adverb. – duly, rightly.

Dúnamis (δύναμις, noun, from *dúnamai*), potency, i.e. a special ability to do a particular thing (a natural ability, *dúnamai*); the total amount that can be contained or produced (capacity). The Romans translated *dúnamis* as *potentia*, which has formed the root of the English word “potential.”

Eimí (εἰμί, verb), exist, be;¹⁵¹ ἢ ὄν (ὄν, participle, noun) the things which actually exist, the present, reality;¹⁵² opposite *gígnomai*¹⁵³ and *phtheirō*.¹⁵⁴

Génesis (γένεσις, noun) coming into being, production, generation. *Génesis* is a derivative of the verb *gígnomai*.

Gígnomai (γίγνομαι, verb) to come into being, namely, (i) to become, i.e. to come into existence, begin to be, receive being, and (ii) to become equivalent to come to pass, happen, of events;¹⁵⁵ opposite (i) *phtheirō*, “We should all agree that the opposite of *gígnesthai*¹⁵⁶ is *phtheiresthai*,¹⁵⁷ should we not?”¹⁵⁸ and (ii) *eimí*.¹⁵⁹

Homoíōsis (ὁμοίωσις, noun) and **Hómoios** (ὅμοιος, adjective), a being made like, assimilation, establishment of a resemblance.¹⁶⁰

¹⁴⁹ See (Schur, 2015; Gonzalez, 2009: 207-208; McPherran, 2007: 92).

¹⁵⁰ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1349.htm>

¹⁵¹ I follow Myles Fredric Burnyeat: ‘x ἐστὶ’ is, “uncontroversially, complete statements”; the pass from ‘x ἐστὶ’ to ‘x ἐστὶ *F*’ “is not to change the meaning of the verb, but to add a complement to a verb that was already complete, but further *completable*.” Where *x* is a subject and *F* is some predicate (Burnyeat, 2003: 9-10). “Platonic Greek for “X exists” is “X is something”, εἶναι τι.” For examples of this use of εἶναι τι see *Phd.* 74a9-12, 102b1, *Rep.* 9.583c 5, 584d3, *Tht.* 157a3 and 5, *Soph.* 246e5, 247a9, *Tim.* 51b7-8, *Phlb.* 37a2-9” (Burnyeat, 2003: 16).

¹⁵² (*Sophist* 263d; Liddell & Scott, 1940).

¹⁵³ See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 22-23; Ademollo, 2018).

¹⁵⁴ “that being (*ousiā*) which always is (*ousiā*) and does not wander under the influence of *genéseos* and *phthorās*” (ἐκείνης τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀεὶ οὐσης καὶ μὴ πλανωμένης ὑπὸ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς) (*Republic* 6.485b). Translated by Myles Fredric Burnyeat with modification (Burnyeat, 2003: 22; Ademollo, 2018: 62-63).

¹⁵⁵ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1096.htm>. Also, I follow Burnyeat: “x γίγνεται” is, “uncontroversially, complete statements”; the pass from “x γίγνεται” to “x γίγνεται *F*” “is not to change the meaning of the verb, but to add a complement to a verb that was already complete, but further *completable*.” Where *x* is a subject and *F* is some predicate (Burnyeat, 2003: 9-10). Also, I follow the formula: “Everything that is made to be comes to be (i) by the agency of something (*Timaeus* 28a4-6) and (ii) from something (*Phaedo* 70c) and (iii) something” (Burnyeat, 2003: 18; 22-23) with modification.

¹⁵⁶ Present infinitive of *gígnomai*.

¹⁵⁷ Infinitive of *phtheirō*.

¹⁵⁸ (*Philebus* 55a). Translated by Harold N. Fowler. See discussion (Ademollo, 2018; Burnyeat, 2003; Gonzalez, 2009; Vlastos, 2005).

¹⁵⁹ (*Timaeus* 27d-28a; *Republic* 6.485a-b). See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 22-23; Ademollo, 2018: 59).

¹⁶⁰ “The verb ὁμοίω is an active verb, which denotes an active process performed by an active subject. For this reason, the related noun ὁμοίωσις must be translated as “assimilation,” or “establishment of a resemblance,” rather than simply as “likeness, resemblance”” (Torri, 2017: 10-11).

Kalós (καλός, adjective; neuter **Kalón**, καλόν), moral beauty, of fine quality; and **Kállos** (κάλλος, noun), beauty. According to Plato, the *kalós* meanings followed from the *agathós* meanings: “All that is *agathón* is *kalón* (ἀγαθὸν καλόν), and the *kalón* is not excessive (καλὸν οὐκ ἄμετρον).”¹⁶¹ Diogenes Laertius wrote, “He was the first to define the notion of *kāloû* (καλοῦ)”¹⁶² as that which is bound up with whatever is praiseworthy (ἐπαινετοῦ) and rational (λογικοῦ) and useful (χρησίμου) and proper (πρέποντος) and becoming (ἀρμόττοντος).”¹⁶³

Kósmos (κόσμος, noun), order.

Lēthē (λήθη, noun), concealment, oblivion, closedness; opposite *alētheia*.

Méthodos (μέθοδος, noun), path (hodos) of pursuit (meta-), to pursue one’s inquiry), or literally “the way to follow.”

Mīmēsis (μίμησις, noun), imitation, in the meanings of an identification and a reproduction.¹⁶⁴

Nóos (νόος, noun; contracted form: **Noûs**, νοῦς), mind (perception), an act of mind (thought)).

Parádeigma (παράδειγμα, noun), pattern (model) as a norm, or simply an example, or a combination of both.¹⁶⁵

Phtheirō (φθείρω, verb), to pass away, perish, be destroyed.¹⁶⁶ On the one hand, it was opposed to *gígnomai*;¹⁶⁷ on the other hand, it opposed to *eimí*.¹⁶⁸

Phúsís (φύσις, noun), the energy that causes the expansion of the *kósmos*.¹⁶⁹ “That *physis* is even more basic than *kósmos* is evident from the fact that the discoverers of the *kósmos* came to be called *physiologoi*, not *kosmologoi*, and that “nature” occurs much more frequently in tides of their treatises than does “cosmos.””¹⁷⁰

Psukhē (ψυχή, noun). Plato’s research was aimed at affirming the two main meanings of *psukhē*: (1) the *psukhē* is immortal,¹⁷¹ and its nature differs from the nature of the body.¹⁷² (2) *Epistēmē* is stored in the *psukhē*, therefore to seek for something (ζητεῖν ἄρα) and to know (τὸ μανθάνειν), in general, was called *anamimnēskō*.¹⁷³

¹⁶¹ πᾶν δὴ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καλόν, τὸ δὲ καλὸν οὐκ ἄμετρον (*Timaeus* 87c).

¹⁶² Masculine/neuter genitive singular of *kalós*.

¹⁶³ (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.79). Edited by Robert Hicks (1972).

¹⁶⁴ See (Capra, 2015).

¹⁶⁵ See (*Meno* 77a9-77b1; *Sophist* 218d9; 235d7). “A *parádeigma* is not merely an example (or paradigmatic example) of some general concept... The search for the definition of the example reveals a procedure, which the enquirers can transfer to the harder case, independent of content. (...) A *parádeigma* indicates how to go on, how to begin an enquiry or how to get beyond an impasse” (Gill, 2010: 175-176).

¹⁶⁶ Unlike the verbs *gígnomai* and *eimí*, the verb *phtheirō* “can only be used without a complement”: “in ordinary Greek you do not say ‘X φθίρεται F’ to mean ‘X ceases to be F’” (Ademollo, 2018: 63).

¹⁶⁷ See (Ademollo, 2018: 62-63).

¹⁶⁸ See (Burnyeat, 2003).

¹⁶⁹ I follow Gregory Vlastos (2005: 4-19) and Werner Jaeger (1961), which indicate the difference between the meanings of *phúsís* and naturalism.

¹⁷⁰ (Vlastos, 2005: 18).

¹⁷¹ ἀθάνατος ἂν ἡ ψυχὴ εἴη (*Meno* 86b).

¹⁷² For example, (*Phaedo* 115c-116a; *Phaedrus* 245c-249d; *Timaeus* 34c).

¹⁷³ (*Meno* 81d).

 References

- Ademollo, Francesco (2018) On Plato's Conception of Change. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Volume 55, 35-84. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198836339.003.0002>
- Annas, Julia (2002) *Plato: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Bazaluk, Oleg (2022) Philosophy of the Cosmos for a Discursive "Thinking Through" of the Chronology of the Universe. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 28, 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/28/1>
- Brown, Lesley (2010) Definition and Division in Plato's *Sophist*. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 151-171.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1901) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 2: Tetralogia III-IV. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1903) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 3: Tetralogia V-VII. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1978) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 4: Tetralogia VIII. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1907) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 5: Tetralogia IX Definitiones et Spuria. Oxford University Press.
- Burnyeat, Myles Fredric (2003) *Apology* 30b 2-4: Socrates, money, and the grammar of γίγνεσθαι. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 123, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3246257>
- Bury, R.G. (1937) Theory of education in Plato's "Laws." *Revue des Études Grecques*, tome 50, fascicule 236-237, 304-320. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1937.2825>
- Capra, Andrea (2015) *Plato's Four Muses: The Phaedrus and the Poetics of Philosophy*. Hellenic Studies Series 67. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies. Available online: http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_CapraA.Platos_Four_Muses.2014
- Carone, Gabriela Roxana (2007) The Virtues of Platonic Love. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Lesher, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 208-228.
- Charles, David (2010) Introduction. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 1-30.
- Coates, Cameron F. (2018) Cosmic Democracy or Cosmic Monarchy? Empedocles in Plato's *Statesman*. *Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 35, 418-446.
- Daqing, Wang (2010) On the Ancient Greek αἶσχος. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 2, Issue 5, 6805-6812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.05.031>
- Diogenes Laertius (1972) *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Edited by Robert Hicks. Cambridge. Harvard University Press.
- Duke, E.A., Hicken, W.F., Nicoll, W.S.M., Robinson, D.B. & Strachan, J.C.G. (eds) (1995) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*, Vol. 1: Tetralogiae I–II. Oxford University Press.
- Fierro, Maria Angelica (2003) *Plato's theory of desire in the Symposium and the Republic*. Durham theses, Durham University.
- Gerson, Lloyd P. (2007) A Platonic Reading of Plato's *Symposium*. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Lesher, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 47-70.
- Gill, Mary-Louise (2010) Method and Metaphysics in Plato's *Sophist* and *Statesman*. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 172-199.

-
- Gonzalez, Francisco J. (2009) *Plato and Heidegger. A Question of Dialogue*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Griffith, Mark (1990) Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry. In *Cabinet of the Muses*, ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde. Scholars Press, 185-207.
- Hadot, Pierre (1999) *What Is Ancient Philosophy?* Moscow: Publishing House of Humanities.
- Horky, Phillip Sidney (2020) Approaches to the Pythagorean *Acusmata* in the Early Academy. *Plato's Academy: Its Workings and its History*. Edited by Paul Kalligas, Chloe Balla, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Vassilis Karasmanis. Cambridge University Press, 167-187.
- Jaeger, Werner (1961) *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav (1981) *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton University Press; 2nd edition.
- Kalvesmaki, Joel (2013) *The Theology of Arithmetic: Number Symbolism in Platonism and Early Christianity*. Hellenic Studies Series 59. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McNulty, Kieran P. (2016) Hominin Taxonomy and Phylogeny: What's In a Name? *Nature Education Knowledge*, 7(1): 2.
- McPherran, Mark L. (2000) Does Piety Pay? Socrates and Plato on Prayer and Sacrifice. *Reason and Religion in Socratic Philosophy*. Edited by Nicholas D. Smith and Paul B. Woodruff. Oxford University Press, 89-114.
- McPherran, Mark L. (2007) Medicine, Magic, and Religion in Plato's *Symposium*. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Leshner, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 71-95.
- Philodemus' *History of the Philosophers: Plato and the Academy* (PHerc. 1021 and 164) (2020) Translated with Introduction by Paul Kalligas and Voula Tsouna, and Notes by Myrto Hatzimichali. *Plato's Academy: Its Workings and its History*. Edited by Paul Kalligas, Chloe Balla, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Vassilis Karasmanis. Cambridge University Press, 276-383.
- Plato. *Collected Works in 4 Volumes* (1990-1994) Ed. by A.F. Loseva and others; Auth. enters, articles by A.F. Losev; Note. A.A. Takho-Godi. Moscow: Mysl.
- Plotinus. 1952. *The Six Enneads*. Translated by Stephen MacKenna and B. S. Page. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available online: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/plotenn/index.htm>
- Robinson, Thomas More (1995) *Plato's Psychology*. 2nd ed. University of Toronto Press.
- Sagan, Carl (2013) *Cosmos*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Schur, David (2015) *Plato's Wayward Path: Literary Form and the Republic*. Hellenic Studies Series 66.
- Sheffield, Frisbee (2007) Two: The Role of the Earlier Speeches in the *Symposium*: Plato's Endoxic Method? *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Leshner, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 22-46.
- Tell, Hakan (2011) *Plato's Counterfeit Sophists*. Hellenic Studies Series 44. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.
-

The Christian Pioneer (1842) Edited by George Harris. Volume 16. Edinburgh: R.R. Nelson.
Torri, Paolo (2017) *Homoiōsis Theōi. A Study of the Telos in Middle Platonism*. Università degli Studi di Milano.

Vlastos, Gregory (2005) *Plato's Universe*. With a new introduction by Luc Brisson. Parmenides Publishing.

Wilson, George and Samuel Shpall (2016) Action. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). Available online: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/action/>

Zeyl, Donald and Barbara Sattler (2022) Plato's Timaeus. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2022 Edition, Edward N. Zalta (ed.). Available online: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-timaeus/index.html#ref-32>

Section Two

NATURE AND CIVILIZATION

The Discourse of Humanism in the Context of the Civilizational Process in the 21st century

Valerii Akopian

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associated Professor,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: avgmaster1958@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0466-9011>

Viktoriya Timashova

Doctor of Political Sciences, Associated Professor,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: tavitum2020@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5717-9476>

Akopian, Valerii and Viktoriya Timashova (2023) The Discourse of Humanism in the Context of the Civilizational Process in the 21st century. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 24-32. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/2>

The article explores the concept of humanism both in modern discourse and in historical retrospective. Human has always been at the center of philosophy, regardless of what spheres of being were studied. Anthropology, cultural studies, psychology, philosophy, and many other sciences explore various manifestations of a person, all of which are ultimately designed to answer perhaps one of the most critical questions – what makes us human? However, this discourse significantly changed over the course of two thousand years. For example, Martin Heidegger points out an important nuance of the emergence of the concept of humanism, namely, as a kind of chauvinism – the division into humans (Romans) and non-humans (barbarians). This point of view is often overlooked, but it is critical to

© Akopian, Valerii, 2023

© Timashova, Viktoriya, 2023

understanding the essence of this phenomenon. In the subsequent era of the Middle Ages, human was understood as the opposite of the divine, but in such realities, there were humanistic ideals and values. Already in the Renaissance, a return to the traditions of antiquity was announced, but the understanding of a person acquired a romantic character. Humanism clearly saw something more in a person than a person himself could demonstrate. It is for this metaphysical image that many critics of humanism have criticized this phenomenon. However, where there is criticism, there is progress, which is why this concept has gained a new round of discourse, which is why new trends have appeared that have brought the concept of humanism to a new theoretical level. As a historical phenomenon, humanism is faced with certain difficulties of new eras; because of these collisions, humanism is modified and adapted. Among humanism's problems are multiculturalism, technological breakthroughs, and the need to search for new theories. In its development, the course of humanism takes on various forms and iterations. It is worth mentioning transhumanism (the idea of becoming someone more than just a human), posthumanism (philosophical views on human nature as a posthuman), and global humanism.

Keywords: the discourse of humanism, human, person, civilization process, transhumanism, posthumanism, global humanism.

Received: 14 October 2022 / Accepted: 21 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

It can be said without any exaggeration that the question of human essence has always been the key to philosophy; human has always been at the center of philosophizing. It can be argued that the key themes of philosophy are the problems of being, the nature of reality, eternal and unchanging essence. The question is justifiably fair, but it is worth remembering that the inquiring mind of a person asked all kinds of questions not for the sake of the outside world. It would be more accurate to say that human of all ages has asked questions about the outside world with the aim, in the end, to know themselves. This was the essence of the ancient turn from nature to human. This was not so much a change in the research subject as a clarification of the ultimate goal of the question itself. In addition, no matter whether it was the study of the world of abstract and absolute ideas or the doctrine of the goodness of God, the binding factor has always been human thinking. If, in antiquity, human was perceived as an integral part of nature, and in the Middle Ages – as part of the world created by God, then in the Renaissance, there were some significant changes in the worldview. Therefore, it is not surprising that such a worldview and ideological trend arose in the Renaissance for the first time. It was one of the most significant cultural and historical eras in the history of Europe between the Middle Ages and the New Age. This era laid the foundations of a new European culture and marked a return to ancient values. In addition, the concept of humanism arose in antiquity.

According to the definition of the ancient Roman philosopher Cicero, humanism is the highest cultural and moral development of human abilities into an aesthetically complete form, combined with softness and humanity. The growing secularization of European life contributed to the recognition of the value of earthly existence, the awareness of the significance of humans as a being, not only spiritual but also bodily, and the importance of their physical existence. Humanism's ideological and cultural sources were ancient culture, early Christian heritage, and medieval writings. After many centuries, the ideas of humanism do not lose their relevance but, on the contrary, become more critical. Like many phenomena of modernity, humanism acquires features characteristic of postmodernity it

becomes branched and contradictory. One thing remains without a doubt, over the centuries, the tradition of philosophizing has undergone significant changes, human has not changed, and therefore there is a need to study the status of humanism in the civilizational processes of our time.

Axiological dimension of a human in the theory of humanism

In his critique of traditional humanism, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) criticizes the senseless exaltation of humans for all their imperfect actions. The philosopher objects to the fact that the image of humanism, which arose during the time of the Roman Republic, was applicable to other eras. In his philosophy, Martin Heidegger was meticulous in his choice of words, paying great attention to their origin. Thus, the etymology of the word gives, according to the German philosopher, the true meaning of this or that statement. In antiquity, the concept of *humanitas* was opposed to barbarities, this dichotomy meant that there are Romans – people, but there are other tribes – they are not people, but barbarians. The philosopher describes this not-quite-familiar point of view as follows: “*Humanitas*, explicitly so called, was first considered and striven for in the age of the Roman Republic. *Homo humanus* was opposed to *homo barbarus*. *Homo humanus* here means the Romans, who exalted and honored Roman *virtus* through the ‘embodiment’ of the *paideia* [education] taken over from the Greeks. These were the Greeks of the Hellenistic age, whose culture was acquired in the schools of philosophy. It was concerned with *eruditio et institutio in bonas artes* [scholarship and training in good conduct]. *Paideia*, thus understood, was translated as *humanitas*. The genuine *romanitas* of *homo romanus* consisted in such *humanitas*. We encounter the first humanism in Rome: it therefore remains in essence a specifically Roman phenomenon which emerges from the encounter of Roman civilization with the culture of late Greek civilization” (Heidegger, 1977: 200-201).

Katrine Smiet also speaks about the contradictory nature of the concept of “humanism” in her article *Rethinking or delinking? Said and Mignolo on humanism and the question of the human* (2022): “The track record of ‘humanism’ as an ethical and political framework is deeply fraught. On the one hand, ‘humanism’ could be credited with developing noble ideas and ideals about human equality, human dignity and human rights. From the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen to the twentieth-century Universal Declaration of Human Rights, humanism stands for the idea that ‘being human’ carries a certain worth and given rights. However, who is considered (fully) human is then a crucial question. Historically, many have been actively excluded from this supposedly common humanity” (Smiet, 2022: 73).

The Italian Renaissance is the revival of Roman virtue, which was based on the Greek *paideia*. Therefore, *studium humanitatis* always refers to humanism in its historiographical understanding, which refers in all senses to antiquity. Nevertheless, in all types of humanism, according to Martin Heidegger, there is something in common: the understanding of human as rational being or animal rationale. In the Middle Ages, *humanitas* was opposed to *divinitas*. This, in turn, meant that everything human is perishable, that a person can be a person as much as he is with God. In his chapter for *The Oxford Handbook of Humanism* (2021), John Shook devotes much attention to the question of humanism in the Middle Ages. In his understanding, these were not the dark ages, as they have been described since the time of that very humanism. The Dark Ages are called so not because of the absence of light or hope but because there are so many unknowns. Christian humanism and humanitarianism defended the moral value and dignity of people. Humanistic thought, which has achieved a certain

degree of independence from Christian doctrine, can be divided into four main categories: “the human ability to reason without the following religion; the human competence to understand the world without religion; the human aptitude for virtue and morality without religion; and the human facility for political organization without religion” (Shook, 2021).

The meaning of the term “humanism” in the Renaissance was significantly different from modern understanding. Renaissance “humanism” is not a defense of human rights; it is the study of human as one is. The study of ancient literature – a turn towards the past was to determine the essence of human nature. From the point of view of the famous humanist Petrarch (1304-1374) and other philosophers, humanism meant that a person is placed in the center of the world. Humanism largely determined the formation of the Renaissance. Humanism was the cause of a cultural transformation that radically changed the arts and sciences of Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries. The spread of the ideas of humanism opened the door to new ideas about human, which were developed in the period to future eras. The Renaissance marked a new way of perceiving the world and comprehending the role of human in it, replacing medieval theocentrism with relative anthropocentrism. In fact, all these changes anticipated the rediscovery of individualism, which manifested itself in philosophical ideas, art, and scientific methodology.

Multiculturalism, scientific and technological progress and global humanism as critical factors for modern humanism

The ideas of humanism are closely related to issues of identity, this is a certain property of the human psyche to have an idea of one’s belonging to various social, economic, national, cultural, gender, and other groups. Identification of oneself with another person on the principle of having common qualities is one of the properties of human nature (Bugental, 1976). Identities can be different, natural, not requiring participation for belonging (ethnos, territorial community, etc.), and artificial, needing organized maintenance (nation, profession, etc.). Identities such as gender are mixed. In the modern world, the issue of identity is acute, because, a person no longer belongs to a certain place, a certain country due to the processes of globalization. In the modern world, a person can change the country, culture, or nation in connection with business, military service, religious beliefs, and so on. A new type of society is emerging, which is characterized by multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a worldview aimed at preserving and developing cultural differences. Multiculturalism is opposed to the “melting pot” concept, a model of ethnic development promoted in American culture in the 20th century. The term itself originated from the title of a play by British journalist and playwright Israel Zangwill (1864-1926) *The Melting Pot* (1908). In this cauldron, according to the theoreticians, there is a natural fusion of various peoples into one nation. This concept has traditionally been proclaimed in the United States of America. Now it is more politically correct to speak not of a mixture of cultures, since this levels out their identity, peculiarity, and value, but as a mosaic of cultures, where each element, like a piece of glass, retains its color in a common ornament. Canada is such an example; it cultivates an approach to different cultures as partmosaic. One of the aspects of modern multiculturalism is tolerance and tolerance, the conditions for the parallel existence of cultures for the purpose of their mutual enrichment and development. All this happens in line with popular culture.

Andrew Collier, in his interview, emphasizes how little the phenomenon of multiculturalism has been studied and that it is necessary, in addition to striving for unity, not to forget about

individual cultures: “Now multiculturalism is a more complex issue. It is unclear whether multiculturalism is the right answer to the oppression of cultural minorities. Obviously, a socialist would be committed to abolishing the oppression of cultural minorities, but the question is how that is done. There is a certain form of multiculturalism which has been satirised, presumably from the liberal end of the spectrum, as ‘liberalism for the liberals and cannibalism for the cannibals’ – which I think is probably not acceptable” (Collier & Calder, 2009: 85). A professor from the University of Southampton asks a very logical question what will happen to most cultures in the context of multiculturalism. Are people trying to preserve, say, English culture? He emphasizes that sometimes such reasoning can be misinterpreted; but he is convinced that any culture in the world can be threatened by the domination of another culture, as in the case of the United States and other countries: “But one could argue that English culture is just as threatened as any culture worldwide by the domination of American culture, and that therefore multiculturalism should preserve it. In fact it is almost gone” (Ibid.).

In the modern world with its many cultures, advanced technologies play one of the most important roles in the “new” humanism. Technological breakthroughs were supposed to help people free themselves from routine work, heal diseases, and extend their lives, which could be devoted to creative activity. However, as you know, in technological development, profit always goes hand in hand with danger. In the article *Post-humanism, or the cultural logic of global capitalism* (2004), Frederic Vandenberghe writes: “Looking back at a tradition of its own making and desperately searching for some kind of stability, different forms of fundamentalism – from ecological to theological – are willing to pay the price of the cultural and structural de-differentiation of modern societies to obtain some illusory security. The second way to destroy civilisation is systemic. Modern societies cannot only destroy themselves through de-differentiation, but also through the exacerbation of the differentiation of its subsystems. Systematically uncoupled from the communicative structures of the life-world, the reifying logic of the economic, legal, scientific, technological subsystems can enter the life-world, with the result that the subjects start to behave as if they and the others in their environment were some kind of mini-systems themselves” (Vandenberghe, 2004: 56).

Technological breakthroughs give humanity a positive sense of hope, but there are critics of this optimistic approach. It is necessary to recall the ideas of well-known critics Francis Fukuyama (Fukuyama, 2002) and Jürgen Habermas (Habermas, 2003), who showed the possible use of modern technologies to improve human nature can turn into a problem. The danger of the ideas of transhumanism lies in the similarity with the goals of eugenics. It causes heated discussions about the potential return within the framework of such studies to racist doctrines. This creates the threat of a return to inhumane practices; it can give rise to a huge number of ethical problems. In addition, not only in the sphere of ethics but difficulties will inevitably arise in the socio-political sphere. The question of social inequality between posthumans and people will appear, and this will manifest in the form of biological inequality as a new kind of separation of people. In any case, critics of the ideas of transhumanism have good reasons for doubts, their fears are not groundless. Transhumanism can become an extremely dangerous experiment since people’s knowledge in this area is insignificant, and the consequences of such studies are unpredictable.

Transhumanists are correct that the development of technology can contribute to an active discussion of issues related to self-knowledge. All our attempts to comprehend our essence encourage a revision of the prevailing ideas on many aspects of human existence. Indeed, to improve something, it is necessary to know the shortcomings, in other words, to improve a

person, it is essential not only to know the person but also to know his weaknesses, bad sides, and shortcomings. How can a person know his essence and his shortcomings, only becoming an object of study for himself? Man as an object is expressed in the essence of his activity, in the results of his activity. For example, in studying the possibility of creating artificial intelligence, Ray Kurzweil saw the possibility of human self-knowledge and the expansion of ideas about one's own essence (Kurzweil, 2012). Research on this problem, in his opinion, makes it necessary to comprehend the mechanisms of the work of one of the most poorly understood human organs – the brain. Such an attitude to understand the question of the essence of human nature repeatedly slips in the public speeches and works of Ray Kurzweil.

Future challenges and difficulties in the face of humanism: transhumanism, posthumanism, global humanism

Humanism, being a historical phenomenon, is changing. This is primarily due to changes in society, culture, politics, philosophy, etc. With the advent of new conditions, new worldview guidelines also arise. For example, technology has been present in culture since ancient times, but with the complication of technology, the relationship between human and technology becomes more complicated. An attempt to give an answer to the question “who is a human?” necessarily collides with the need to define the features of the modern world. If the world is striving for globalism, postmodern discourse blurs boundaries, language skills become the norm, and technologies make it possible to reduce the world, not in physical parameters, but in terms of the possibility of transportation, then a person must be understood in accordance with all these conditions.

In the essay *The Philosophy of Transhumanism* (2013), Max More described the problem of transhumanism: “‘Trans-human’ emphasizes the way transhumanism goes well beyond humanism in both means and ends. Humanism tends to rely exclusively on educational and cultural refinement to improve human nature, whereas transhumanists want to apply technology to overcome limits imposed by our biological and genetic heritage. Transhumanists regard human nature not as an end in itself, not as perfect, and not as having any claim on our allegiance. Rather, it is just one point along an evolutionary pathway and we can learn to reshape our own nature in ways we deem desirable and valuable. By thoughtfully, carefully, and yet boldly applying technology to ourselves, we can become something no longer accurately described as human – we can become posthuman” (More, 2013: 4). The author tried to give the most accurate idea of the philosophy of transhumanism. In another work, Max More gives the following definition of “transhumanism”: “Humanism is a eupraxophy or philosophy of life that rejects deities, faith, and worship, instead basing a view of values and meaningfulness on the nature and potentials of humans within a rational and scientific framework. Transhumanism is a class of philosophies that seek to guide us towards a posthuman condition. Transhumanism shares many elements of humanism, including a respect for reason and science, a commitment to progress, and a valuing of human (or transhuman) existence in this life rather than in some supernatural “afterlife”. Transhumanism differs from humanism in recognizing and anticipating the radical alterations in the nature and possibilities of our lives resulting from various sciences and technologies such as neuroscience and neuropharmacology, life extension, nanotechnology, artificial ultraintelligence, and space habitation, combined with a rational philosophy and value system” (More, 1990). Despite the many varieties and interpretations of “transhumanism”, there are similar central themes and issues that make it possible to define the essence of this phenomenon.

According to transhumanists' ideas, posthumans will have much greater cognitive abilities than they do now. The emphasis on rationality will also affect the emotions of the posthuman, a person will be able to experience more pleasant emotions, and will be able to rid himself of unpleasant or traumatic emotions. The main goal of transhumanism is the endless improvement of human, based on the latest achievements of scientific and technological development. According to transhumanists, it is necessary to support technical development in every possible way. Only thanks to science and technology, humanity will be able to timely prevent existential dangers that may hinder the achievement of goals. Thanks to science and technology, it is possible to expand the limits of human freedom. However, transhumanists in their views meet worthy rivals in the face of environmentalists who call for the rejection of the achievements of science and technology in favor of nature. This is not the only form of anti-modernism that opposes the emergence of the posthuman; among such currents, one can recall religious fundamentalism and anti-progressivism. Transhumanists consider information technologies, nanotechnology, and biotechnology to be very promising, and special attention is paid to developments in the field of artificial intelligence. In this direction, a certain metaphysical attitude is felt, because by creating artificial intelligence, the human intellect becomes especially creative.

Douglas V. Porpora in the article *Dehumanization in theory: anti-humanism, non-humanism, post-humanism, and trans-humanism* (2017) describes the emergence of posthumanism: "It is thus for humanity to extend its fellow-feeling beyond its own species that posthumanism is in part meant to call. But this post-humanist call arises largely within the discourse of poststructuralism" (Porpora, 2017: 3). The identification of human value with rationality is most evident in the non-poststructuralist form of posthumanism associated with the transhuman movement. "The situation is similar, I think, with post-humanism. Post-humanism makes up for its analytical mistakes – specifically its conflation of causal and human agency – with its appealing ecological affect. It is hard to beat the emotional allure of an emerging pan-psychism that sees elements of mind in all matter down to elementary particles; since it bespeaks cosmic community" (Porpora, 2017: 4).

Becoming posthuman means transcending the limitations of the human condition. Posthuman beings will no longer age and suffer from diseases, minimizing the risks of death, which is likely to lead in turn to new problems. Posthumans will have significantly greater physical capabilities and freedom of form, often called morphological freedom. Anders Sandberg states: "Morphological freedom implies a subject that is also the object of its own change. Humans are ends in themselves, but that does not rule out the use of oneself as a tool to achieve oneself. In fact, one of the best ways of preventing humans from being used as means rather than ends is to give them the freedom to change and grow. The inherent subjecthood of humans is expressed among other ways through self-transformation" (Sandberg, 2013: 63).

Rosi Braidotti repeatedly emphasizes that her book *The Posthuman* (2013) aims to develop a positive form of posthumanist critical theory. In her vision, the theory of posthumanism will make it possible to confront better various modern socio-political challenges: "The debates in mainstream culture range from hard-nosed business discussions of robotics, prosthetic technologies, neuroscience and bio-genetic capital to fuzzier new age visions of trans-humanism and techno-transcendence. Human enhancement is at the core of these debates. In academic culture, on the other hand, the posthuman is alternatively celebrated as the next frontier in critical and cultural theory or shunned as the latest in a series of annoying 'post' fads" (Braidotti, 2013: 2). Michiel van Ingen doubts the positive vision offered by the transhumanists, he offers a constructive critique of the ideas of Rosi Braidotti: "This review

essay argues, however, that the philosophical position which Braidotti's book develops is unsustainable, and that it does not provide us with the kind of basis for affirmative forms of critical theory and political practice which she suggests it does. Specifically, it argues that her philosophical framework results in persistent theory/praxis inconsistencies and is therefore lacking in 'seriousness'" (van Ingen, 2016: 530).

In the context of globalization, a change in the mentality of people is inevitable. This influences the formation of the ideology of global humanism; various concepts of the future development of society go to the global level. The basis of these concepts is the knowledge of man. For global humanism, cognitive, value, and evaluative criteria are subject to revealing the meaning of human existence in the global world. A person has to preserve one's ethnic roots, define oneself in various cultural worlds, correlate one's individual and societal goals, and implement them in his activities. In the global community, each person feels even more strongly involved in all the events that take place. This can be seen in the example of The Russo-Ukrainian War; the events in Ukraine did not leave anyone in the world indifferent. This can be seen in social networks, media, and personal contacts.

Conclusions

Humanism faces all these crises, namely multiculturalism, scientific and technological breakthroughs, and social and political crises, forcing scientists to develop new theories and concepts. This is a natural process, like for any historical phenomenon that develops depending on socio-historical conditions. Fortunately, the problems that a human faces can, in turn be the solution to these same problems. Therefore, for example, in the conditions of multiculturalism, if uniqueness is preserved in unity, this unity will be more productive on the way to solving urgent problems. As for scientific and technological progress, it carries both a threat, sometimes an existential one, but also a solution to many problems of humankind. Science can solve and prevent many of the troubles that humanity faces. The development of medicine contributes to the emergence of new drugs, improving people's health and their longevity. The development of computer engineering gives people incredible opportunities. If not so long ago, people were geographically distant from each other, then social space has become much more critical thanks to digital technologies. The world is getting smaller, not in geography but in the human ability to travel, communicate, and engage in scientific research.

Technologies are gradually taking over the daily work of a human, freeing one for creative and heuristic activities aimed at the good. The ethical aspect of humanism remains essential; it is crucial in the context of the development of humanism. With the advent of transhumanism, which symbolizes going beyond the human, and posthumanism, which symbolizes the emergence of a new person in a new era, new challenges arise. Future ethical issues are brewing, and the task of transhumanists is to be ahead of the times and have time to provide answers to emerging questions. Today, in the context of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research, scientists from different fields of science and practice are united in the search for solutions to these issues.

 References

- Braidotti, B. (2013) *The Posthuman*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Bugental, J.F.T. (1976) *The Search for Existential Identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collier, A., and G. Calder (2009) Values and Ontology. *Journal of Critical Realism*, Volume 8, 63-90. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jocr.v8i1.63>
- Fukuyama, F. (2002) *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Habermas, J. (2003) *The Future of Human Nature*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1977) *Basic Writings*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kurzweil, R. (2012) *How to Create a Mind: The Secret of Human Thought Revealed*. Viking.
- More, M. (1990) Transhumanism: Toward a Futurist Philosophy. *Extropy*, Volume 6, 6-12.
- More, M. (2013) The Philosophy of Transhumanism. In *The Transhumanist Reader*, 3-17. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118555927.ch1>
- Planinc, E. (2020) Regenerating humanism. *History of European Ideas*, 46 (3), 242-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2019.1697942>
- Porpora, D.V. (2017) Dehumanization in theory: anti-humanism, non-humanism, post-humanism, and trans-humanism. *Journal of Critical Realism*, Volume 16, 353-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2017.1340010>
- Sandberg, A. (2013) Morphological Freedom – Why We Not Just Want It, but Need It. In *The Transhumanist Reader*, 56–64. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118555927.ch5>
- Shook, J. R. (2021) Humanism in the Medieval World. In *The Oxford Handbook of Humanism*, 132-150. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190921538.013.1>
- Smiet, K. (2022) Rethinking or delinking? Said and Mignolo on humanism and the question of the human. *Postcolonial Studies*, Volume 25, 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2022.2030595>
- Takhar, J. H., R. Houston, and N. Dholakia (2022) Live very long and prosper? Transhumanist visions and ambitions in 2021 and beyond... *Journal of Marketing Management*, 38 (5-6), 399-422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2022.2069953>
- van Ingen, M. (2016). Beyond The Nature/Culture Divide? The Contradictions of Rosi Braidotti's *The Posthuman*. *Journal of Critical Realism*, Volume 15, 530-542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2016.1211371>
- Vandenbergh, F. (2004). Post-humanism, or the cultural logic of global capitalism. *Société*, Volume 24-25, 55-132.

**World Philosophy Day 2022:
The Human of the Future
(Based on the materials of the symposium
“The Human of the Future,”
November 16-18, 2022, UNESCO, Paris)**

Kseniia Fedorova

Odesa Mechnikov National University (Odesa, Ukraine);

University of Luxembourg (Luxembourg, Luxembourg)

E-mail: kseniia.fedorova@uni.lu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6875-4704>

Fedorova, Kseniia (2023) World Philosophy Day 2022: The Human of the Future (Based on the materials of the symposium “The Human of the Future,” November 16-18, 2022, UNESCO, Paris). *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/3>

The paper is devoted to reviewing the materials of “The Human of the Future” symposium, which took place at UNESCO Headquarters from 16 to 18 November on the occasion of the World Philosophy Day. In a hyper-technological world, the very concept of humanity undergoes constant evolution. In view of the scale of modern challenges, within the framework of the event, it was suggested to reflect upon the concept of “the human of the future” from the point of view of their own evolution and historical development, as well as from the viewpoint of the world upheavals causing human to overflow and surpass their own historical formation. The purpose of the article is to determine contemporary philosophical and anthropological tendencies in the development of Humanities and Social studies and to examine the status of a philosophical approach as relevant to the digital world for understanding the “human”. The theoretical basis is represented by the materials of the speeches of contemporary philosophers, anthropologists and researchers within the framework of “The Human of the Future” symposium and focused on the search for alternative anthropocentrism ways of understanding human and technology. Conclusions. The future is presented as a challenge faced with a number of serious crises in the context of information overload and unstoppable speed of data flows circulation. Studying the process of multiplying technological updates and human transformations leads to the idea of reconstructing the nature of philosophical research. Two philosophical and anthropological trends are presented: the expansion of the understanding of “human” through the introduction of technological objects and the biogeophysical dimension into its interpretation, as well as the process of ontologization of digital technologies. There is specified a range of current issues in the Social Sciences and Humanities research: communication between species, life definition, ambiguous relationship of people with technology, with increasingly blurred boundaries between technology and biology.

Keywords: philosophy and society, human, philosophical and anthropological tendency, technologization, digital technologies, philosophy and war in Ukraine

Received: 25 November 2022 / Accepted: 28 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

© Fedorova, Kseniia, 2023

Introduction

In the contemporary world, the concept of humanity is in constant transformation and forces researchers to think about the search for new forms of human experience. Countless digital interventions in the production of human experience, the speed of fluidity of contemporary world, the rapid growth of technological updates and global social transformations raise new questions about the essential forms and manifestations of human. Today's challenges make it possible to look differently at the basic problem for philosophy, what it means to be human and to consider who comes after the subject of humanism. Thus, in the last two decades, scientific research discourse has been actively saturated with questions about the possibilities and consequences of the use of modern technologies, in particular, about the idea of convergence of the biological and technological dimensions of humanity. In such circumstances, the transhumanist vision flourished, which gave humanity hope and fear at the same time, raising a number of questions. They include potential benefits and risks of transhumanism, which involve a radical transformation, overcoming the human nature by technological means, with the replacement for a radically different being (in the form of a robot, cyborg, or even a computer program); human / post-human evolution; hybridization of human and machine; ethics of physical, cognitive and moral improvement; concepts of equality, social justice, defense and security in the post-human world. Pretending to maximally realize the possibilities of human development, to embody new trends in the scientific and technological world at the expense of establishing the primacy of technology over human, transhumanism bears the stamp of the limitations of anthropological vision with the impossibility of presenting a full-fledged method of the anthropological constitution. Today, during such critical changes, human still needs to consider not only and not so much technological, but personal scenarios and strategies.

The return of Human: (non)anthropocentric optics

World Philosophy Day is celebrated every year on the third Thursday of November. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) launched this event to encourage civil society to engage in public debate on the pressing challenges of today. As the initiators of the Day of Philosophy, the European institution honors it by holding philosophical debates, conferences, seminars and cultural events with the participation of philosophers and scientists from various fields of natural and social sciences around current socio-cultural issues. UNESCO aims to raise public awareness of philosophy and significant role not only in understanding the contemporary problematic agenda, but also in demonstrating connection between the future and the past. Therefore, it is not for nothing that the theme of the World Philosophy Day in 2022 was "*The Human of the Future.*" Together with the National Studio of Contemporary Art Le Fresnoy, UNESCO's Social Sciences and Humanities Sector organized a symposium and exhibition held in Paris from 16 to 18 November. The three-day event covered a number of issues: ethical and epistemological dilemmas of the contemporary world, the interaction of living beings with technological objects, ecological challenges of the Anthropocene era, the situation of post-colonialism, gender issues and the potential of outer space as the place for human existence. The symposium program was designed to create an interdisciplinary dialogue and, in addition to philosophy, it included natural sciences, anthropology, and art.

Accumulating the ideas presented within the framework of the symposium, it is possible to identify *two contemporary philosophical and anthropological trends*, phenomena in the

digital world; concepts that are subsequently explained and become essential factors in social reality. The complexity and heterogeneity of the digital age is determined by a certain level of anthropological reflection and forces philosophers and anthropologists to revise their research strategies. Post-nonclassical methodologies are beginning to be actively used, since the multidimensionality of human is not covered by one type of rationality. Thus, at the beginning of the 21st century, actor-network theory, new materialism, and speculative realism are developing. The principled openness to objects targets these developments at the search for new (non)anthropocentric optics, an orientation that continues to grow. This trend is connected with several strategies and programs that offer consideration of human integrity with the world: as an after-effect of the geological environment, the Anthropocene era; in relationship with technological objects, which are subject to their own genesis of their development.

As part of the section *“Life, cosmos and deep time”*, a French philosopher, paleoanthropologist, and professor at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) Claudine Cohen outlined the figure of the human of the future by referring to the past and to the biological origin of humanity. It was suggested to refer to the original biological characteristics of human in the context of the concept of anthropogenesis of a French paleoanthropologist, historian of technology and art Andre Leroi-Gourhan (Leroi-Gourhan, 1964). The Leroi-Gourhan model of anthropogenesis or hominization represents the gradual formation of the Homo Sapiens species as a chain of successive liberations: a hand is liberated from participation in the body movement and grows into a gesture and a tool, and at the same time, the mouth, liberated from holding the prey, acquires the ability to speak and reveals a face around itself that captures the moment of the skull transformation. During the “liberation” or “exteriorization,” brain and inorganically organized matter (technique) develop equally rapidly. Technique acts as a factor in the biological dimension of humanity and is established in the structure of the human race. Since this non-anthropocentric conception contradicts the classical view of human as a reflective animal, it seriously calls into question the radical opposition between human and animal. The body vertical position and the evolution of movements played a decisive role in the process of hominization. The very fact of upright walking makes it possible to talk about the formation of a biological species, while evolutionary processes take place both at the biological and cultural levels of development. A feature of the human species is the constant use of tools. However, it would be a mistake to recognize this property as specific only to humans, because it is characteristic of animals as well. In fact, a characteristic feature of humanity is the ability to separate the tools of labor from their bodies, while the tools of animals remain fused with their bodies.

The challenge of modernity is to talk about different scenarios of hominization and to define the gaps and boundaries of the “human.” Only by expanding the understanding of the human with the help of introducing the world of multiplicity of biological and non-biological species into its interpretation, is it possible to find a human. Human falls out of the approved natural order and is constituted thanks to technological objects. The evolution of humanity is presented in a non-linear way as countless attempts to build relationships and connections between different types of living and non-living things, thanks to which human becomes inextricably linked with technology. Technological objects and tools, along with animals, plants, cells, with the planet and outer space, are transformed into a political arena. Non-human entities play an important role. They are considered and reinterpreted as “conceptual characters.” Their primary function is to challenge the distinction between nature and culture while at the same time asserting anthropocentric exceptionalism.

At the end of her speech, Claudine Cohen outlined three scenarios for the future of human, while rhetorically stating several potential consequences in each. The first is based on the interaction of digital technologies and humanity. Rapid technological development has led to the confusion of humanity, so the search for a new subject perspective is realized through the reconstruction of the status of digital technologies, assessment of the consequences of technological processes, and hybridization of human and technology. Will human be able to “liberate” themselves thanks to technology, like the hand was once liberated, or are we facing a return to the stage of alienation? The second way is adaptation, as an opportunity to shape everything that is human, to imitate the achievements of the Anthropocene era (caused by driving and harmful actions of human in relation to nature, as well as the post-effects of anthropogenic actions). Is such an adaptation possible at all, or will human face the total devastation of the environment caused by themselves? Finally, the third direction involves cultural extinction or nutritional exchange. The consequences of this path depend on the humanity’s ability to preserve specific cultural codes but not to lead to cultural unification. What awaits the human of the future – a rich and sustainable cultural exchange or a simplification of cultures?

The section “*The Anthropology to come*” was started by a British anthropologist, professor of social anthropology at the University of Aberdeen, Tim Ingold, with an apt look into the past, which causes the “*return of the human*”. Scientific and biotechnological developments of the last two centuries have caused an urgent need to redefine the concept of “human”, and have led to discussions on modern academic platforms around the figure of “post-human.” A contemporary trend of the development of post-Human as a convergent phenomenon of post-humanism and post-anthropocentrism, which involves criticism of the universal ideal of the thinking human, on the one hand, and rejection of the species dominance, on the other, has exhausted itself. In this post-human convergence, Tim Ingold calls for abandoning the label “post-human” because it leaves no room for human in the future. Instead, it is suggested to transform the word “human” itself by adding a procedural character to it, and using the verb “humaning.” Such an anthropocentric view shifts human to the center, which becomes a prerequisite for the transition from progress to the society sustainable development. At the same time, the researcher does not proceed from the position of classical anthropocentric optics, which contrasts only with the object left for the redemption of epistemology. He defines a human as a “humanifying animal.” Next, he adds a description to this position: one should not exclude the biogeophysical dimension, which requires a shift to a whole complex of things, consisting of the Earth with all beings and non-beings, including human. The Earth is not meant only for the human species, so wholeness is foregrounded, a human / non-human continuum that refuses to single out the aspects of human existence in the fullness of its essential characteristics. At the same time, it is not about a versatile understanding of human, but rather about the potential opportunities that are inherent in them and need to be understood.

Finally, Tim Ingold mentioned that the future of humanity depends on the ability to push aside science and technology and give way to anthropology. It is anthropological research with its desire to learn from others, and not only about them, that can offer a better perspective than post-science. The speculative ambitions of anthropology are constantly compromised and subordinated to the academic model of knowledge production, according to which the data obtained from practical participation are processed into empirical material for further interpretation. In this fatal step, anthropology not only collapses into ethnography, but also inverts the relationship between knowledge and existence. Contrary to this false

identification of ethnography and anthropology, the latter is not associated with a retrospective commitment to descriptive fidelity. It presents itself as a space for an open and critical study of the conditions and possibilities of human life, behind which the future lies.

Ontologization of digital technologies

The process of digitalization took its form within the framework of information technology research in various disciplinary areas at the end of the last century, and by the mid-2000s, there was hardly any field of knowledge left that did not involve a preliminary understanding of digital. Moreover, a “new” and established nature of digitalization has unwittingly linked this process to a much broader and older metadiscourse of modernism: from science fiction to various versions of technoliberalism. Ultimately, digital became a discursive catchall for novelty. As a result of continuous technological progress, “newness” is indeed a cause of concern today. A rapid nature of technology renewal leads to the transformation of a “new” temporal dimension: from calculation in years to that in seconds. There is an orientation to microtime, which defines digital culture only at the level of machines and technological processes, as well as to the expansion and recursion of time, which creates a feeling of being in time of a different order. In these conditions, a second trend has been born: instead of the functionalist view on technology, the ontological optics is suggested. Yuk Hui, a philosopher and professor at the University of Hong Kong and Goldsmiths College in London, the initiator of the Philosophy and Technology Research Network, dedicated his speech entitled “*The obsolescence of the human and the becoming of technology*” as part of the section “*The question of technology*.”

The philosopher began his speech with two facts about human. First, human is a mortal being with limited capabilities, in particular, memory. Secondly, following Ernst Cassirer, Yuk Hui recognizes human not so much as a rational animal but as a symbolic animal. Humans have always lived in a hybrid environment surrounded by artificial and natural objects. In fact, “artificial” and “natural” do not exist separately, and artificial objects are not simply tools for conquering the nature; instead, they constitute a dynamic system giving rise to human experience and existence. And that is why the artificial is constantly moving towards greater concretization, and needs constant reflection on a peculiar historical state. Today, the power of thinking is distributed among many species and is often implemented by technologically mediated systems of knowledge production, managed networks and computational processes. Technological objects challenged a clear division between living and non-living things: technological mediation comes to the fore. Yuk Hui suggests turning to Andre Leroi-Gourhan’s concept of anthropogenesis (Leroi-Gourhan, 1964), which was already discussed in the context of Claudine Cohen’s speech. Hui equates the process of anthropogenesis with technogenesis. A usual understanding of technology as an external extension of human is complicated: technical objects do not complete the evolutionary process of humanity, they are woven into this process. Technology is in the form of a “purely zoological fact”, and transition from the zoological stage to the sociological stage is connected with the liberation of technology from connections with the organism, with the acquisition of their own form of existence. That is, the central question is formed not around the process of human formation, but rather around the formation of technology. Next comes the question of predicting the future of technology by human, because otherwise, the problem of the human of the future arrival becomes irrelevant.

In this connection, the “agonizing points” of the Anthropocene era are formed, which are worth more attention than the concern about the capture of humanity by machines:

technological rationality, the path to universality as society's constant monitoring and the suppression of irrational human impulses; economic competition, which determines the development of technologies in terms of profit, efficiency, and an increase in human potential; and military expansion aimed at increasing the speed of technological development and the scale of destruction. These three forms of technology development lead to the impossibility of discussions about "the human of the future", because it will be determined by a certain type of technology, and this type will be caused by one of the directions of technology development, so the future of humanity is characterized as "*pure human becoming*." It reveals the difference between "the future", which is predictable, programmed, planned, and "l'avenir", which refers to the one who comes, whose arrival is completely unexpected. The real task of modernity consists in the democratization of technologies, in other words, in demand for "*technodiversity*". This phenomenon can be revealed through the imperative of diversification of technologies with the help of diverse cultural resources: the multiplicity of technologies is revealed through the multiplicity of nature, which anthropologists are actively talking about today. Thanks to different cultures, it is possible to find resources for finding different technological forms and ways of influencing technological diversity. For its establishment, a constant search for alternatives to the currently dominant technologies through the epistemological dimension (various forms of knowledge, in particular, various forms of modeling techno-knowledge to create technologies) is also important.

After the philosopher Yuk Hui, the floor went to a technology anthropologist, curator and professor at the *Haute École d'art et de design in Geneva (HEAD) Nicolas Nova*, who is active in the field of digital culture. His research focuses on observing and documenting digital media practices and environmental change. Using ethnographic approaches, Nicolas explores everyday culture and uses design methods such as Design Fiction to study the effects of social or technological change. Inspired by medieval bestiaries and observations of the consequences of the technogenic era, Nicolas Nova in collaboration with the Parisian research group DISNOVATION.ORG., which works at the intersection of contemporary art and digital technology research, launched the "A Bestiary of the Anthropocene" (Nova, 2021). This is a controversial project that later turned into a book challenging the dominant ideology of technological innovation and stimulating the emergence of alternative narratives. "A Bestiary of the Anthropocene" presents a collection of hybrid beings of our time, emerging at the same moment when the biosphere and the technosphere merge into one new hybrid body. Presenting the concept of the project as part of the "The Human of the Future" symposium, Nicolas Nova addresses both the issue of technological objects and technogenic artificial environment. Advances in science and technology have also spawned an array of hybrid bodies from humanoid robots to rock-shaped Bluetooth speakers and cultured meat; not to mention prosthetics of animals, genetically modified creatures and industrial production of trees. These phenomena are spreading exponentially and are the symptoms of rapid transformation of the "post-natural" era. Such upheavals require a revision of a set of bestiaries of the Anthropocene era to be able to navigate in the artificial fabric of today.

To assess the ability to exist in a hybrid environment, the question about researching the natural-technical continuum arises. It is suggested to think about the internal accessories of an ordinary smartphone: when anatomizing the device, a picture opens with a whole series of components-elements. Mineral lithium, gold, copper, tin, cobalt, plastic form the internal organs of the smartphone. Plastic, living for years, has already entered the food chain. A smartphone can hardly be called a living organism, but it definitely makes you think about the division between artificial and natural and forces you to recognize the existence of a

certain continuum. This operational chain becomes a way of analyzing humanity: from meta, from dirt and minerals to the creation of tools, things, and objects. So, it is interesting how it is possible to move from natural resources, things that are in their natural state in the environment, to the production of objects. At this stage, a connection is formed between technology and our environment, thanks to which the environment itself is transformed.

It becomes a difficult task to use the past technological vocabulary to describe and analyze modern processes, in particular, such words as “technique”, “technology”, “technological objects”, because the very positions of the technosphere are changing, the most important of which is the formation of an exceptionally developing system by technologies. There is a fantastic example of a “fake tree” in Cape Verde. Nearly a third of Britain’s mobile masts struggle to pick up signals due to the trees that operators have had to plant next to them to hide the “ugly” elements. The trees were planted in the 1990s, and as their trunks have grown and branches filled in, they are now wreaking havoc on telephone lines. Therefore, there was created a palm tree, a disguised cell phone tower, a completely man-made structure, which at the same time continues its life cycle at night. It is interesting, because it is a fake tree, but a real antenna; a way to remind us that technological things only work because there is a system around us.

The technology issue is that of environment transformation, and if we talk about human nature, we should rather think about coexistence with technological objects than about technological determinism. The realization of coexistence lies in what Yuk Hui has described as “technodeterminism.” It was also added by Nicolas Nova with the process of democratizing the design of technologies for use: the development of technologies taking into account biogeophysical dimension, social and environmental justice, which is complicated because economic and military relations are asymmetrical. The possibility of the “human of the future” existence depends on the ability of humanity to create new devices without destroying the environment and preserving the logic of the development of technical objects, their own existence.

UNESCO symposium beyond the crisis

To complete the review of “The Human of the Future” symposium, it is suggested to reflect upon the message of the UNESCO Director Audrey Azoulay on the occasion of the World Philosophy Day. Since time immemorial, philosophy has responded to the pressing problems of society and contributed to intercultural communication and creation of new intellectual conditions for changing communities. At the same time, the task of philosophers required avant-gardism in response to modern life challenges and demonstration of deep reflection. It is no coincidence that Audrey Azoulay noted in her speech that “*philosophy is therefore essential when it comes to defining the ethical principles that should guide humanity*” (Azoulay, 2022: 1). In order to build a better world, it is necessary to realize the importance of applying a philosophical approach, namely the need to question the flaws of the world “*beyond the tumult of crises*” (Azoulay, 2022: 1). In addition, as the politician notes, the discussion on this topic should be *open*. Open to all types of knowledge, especially to other human sciences, which will make it possible to understand the world in all its complexity and be able to transform reflection into action. It is also open to all societies, because philosophy is not isolated from the world; it is a practice of exploring the world, where everyone should be able to master their tools “*to reinvent a common world*”. Therefore, UNESCO calls for a moment to take a step back and think collectively about *the future of humanity* (Azoulay, 2022: 1).

Following the proposed path, we will try to consider these theses through the lens of contemporary Ukrainian philosophical community. To maintain an intercultural status of the event, researchers from different countries of the world were invited as part of the symposium: from France, Great Britain, Italy and Switzerland to China, Colombia, Australia and India. Ukrainian representatives were not included into this international gathering, besides, not a word was heard about the Russian invasion of Ukraine. UNESCO's moral and institutional energy, which for years has demonstrated attempts to build a strong world based on dialogue and mutual understanding, has been exhausted in the face of pressing societal challenges. On the main platform of intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity, not a single speech touched on the global social crisis unfolding in the heart of Europe right now. Is the position of distancing and abstracting from crisis upheavals correct? It seems that philosophical reflections upon "the human of the future" may not be timely in the midst of war. However, does not the crisis become a moment of total reassessment and change of the current order of things? Perhaps it is the state of crisis that makes it possible to cut off the unnecessary, separate the painful, break the current and create a new one. And this is the time for philosophical reflections. Philosophy needs to apply its toolkit to reflect upon the moral, social and ecological catastrophe of today and plunge into the diversity of human, creating new vectors for reflection. It really plays an important role in determining the path of society's development, but only when approaching the crisis peaks of society and when thinking about urgent ethical problems of today with subsequent public discussions. Under such a condition and with a general trajectory towards an understanding of the human phenomenon, with the active participation of philosophers, in inseparability with other Humanities and Social disciplines and sciences, it is possible to ask questions about "the human of the future".

Through the general vision of the symposium, a systemic review of the current situation of the Anthropocene, when people and nature are dynamically interweaved, shone through. In these circumstances, humanity has become the main driving force in shaping the future of the earth system as a whole; and the scale and pace of the human dimension has caused climate change and rapid biodiversity loss. Collective actions of people challenge the biosphere basis of the flourishing development of civilizations and make these natural and social shocks part of the world dynamics. The reality we are witnessing today is an ever-increasing turbulence in the entire system, which requires transformative changes in the direction of sustainable development. Reflecting upon the communication of humans with non-humans, the discussion agenda of "The Human of the Future" symposium, in reality, did not cover the true meaning of the idea of sustainable development. The Anthropocene global challenges require learning with and from people, not just making them the subjects of analysis. The application of the principles of openness, cooperation and universal accessibility is the guarantee of the idea of sustainability of the future. However, is it possible to talk about the openness of the discussion and the stability of the international dialogue, when the Ukrainian voice was not heard within the framework of the event of the organization that sets international standards and implements cooperation programs promoting the free exchange of ideas and knowledge? The organization, which has been developing educational tools for years, promotes the openness of education around the world, conscientiously preserves cultural heritage and protects freedom of expression as a necessary condition for democracy and the society development. These questions remain open. However, "*reinventing a common world*" and delineating the future beyond the Anthropocene era depends on the ability of the society and its institutions to fundamentally

unite around Ukraine, plunge into the stormy crisis and make it a common cause for the struggle of “the *human of the future*”, turning it into a source of energy for the new sustainable future.

Conclusions

Aimed at the creation of various systems of representations of the world's current state and the future from a multicultural and multidisciplinary perspective, “The Human of the Future” symposium became a platform for discussions of contemporary philosophical politics. The search for a new subject perspective is realized by reconstructing the status of digital technologies, which leads to the actualization of the work of the anthropological apparatus. Moods of technological determinism and radical reduction, amputation, rejection of many aspects and dimensions of human existence are replaced with discussions about “human becoming” in the principled openness to the objects of the material world in its integrity with the world. The current human anthropolandscape consists of a biogeophysical dimension in interaction with technological objects, thanks to which biological nature is not replaced with a technological substrate, but is constituted thanks to digital technologies. Modern research strategies focus on considering a specific dynamic and hybrid existence in its formation, which expands our perception of reality by including anthropological factors of existence in it. Together with the proposal of various options for answers to the question “what happens to a person on the way to becoming a human”, the possibility of implementing the presented philosophical and anthropological trends in the field of the modern system of Humanities thought acts as an attempt to systematize the philosophical understanding of being and becoming human in the post-human world.

In such an anthropological situation, philosophical knowledge about human is fragmented. However, philosophy is invited to immerse itself into the diversity of human and apply its tools to reflect upon moral, social and environmental problems of today, creating new vectors for reflection. The modern character of philosophy is ensured by its inseparability with Humanities and Social disciplines and sciences, and opens up the perspective of understanding human in their changeability and dynamism. It remains humanity's duty, both philosophical and ethical, to reflect upon this unedited contemporary manifestation of the “human” while immersing itself in social crisis upheavals. New philosophical, ethical, and political questions require engagement, openness and the capacity for dialogue, which can offer a different perspective on the distance between our present and the tumult of changes taking place within.

References

- Azoulay, A. (2022) *Symposium and Exhibition “The Human of the future “L’humain qui vient”*. UNESCO Social and Human Sciences Sector/ Le Fresnoy – Studio national des arts contemporains. Available online: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383675_eng
- Leroi-Gourhan, A. (1964) *Le geste et la parole. Tome I: Technique et langage*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Nova, N. (2021) *A Bestiary of the Anthropocene: Hybrid Plants, Animals, Minerals, Fungi, and Other Specimens*. The Netherlands: Onomatopée.

The Civilizational Choice of Ukraine: Questioning the Conceptual Roadmap

Oleg Rafalskyi

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: office@ipien.gov.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7317-2765>

Rafalskyi, Oleg (2022) The Civilizational Choice of Ukraine: Questioning the Philosophical Roadmap. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Vol. 30, 42-52. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/4>

Modern Ukraine is a post-colonial, post-totalitarian state in which decolonization, de-communization, and de-russification have not yet been fully implemented. This article sets itself the goal of reviewing the agenda of the processes of civilizational transit of Ukraine and developing theoretically grounded vectors of the said process. The important fact that the current stage of development of the “worldview gravity” of Ukrainian society is characterized by an eclectic system of stereotypes is also of significant importance: here coexist both old stereotypes of consciousness and behavior, which have largely ceased to fulfill their functions, and new ones that are unstable and ambiguous. The series of ideas regarding the Ukrainian civilizational choice was already discovered in a monograph, “Civilizational crossroads of modern society,” and presented for Ukrainian readers a few years ago. The current article offers a revision of the previously presented ideas for the international audience of the journal readers, taking into account the current Ukrainian socio-cultural situation, at the center of which are the challenges produced by the military aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine. The policy of new realism can become an effective tool for social modernization. The given word combination is not accidental: the realism of this type of politics insists on the need for the adequate perception of reality in all its essential aspects, and the novelty emphasizes the need to operate not with the laws and features of the socio-political status quo “in general,” but taking into account the latest dynamics, trends, threats, and problematic challenges. The people and the country need not only (and sometimes not so much) a thorough understanding of their cultural-civilizational, geopolitical, and economic-economic prospects but an indomitable character that guarantees the realization of their potential in spite of anything and against anything. On the difficult path of establishing a civilizational choice, Ukrainians will need not only the awareness of the incomplete state of political modernization, the limited, post-totalitarian (post-colonial, etc.) status, but also to work at the individual level to accelerate evolutionary processes. These processes can catalyze political decisions, not at the declarative level but at the practical level, to fill the steps for the approval of the civilizational choice with content. Step-by-step changes in favor of a new worldview horizon will require significant changes at the personal level through the rejection of destructive post-colonial (post-totalitarian, etc.) narratives in

social practice in favor of the development of Ukrainian national identity, which will be preceded by the rational assimilation of the perspectives of civilizational choice, which is a fruitful combination of the European civilizational project and heritage of Ukrainian culture.

Keywords: Ukraine, civilizational choice, post-colonialism, idea of Europe, national identity.

Received: 9 November 2022 / Accepted: 12 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

Open military aggression by the Russian Federation in 2022 became a real challenge for Ukraine. This event, in addition to the violence never seen in the 21st century, catalyzed the existing discourse of Ukrainian and foreign intellectuals regarding the deep civilizational contradictions that make up the ontology of military aggression directed towards Ukraine, its state, and civilizational subjectivity. The issues of researching the causes of the civilization gap between Russia and the world and finding mechanisms to prevent or at least minimize the risks of repeating the tragic experience for Ukraine appeared on the agenda with even greater urgency. Civilizational studies, problems of Ukrainian identity, challenges to state building, and other issues have intensified the need to rationalize views on the Ukrainian past, present, and future.

To have a realistic view of the prospects for the future, it is necessary to give maximum realism to the vision of the past. As Friedrich Nietzsche insisted, it is essential to settle accounts with the past so that its burden does not become an obstacle to the movement towards the goal. However, such “reconciliation” should not be carried out in a subjectivist or voluntarist way, but *sine ira et studio* – that is, without anger and prejudice, objectively, impartially, taking into account the interaction of all significant elements of the systemic unity of the historical process. However, social praxis has many examples of how difficult it is to move in the fairway of even obvious requirements and recommendations. Many factors stand in the way of such a goal, ranging from fruitless resentments and euphoria to pharisaism in the form of formalistic pettiness. After all, even “phantom pain” due to historical mistakes is a rather insidious indulgence because if there is phantom pain, then there can be phantom happiness, phantom success, and so on.

We need a reliable worldview and methodological guide that will clarify the perception of reality and give social realities the signs of an essential hierarchical structure. It is necessary to create criterion filters for understanding society and adjust the optics of consideration of problem areas. However, the simplicity of the formulation of the task does not mean the symmetrical simplicity of its implementation because, for example, sensitivity to problems is primarily determined by the level of worldview culture. If this level is low, realizing the outlined need is under a big question mark. A country can be sovereign in a political sense but subordinate in a social and cultural sense. Modern Ukraine is a post-colonial, post-totalitarian state in which decolonization, de-communization, and de-Russification have not yet been fully implemented. In general, we have to admit that the current state of affairs does not require prescription-methodical but theoretical-methodological efforts of a wide range of action – at least at the initial stage of understanding the multifaceted civilizational issues in the specific conditions of modern Ukraine.

Conceptual constructs of the Ukrainian civilizational archetype, civilizational identity, civilizational potential, strategic and tactical civilizational interests, the perspectives of the

violent and non-violent civilizational influence, civilizational risks, threats, and dangers should receive deep theoretical conceptualization. Investigating the problems of post-coloniality in terms of post-socialism, W. Partlett and H. Küpper emphasize that the success of post-colonial transit requires a significant activation of state-building processes, the development of systemic ethnopolitics: “When the colonial power withdraws, the formerly subordinate territory faces a number of problems of becoming a full-fledged state... This may involve intensive nation-building and, as the case may be, overcoming or reacting to the legacy of colonial ethnopolitics, which sometimes are based on the principle of divide and conquer. Especially in situations where the colonial power had exercised direct rule and reduced the colonial populations to mere wards of a paternalist colonial ruler, this population needs to learn how to deal with its own affairs without being led by an external agent” (Partlett & Küpper, 2022: 9). Therefore, the attempts to outline the roadmap of Ukrainian civilizational choice should deal with the post-colonial heritage of Ukraine and keep focused on the nation-building, state-building, and ethnopolitics issues.

The important fact that the current stage of development of the “worldview gravity” of Ukrainian society is characterized by an eclectic system of stereotypes is also of significant importance: here coexist both old stereotypes of consciousness and behavior, which have largely ceased to fulfill their functions, and new ones that are unstable and ambiguous. This feature creates prerequisites for conceptual alternatives and, at the same time, is an obstacle to an adequate perception of a dynamically changing reality. A number of heuristic social theories recognized in the world act as a methodological framework for clarifying the problems of civilizational choice for Ukraine: post-colonialism theory (Mälksoo, 2022; Yermolenko, 2021), approaches of the post-totalitarian modernization theory (Kloubert, 2020), theories of the hybridity of the political systems and military conflicts (Jackson & Albrecht, 2018; Magda, 2015; Muradov, 2022), theory of limitrophe states (Kalinichenko, 2018), etc. Each of these theories offers specific heuristic provisions regarding the Ukrainian case, the general complicating background of which is the complex processes of globalization, the further establishment of postmodern ideology, etc. This article sets itself the goal of reviewing the agenda of the processes of civilizational transit of Ukraine and developing theoretically grounded vectors of the said process.

The need for accelerated worldview and political modernization, increasing the efficiency of all spheres of public life in Ukraine, cannot be doubted. In this context, the specifics of the cultural and civilizational choices that our country has to make in a short period of time become extremely important. In addition to time constraints, such a choice contains another significant problematic aspect – its practical effectiveness depends on the way in which it will be carried out. It is possible to achieve social solidarity, which is extremely necessary for modern Ukraine, only in the case of a consensual adoption of such a fateful decision as a cultural and civilizational choice. The series of ideas regarding the Ukrainian civilizational choice was already discovered in a monograph, “Civilizational crossroads of modern society,” and presented for Ukrainian readers a few years ago (Rafaskyi & Samchuk, 2018). The current article offers a revision of the previously presented ideas for the international audience of the journal readers, taking into account the current Ukrainian socio-cultural situation, at the center of which are the challenges produced by the military aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine.

European civilizational perspective for Ukraine: in search of the rational models of transition

In Ukraine, the mass and, to a large extent, specialized “consciousness” in the field of social sciences is still in the grip of a simplistic and uncritical picture of the world, according to which the reference point worthy of the status of a model of national development has the generalized name “Europe,” “the West,” “the civilized world,” “developed democratic countries,” etc. All these names in many narratives and discourses have related and identical content, performing a purely synonymous function as a means by which tautology can be avoided.

In fact, the semantic ranges of these concepts, firstly, do not coincide, and secondly, they have many significant differences. In addition, there is no consensus in modern social science regarding the substantive and ontological parameters of each concept. Take at least the most frequently used in the Ukrainian information field in the past few years, the generalized conceptual reference point called “Europe”: if it is not a mythologized conjunctural abstract but a real sample endowed with concrete content, then why is it so difficult to find a convincing answer to the question about significant differences in the cultural and civilizational terrain of various countries and peoples, which are united by this term? And if the mentioned differences still exist, then isn’t unification under the auspices of the common term “Europe” a tendentious formalism and populism, a desire to pass off wishful thinking?

If the apologetics of the European civilizational trend has recently acquired an almost non-alternative character in Ukraine, then within the borders of Europe itself and beyond its borders, it is necessary to state the predominance of analytically balanced and balanced and argumentatively weighted approaches. A respectable status within this wide range of interpretation has been acquired even by the conceptual approach, shocking for modern Ukrainian stereotyping. The Eurocentrism thesis is, first and foremost, an ideological echo of Europe’s colonial past and not some “historically proven cultural and civilizational advantages.” In this sense, the methodological remark of E. Evink is essential: “What can we say of the idea of Europe, today? Today we cannot ask this question without referring to the fragile and challenging situation of Europe’s political and cultural institutions. It has become part of the European philosophical tradition, at least since the Enlightenment, that philosophical questions need to be related to the situation in which they are articulated. Through the centuries of modernity, man has become aware of his historical disposition and of the historical nature of philosophy. The question of the idea of Europe, therefore, cannot be separated from its current historical situation” (Evink, 2020: 2011).

In the current Ukrainian situation, it is difficult not to agree with S. Pyrozhkov and N. Khamitov: “When answering the question, “which choice should Ukraine make – European, Euro-Atlantic or Western in general?”, one should answer – both the first, and the second, and the third. Ukraine makes a European choice as a part of the European culture and civilizational community. Choosing development in the civilizational context of an open democratic society makes a Euro-Atlantic choice. Accepting the individual, one’s rights, dignity, and freedom as the highest values, Ukraine chooses the Western world, Western civilization in general” (Pyrozhkov & Khamitov, 2016). However, this thesis will not be hindered by clarification: which stylistic branch (and why exactly) of the Euro-Atlantic choice and Western civilization should Ukraine give priority to civilizational borrowing? The fact is that in the given abstract format, we reduce the multifaceted reality of the modern world to schemes that are convenient in the sense of clarity, but a priori problematic from the point of view of practical application,

because the worldview, axiological and ethical gulf in many aspects exists not only between the two main whales, on which modern Western civilization (Europe and the USA) stands. Each of these whales is a common vector of many almost incompatible trends. If this status quo has always been obvious for Europe and will remain so for at least a long time, then in the USA, it acquired distinct signs after various excesses and civil unrest during and after the previous presidential elections.

For this study, the recognition of the fact that the European civilizational project is generally the basis for the development of a modern civilizational project for Ukraine, in which the synthesis of Ukrainian cultural traditions with the achievements of the European cultural project would take place on a theoretically balanced, rational basis, is unambiguous. Undoubtedly, the bloody Russian regime once again proved its unsuitability for involving the civilizational project of the “Russian world” in the “optics” of the search for ways of developing Ukraine in the 21st century. The content of this project was and remains a simulacrum of the uniqueness and excellence of the Russian civilizational project. When the critical mass of the incompatibility of Russian and European civilizational factors acquires obvious signs, the Russian mass and even scientific consciousness begin to challenge it with various profiles. And since reinforced concrete arguments in the form of financial, financial, and economic power are absent in the majority of cases, we have to resort to self-suggestion: we are the best.

In fact, Russia’s non-compliance with the fundamental canons of European civilization is due to “genetic” civilizational reasons that give authoritarianism, despotism, and totalitarianism a normative status. Behind the screen of the “Russian measure” hides a complex socio-cultural mechanism to ensure the existence of which there are no boundaries, among which civilized countries consider war: “Russia’s 2022 full-fledged invasion of Ukraine is many things at once: a war of aggression; an attempt at yet another territorial conquest after the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the eight-year-long struggle for Donbas; a parading of an ontologically anxious state whose leadership appears obsessed with being a great power through consolidating the idea of a *Russkii Mir* by ruthless violence and lies outperforming George Orwell’s dystopic imagination. Most importantly, it is an imperial war in the world of nation-states, underpinned by Russia’s open denial of Ukraine’s political sovereignty and the Ukrainians’ right to exist as an independent nation. The incompatible logics of sovereignty (Ukraine’s) and imperialism (Russia’s) are at loggerheads in this conflict” (Mälksoo, 2022).

As a result of civilizational development, the status of imperative features of Russian civilizational specificity acquired some value-mental features. First of all, there is a lack of political culture, where there is a demarcation of citizens from participation in political decisions, a dubious electoral system, and paternalistic attitudes of the population. This mentality does not lose its importance even in the 21st century. In addition to the political dimension, at the level of individual consciousness, this civilizational paradigm works both at the level of political legitimation and at the level of everyday socio-cultural practices – relations with superiors, trust in institutions, etc. In this civilizational project, there is not enough “space” for public trust in institutions, rationalization of social relations, support of rights and freedoms, etc., inherent in the European civilizational project. Such a civilizational project, taking into account the realities of today, cannot serve as any guidepost for the civilizational choice of our state.

From civilization choice to the generation of the national identity

In the previous part of the study, we demonstrated that Ukraine should perceive the European civilizational project as a heuristic metaphor, a horizon of changes, the center of which are opposite to the Russian (Soviet) civilizational projects, the values of rational thinking, respect for the priority of individual rights and freedoms, etc. It is clear that step-by-step changes in favor of a new worldview horizon will require significant changes at the personal level due to the rejection of destructive post-colonial (post-totalitarian, etc.) narratives in social practice in favor of the development of Ukrainian national identity. Accelerated worldview modernization in the face of challenges of military aggression from Russia, which will act as an “immune response” to attempts to consolidate the Russian civilizational project on the territory of Ukraine: “Russia’s fervour speaks of the denial of genuineness of the Ukrainian nation, culture, history and the state, on the one hand, and reveals the ontological void of the Russian nation, the fact that any politically meaningful Russian state identity is perceived to be viable only when linked to the empire, on the other. The political fate of Ukraine hence appears as the ultimate test of Russia’s brand of imperial nationalism: that the Russian state and nation have been conceived as imperial, and need to be continuously policed, defended and substantiated as such” (Mälksoo, 2022).

It is possible to adequately understand the prospects for the generation of Ukrainian national identity only if we consider the determining factors that serve as integrals and differentials of the cultural and civilizational sphere of modern Ukrainian society, forming a kind of identification crossroads. As for the lines of unification in Ukrainian society, they are traced “...in common dissatisfaction with the current situation in the country, that is, there is unification on the negative side; instead, there is no consensus on the pressing issues of the past and development prospects. Ukrainian society is at the point of bifurcation, when several possible paths (European, Eurasian) of further development are generated” (Mykhailich, 2008: 149). After all, modern Ukrainian society is characterized not only by lines of unification but also by differentiation (socio-cultural, political, ideological, ethnonational, linguistic, regional, confessional), which are the basis of various identities. In particular, “...if the factor of identity is language/region, then a sense of commonality without significant internal differentiation by speakers of this language/residents of the region and separation from speakers of other languages/residents of other regions is assumed. On this basis, Ukrainian voters’ political self-identification is often formed: awareness of the difference between “own” and “others” simplifies their positioning concerning the objects of electoral choice. This contributes to the actualization of linguistic and regional factors of electoral orientations. However, the results of sociological studies give grounds for asserting that in all regions of the people are most concerned about socio-economic rather than national-political problems” (Mykhailich, 2008: 140).

In general, modern Ukraine resembles a patchwork quilt in the sense of cultural and civilizational identity. Such a feature of it contains many threats and dangers to the prospects of development. Therefore, it requires urgent efforts to form an effective strategy to counteract centrifugal tendencies. The question arises: how to overcome alienation, with the help of which threads can be reliably stitched together significantly different worldviews and axiological priorities and preferences of other parts of society? It should be recognized that the vision of the hierarchy of cultural and civilizational markers and problematic factors in the professional environment of Ukraine fluctuates in a wide range. Quite popular is the

thesis that “instead of showing the natural Europeanness of the Ukrainian world, there has been a tendency to emphasize the borders of Ukrainian lands: they say, Ukraine is not the eastern gate of Europe, but only a buffer zone between East and West, with an uncertain civilizational perspective and questionable internal integrity. And from this point of view, the three-hundred-year-old aspirations of Muscovy-Russia to absorb the Ukrainian world and various projects of its dismemberment (such as “federalization”) are seen as fully motivated as a result of the alleged blurring of Ukrainian identity” (Rozdobudko, 2013).

The tragic experience of the war in 2022 has its catalytic potential for revising the foundations of Ukrainian identity at the individual level. The mosaic Ukrainian identity does not serve as an indulgence for Russia’s expansionist encroachments. By and large, any status and actual shortcomings of the civilizational progress of modern Ukraine are, to a large extent, the result of the purposeful influence of Russia itself. Therefore, there should be no illusions about this: “One of the most noteworthy consequences of the recent events in Ukraine is a dramatic change in Ukrainian national identity. In various media one can regularly encounter assertions of individuals’ increased self-identification as Ukrainian, greater pride in being a citizen of the Ukrainian state, stronger attachment to symbols of nationhood, enhanced solidarity with compatriots, increased readiness to defend Ukraine or work for Ukraine, and increased confidence in the people’s power to change the country for the better. Most speak of their own experiences or those of people around them, while some generalise individual changes and assert a greater consolidation of the Ukrainian nation or even the ‘birth’ of a nation out of people supposedly lacking in the national consciousness. The reverse side of this consolidation of Ukrainianness is a sense of alienation from or even enmity towards Russia, which is targeted primarily at the state but sometimes also at the people, who, it is believed, overwhelmingly support the state’s aggressive policy towards Ukraine” (Kulyk, 2016: 588).

For example, in contrast to “classical” colonial projects, when the dominion never tried to make the population of its colonies “representatives” of the dominion (for example, British used India as a raw material appendage and did not seek to make the Indians British), Russia always sought to legitimize the cultural kinship with Ukraine, even more, to prove the Russian origin of Ukrainians and to “reunite” under the Russian flags, solving the historically determined tasks of preserving and developing the colonial logic. The uniqueness (in a negative sense) of the Russian civilizational project is also emphasized by W. Partlett and H. Küpper: “Russian colonialism was therefore distinct from West European colonialism: Russia used its colonies neither as a reservoir of commodities and a market for its products nor as a catch basin for its own surplus population. Russia’s colonialism was less economic and more ‘political’ than its Western counterpart, its motive was ideological and security-based. The economic interdependence of the various colonies was a tool to achieve this political goal but not an economic goal to enrich the centre” (Partlett & Küpper, 2022).

The hard edge of modern Ukrainian society also lies in the three archetypally rooted ethno-social components (Ukrainian, Russian, and “Soviet people”), functioning at a subconscious level, absolutely do not tolerate each other, and all together, the state. Some researchers insist on the priority of harmonious balancing of these three components of modern Ukrainian society. The term “balancing” causes a caveat – particularly in that, there are phenomena for which compromise is either impossible or fatal.

On the language issues of Ukrainian civilizational choice

It is challenging to deny W. Humboldt: “Language is the united spiritual energy of the people, which is miraculously fixed in the corresponding sounds and in this manifestation and through the interrelationship of its sounds is understood by all speakers, arousing a similar energy in them” (Humboldt, 1985: 348). The language transforms it into an ideal sphere, feeds human mental activity with information, and transmits the experience of generations, encoding and decoding knowledge and spiritual essences. Language belongs to the list of classic causes of ideological confrontations because it is an integral attribute and a creative factor of national identity. Its generative and structuring potential is determined mainly by essential dialectics: with permanent dynamics of evolution, and on the other hand, with a certain normative constancy, which serves as a decisive criterion feature of the identity of the speaker of the language.

It is in the language that the essence of ethnonational specificity, peculiarities of world perception, and goal-setting are concentrated. It is no accident that denationalization is always carried out primarily to separate the younger generation from their native language. The discussion on the “language issue” is successfully clarified by the traditional desire of external subjugators to make the most of the opportunities for internal disintegration, as written in the classics of the study of post-Soviet countries through the prism of post-colonial theory: “Colonial rulers often strive to divide the population of a colony into various groups and to ground their dominance in these antagonisms. They actively try to prevent the colonial population from becoming a force that may endanger the colonial rule. In such a situation, the newly independent state faces the challenge to overcome old antagonisms, to create a platform which allows the various groups and factions within a population to merge into a nation that both accepts the state and is the basis for mutual solidarity of its members. The differences the colonial masters instrumentalised – and sometimes introduced by ethnic engineering – to divide society must be converted into factors of cohesion. One constitutional means to achieve this cohesion is the use of constitutions to tell stories of national history and collective memory” (Partlett & Küpper, 2022: 14).

History ordered that at least the previous 400 years of the formation of the Ukrainian language took place under the influence of the Russian language and the pressure (political, administrative, institutional) of the Russian cultural and civilizational factor. Russia has always realized that language is not only a means of communication between people but also a mechanism for national consolidation: without this mechanism, it is difficult to count on consolidation. It is no accident that the diagnosis of leading social scientists is imbued with genuine anxiety: not only relapses of language deafness and renunciation of the native culture are deepening, but also a general spiritual crisis aimed at further destabilizing the life of the nation. The linguistic consciousness of the people is a clear criterion of its national self-determination, self-identification, and maturity as a cultural and historical subject. In transitional and young states, it largely depends on the responsibility of the authorities and the formal elite.

The fact is that “... the Russian language is not so much a tool of ethno-socio-cultural identification as a catalyst of common historical memory, as a result turning into a problem of the rights and freedoms of Russians in Ukraine. In such a context, the Russian language and culture are identified with Russian statehood. Therefore, the very fact of being Russian-speaking puts a person in front of a dilemma: strive with all his might for the reunification of Ukraine and Russia or the introduction of dual citizenship in Ukraine. At the same time,

everything is done to form a negative attitude towards Ukrainian independence in the minds of Ukrainian citizens” (Lanovenko & Shevchenko, 1998: 164–165). And in recent years, the Russian language as a tool for promoting Russian identity has turned from the status of a tool into a weapon in the literal sense.

Events after 2014 in Ukraine once again prove that the language issue and individual revision of views on it play an important role in forming preventive socio-cultural mechanisms of delegitimizing Ukrainian culture. Clearly, the state’s development and consistent implementation of a language policy is the starting point. The fact is that the so-called “natural, non-repressive formation of linguistic materiality” from the point of view of social reality has all the signs of nonsense, and virtuality. In other words, the linguistic environment is doomed to undergo significant motivational, teleological, axiological and other influences from social reality. If the state ignores the linguistic element of its systemic functioning, then it automatically gives this sphere “for ransom” to non-state (in the case of Ukraine, foreign) influences or street elements. It is clear that in such cases, it is not worth counting on compliance with the state’s interests: if a coincidence with the state’s interests does occur, it will only be situational, accidental, and short-lived.

Conclusions

The ideas presented in the article were formulated based on a clear understanding that the ambitious task of analyzing Ukraine’s civilizational choice agenda cannot be fully resolved within its scope. At the same time, without pretending to the completeness of the presentation and the corresponding analysis, it was possible to summarize the priority directions of a successful civilizational and political transit as of the end of 2022, the result of which should be Ukrainian statehood, which would be based on a rationally designed project of Ukrainian identity commensurate with geopolitical challenges. One of the main tasks is to determine possible and necessary conditions for social cooperation. Theoretically, this can manifest itself in different ways – as a search for ways of harmonizing personal and public interest, creating schemes for the effective and fair distribution of material and non-material resources, or the optimal configuration of social institutions. Ukraine of the modern format should not take this aspect lightly: the priority of national interests should become its key message and development priority. It is not about an empty slogan – the abstraction of the general public and national interests must be intensively filled with real content, consistent and progressive actions to ensure an acceptable form with adequate content and a practical dimension.

It is worth admitting that coming to specific consensus decisions in this format is difficult. Ukraine will need it most in the foreseeable future. The identified problem requires not so many particular measures and not their specific number, but focused, symmetrical efforts of the authorities, civil society, and a particular individual – an agent of change. The policy of new realism can become an effective tool for social modernization. The given word combination is not accidental: the realism of this type of politics insists on the need for the adequate perception of reality in all its essential aspects, and the novelty emphasizes the need to operate not with the laws and features of the socio-political status quo “in general”, but taking into account the latest dynamics, trends, threats, and problematic challenges. Only by complying with such requirements can one count on creating an effective preventive policy and not its counterproductive version in a permanent crisis, “fire mode.”

The people and the country need not only (and sometimes not so much) a thorough understanding of their cultural-civilizational, geopolitical, and economic-economic prospects but an indomitable character that guarantees the realization of their potential in

spite of anything and against anything. On the difficult path of establishing a civilizational choice, Ukrainians will need not only the awareness of the incomplete state of political modernization, the limited, post-totalitarian (post-colonial, etc.) status, but also to work at the individual level to accelerate evolutionary processes. These processes can catalyze political decisions, not at the declarative level but at the practical level, to fill the steps for the approval of the civilizational choice with content.

The study managed to emphasize the existence of complex poles of worldview gravity of Ukrainians, among which archetypal rooted ethnosocial components (Ukrainian, Russian, and “Soviet people”) are dominant. Dismantling the destructive ethnosocial parts for the successful implementation of the civilizational choice is a complex socio-cultural mechanism that will require both the presence of active political instruments and the individual efforts of citizens, who should appear as direct “agents of change” in the conditions of civilizational transit. Step-by-step changes in favor of a new worldview horizon will require significant changes at the personal level through the rejection of destructive post-colonial (post-totalitarian, etc.) narratives in social practice in favor of the development of Ukrainian national identity, which will be preceded by the rational assimilation of the perspectives of civilizational choice, which is a fruitful combination of the European civilizational project and heritage of Ukrainian culture.

References

- Evink, E. (2020) The idea of Europe in a post-European era. *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*, 81:3, 211-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21692327.2020.1753094>
- Jackson, P., and Albrecht, P. (2018) Power, Politics and Hybridity. In *Hybridity on the Ground in Peacebuilding and Development: Critical Conversations*, 37-49.
- Humboldt, W. (1985) *On language*. Moscow: Progress.
- Kalinichenko, B. (2018) Value gaps in the planetary matrix of the world community as a limitrophe of war and peace. *EUREKA: Social and Humanities*, (2), 67-72. <https://doi.org/10.21303/2504-5571.2018.00605>
- Kloubert, T. (2020) Promoting perspective transformation in post-totalitarian societies. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 18(1), 8-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344619876274>
- Kulyk, V. (2016) National Identity in Ukraine: Impact of Euromaidan and the War. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 68:4, 588-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2016.1174980>
- Lanovenko, O., and Shevchenko, O. (1998) Common Ukrainian-Russian information space as a zone of possible socio-cultural influence on Ukraine. *Strategic Panorama*, 1998, No. 3-4, 164-167.
- Magda, Ye. (2015) *Hybrid War: Survive and Defeat*. Vivat Publishing.
- Mälksoo, M. (2022) The Postcolonial Moment in Russia's War Against Ukraine. *Journal of Genocide Research*, e2074947. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2022.2074947>
- Moore, D. C. (2001) Is the Post- in Post-colonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Post-colonial Critique. *PMLA*, 116(1), 111-128. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/463645>
- Muradov, I. (2022) The Russian hybrid warfare: the cases of Ukraine and Georgia. *Defence Studies*, 22:2, 168-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14702436.2022.2030714>
- Mykhailich, O. (2008) Language and regional identities as factors of differentiation of Ukrainian society. *Political management*, No. 6, 139-150. Available online: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PoMe_2008_6_15

- Partlett, W., and Küpper, H. (2022) Chapter 1: Post-colonialism and post-socialist constitutional change. In *The Post-Soviet as Post-Colonial*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 7-35. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802209440.00007>
- PyrozHKov, S., and Khamitov, N. (2016) Civilizational choice of Ukraine in the globalized world. *Mirror of the week*, No. 28. August 13. Available online: <https://zn.ua/ukr/internal/civilizaciyniy-vibir-ukrayini-v-globalizovanomu-sviti-yakiy-civilizaciyniy-vibir-robit-ukrayinu-ne-ob-yektom-a-sub-yektom-geopolitik-.html>
- Rafalskiy, O., and Samchuk Z. (2018) *Civilizational crossroads of modern society*. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine.
- Rozdobudko, I. (2013) Ukrainian Taganrog. *Week*, June 14. Available online: <https://tyzhden.ua/History/82144>
- Tava, F. (2016) Phenomenology and the idea of Europe: introductory remarks. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 47:3, 205-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071773.2016.1180851>
- Yermolenko, V. (2021) Atypical Post-Colonialism: Ukraine in Global Political Thought. *Ukraine Analytica*, 02 (24), 19-25.

Cosmological Methodological Prism of the Conceptual Demarcation of Culture and Civilization

Zoreslav Samchuk

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Research Fellow, Kuras Institute
of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: warrier1@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7247-186X>

Lesya Panchenko

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: E-mail: rada@npu.edu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8436-1206>

Samchuk, Zoreslav and Lesya Panchenko (2023) Cosmological Methodological Prism of the Conceptual Demarcation of Culture and Civilization. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 53-63. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/5>

One of the most expressive definitions of philosophy equates it with the field of knowledge about meaningful demarcation of the semantic boundaries of objects, phenomena and trends. In this context, the conceptual distinction between culture and civilization is quite logical, natural, and even irreplaceable. Nevertheless, such a research and interpretive approach acquired fundamental features only at the beginning of the 20th century and mainly within the limits of the German worldview, semantic and axiological hierarchy. The remaining socio-cultural forms of worldview stylistics continued to prefer the symbiotic and synonymous interpretation of social reality's cultural and civilizational components. The meaningful distinction between culture and civilization has a characteristic feature – a surge of further efforts in this direction is always a consequence of crisis trends in the global world order. In particular, this was the case at the beginning of the 20th century, when the exhaustion of the previous resources of civilizational development and the deepening of contradictions between the main centers of power caused by this factor led to a resolution in the form of the First World War. The second wave of careful attention to the meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization occurred in the 1930s when the tendency of the inability or unwillingness to resolve existing global contradictions led to the situation slipping into the maelstrom of the Second World War.

© Samchuk, Zoreslav, 2023

© Panchenko, Lesya, 2023

Currently, there is an unequivocal awareness of the inappropriateness of the illusions associated with the global world order formed on the ruins of the Berlin Wall according to the patterns of neoliberalism. The world at the beginning of the third decade of the 21st century feels confused about its inability to respond to the challenges of modernity convincingly and promptly. This state of affairs once again objectively and logically actualizes the interest in a meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization since it is precise with these tools that the answers to the crisis status quo and the prospects for overcoming it are connected. An important task for concretizing this research goal is the cosmological prism of the conceptual demarcation of culture and civilization.

Keywords: cosmological prism, culture and civilization, meaningful separation, criterion features, conceptual approaches, crisis phenomena.

Received: 1 November 2022 / Accepted: 12 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

The existence at the level of both modern humanitarianism in general and philosophical thought in particular of two paradigmatic approaches – on the one hand, meaningful separation and, on the other hand, homogenization of culture and civilization – requires certain reflections and clarifications. Each paradigmatic approach a priori has the right to exist, and only two types of regulatory norms and restrictions can exist a posteriori in relation to it: firstly, such an approach must be internally consistent; secondly, its conceptual respectability depends on argumentative persuasiveness.

Until quite recently, the paradigmatic approaches to meaningful separation and homogenization of the cultural-civilization array maintained approximate parity according to the sign of internal consistency, and according to the criterion of argumentative persuasiveness, the homogenization tendency had the advantage, which was a consequence of the idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon. In this context, the cultural component performed the function of organic addition or illustrative accompaniment of civilizational hegemony.

The natural consequence of such a trend was the perceptible prevalence of publications in which the concept of “civilization” had an irreplaceable dominant status. The fundamental book of Adam Hart-Davis “History: From the Dawn of Civilization to the Present Day” is indicative, in which the genesis of human history is carefully conceptualized and clearly illustrated as a progressive evolution from barbarism to civilization (Hart-Davis, 2015). For the author of this work, the history of mankind is primarily the history of human achievements in the form of innovative inventions, ideological conceptualism, as well as outstanding figures, and defining historical events.

In the book “Civilization: The West and the Rest”, Niel Ferguson tried to find an answer to the question of the reasons thanks to which the civilization of the West managed to overtake its eastern rivals (Ferguson, 2012). The author conceptualized the position according to which, starting from the 15th century, the West made a breakthrough in six crucial areas in which the rest of the world could not compete with it – socio-economic lifting, the rule of law, science, work ethics, consumer culture, and medicine.

Opportunely, we note that both Adam Hart-Davis and Niel Ferguson give the status of civilization to many features that are imperatives of culture, but since there is no mention of culture in these works at all, this feature created the prerequisites for the “appropriation” of possessions and options by civilization cultures.

Another wave of homogenization of the cultural and civilizational array under the auspices of the civilizational factor took place after the end of the Cold War and the significant expansion of the European Union. Such tectonic shifts led to inflated expectations and idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon at the level of mass consciousness and political elites, at whose service was a vast information array about the substantive heterogeneity and internal contradictions of various components of the supposedly unified Europe.

The key problem is that behind the facade of formal unification, there remain significant and even glaring differences on the mental, socio-cultural, socio-economic, and other levels. It turned out that there were fundamental civilizational gaps between individual countries and entire regions of Europe, which led to mistrust, xenophobia, and generally disappointing stagnation of what one and a half to two decades ago was denoted by the pathetic phrase “European project.” The idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon is inherent not only in tendentious political memoranda and proclamations but respectable humanitarian conceptualism also did not avoid the temptation to meet the requirements of contemporary trends. In addition, in the presence of a certain level of “social expectations”, the need for thorough and convincing argumentation disappears, giving way to postulateness.

This feature can be traced at the level of the resonant book “Faustian Man in a Multicultural Age” by Ricardo Duchesne, in which the author tried to “discover the origins of the uniqueness of the European civilizational phenomenon” (Duchesne, 2017: 6). Duchesne explored the formation of the European civilizational type through the prism of the vicissitudes of the Faustian spirit, the basis of which is innovation and creativity. The author emphasizes the heroic and individualistic tradition of the West and its Indo-European roots. However, regarding each criterion marker of the European civilizational phenomenon (starting with its “uniqueness” and ending with “Faustian spirit”, “innovation and creativity”, and “heroic and individualistic tradition”), many questions arise that require argumentatively convincing answers, as well as factual support, which in this case is absent. An attempt to avoid burdensome argumentation by giving hypothetical judgments an axiomatic status has too little in common with science, its theoretical component.

The lack of polemical, reflective, and argumentative components has been forming an interpretative-narrative trend for a long time, which is increasingly taking on the characteristics of having no alternative. For example, the same Ricardo Duchesne five years earlier published the ambitious book “The Uniqueness of Western Civilization”, which, according to the author, was supposed to “challenge widespread attempts to provincialize the history of Western civilization” (Duchesne, 2012: 475). Duchesne tried to conceptualize the position according to which “the roots of intellectual and artistic creativity of the West should be sought in the unique aristocratic culture of Indo-European language speakers” (Duchesne, 2012: 477), and “the uniqueness of Western civilization is the embodiment of the desire for high achievements and the desire to leave its mark in of history” (Duchesne, 2012: 478).

The author probably believed that the publication of pleasant and desirable maxims for the mass European consciousness was quite enough for the publication’s success. Therefore, he decided not to burden himself with an argumentative clarification of what exactly consists of the “uniqueness” and “aristocracy” of the “culture of speakers of Indo-European languages” and what their undeniable advantages are over the culture of speakers of other languages. Also, how the Europeans’ “striving for high achievements and the desire to leave their mark in history” fundamentally differs from the similar aspiration of representatives of other cultural and civilizational formations that remained outside the brackets of the author’s attention.

Dissatisfaction with civilization 2.0.

The crisis of the idea of a united Europe first led to conclusions about the essentially illusory nature of the European civilizational phenomenon and later to the conceptual strengthening of the paradigmatic approach, which gives priority attention to the meaningful differentiation of the cultural and civilizational array, to the expression of the meaningful differences of various components of modern civilizational reality. However, such a trend is not something unique or extraordinary: almost a century ago, the resonant book “Civilization and Its Discontents” was published by Sigmund Freud (Freud, 2019).

Freud saw the main problem in the incompatibility of the expectations of the individual and society: the range of material options that the individual expects in one’s contact with civilization, in the absolute majority of cases, does not coincide with the list of regulatory norms by which society “civilizes” the life of the individual. Freud’s conclusions were disappointing: he did not know effective means for a posteriori overcoming the aforementioned a priori contradictions. Our modernity leaves this gestalt open – at least, it is not yet possible to come across optimistic reports on this matter.

By the way, Sigmund Freud was by no means the first iconic figure to diagnose the genetic dysfunctionality of civilization both in relation to man and society and culture: for example, Immanuel Kant likened civilization to “at best a technical type of culture.” According to him, a person of culture is guided not by regulations external to him (such as social norms and prescriptions) but by one’s ethical foundation, and conscience. This means that a person of culture not only can, but sometimes must behave contrary to social regulations. On the other hand, for a civilized person, ignoring external regulations is categorically unacceptable, but ignoring one’s own conscience is quite acceptable, so such an individual appears as a textbook embodiment of cynicism.

Oswald Spengler’s thesis that the transition from culture to civilization always symptoms and signals degeneration, and depletion of vital and creative resources, remains an unbreakable argumentative monolith despite numerous attempts to deny and refute it. In most cases, civilization appears as a triumph of routine, mediocrity, and everyday life. It is an empty shell devoid of soul and content, which, nevertheless, insists on its significance and even its irreplaceability on its status as an imperative element of the social system.

Civilization is the final stage of the existence of culture, a natural stage of internal burnout, exhaustion of the welcome, creative, heuristic, intellectual and spiritual capacity of culture. This is always a certain level of population concentration, complemented by centralized management of most of the life processes of society, which creates a visual effect of orderliness, controllability, and predictability. It is such functional options that civilization considers its key advantages. In fact, in many cases, they are disadvantages because the fact of order in itself is not a panacea. For example, orderliness, which functions on purely formal, dogmatic principles, is a priori doomed to a downward, entropic development trend, to movement in the direction of chaos.

The above-mentioned functional-instrumental specificity of civilization acquired distinct features only in the 19th century, when “the meaningful emphasis of the concept of “civilization” began to shift in the direction of indicating a high level of social development (for obvious reasons, at that time it was primarily about the countries of Western Europe). Such a drift in meaning led to the mention of civilization often accompanied by a series of synonyms primarily and mainly of material culture. In other words, civilization was associated with providing a high standard of living and creating everyday coziness, comfort, and convenience. From this point of view, the attributes of civilization are housing, the

sphere of service, transport and communication, household appliances, etc. (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 38). The only intractable problem is that technological civilization may well be accompanied by worldview, axiological, ethical and other barbarism – that is, a direction of a development opposed to the priorities of culture.

It is significant that in the Western philosophical tradition, there has been a structuring division into rational and reasonable forms of human activity and behavior for about two centuries. This time limit coincides with the meaningful expression of civilization, not by chance. As Erich Fromm wrote, “the power of rationalization as a kind of forgery of the mind is one of the most mysterious phenomena of humanity. If it were not so closely intertwined with our existence, the tendency to rationalize would be likened to paranoia: a paranoid can be an extremely intelligent person and effectively use his mind in all spheres of existence – except for that isolated segment that is included in his paranoid system. A person who uses the mechanism of rationalization acts in the same way” (Fromm, 1998: 51).

In addition, civilization’s emphasis on the cultivation of rationalization mechanisms paradoxically paves the way for numerous cognitive distortions and the inability to build a correct hierarchy of semantic priorities. As for irrationality as a worldview tool and means of knowledge, civilization generally imposes a taboo on it, considering it a priori destructive and dangerous. As Dan Ariely points out in the book “The Upside of Irrationality: The Unexpected Benefits of Defying Logic”, irrationality exerts a surprising influence on our lives: a collection of small and seemingly insignificant motives of everyday life is often the determining determinant for making fateful decisions as an individual, as well as at the global level (Ariely, 2011).

Don Juan, through whom Carlos Castaneda broadcasted his worldview hierarchy, has wise advice: if you want life not to leave a bitter taste, perceive it as a dream – act decisively, boldly, and do not look for excuses. It is a memorandum of the perniciousness of rationalism – at least in its refined, hypertrophied, and total versions. Rationalism should not be overestimated: even those who equate it with humus should understand that humus is only a thin layer of soil, the practical resources of which are pretty limited. Given the visibility of its existence, it is impossible not to reckon with it, but at the same time, one should not hyperbolize its capabilities.

If the shortcomings of civilization concerned only its functional specificity, then they could be ignored or distanced from them. However, the postulative and absolutely non-reflective presentation of dubious symbols of faith and speculative theses in the format of indisputable truth inherent in civilization is spread in the form of a regulatory norm to almost all spheres of society’s life. This has a particularly dramatic effect on those spheres of society that, according to their functional vocation, should generate a critical analysis of reality.

The mission of educational institutions in affirming the ideals of the culture of rationality is interesting: Humboldt believed that the university is a work for the formation of individuality through the unity of science and education, Weblen argued that a university is a place of striving for truth, Ortega-y-Gasset adhered to the need for the existence of a faculty of culture in every university, Jaspers saw the university as a place of spiritual communication, etc. However, in the process of accelerating the pace of scientific, technical, and social progress and increasing the social and professional mobility of the population, the new European ideal of the university as a “temple of liberal sciences” came into conflict with the needs and expectations of the social environment: “At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, under the influence of structural changes in the economy and employment, as well as the trends of massification, professionalization, and “polytechnicization” of education, the classical

model of the university and university education underwent severe changes. This reduced the social functions of universities mainly to the training of specialists of a certain profile for the economic and social spheres to the order and under the control of the state, as a result of which university education was equated with professional education. The concept of “university” was reduced only to the status of a higher educational institution” (Samchuk, 2015: 28-29).

The postulative nature of the essential foundations of civilization leads to the fact that all versions of dystopias are associated with it, with its genetic defects – negative utopias, utopias with a “minus” sign. As Umberto Eco noted, three-quarters of what George Orwell described in the novel “1984” is not even a dystopia but the history and everyday life of our civilization.

The credo of Aldous Huxley’s worldwide technocratic state is the triad “Unity – Unanimity – Stability”, which is coherent with the stereotypes of every civilization. The same applies to Aldous Huxley’s phenomenon of “enforced happiness,” which is not just a desirable possibility or possibility, but the sacred duty of every law-abiding member of a dystopian society. And, of course, civilization resonates with dystopia under the regulation, which has the metaphorical name “Big Brother.” Undoubtedly, he only formalizes himself as a brother, but in reality, he is an authoritarian-totalitarian tyrant. This is where the legendary phrase “Big Brother is watching you” comes from.

Another characteristic feature of every civilization is excessive attention to its protection from external threats. So, the exquisite irony, curiosity, and at the same time, a paradox is that, in fact, “civilization needs protection not only from external expansionism, threats, dangers, and challenges but also – as paradoxical as it may sound – from itself: in the sense of its shortcomings, chronic problems, trends of degradation and degeneration, which a priori to one degree or another is inherent in every civilizational phenomenon” (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 95).

Solemn aimlessness or technological utilitarianism: the quintessence of essential differentiation of culture and civilization

Suppose utopianism (inherent in every cultural effort, project, and idea) can be considered a shortcoming of culture in one way or another. In that case, functioning on dystopian principles should be recognized as a shortcoming of civilization. However, this feature does not end the significant differential. Still, it only begins: for example, if culture functions, expressing in the style of Blaise Pascal, with that sublime aimlessness with which wildflowers surprise the world with their inexhaustible altruism, then civilization applies a purely utilitarian approach to its life activities. It certainly has a purpose, but this purpose refers to narrowly applied aspects designed to ensure life activity for the near future, for the here and now.

In other words, if culture is not always able to decide on effective tactical means based on distant priorities, then civilization – on the contrary – in its life activities proceeds only from tactical considerations, considering the aspect of strategy either incompatible with life pragmatics or as something that is automatically implemented in case of pedantic observance of a specific set of postulates. This thesis can be presented in a slightly different interpretive format. If organicity is a distinct common feature of creations of nature and culture, then the critical feature of civilization is instrumental efficiency and convenience in a concrete historical applied context.

In essence, culture and civilization are related in the same way as a flower, and the results of flowering relate fruit: a flower is the embodiment of creativity, perspectives, and possibilities, on the other hand, a fruit appears as a concrete embodiment of such perspectives and possibilities and means the triumph of methods, mechanisms, and algorithms instead of creative multifacetedness. It is for this reason that the humanitarian sphere operates with the concepts of culture, not civilization because these historical phenomena were characterized by life-affirming creativity like flowering (that is, culture), which for various reasons did not lead to the appearance of fruits as a result of such flowering in the form of large cities, excellent transportation communications, systems of administration and taxation (that is, civilization).

Finally, the imperatives, essential, and criterion demarcations of culture and civilization are not exhausted by the above aspects: in particular, if culture is creation, then civilization is reproduction, replication based on technical (technological) devices, skills, abilities, stereotypes, and various innovations and production machines. If civilization reflects natural, spontaneous selection, then culture is the embodiment of a higher type of selection – purposeful cultivation according to certain priority features and criteria: “If the criterion reference point of culture is quality, creativity, art, heuristics, and creativity, then civilization is correlatively compatible with quantity, technology, procedure, “scientometrics.” Suppose culture reflects the spiritual origins, refined quality, and genealogical rootedness in the social reality of a certain concrete-historical format. In that case, civilization is characterized by diametrically opposite features – material criticality, mostly quantitative signs, and units of measurement, as well as the desire not to burden oneself with close and deep connections with one or another paradigm of social functioning” (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 629).

Another differentiating criterion concerns the marker of historical memory: if a long historical memory characterizes a culture, then civilization is characterized by either a short-term memory of the critical stages of social processuality or no memory at all, the displacement of memory as an option, excessive and burdensome to preserve the zone of physical comfort. Therefore, phantom pain (in the conditions of which something hurts that is no longer there) can be an attributive sign of culture but by no means civilization.

As for the fundamental differences between culture and civilization, they are mostly related to the dichotomy of spirit and matter: if the phenomena, phenomena, and trends of spiritual culture reflect the culture in the diversity of its essential features, then artifacts and achievements of material culture testify to the level and instrumental capabilities of civilization. True, at the base of every material culture, there are particular spiritual prerequisites, worldview foundations, and priorities: no matter how unspiritual a civilization may seem on the surface, it is, one way or another, born of specific spiritual intentions. It is the spiritual component that makes any act of creation possible – and the creation of civilization is no exception to the general rule.

The spiritual intention of civilization appears as the main and, in many cases, the only link between culture and civilization. In this case, the term “connection” is not used by chance: if this process were reversed, then the concept of “relationship” should be applied, but since the reverse influence of civilization on culture is mostly either absent or has destructive signs, it is correct to state one-sided influence – the connection of culture with civilization.

However, even this one-way connection with time inexorably fades, and the practice of the functioning of a civilization can acquire essential features that are the actual antipodes of the cultural intentions that led to the birth of the civilization. For this reason, it is sometimes difficult to detect the correlation of civilization with culture in general and a specific culture

in particular, which is not only possible a priori, but also necessary. This phenomenon creates the effect of the cultural decline of civilization, which can be refuted only as a result of a careful study of the logic of cultural and civilizational continuity.

Suppose there are essential differences between cultures and civilizations. In that case, it is quite correct to raise the issue and sharpen the aspect of particular anthropo-social types (categories) of people according to the criterion of cultural or civilizational correspondence – people of culture and people of civilization. On the example of the history of the intellect and worldview and stylistic features of life, Socrates can be considered an expressive representative of the category of people of culture, on the other hand, his student Plato and Plato's student Aristotle are to a more significant extent representative of the category of *people of civilization*.

Cosmological scaling for meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization

The importance of cosmological scaling for a meaningful separation of culture and civilization is because the cosmological factor is recognized as a respectable argument in favor of the advantages of each of the parties in this conceptual confrontation. In particular, civilization's claims to its alleged superiority over culture are linked to the imperative of orderliness, which associatively resonates with an order as the key identity of the Cosmos, and hence of cosmology. However, such kinship is purely formal and superficial. In the substantive sense, cosmology is based on principles and criteria that are identical to the ontology and functionality of culture, not civilization.

The key advantage of culture is its organicity. Organicity clearly and unequivocally likens and identifies culture with cosmology and these two spheres as fundamentally, essentially, and substantially related. On the other hand, civilization is generally unable to identify itself with a certain status quo of organicity since it long ago and unconditionally got rid of the roots that make it kindred to any specific historical or socio-cultural format of organicity. Accordingly, a priori civilization cannot understand the principles and value priorities on which cosmology is based, not to mention that these principles and priorities are the basis of its own functioning.

Another vital research aspect concerns the criterion dichotomy embodied in the conceptual metaphor of letter and spirit: if the level of the spiritual culture is much more related to the very idea of cosmology and its fundamental principles, then at the level of the letter, there are clear associative parallels between civilization and cosmology – in particular, as on civilization, as well as cosmology, the second law of thermodynamics and its statement about entropy as an alternative perspective of every inertial system fully applies.

After all, even in this aspect, culture can challenge civilization because it is possible that it, as a living and, therefore, non-inertial system, has much more content than civilization, the coherent logic of the functioning of the Cosmos. Such fundamental principles of living systems characterize it as unique orderliness, impeccable stereometric balance, and aesthetic perfection of human-sized and culture-creating ideal models. Unfortunately, the level of instrumental support of modern science does not allow us to verify such an assumption at an impeccable level. However, the given statement is based on a much more reliable argumentative foundation, the formal kinship of civilization and cosmology based on orderliness as a regulatory norm.

Let's trace several other factors that throw over the bridge of essential kinship between culture and cosmology. At the same time, they are unattainable for civilization or a priori

ignored by it. For example, if civilization is correctly identified with craft, then culture is, first and foremost, creativity. Suppose civilization is formed by a set of tools thanks to which life cycles are reproduced. In that case, culture is, first of all, a school of thinking – a special kind of thinking: independent, critical, semantically expressive, argumentatively weighted, interpretatively convincing, complex, systemic, comparative, dialogical, etc. Such options of thinking are at the basis of the phenomenon of the evolution of humanity based on the principles of qualitative growth. Christopher Celenza convincingly presents this aspect in the book “The Intellectual World of the Italian Renaissance” (Celenza, 2020).

With the help of critical reflection tools, science outlines the horizon of knowledge. The resonant work of Charles Johnston (Johnston, 2020a) is devoted to the aspects of productive thinking and cognitive improvement. Based on the results of the analysis of the key challenges of our present, the author concludes that the challenges faced by modern society require more balanced and systematic ways of understanding the situation and responding to it. The prologue to such a consensus could be the transparent form of the conceptual foundations of the “new common sense.”

In another book, “The Creative Imperative: Human Growth and Planetary Evolution”, Charles Johnston tries to answer one of the most critical questions of our time, namely: how we should think to achieve a chosen goal (Johnston, 2020b). The author’s answer is related to the theory and practice of creative systems. This conceptual framework combines a reasoned understanding of the goal, the efforts required to achieve it, and interaction at the level of interpersonal relationships.

Stephen Johnson’s book “Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation” (Johnson, 2011) made an essential contribution to the innovation theory. The author tried to answer tough questions – such as what factors determine the emergence of innovative bursts in the history of mankind and what is a necessary and sufficient prerequisite for creativity? Perhaps there is no comprehensive answer to such questions at all. Still, Steven Johnson analyzed various innovations by time parameter and in various spheres of life. He convincingly systematized the standard features of innovative bursts of the most diverse profile.

The book “The Systems Thinker – Mental Models: Take Control Over Your Thought Patterns. Learn Advanced Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Skills” by Albert Rutherford pay attention to a typical case in the age of the information society, when an excess of information leads to the fact that we are dealing with too many options and conflicting advice about the appropriateness of a particular choice (Rutherford, 2020). Under such circumstances, as the author argues, it is essential to determine your priorities and find the most relevant information: if mental models serve as a source of transparency, orderliness, deep understanding, and meaningful context, then the use of systems thinking as a cognitive tool provides depth and balance to analytical efforts.

The resonant manifesto of the ethno-futurists connects the prospects of Europe’s revival precisely with a return to cosmological principles and priorities of functioning (Kaalep & Meister, 2020). The authors convincingly insist: to achieve success in the future, it is necessary to realize today that we are integral components of the cosmological chain that stretches from our ancestors to our heirs. Only by effectively using the cosmological heritage will Europeans be able to obtain reliable landmarks on the way to the goal.

“Manifesto for a European Renaissance” by Alain de Benoist and Charles Champetier makes a compelling case for the transhistorical significance of differences between cultures and civilizations, as well as the right of peoples to defend themselves against cultural

homogenization. The “Manifesto” conceptualizes the ideal of a reborn Europe that “will find its strength in return to authentic values and traditions, in uncompromising opposition to multicultural imperialism and the global market” (Benoist & Champetier, 2021: 37).

Conclusions

Since there is a close correlation between civilization and world order realities on the associative and stereotypical levels, the crisis state of the current world order objectively and naturally actualizes the aspect of rethinking the meaningful and functional features of the phenomenon of civilization. Such an analysis involves, first of all, the identification of the immanent shortcomings of civilization and the ways of their leveling and compensation.

The fundamental problem of the civilizational format of the existence of man and society lies in the practical inability of self-critical reflection of civilization and hence its unwillingness to work on mistakes and learn the instructive lessons of the historical past. This leads to the fact that each specific historical format of civilization is precisely what it is, and it can be significantly different in principle – neither a priori nor a posteriori.

The cosmological prism is a vital criterion marker for the conceptual separation between culture and civilization. In this context, it should be noted that civilization is characterized by a purely formal affinity with the Cosmos as a universal world order and cosmology as a set of ontological principles and functional algorithms. Instead, cultural kinship is meaningful and principled at the level of essential quintessence and the very logic of being.

The only means of saving the world order in the way of leveling and compensating for the shortcomings of civilization is the cultural factor: only the functioning of the world order and civilization based on ontological principles, values, and priorities of culture and cosmology opens the way for qualitative renewal and vital reboot based on the principles of functional efficiency and perspective.

References

- Ariely, D. (2011) *The Upside of Irrationality: The Unexpected Benefits of Defying Logic*. Harper Perennial.
- Benoist, A. de, and Champetier, C. (2021) *Manifesto for a European Renaissance*. Arktos Media Ltd.
- Celenza, C. (2020) *The Intellectual World of the Italian Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Duchesne, R. (2017) *Faustian Man in a Multicultural Age*. Arktos Media Ltd.
- Duchesne, R. (2012) *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*. Brill Academic Pub.
- Ferguson, N. (2012) *Civilization: The West and the Rest*. Penguin Books.
- Freud, S. (2019) *Civilization and Its Discontents: Adapted for the Contemporary Reader*. Independently published.
- Fromm, E. (1998) *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. Kyiv: Nika-Center.
- Hart-Davis, A. (2015) *History: From the Dawn of Civilization to the Present Day*. Dorling Kindersley.
- Johnson, S. (2011) *Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation*. Riverhead Books.
- Johnston, C. (2020a) *Rethinking How We Think: Integrative Meta-Perspective and the Cognitive “Growing Up” On Which Our Future Depends*. ICD Press.

- Johnston, C. (2020b) *The Creative Imperative: Human Growth and Planetary Evolution*. ICD Press.
- Kaalep, R., and Meister, A. (2020) *Rebirth of Europe: The Ethnofuturist Manifesto*. Arktos Media Ltd.
- Rafalskiy, O., and Samchuk, Z. (2018) *Civilizational crossroads of modern society*. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine.
- Rutherford, A. (2020) *The Systems Thinker – Mental Models: Take Control Over Your Thought Patterns. Learn Advanced Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Skills*. Independently published.
- Samchuk, Z. (2015) *Cause-and-effect relationships of worldview maturity and quality education*. Available online: https://ihed.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Analiz_dosvidu_gumaniz_VO_ch1_2015_203p_IBO_avtors-kolektiv.pdf

Modern Views on Criminal Liability for Crimes in Outer Space

Larysa Soroka

Doctor of Law, Professor, Scientific Institute of Public Law (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: lsoroka_kw@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6979-6049>

Soroka, Larysa (2023) Modern Views on Criminal Liability for Crimes in Outer Space. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/6>

The article attempts to answer the following questions: What criminal law, if any, is applied in outer space when a crime is committed there? How will the issues of demarcation of criminal jurisdiction be resolved? Who and how will investigate such crimes? Which international or national institution will decide the issue of criminal prosecution and application of sanctions for crimes in space? Basing on the analysis of the sources of space and international law, it was concluded that today there is no detailed procedure for investigating and bringing to criminal responsibility for committing a crime in space. There is also no international legal act that would establish a list of space criminal offenses. To solve existing problems, it is suggested to adopt the Convention on Criminal Liability for Space Crimes and to create a Space Criminal Statute (code). The article also claims that the creation of a World Space Union on regulating the commercial space activities will help in solving many issues in the field of research.

Keywords: criminal space crime, criminal responsibility, space activity, outer space, criminal jurisdiction, extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction.

Received: 5 October 2022 / Accepted: 10 November 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

Crime as a criminal phenomenon, social phenomenon and socially dangerous act has existed since ancient times. This is evidenced by both archaeological findings and Bible texts. Neither education nor technological advances have changed anything in human nature. And although the issues of criminal liability in the field of outer space activities may not be very relevant today, this situation can change at any time. After all, more than 50 countries of the world are actively exploring outer space (Soroka, 2022).

That is why we should already be prepared for such events. Moreover, there is already a precedent. Thus, in 2019, it was reported that NASA was investigating a case that may be the

first crime in space. Astronaut Ann McClain was accused of committing a crime using the Internet while on board the International Space Station (ISS). McClain's ex-wife, Summer Warden, accused the NASA astronaut of illegally accessing her bank accounts while being in orbit around the Earth (Bateman, 2020; Soroka, 2022).

In this connection, the following questions arise. What criminal law, if any, applies in outer space when a crime is committed there? How will the issues of demarcation of criminal jurisdiction be resolved? Who and how will investigate such crimes? Which international or national institution will decide the issue of criminal prosecution and application of sanctions for crimes in space?

Another important question is whether there is a need at all to create a global space administrator that could regulate and control commercial space activities (Soroka, 2022). After all, as the full-scale war in Ukraine clearly showed, no international organization proved to be capable of constructively and effectively regulating anything or controlling it. Even the UN, with all its structures, has shown its incapacity. Other international organizations responsible for global security, such as the IAEA, show the same inability (Parkhitko, 2022; Resolution, 2022) or the Red Cross organization (Pryshchepa, 2022; Olenivka, 2022), which have a wide functionality, but a narrow jurisdiction.

So, do we need the international organizations and global administration?

Today, we can state with certainty only that the international law, sustainable development, and global world security are in danger of disappearing. All this does not exist in today's realities. No laws, no political system – work. There is no mechanism today that would guarantee safety in the future, even if all established norms and rules are followed. For example, Ukraine has signed the Memorandum on security assurances in connection with Ukraine's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (Memorandum, 1994), and fulfilled all his conditions – so what? The guarantees that were given for giving up its own nuclear arsenal have not been fulfilled by any guarantor country. In addition, the Russian Federation, which was one of these guarantor countries, started a war against Ukraine, threatens with nuclear weapons, global hunger, energy terror and even the use of nuclear space weapons.

Experiments with space forces and nuclear weapons are not isolated, other countries with dictatorial systems also create and test such weapons. But the question is that the detonation of nuclear weapons in space is the disabling of satellites, that is, aggression against third countries, as well as the scenario of the start of a nuclear attack. The location and use of nuclear weapons in space is prohibited, and if an electromagnetic pulse is used, it is capable of blowing out electrical networks at a considerable distance and causing extremely heavy damage (Electromagnetic, 2022). The application of such momentum against Ukraine also threatens the Russian Federation (Pardo-Maurer, 2022).

Then the question is – how can we master the outer space and talk about long-term plans, if we cannot restore order on Earth? How can we be sure that critical space infrastructure won't become even more critical?

In the context of this research, the problems of criminal jurisdiction and those problems that arise when a crime is committed in space are studied. The authors, while investigating the problem of the delimitation of criminal jurisdiction in the first part of this work, state that there is no universal international order for resolving disputes on the application of criminal jurisdiction in disputed territories (special maritime zone, Arctic, Antarctic, space, and cyberspace). The authors preliminarily advocate the adoption of the Convention on Criminal Liability for Space Crimes and the creation of a Space Criminal Statute (code), rather than going through the process of making changes to national legislation. The article also claims

that the creation of a World Space Union to regulate commercial space activities will help in solving many issues in the research field.

Criminal jurisdiction under international law

The term “jurisdiction” means that the law gives a court the power to process cases and make decisions on legal issues in a certain geographical area and/or in relation to certain types of legal cases (Search, 2022). As very rightly mentioned in the note on the topic “jurisdiction” in the “American and English Encyclopaedia of Law,” “There is perhaps no word in English law that has been more frequently defined than this of “jurisdiction.” From the earliest times we find the question of its proper definition engaging the attention of jurists” (Walsh, 1901).

Jurisdiction is always considered in the context of state sovereignty, since the right to make and enforce laws is an essential feature of a state. In classic Westphalian (Ryngaert, 2015) understanding, this right was limited to the territory of the state, a limitation which at the same time guarantees that no state interferes in the affairs of another state.

There are five basic jurisdictional principles in international law (Perkins, 1971: 1155; Hook, 1978; Benchbook, 2014):

1. Territoriality (it is the principle by which a country can regulate both civil and criminal matters within its sovereign borders, both as to the act and as to the consequences).
2. Nationality/Active Personality (a sovereign state has the right to regulate the behaviour of its own citizens anywhere).
3. Passive Personality (the nationality of the victim or the person against whom the disputed conduct was directed is relevant).
4. Protective Principle (the state can exercise jurisdiction over the actions of a person committed outside its territory – both by its citizens and non-citizens – if their behaviour threatens national interests and security).
5. Universality (a state can exercise extraterritorial jurisdiction even in the absence of all the other four jurisdictional links discussed above – but only if the act of a person falls under a separate category of crimes).

In the national legislation of different countries, these principles receive different interpretations, establishing different types of jurisdictions. For example, in the Law on the Foreign Relations of the United States, three types of jurisdiction are defined: (a) jurisdiction to establish, that is, the ability of a country to apply its law to persons, conducts, relations or interests; (b) Jurisdiction to adjudicate and impose sanctions, i.e. the ability of a country to prosecute individuals before national courts or administrative tribunals; (c) enforcement jurisdiction, i.e. the ability of a country to induce or compel compliance with decisions or punish failure to comply with its laws or regulations (Page II.A-1) (Benchbook, 2014; Multi-jurisdictional, 2014).

Thus, when delimiting jurisdictional powers and when developing permissive and prohibitive rules, they mainly rely on sovereignty and its territorial character. As a general practice, neither the Constitution of any country nor its laws apply to the territory of another country, but there is an exception if the dispute concerns only their citizens. Therefore, the country’s jurisdiction over a specific case is decided on the basis of international treaties and agreements, or on the basis of the principles of international law. The same rules exist in the application of criminal jurisdiction, with the exception of issues of extraterritoriality. This will be mentioned in the next section.

The law of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction

In space law, the norms of maritime law are sometimes used by analogy, as well as the norms governing the jurisdiction of special territories, such as: the open sea, the Arctic, and the Antarctic. At the same time, the starting point is that outer space, like the mentioned territories, is considered either “*res communis*” or “*res nullius*” – they belong to everyone and no one.

International agreements are concluded to settle issues of demarcation of criminal jurisdiction over the specified territories. For example, according to the conditions Antarctic Treaty (The Antarctic, 1959), signed by 53 countries, workers who were accused of serious crimes at the research base were subject to the jurisdiction of their country. For example, when a cook, a US citizen, attacked a colleague with a hammer in 1996 at McMurdo Station (Antarctica), the FBI sent agents to investigate and take the perpetrator into custody (Rousseau, 2016). Also, in the jurisdictional practice of the USA, there is a procedure for consideration of minor offenses and environmental crimes that were committed on the territory of the polar station. As a rule, they are considered by the chief scientist of the station, who is a deputy US marshal (James, 1996).

These examples, as well as the analysis of other known cases of crimes committed in territories outside the jurisdiction of any country, indicate that the participants in such crimes were mainly citizens of one country, therefore, the jurisdiction of the country of which they were citizens was applied. Therefore, the national principle of the jurisdiction (active and passive) was applied. And if the participants in the crime are citizens of different countries, then as correctly mentioned by Alan Hemmings (Handbook, 2017), an expert on polar law, the question of “whose jurisdiction” beyond national jurisdiction has not yet been resolved.

In addition to several international treaties and conventions on the delimitation of criminal jurisdiction in territories that do not belong to any country, national jurisdictional norms are applied. For example, the United States made a special provision in US Code considering the outer space jurisdiction, as well as in other related areas. It is known as the “special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States” and deals with how to handle criminal disputes outside the jurisdiction of any country.

It states that “The “special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States” has been expanded to include any place outside the jurisdiction of any nation when the offense is committed by or against a national of the United States. Among the offenses within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States are the crimes of murder, manslaughter, maiming, kidnapping, rape, assault, and robbery. Pursuant to 18 USC § 7(1) there is also jurisdiction over such offenses when they are committed on the high seas or any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States that is out of the jurisdiction of any particular state” (Justice, 2018). With regard to the jurisdiction of the United States in outer space, it is specified in paragraph 6 of Article 18 USC Code § 7 that the United States takes responsibility for “the vehicle and for persons and property aboard” (United, 1948).

As a result, it's possible to use the “special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States” in the outer space when we have three reasons: 1) vehicle: (a) used/intended for flight or navigation in space; (b) registered in accordance with the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies and the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space; (c) is airworthy; 2) the crime was committed by or against a US citizen. At the same time, it is noteworthy that in Clause 6 of Article 18 of the US Code § 7 uses the

term “persons,” not “personnel,” as in the Liability Convention; 3) the crimes are federal, namely directed against the national interests or security of the United States or are murder, manslaughter, maiming, kidnapping, rape, assault, and robbery. Therefore, we can assume that if a US astronaut was attacked and harmed during a spaceflight, or if a member of the staff of another country was distributing drugs while on a US spacecraft, then this special type of jurisdiction would work.

But suppose that a space hotel is built by a company in one country, operated by a company in another, and launched in a third state – which of them will have jurisdiction over theft committed on the territory of such a hotel by representatives of different countries? Taking into account that thanks to various private space companies, in one the year 2021, more than 20 individuals have already flown into space on four different spacecrafts (Chebakin, 2022). We express consent with Alan Hemmings, who says that there’s no answer on that for now.

By taking into account the mentioned above, it can be stated that today in the international legal field, there are no universal norms that would regulate criminal jurisdiction and the procedure for consideration of criminal cases in the event of a crime being committed on the territory that does not belong to any country in the world and the parties to which are citizens of different countries.

Although, there was a historical precedent when several countries managed to agree on criminal jurisdiction in the disputed territory, in addition, to prescribe the procedure and outline the powers of the responsible persons in case of committing a crime in this territory.

Thus, in 1910, on the initiative of Norway, a conference was convened, as a result of which, in 1912, the Spitzbergen protocol (Hook, 1978). Among other things, it was noted there that the signatory countries formed a Commission, whose members were representatives of these countries, to manage and resolve disputes on the archipelago. The powers of the Commission included the establishment of rules for ensuring law and order and security and sanctions for their violation. In addition, the Commission was an appellate authority in the event of a disagreement regarding the decision rendered in cases of violation of established rules by the international police commissioner. But if a serious crime was committed, the case was sent for judgment to the national court of the country whose citizen committed it.

As correctly mentioned by Elizabeth K. Hook, “The Spitzbergen protocol therefore presented the following framework: 1) a penal code enacted by treaty (in this case by vesting drafting powers in an international commission); 2) an international criminal tribunal and court of appeal; and 3) an international police force. No facet of the plan was dependent upon or connected with sovereignty; that is, the jurisdiction of the tribunal and the power of the Commission to draft the penal code were not based on territorial sovereignty. Instead, it was founded simply on the terms of the treaty or convention itself. Since this treaty never went into force, it is, of course, impossible to assess the difficulties which might have been encountered after its implementation. It is nonetheless indicative of the fact that, for an area similar to Antarctica, international cooperation in enactment of a regime unrelated to sovereignty was possible” (Hook, 1978).

Therefore, the international community has not yet reached an agreement on the development of such international rules that would clearly delimit criminal jurisdiction in territories or spaces outside the sovereignty of any country. The existing five international principles of demarcation of jurisdiction need to be modernized, taking into account the intensification of human activity in outer space and cyberspace, which exist outside the sovereignty of any country.

Analysis of the sources of space law regarding criminal jurisdiction

Currently, there are five key treaties that regulate space activities: the Treaty on the Principles of the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty), the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts, and the Return of Astronauts objects launched into outer space (Salvage Treaty), the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (Liability Convention), the Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (Registration Convention) and the Agreement on activities of states on the Moon and other celestial bodies (Moon Treaty).

The Liability Convention has significant jurisdictional implications because it provides procedures for settling claims for damages, while the Registration Convention creates an obligation to register space objects, which in turn may relate to the issue of jurisdiction over the object. However, the fundamental jurisdictional norms are enshrined in the Outer Space Treaty, which is also called the Space Constitution, as it established the guiding principles of peaceful space exploration. There at article VIII it states that “A State Party to the Treaty on whose registry an object launched into outer space is carried shall retain jurisdiction and control over such object, and over any personnel thereof, while in outer space or on a celestial body” (Treaty, 1967). At the same time, it does not matter whether this object is in a state or private ownership.

The specified agreement established the rules of behaviour in space, but it is based on the “good will” of participants in space activities and does not establish any mechanisms or tools for the application of coercion or sanctions in case of violation or non-fulfilment of its norms. Also, there are a number of controversial issues regarding the terminology used in it. Thus, to this day, there is no clear definition of what “space” is, its boundary has not been established, and the legal status of individual participants in space flight has not been defined. For example, this applies to the “personnel” category because it is not clear whether its status applies to space tourists or only to professional astronauts.

It should be noted that before the flight of the first space tourist, there was no regulatory framework at all that regulated flights into space by individuals. But after Dennis Tito’s flight to the International Space Station (ISS), “Principles Regarding Processes and Criteria for Selection, Assignment, Training and Certification of ISS (Expedition and Visiting) Crewmembers” (Principles, 2001) were developed. Who defined such a concept as “space flight participants” and regulated the necessary issues for their participation in the expedition to the station. In particular, “space flight participants” will be eligible to be assigned as visiting scientists, commercial users, or tourists (Principles, 2001). Towards whom requirements are put forward to meet established medical criteria for both physical health and behavioural aspects. In addition, you must be fluent in English and undergo minimal training. Another thing to think about, consider and legislatively regulate – the fact that mentioned space flight participants should also pay for their space travels.

As for the settlement of the delimitation of criminal jurisdiction in outer space, the first attempt at such a settlement was during the implementation of the ISS project, because the station is still the only long-term environment for the stay of people outside the Earth. And it is clear that when sending their envoys there, the countries had to agree on how to resolve disputes in the event of their occurrence.

In 1998, the parties involved in ISS international treaty, have signed the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) (Agreement, 1998) on Space Station Cooperation and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (Astronaut, 2022), which gave them criminal jurisdiction over their own citizens during their stay on the station. The basic rule is that “each partner shall retain jurisdiction and control over the elements it registers and over personnel in or on the Space Station who are its nationals” (Article 5 of the Intergovernmental Agreement) (International, 2022). In the case of a crime committed by a representative of the European Space Agency (ESA), the laws of the European countries participating in the agency will be applied. Such a legal regime recognizes the jurisdiction of the courts of the partner states and allows the application of national legislation in such areas as criminal cases, issues of liability and the protection of intellectual property rights (Bateman, 2022). Simply put: the national laws of each country apply to the ISS, as well as in the case of a criminal offense committed by their citizens.

This rule was also used during the qualification in the above example with the participation of the American astronaut Ann McClain. Thus, McGill University of Montreal professor Ram Jakhu noted that since both McClain and Worden were US citizens, the crime allegedly took place in the US module of the ISS and involved assets stored in the US (Bateman, 2022). As a matter of result, in this case the US laws should be applied.

If we suppose that the criminals who commit a crime at the International Space station would be citizens of different states. How should the issue be solved under these circumstances?

The manual of ECA “International Space Station legal framework” mentions that: “Any conflicts of jurisdiction between the Partners may be resolved through the application of other rules and procedures already developed nationally and internationally” (International, 2022).

According to the Liability Convention, if a dispute arises regarding jurisdiction, the following procedure is established: a Claims Review Commission is established and consultations are held between partner states, parties to the conflict. These consultations can be held within 90 days (Convention, 1972). The decisions are published (Article. XIX. 4), but the specified decisions are only of a recommendatory nature, unless the parties have agreed otherwise in advance (Article XIX.2). The optional nature of this mechanism is often criticized. This method of dispute resolution is only used as conciliation if the parties have not agreed that the decision of the claims panel will be binding on them (or if they have done so only after the Commission’s decision) (Tayal, 2022).

Thus, it can be stated that the sources of space law have significant uncertainties, which include that not all disputes that arise will ever be brought to trial; investigations and prosecutions can take a very long time, and the decisions made may be far from satisfactory and, most likely, will not even be enforceable (Tayal, 2022).

Considering these blurred provisions of Space Law, potential conflicts can be foreseen. What happens, for example, when states do not agree on who will administer justice after a crime is committed? What if the state demands the extradition of the criminal, but this request is not fulfilled? Sources of space law do not answer these questions.

In addition to terminological and procedural problems regarding criminal prosecution for committing a crime in space, there are also dogmatic problems – this is the normative establishment of an act as a crime committed in space, as well as the definition of the composition of such a crime.

Principle of individual criminal responsibility in outer space law

As we noted above, governments are responsible for what their space companies and private organizations do in space. As a matter of fact, we are talking about the responsibility of states and legal entities, but in criminal law, only a specific natural person or individual whose actions constitute a crime, as well as proven guilt, can be prosecuted.

If we turn to international law, it, as in criminal law, has the principle of personal or individual criminal responsibility. The principle of personal criminal responsibility is enshrined in the Fourth Geneva Convention (Geneva, 1949), as well as directly foreseen in several military statutes and guidelines (Multilateral, 1969; Joint, 2001). This is one of the basic norms of most, if not all, national legal systems. This principle is used during international and local armed conflicts (Individual, 2022). But again, as in the case of the “special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States,” the application of this principle has limitations. It applies only if an individual commits a war crime, a crime against humanity or genocide (Individual, 2022) and the responsibility for these crimes is in the relevant national legislation.

However, as the volume of space activity increases, the nature of space crimes may become more complex and require more complex solutions. Such crimes include not only classic earthly crimes against a person’s life and health (murder, grievous bodily harm, banditry, theft, fraud, etc.), but also crimes in other spheres: economic (for example, criminal extraction of space resources), military (for example, placement and use of nuclear weapons), environmental (destruction of a space body or pollution of the space environment).

And if we add to certain problems the problems of legal regulation of the use and application of artificial intelligence in space activities, the issues of liability in general and criminal liability, in particular, are taking on a new meaning. After all, it is not clear if a program with artificial intelligence, created for protection, neutralizes a space object whose actions are accidentally mistaken for danger (Boucher, 2021). What will it be: an instrument or a subject of a crime?

Therefore, it can be stated that today there is no detailed procedure for the investigation and prosecution of criminals for committing a criminal act in space. Just as there is no international legal act that would establish a list of space criminal offenses. Moreover, it is not clear which body or institution will consider such crimes, if it is not possible to apply national jurisdiction.

Possible solutions to the delimitation of criminal jurisdiction in outer space

Among the scientists, there are proposals to create a body for resolving disputes in the space sphere at the UN or to grant powers to already existing structures (White, 2021: 333; Bateman, 2022). For example, it was suggested to use the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordinating Committee (Bourbonniere, 2005), or the Space Claims Commission is proposed to be treated as a special tribunal (Tayal, 2022).

Other researchers believe that it is necessary to continue the application of the current international principles of jurisdiction in space, and not to develop a specialized regime. For example, Danielle Ireland-Piper (Ireland-Piper, 2019) argues that, despite a number of challenges, national courts remain an adequate forum for adjudicating criminal conduct in space to date. So, for example, the Canadian Parliament passed the first reading of the draft law on amendments to “Civil Lunar Gateway Agreement Implementation Act” (Civil, 2022)

in which it is assumed that Canadian law will also apply to acts committed in space, that is, anything that would be illegal in Canada will become illegal on board spaceships traveling to Lunar Gateway, on the Gateway itself and on the surface of the Moon (Civil, 2022). Or another example, in the UAE in 2021, it was suggested to create the world's first "Space Court" as part of the DIFC "Courts of the Future" initiative (Atkins & Battisson, 2022).

But, in most cases, these suggestions concerned the resolution of commercial disputes or disputes regarding the safety of space ecology. Therefore, in our opinion, in order to regulate criminal jurisdiction in space, countries need to conclude a Convention on Criminal Liability for Space Crimes or create a Space Criminal Statute (code), rather than go by the way of making changes to national legislation.

In our opinion, the creation of a Special Tribunal for consideration of space disputes, including criminal ones, is a valid proposal. But we need specialists with special knowledge both in the field of jurisprudence and forensics and in the field of space activities. In addition, the commanders of the spacecraft, the station, or the head of the space hotel must be empowered by the international space commissioner to make decisions regarding: the initiation of investigative actions, the detention, and isolation of a suspect, the recording and preservation of evidence, etc.

Conclusions

Sources of international law partially resolve the issue of criminal jurisdiction in territories that do not belong to any state. A number of international treaties and conventions have been concluded, but not all countries have joined them, nor have they created a universal mechanism for resolving disputes regarding the delimitation of criminal jurisdiction. Some countries (the USA, Canada, Australia, the UAE) have taken the path of adopting national legislation to settle issues of criminal jurisdiction over disputed territories, including outer space.

As for the sources of space law, they regulate the issue of the jurisdiction of registered and launched objects into space and the personnel stationed on them. Partial settlement of the issue of criminal jurisdiction over crimes committed on the territory of the International Criminal Court and against citizens of one country. Issues of criminal jurisdiction remain unresolved in the case of crimes committed by citizens of different countries both on the territory of the ISS and outside it, for example, on the territory of a private space facility, in open space, or on the surface of a space body.

The existing procedure for dealing with jurisdictional disputes through consultations is also not perfect. First, it is based on the "good will" of the parties and is not applicable for cases when the party does not want to implement the decisions made. Secondly, 90 days are set aside for the settlement of disputes, and for the objective investigation of a crime, the timely conduct of investigative actions is of great importance. Therefore, the resolution of disputes about criminal jurisdiction due to the Commission of a crime in space through consultations between states is not an option.

Therefore, we believe that it is necessary to: 1) conclude the Convention on Criminal Liability for Space Crimes or create a Space Criminal Statute (code); 2) create a Special Tribunal for consideration of space disputes; 3) to form the World Space Union to regulate commercial space activities; 4) to modernize the current international space legislation (to determine the terminology, as well as the status of individual space flight participants); 5) create a program for training ship captains and leaders of space expeditions in the basics of criminology and the criminal process.



References

- Agreement Among the Government of Canada, Governments of Member States of the European Space Agency, the Government of Japan, the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Cooperation on the Civil International Space Station (1998) Treaties and Other International Acts Series 12927. Available online: <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/12927-Multilateral-Space-Space-Station-1.29.1998.pdf>
- Astronaut Social Media Guideline documents (2022) NASA. Available online: https://cdn.vox-cdn.com/uploads/chorus_asset/file/24202117/NASA_Astronaut_Social_Media_Guideline_documents.pdf
- Atkins, Scott and Andrew Battison (2022) Dispute resolution and restructuring in outer space: Using ADR to drive efficiency and better outcomes for creditors. *Norton Rose Fulbright*. Available online: <https://www.nortonrosefulbright.com/en/knowledge/publications/5bf5d3bb/dispute-resolution-and-restructuring-in-outer-space>
- Bateman, Tom (2022) Outlaws in orbit: Canada to introduce a new law to punish astronauts committing crime in space. *Euronews*. Available online: <https://www.euronews.com/next/2022/05/05/outlaws-in-orbit-canada-to-introduce-a-new-law-to-punish-astronauts-committing-crime-in-sp>
- Benchbook on International Law (2014) Diane Marie Amann ed. American Society of International Law. Available online: https://www.asil.org/sites/default/files/benchbook/ASIL_Benchbook_Complete.pdf
- Boucher, Marc (2021) Advances in artificial intelligence in contested space. SpaceQ Media. Available online: <https://spaceq.ca/advances-in-artificial-intelligence-in-contested-space/>
- Bourbonniere, Michel (2005) National-Security Law in Outer Space: The Interface of Exploration and Security. *Journal of Air Law and Commerce*. Volume 70, Article 2: 3-62. Available online: <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1066&context=jalc>
- Chebakin, Val (2022) Private Spaceflight in 2022. *Spaceadventures*. Available online: <https://spaceadventures.com/private-spaceflight-in-2022/>
- Civil Lunar Gateway Agreement Implementation Act (2022) The official website of the Government of Canada. Available online: <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-31.4/index.html>
- Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (1972) United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs. <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/intoliability-convention.html>
- Electromagnetic weapon of the Russian Federation – what is it and does it really threaten Ukraine: about “Alabuga” and other horrors of the Russian Federation (2022) DEFENSE EXPRESS. Available online: https://defence-ua.com/weapon_and_tech/elektromagnitna_zbroja_rf_scho_tse_take_ta_chi_dijsno_zagrozhuje_ukrajini_pro_alabugu_ta_inshi_zhahachki_rf-9622.html
- Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 august (1949) UN. Available online: https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocity-crimes/Doc.33_GC-IV-EN.pdf
- Handbook on the politics of Antarctica* (2017) K. Dodds, A. D. Hemmings, and P. Roberts (editors). Cambridge University Press. Available online: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/polar-record/article/handbook-on-the-politics-of-antarctica-k-dodds->

-
- ad-hemmings-and-p-roberts-editors-2017-cheltenham-edward-elgar-publishing-xx-610-p-illustrated-hardcover-isbn-9781784717674-18900/760B6B614D652A4BF500CDE1987F5940
- Hook, Elizabeth K. (1978) Criminal Jurisdiction in Antarctica. *Journal University of Miami Law Review*. Volume 33, Number 2. Article 10: 489-514. Available online: <https://repository.law.miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2471&context=umlr>
- Individual Criminal Responsibility (2022) International Committee of the Red Cross. Available online: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/customary-ihl/eng/docs/v1_rul_rule102
- International Space Station legal framework (2022) ESA. Available online: https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Human_and_Robotic_Exploration/International_Space_Station/International_Space_Station_legal_framework
- Ireland-Piper, Danielle (2019) Space Laws: Criminal Jurisdiction in Outer Space. *International Law Association*. Available online: <https://ilareporter.org.au/2019/10/space-laws-criminal-jurisdiction-in-outer-space-danielle-ireland-piper/>
- James, Peter (1996) FBI Agents to Visit Antarctica in Rare Investigation of Assault. *Spokesman-Review*. Available online: <https://www.spokesman.com/stories/1996/oct/14/fbi-agents-to-visit-antarctica-in-rare/>
- Joint Doctrine Manual B-GJ-005-104/FP-021 (2001) National Defence Canada. P. 141. Available online: https://www.ficlh.org/fileadmin/_migrated/content_uploads/Canadian_LOAC_Manual_2001_English.pdf
- Justice Manual (2018) 8. CRIMES COMMITTED WITHIN THE SPECIAL MARITIME JURISDICTION OF THE US (18 USC 7, 113, 114, 1111, 1112, 1201, 2031, 2111). US Department of Justice. Available online: <https://www.justice.gov/archives/jm/criminal-resource-manual-8-crimes-committed-within-special-maritime-jurisdiction-us-18-usc-7>
- Memorandum on security assurances in connection with Ukraine's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1994) Budapest. Available online: <https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=0800000280401fbb>
- Multi-jurisdictional law (2022) Legal Information Institute. Available online: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/category/multi-jurisdictional_law
- Multilateral American Convention on Human Rights: "Pact of San José, Costa Rica." Signed at San José, Costa Rica, on 22 November (1969) Article 5(3): "Punishment shall not be extended to any person other than the criminal." Available online: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%201144/volume-1144-i-17955-english.pdf>
- Olenivka penal facility: Prisoners of war and ICRC's role (2022) International Committee of the Red official website. Available online: <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/olenivka-penal-facility-prisoners-war-and-icrcs-role>
- Pardo-Maurer, Roger (2022) Putin's nuclear threats may hint at an electromagnetic pulse strike. *Financial Times*. Available online: <https://www.ft.com/content/d6ecbf62-f26d-401f-936b-e5bd85f25c06>
- Parkhitko, Oleg (2022) UN: International Atomic Energy Agency. IZBIRKOM. Available online: <https://izbirkom.org.ua/publications/mir-24/2022/oon-mizhnarodne-agentstvo-z-atomnoyi-energiyi/>
- Perkins, Rollin M. (1971) The Territorial Principle in Criminal Law. *Hastings Law Journal*. Volume 22, Issue 5/2: 1155-1172. Available online: https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2186&context=hastings_law_journal
-

- Principles Regarding Processes and Criteria for Selection, Assignment, Training and Certification of ISS (Expedition and Visiting) Crewmembers (2001) Spaceref. Available online: <https://spaceref.com/status-report/principles-regarding-processes-and-criteria-for-selection-assignment-training-and-certification-of-iss-expedition-and-visiting-crewmembers/>
- Pryshchepa, Yaroslav (2022) Ukraine expects more concrete steps from the Red Cross regarding Ukrainian prisoners – Yermak. *Suspilne*. Available online: <https://suspilne.media/335972-ukraina-ocikue-vid-cervonogo-hresta-konkretnisih-kroktiv-sodo-ukrainskih-polonenih-ermak/>
- Resolution of the Board of Governors of the IAEA on the consequences of the situation in Ukraine regarding safety, security and guarantees of November 17 (2022) State Nuclear Regulatory Inspection of Ukraine official website. Available online: <https://snriu.gov.ua/news/rezoliutsiia-rady-keruiuchykh-mahate-pro-naslidky-sytuatsii-v-ukraini-stosovno-bezpeky-zakhyshchenosti-ta-harantii>
- Rousseau, Bryant (2016) Cold Cases: Crime and Punishment in Antarctica. *New York Times*. Available online: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/world/what-in-the-world/antarctica-crime.html>
- Ryngaert, Cedric (2015) *Jurisdiction in International Law*. Oxford. Available online: <https://unijuris.sites.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2014/12/The-Concept-of-Jurisdiction-in-International-Law.pdf>
- Search Legal Terms and Definitions (2022) Law.com. Available online: <https://dictionary.law.com/default.aspx?selected=1070>
- Soroka, Larysa (2022) Criminal Responsibility for Crimes Committed in Space: Contemporary Challenges and Looking to the Future. *Advanced Space Law*, Volume 10. Available online: <http://asljournal.org/>
- Soroka, Larysa (2020) Modern Challenges to Establishing Global Law on Sustainable Development of Space Activities. *Advanced Space Law*, Volume 6: 64-71. <https://doi.org/10.29202/asl/6/7>
- Tayal, Jhanvi (2022) Space Law: Settlement of International Disputes. Legal Service India. Available online: <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-6913-space-law-settlement-of-international-disputes.html>
- The Antarctic Treaty (1959) Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty. Available online: <https://www.ats.aq/e/antarctic treaty.html>
- Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (1967) United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs. Available online: <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introouterspacetreaty.html>
- United States Code – Title 18: Crimes and Criminal Procedure (1948) 18 US Code § 7 – Special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States defined. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Available online: https://sherloc.unodc.org/cld/en/legislation/usa/usc_title_18_-_crimes_and_criminal_procedure/part_i/section_7/18_usc_7_-_special_maritime_and_territorial_jurisdiction_of_the_united_states_defined.html?
- Walsh, John W. (1901) The True Meaning of the Term “Jurisdiction.” Source: The American Law Register (1898-1907), Jun., 1901, Vol. 49, No. 6, Volume 40 New Series (Jun., 1901), 346-356. Published by The University of Pennsylvania Law Review. Available online: https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3306463.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A477b7b74319821de7fca32c3de280c&ab_segments=&origin=&acceptTC=1

White, Reid (2021) Plugging the Leaks in Outer Space Criminal Jurisdiction: Advocation for the Creation of a Universal Outer Space Criminal Statute. *Emory International Law Review*. Volume 35, Article 2: 333-376. Available online: <https://scholarlycommons.law.emory.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1258&context=eilr>

Social Responsibility as a Basis for Implementing the Goals of Sustainable Development in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic

Denys Svyrydenko

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Guangdong University of Petrochemical
Technology (Maoming, Guangdong Province, China)
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: denis_sviridenko@ukr.net
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6126-1747>

Nataliia Krokmal

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: nkrokmal73@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5744-8103>

Lesya Chervona

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Senior Researcher, Institute of Higher Education of the National
Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: l.chervona@ihed.org.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3036-3668>

Svyrydenko, Denys, Nataliia Krokmal and Lesya Chervona (2023) Social Responsibility as a Basis for Implementing the Goals of Sustainable Development in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/7>

Social responsibility as an awareness of the responsible attitude of the subjects (person, group, community, organization, state, society) to themselves and other subjects of this phenomenon and process is the basis for implementing Sustainable Development Goals. It permeates the entire

© Svyrydenko, Denys, 2023
© Krokmal, Nataliia, 2023
© Chervona, Lesya, 2023

structure of society both vertically (society – communities – person; state – region – citizen; economy – organization/enterprise (employer) – employee) and horizontally (society – states – economy; communities – regions – organizations/enterprises (employers); person – citizen – employee). The formation of social responsibility is necessary for implementing Sustainable Development Goals and, at the same time, is its basis. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the formation and development of the phenomenon of social responsibility as a basis for the implementation of the goals of sustainable development, encouraging new actors of this phenomenon to act, creating conditions for the public (planetary) association to fight COVID-19; changed approaches to the economy, ecology, social sphere, education, etc. These changes can no longer be reversed, and society can only use them as a basis for further implementation of sustainable development goals.

Keywords: social responsibility, sustainable development goals, COVID-19.

Received: 7 November 2022 / Accepted: 9 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has become a catalyst for society, which has accelerated the rethinking of fundamental values of contemporary society, the balance between rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of the individual, group, community, state, and society in relation to itself and others, has created conditions for further transformation of the modern world. The constant emergence of new mutations of the virus, the wave-like nature of the course of its spread, and combating it cause international organizations and states to constantly coordinate actions to fight the virus, find new forms and methods of such combating, precautionary measures to reduce the spread of the virus and its consequences (World Health Organization, 2022). For ordinary citizens, the coronavirus pandemic has led to reconsidering their own needs, interests, limits, and extent of interference in the private lives of others, groups, communities, the state, or society as a whole, restrictions on rights and freedoms, and responsibilities for themselves and others. In this regard, speeches, demonstrations, and protests against the state's violation of the rights and freedoms of citizens have begun to gain popularity and spread resistance to changes in the world.

Defining all the trends and patterns of development of the modern world, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of responsibility, particularly social responsibility, which characterizes the individual and the group, community, state, or society as a whole. The actualization of a socially responsible attitude to oneself and others in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic extends to other spheres of society, in particular, political, socio-economic, and spiritual spheres, being consistent with the goals of sustainable development (How to fight COVID-19 in the world, 2020). Social responsibility is an awareness of the responsible attitude of the subject (person, group, community, organization, state, society) to themselves and other subjects of this phenomenon and the way to achieving Sustainable Development Goals (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015). Such a postulate requires an in-depth analysis of social responsibility as a basis for achieving the mentioned Goals, the study of this phenomenon and process from a historical perspective to substantiate and generalize the subjects of social responsibility, forms, methods, means by which its formation, establishment, and dissemination among subjects takes place, etc.

Research Methodology

The study of social responsibility as a basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic requires the formation of a theoretical basis and practical recommendations for further development and deepening of social responsibility among its subjects. Such a basis can be philosophy, political science, sociology, psychology, management, cognitive and behavioral economics, and educational management, which determine various aspects and facets of social responsibility, mechanisms of its implementation, forms and means of its use, and dissemination within their subjects. The practical work of the UN and other international organizations on implementing global goals also shows the need to form a conscious attitude toward oneself and others in implementing tasks related to Sustainable Development Goals (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015).

The implementation of this idea requires, firstly, an explanation of social responsibility as a phenomenon and process in social development; secondly, the identification of trends in the development of social responsibility as the basis of the global goals at different levels of society; thirdly, an analysis of the relationship between social responsibility as a basis for Sustainable Development Goals and the COVID-19 pandemic: “The crisis resulting from the pandemic has caused a change in the way that corporations pursue their economic, social, and environmental objectives, giving greater importance to the role they must play in society” (García-Sánchez & García-Sánchez, 2020: 1).

A vital role in the study should be played by the historical method, which helps to carry out a systemic analysis of the origin, formation, development, and spread of social responsibility and all its subjects from a historical perspective to determine its limits, extent, restrictions and freedoms, relationships between its actors, its place in social progress and its combination with the global goals. Determining the interaction and relationships between the subjects of social responsibility for sustainable development and the COVID-19 pandemic is possible based on systemic analysis, which helps to determine the lines of intersection and points of interaction of its subjects.

Main research material

Social responsibility is a contradictory phenomenon that affects such scholars' views on freedom and necessity as philosophical categories, morals, relationships, and interrelationships between different actors in social development, the element of social control, and so on. Therefore, it is important to understand which philosophical constructions its theoretical concept adjoins when it comes to social responsibility.

The idea of responsibility, like any idea, has a specific history of development: “In the era of Antiquity, the concept of responsibility was closely related to the collective moral and political norms and duties of a person... Responsibility in the Middle Ages comes from the principle of the free will of a believing person... In the rationalist philosophy of the New Age, a new paradigm of responsibility is born, which can be called the civil liability of an individual... Kant's philosophy became the theoretical premise of the legal state, the essence of which is the affirmation of the principle of universal human responsibility based on one's rational and free choice and responsibility for one's life... In the 20th century, a new paradigm of responsibility is developing. For the first time in history, all people, regardless of their gender, race, national, religious, and class differences, became the subjects of rights and responsibilities according to the law. The circle of responsibility has also expanded significantly, covering both economic, moral, and legal and cultural and environmental

responsibility” (Chervona, 2021). The justification of the principle of collective responsibility is new in the modern approach to responsibility. The concept of collective responsibility is present in H. Jonas’s concept (Jonas, 2001). This new paradigm of responsibility is characterized by the expansion of both the subject and the object of responsibility – for everything, for everyone together, and for and for each one separately, when the subject and the object of the act do not simply coincide, but acquire a general meaning of individual of choice as an available choice that extends to all of humanity. In this regard, the collective actor is actualized, a set of individual actions united by a single principle and task comes to the fore, and the responsibility for the action extends to the sphere of the uncertain future.

Summarizing different views and interpretations of the phenomenon of social responsibility, it can be stated that it is an element of social control of society, it acts as a regulator of human behavior, group, community, state, and society as a whole, and reflects a particular stage of its development. As an element of the system of social control, social responsibility ensures the formation of individuals’ conscious attitude to themselves and others, to the environment, including the social environment, to their place in society, and acts as a regulator of human behavior, the behavior of a group, community. At the level of the state and society in general, social responsibility involves defining, implementing, and guaranteeing a decent standard of living and ways to achieve it. Performing a regulatory function, it structures the relationship between individuals, a person and a group, a community, relations in the state, and society. Historically, it is possible to determine the directions and ways of forming, establishing, and disseminating social responsibility in society.

The responsibility as such was formed in the primitive, archaic society, where each member of the group had to rely on others for survival, which formed the primitive norms of social responsibility in the form of taboos, talion customs, and so on. The social responsibility of archaic societies, proto-states, or early state formations was more severe and “bloody,” punitive in nature, which was connected with the survival of the primitive collective or state as an entity. Social responsibility was formed based on the “slogan” of life or death. With the development of state formations, and society as a whole, the trajectory of formation and development of social responsibility changes in the direction of consolidating the relevant norms of behavior associated with it, from punitive, coercive nature to the use of laws to regulate relations and mitigate punishment, and society with the state become focused not on the community, but on the individual. The historical process of struggle of different groups and communities for their rights (ethnic, professional, gender, political, etc.) formed in the respective groups a conscious, socially responsible attitude towards each other, which determined the social responsibility of the group or community. At the state or society level, the historical progress of the acquisition of certain rights and freedoms by certain groups or communities meant the recognition of the socially responsible attitude of the state or society as a whole towards these groups and communities. That is, recognizing the rights and freedoms of various groups and communities, the state became socially responsible towards its citizens, became the guarantor of their rights and freedoms, as well as allowed to expand its list: “It is critical that developing countries find innovative policy mechanisms to ensure immediate socio-economic support after the COVID-19 crisis as well as continued progress towards the 17 SDGs. A post-pandemic strategy should remove existing policy distortions and correct perverse incentives that inhibit sustainable development. Policies should also create synergies across several SDGs simultaneously, such as boosting economic activity, job creation, poverty reduction, environmental improvement and health outcomes” (Barbier & Burgess, 2020: 2).

Historically, there has been a transformation of social responsibility: as a regulator of human behavior, groups, and communities from archaic norms through taboos and talion customs to the formation of various social norms, which are based on one or another component of social responsibility. The COVID-19 pandemic also raises the question of the search for rational strategies of social responsibility that could be effective in opposite to irrational ones: “The moralization of COVID-19 risk mitigation measures contributed to the polarization of groups along moral values, which ultimately led to the emergence of collective irrational behaviors. Collective irrationality arises from groups explicitly or implicitly endorsing values that ultimately harm both themselves and those around” (Voinea et al., 2023).

In primitive society, archaic norms, taboos, talion customs, and archetypes as carriers of collective memory were formed based on common sense, which became the basis of social responsibility. The formation and development of primitive forms of religion prompted primitive society to the emergence of religious norms, which united all individuals into a single whole based on faith in otherworldly forces, with the emergence of religions – in God. The development of moral norms has formed the responsibility to treat each individual as a tribal being, tied with the natural bonds of brotherhood with all mankind. Moral norms have formed the social responsibility of individuals to defend the interests of those communities to which they belong, i.e., a person is identified as a representative of specific community (Krokhmal, 2004).

The basic principles of social responsibility in primitive society were laid down through the implementation of social norms through experience, which formed the mechanism of their transmission to future generations. This mechanism was assimilation (imitation, inheritance), manifested in customs, rituals, and traditions.

With the emergence of the state, social responsibility as one of the regulators of the behavior of the individual, group, community, and society as a whole becomes part of legal norms that establish the central positions of a new form of development, the state, and act as a means of regulating the behavior of a subject of social responsibility. The mechanism of transfer of social responsibility is obedience to the law as part of the function of regulation/self-regulation. The historical transformation of the state included the historical transformation of social responsibility, which added different social norms to common sense and combined different mechanisms of its transmission to future generations, namely assimilation (imitation, inheritance) and law obedience (Krokhmal, 2004). With the development of society, ideological norms are developing, becoming the basis for forming various groups with their own ideology, which is propagated or even instilled in others. In this context, realizing oneself as part of a particular ideological idea or theory requires the right to promote it and spread social responsibility to other people, groups, and communities that support or oppose these ideas.

After the Second World War, there was a rethinking of values and norms of human behavior in society, which led to the establishment and formation of a new type of a person, manifested in the formation of “free will” as “freedom” of individuals in the “freedom” of the world community. That is, there was a formation of “self-confident” individuals and subordination of all other areas of development of the state and society as a whole to this process. The boundaries and vector of social responsibility have changed: from clearly defined boundaries of freedoms, rights, and responsibilities “allowed” by society, state, group, or individual, there has been an expansion of boundaries and an increase in the number of rights and freedoms of the individual and recognition of new boundaries by group, community, the

state, society as a whole. The mechanism of such a transition is meaning-making. The state began to guarantee the expansion of the list of rights and freedoms for an individual, group, or community, and society formed in people a stable idea of the possibility of achieving more from the state or society. However, gaining more rights and freedoms did not always instill in a person an understanding of social responsibility for the privileges received. Therefore, at the beginning of the 21st century, the world's leading countries came out with a well-established social responsibility at the state level to ensure the rights and freedoms of their citizens and other countries – with the active struggle of various groups and communities for their rights and freedoms.

Dissemination of sustainable development ideas and their formalization in the global goals show that their achievement and implementation of the new action plan “Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” is possible through the development and dissemination of social responsibility at different levels of the structure of society both vertically (society – communities – people; state – region – citizen; economy – organization/enterprise (employer) – employee), and horizontally (society – states – economy; communities – regions – organizations/enterprises (employers); person – citizen – employee). Social responsibility is the basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals, as it involves the formation of the individual (citizen, employee) conscious attitudes to goals, opportunities, and mechanisms for their implementation, their own involvement in these processes through rights, freedoms, volunteering, professional activities, self-expression, etc. At the state/region/community level, social responsibility, on the one hand, is the basis for guaranteeing the management of all citizens to respect their rights and freedoms. On the other hand, social responsibility is a feedback mechanism that determines the reaction and awareness of citizens' responsibility in relation to the subjects of management, policies in the field of sustainable development, and the achievement of global goals. At the level of economy – organization/enterprise (employer) – employee, social responsibility as a corporate responsibility ensures the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, determines further directions of business and economic development, guarantees business on ethical, moral, legal, etc. principles related to a voluntary commitment to improving the well-being of its employees, natural environment and social environment, providing corporate resources, helping communities, maintaining and preserving the ecology and nature, etc. The implementation of Sustainable Development Goals at the level of an individual organization (enterprise), at the regional, state, and interstate levels, and at the level of the whole society is guaranteed by the governing bodies through social responsibility. Many researchers underline that socially responsible education is one of the effective ways to deal with pandemic and sustainable development issues in the 21st century (Karimov et al., 2022).

The COVID-19 pandemic has made adjustments to the Sustainable Development Goals and the implementation of the new action plan (Shulla et al., 2021). On the one hand, it may seem that the implementation of the global goals needs to be postponed because the issues of ensuring the lives and health of people around the world are urgent. On the other hand, such a situation can contribute to the implementation of goals because, at the same time, society has the opportunity to provide a basis for further sustainable social development, which will be based on social responsibility, in the process of achieving goals. The decision-makers have to deal with four primary social dimensions (bioethical, political, psychological, and economic) during the development of the socially responsible roadmap for sustainable development (Etienne, 2022: 305).

As already mentioned, social responsibility has been consolidated in various social norms,

from customs and traditions to legal and ideological norms. The level of social responsibility enshrined in customs, traditions, and various social norms are ingrained in people's minds. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that the norms of social responsibility ingrained in people's minds do not meet the urgent needs and demands of the society fighting the pandemic. Therefore, the question arises of adjusting people's consciousness using various means, methods, and forms so that in the minds of man and society, it becomes rooted that the world has changed and the norms of social responsibility have changed too. This can be done by strengthening social responsibility in the structure of society.

In the line "society – communities – people", during the pandemic, society should act as a unifying principle based on the idea of overcoming the pandemic, which is complemented by ideas of tolerance, global partnership, and cooperation, the interaction between individuals, groups, communities, states, etc. Different mechanisms, forms, and means of popularizing such ideas depend on the level of their implementation, from the general, which is society as a whole, through communities as self-governing systems that ensure the implementation of these ideas at the level of individual territory, to the separate person, individual (Kornievsky, 2020). Social responsibility during the pandemic develops local self-government (communities), namely the expansion of the boundaries of local communities, their powers, spheres of influence, and opportunities for management decisions at the local level. The community strengthens social responsibility for its members, territory, socio-economic situation, and development during the pandemic, creates a socially responsible space of its actions, including the actions of individuals, groups, communities, businesses, and authorities in it, mastering the system of mutual responsibility for their own development.

At the personal level during a pandemic, social responsibility along this line of intersection should be ensured by the presence of beliefs and awareness of the need to participate in activities of a community, society, adherence to social norms in relations with other people, community, government, groups, communities, support the government's position on issues of social development, in particular in the fight against coronavirus and its consequences, to motivate themselves to perform public duties and take the initiative to implement them, etc.

In the line "state – region – citizen", social responsibility is the basis that clearly defines the rights, freedoms, benefits, and responsibilities of the state as a whole and the region (communities) and individual citizens based on social norms, including law principles (Riezanova, 2016). Law obedience as a mechanism for forming and disseminating social responsibility along this line of intersection ensures and guarantees the state's compliance with all determined guarantees to citizens, and citizens, in turn, are obliged to perform their duties honestly to others and the state. During the pandemic, social responsibility on this line of intersection ensures respect for the rights, freedoms, benefits, obligations, and responsibilities of the state and citizens, which is regulated by various social norms. But both the state and citizens have to realize that in the fight against coronavirus, the state must first ensure the protection of the life and health of its citizens, using coercive means because the conscious attitude of citizens to these processes is not high, and measures conducted by the state provoke civil resistance.

In conditions of the pandemic, the effectiveness of the system of relations and relationships that have formed, its optimization is essential in the interaction of the state with regions and citizens, taking into account the fight against coronavirus and its consequences, joint action in different directions with a clear awareness of the position of each participant in such action, the ability to identify and correct behavior to acquire common social values, the ability to increase social contribution to socially significant activities, willingness to take

responsibility for their own and joint actions and deeds. The state, regions, and citizens must consciously fulfill and adhere to their obligations.

During the pandemic, significant changes are also occurring in the line “economy – organization/enterprise (employer) – employee”. During this period, implementing the Sustainable Development Goals should consider the reduction of economic growth through the introduction of lockdowns, quarantine restrictions, and measures that prevent the spread of coronavirus but negatively affect economic development (Yurchyshyn, 2021). At the same time, a pandemic can be the basis for developing new industries, changing priorities in the country’s economy, active innovations and infrastructure expansion, digitalization, etc.

The pandemic should be a catalyst that accelerates the introduction of social responsibility in enterprises and encourages employers to take more responsible care of their employees, not just of the profits, to help society overcome the pandemic and its consequences based on their capabilities. During the pandemic, socially responsible businesses invest in social projects, support projects to protect the lives and health of the population and its employees and focus their activities on positioning themselves as part of society.

Socially responsible businesses, especially during the pandemic, should take the voluntary initiative to accept responsibility for social interaction, environmental protection, and engagement with partners, consumers, employees, communities, and other stakeholders based on ethical principles and norms. This list is supplemented by respect for the rights of employees, taking into account their interests, with the possibility of establishing benefits and guarantors of work during lockdowns and quarantine restrictions, positive impact on society, and so on.

In the line “society – state – economy,” social responsibility is implemented in almost all the Sustainable Development Goals. The basis of social responsibility on this line of intersection is the departure from centralization in society and the state and their transition to decentralization, which changes the parity of power between civil society and the state towards expanding the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of civil society through decentralization processes in the state, transfer of several functions, powers to local levels (regional, community level, etc.). The expansion of the power of civil society enables non-governmental authorities, public organizations, and other subjects of civil society, which base their activities on the principles of social responsibility, to gain the opportunity to continue it and promote conscious, socially responsible behavior in society (Kornievsky, 2020). During the pandemic, civil society actors effectively influence people, groups, and communities on the issues that concern one or another entity. They are active “players” in exacerbating destructive situations, strengthening various forms of resistance to the implementation of pandemic policies and their consequences, etc., or, conversely, support such policies, helping to mitigate the consequences of harmful and unpopular decisions of the authorities in the fight against coronavirus.

An important direction in this line of intersection is building a system and mechanisms of public-private partnership for decision-making, business participation in social programs, infrastructure development, development of socio-economic development plans, lobbying for the interests, advising on socio-economic development of the state, region, etc., speeches of business representatives as advisers to the authorities, etc. The connection of business with the government is based on legal norms and moral and ethical bases, business participation in solving social problems, and development of innovations.

In the line “communities – regions – organizations/enterprises (employers)”, the priority in spreading social responsibility during the pandemic is the participation of businesses

in local projects, their total or partial funding, development and implementation of social and educational projects, projects for children and youth, etc. Today, the participation of business representatives, community managers, their development, and cooperation with communities directly, bypassing the state level, prevails since communities in the process of decentralization gain more power from government agencies, local businesses invest in community development, reimburse them for their development through programs of patronage, sponsorship, and charitable activities, volunteering, cooperation with the external environment based on ethical principles and norms. During the pandemic, this direction of development of social responsibility becomes urgent because it is business at the local level that can help in the fight against the pandemic and its consequences, and it should do so consciously.

In the line “person – citizen – employee”, it is necessary to realize that the COVID-19 pandemic has become a litmus test for individuals to test their own values, norms of behavior, understanding with other people, reactions to various unusual situations, stress, desires, and opportunities to get out of the comfort zone, defining the extent and limits of restrictions on rights and freedoms, etc. This awareness occurs in an environment where various governments and authorities, through constant and growing coercion, are trying to restrict the rights and freedoms of citizens and employers – the right to work and to receive a decent reward. In this regard, social responsibility should be the basis for understanding between the individual (citizen, employee) and government to find parity between guaranteed rights and freedoms and the possibility of their voluntary temporary restriction by government and authorities to save human life and health. The social responsibility of the employee during the pandemic is possible through professional development, as well as during the receipt of quality education, in which the future specialist would already form social responsibility towards colleagues and consumers, customers, and other groups. Although education has become commercialized, it has retained its primary function – forming a professional (citizen) who would meet the demands of the state and society at the appropriate level of social development (Chervona & Bylvinska, 2020: 96-97).

Conclusions

Social responsibility as a conscious, responsible attitude of the subject to themselves and others aims to form an appropriate branched system of its subjects, which would implement and promote its ideas through the appropriately formed mechanisms, forms, methods, and tools. Such a system of subjects, built vertically and horizontally, should cover all spheres of society, all social levels, and structures.

The use of social responsibility as a basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals will provide a common ground for all participants in this process, which should form a common conscious attitude to themselves and others, toward the environment, including the social environment, to partnerships in various spheres of society, etc., to achieve the goals. It is possible to provide this through the system of education and upbringing. After all, starting from the family as the organizational basis of society, where the child is socialized and raised, instilling in children an understanding of duty, and ideas of responsibility, including social responsibility, knowledge, perception, and implementation of social norms, forms a conscious, socially responsible position; through the education system, which not only provides knowledge about social responsibility and global goals but also develops and corrects the conscious socially responsible position of the student; to professional development in the workplace, which helps to understand the employee in the socio-economic structure of society.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the establishment and formation of the phenomenon of social responsibility as a basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals, encouraging new subjects to act, creating conditions for the public (worldwide) association to combat the pandemic, changed approaches to economics, ecology, social sphere, education, etc. In this context, all subjects of social responsibility should be aware of their place, role, and prospects for an existence based on the ideas of social responsibility and their implementation and should indicate their active social and community position. Thus, the society aims to form such social responsibility, which would become a conscious basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals with appropriate behavior, built on the principles of respect, interaction, and support, being an element of the social control system, the regulator of the behavior of the subjects. We formulated ways of reframing the social architecture in the series of social subsystems (vertical and horizontal ones)).

References

- Barbier, E.B., and J. C. Burgess (2020) Sustainability and development after COVID-19. *World Development*, Volume 135, 105082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105082>
- Chervona, L., and O. Bulvinska (2020) Students' participation in quality assurance at university. *Continuing professional education: theory and practice*, 3(64), 95-101.
- Chervona, L. (2021) Social responsibility of the university: the student dimension. In S. Kalashnikova, and O. Orzhel (eds.). *Theoretical foundations of the implementation of social responsibility of universities: preprint (analytical materials)*. Kyiv: Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 86-106.
- Etienne, H. (2022) Solving moral dilemmas with AI: how it helps us address the social implications of the Covid-19 crisis and enhance human responsibility to tackle meta-dilemmas. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, 14:2, 305-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2022.2113669>
- García-Sánchez, I-M, and A. García-Sánchez (2020) Corporate Social Responsibility during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(4): 126. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6040126>
- How to fight COVID-19 in the world: options for government decisions* (2020) Available online: <http://icps.com.ua/yak-boryutsya-z-covid-19-u-sviti-varianty-uryadovykh-rishen>
- Karimov, A., A. Lavazza, and M. Farina (2022) Epistemic Responsibility, Rights and Duties During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Social Epistemology*, 36:6, 686-702. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2022.2077856>
- Jonas, H. (2001) *The principle of responsibility. In search of ethics for a technological civilization*. Kyiv: Libra.
- Kornievsky, O. (2020) *Civil society in the context of the coronavirus pandemic COVID-19: challenges and prospects*. Available online: <https://niss.gov.ua/news/statti/gromadyanske-suspilstvo-v-umovakh-pandemii-koronavirusu-covid-19-vikliki-ta-perspektivi>
- Krokhmal, N. (2004) *Historical forms of self-regulation of the social process*. Zaporozhye: Education.
- Leal Filho, W., L.L. Brandli, A. Lange Salvia, L. Rayman-Bacchus, and J. Platje (2020) COVID-19 and the UN Sustainable Development Goals: Threat to Solidarity or an Opportunity? *Sustainability*, 12, 5343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135343>

- Naidoo, R., and B. Fisher (2020) Sustainable Development Goals: pandemic reset. *Nature*, Vol. 583, 198-201. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01999-x>
- Riezanova, N. (2016) Populist determinants of legitimization of political power in democratic societies. *Humanitarian Bulletin of Zaporizhia State Engineering Academy*, 67, 169-81.
- Robinson, F. (2021) Global health and the COVID-19 pandemic: a care ethics approach. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 17:3, 340-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2021.1990986>
- Shulla, K., B-F. Voigt, S. Cibian, G. Scandone, E. Martinez, F. Nelkovski, and P. Salehi (2021) Effects of COVID-19 on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Discover Sustainability*, Vol. 2, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-021-00026-x>
- Sustainable Development Goals* (2015) Available online: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- Voinea C., L. Marin, and C. Vică (2023) The moral source of collective irrationality during COVID-19 vaccination campaigns. *Philosophical Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2022.2164264>
- World Health Organization* (2022) Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Pandemic. Available online: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>

The Phenomenon of Active Citizenship: the Dialectics of Global and National Discourses

Shishi Xu

Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: super_shishi@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6406-341X>

Xu, Shishi (2023) The Phenomenon of Active Citizenship: the Dialectics of Global and National Discourses. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 88-96. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/8>

The article attempts to rethink active citizenship both from the point of view of social practice and scientific perspective and from the standpoint of modern social philosophy. It is shown that globalization is one of the most used terms of modern socio-humanitarian discourse but simultaneously one of the most difficult to define. Any research related to the global is also related to the national because the reception of global influences is different in different cultures. From the perspective of 2022, the research shows a globalization crisis in the classical sense of the word. It is about the crisis of real and nominal political power, which are often incompatible with each other. In many countries, the desire for "strong statehood" is even stronger. It has been proven that the impact of globalization on society is actively mediated by civil society. In a philosophical sense, a developed civil society as a completed form of morally determined life is almost an ideal product of the history of civilization. The first trend of active citizenship transformation is economic liberalization. The second feature that determines changes in active citizenship is political pluralism. Active citizens control the basis of the activity of the modern state. In these conditions, the control function of the institution of citizenship becomes extremely important for the stable existence of political regimes and for achieving political stability. Another trend in the transformation of active citizenship is the growing role of the state in global processes. It was possible to distinguish two levels of transformation of active citizenship in the era of globalization. The first is interiorization, and the second is exteriorization. It has been proven that active citizenship is not only a social connection of people but also a way of existence characteristic of any civilized human community.

Keywords: globalization, active citizenship, citizen, national state.

Received: 10 November 2022 / Accepted: 23 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

In the conditions of globalization, the institution of citizenship is experiencing a crisis, which determines the relevance of the following questions: what is the role of cultural and political tradition in the emergence of the institution of citizenship; what is citizenship in today's globalized world; how, under the conditions of globalization, the institution of citizenship becomes a real force of active citizens; what are the signs of democratization of the institution of citizenship and how to determine them in practice; what distinguishes the modern model of active citizenship from historical models and how these differences relate to the socio-cultural reality of the West and the East. The study of the problem can lead to the design of the concept of the institution of active citizenship as a complex of elements of civic values, civic participation and lead to a re-thinking of the principles of civil society in general. For this, it is worth using the experience of social philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, social anthropology, history, and political analysis.

Active citizenship should be understood not only from the point of view of practice or social perspective but also in the philosophical space, which can represent a broad public interest. The principle of active citizenship is based on the classic "system dyad": subject and object. The question naturally arises: how can the principle of active citizenship be studied in the philosophical space? Can it be understood, given that human activity has no objective boundaries? First of all, the problem will be that we do not take into account the essential circumstance: there are no objective borders, but there are conditional, relative borders. A person, as a "socio-historical product," is free to choose certain social characteristics for oneself since all human practices are social, but the criteria of social belonging must be set in advance. This postulate is currently the central problem of active citizenship in social philosophy.

Many past and present researchers have paid attention to the issue of citizenship in general and active citizenship in particular. One of the first problems of the relationship between man and the state was raised by the outstanding Chinese philosopher Confucius, who believed that proper civic education is an important factor in the development of the state because each person must know one's role in society, be responsible to one's fellow citizens, obey the state, but at the same time have high-level self-organization (Confucius, 1997). Confucius can be considered the founder of the Eastern tradition in understanding citizenship. On the other hand, there is a Western (classical European) tradition of understanding citizenship, the founder of which can be considered Plato. Among the classical works, we note Plato's *Republic*, where the philosopher puts forward personal courage, and self-sufficiency as the central virtue of a citizen (Plato, 2007). Thus, we see that the Eastern tradition appeals to a collective, and the Western tradition appeals to an individualistic interpretation of citizenship.

Among modern Western researchers, we should mention Paul Magnette. He analyzes the metamorphoses in the thought of such classics as Machiavelli, Locke, Rousseau, etc., and discusses Marx's ambiguous attitude to the ideal of equal citizenship (Magnette, 2005). It should also be noted in Harpaz Yossi's "Citizenship 2.0. Dual Nationality as a Global Asset", where the author reveals the problem of active citizenship in the context of dual and multiple citizenships (Yossi, 2019). In the article "Global citizenship education and peace education: toward a postcritical praxis" Kevin Kester shows the validity of the criticism of active and global citizenship framed as crucial pillars of the liberal world (Kester, 2022). Gershon Shafir explores the problem of actual citizenship beyond its emotional resonance and cultural ramifications (Shafir, 1998). Bryony Hoskins and Massimiliano Mascherini define active citizenship in the European context as a modern wide range of social participation based on

values (Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009). Omar Acha criticizes the inability of the analytical possibilities provided by postmodernism to explain what is happening in society, using the concept of “global citizenship” for analysis (Acha, 2018). Adrian Favell emphasizes that citizenship as a theoretical concept has gone far beyond its conceptual meaning and should now be considered in symbolic, affective, and moral dimensions (Favell, 2010). Alejandro Roberto Alba-Meraz defines citizenship as a complex phenomenon and recognizes the presence of a deep global logic in the processes of civic identity (Alba-Meraz, 2018). Per Gustafson examines the problem of dual citizenship in the example of Sweden and argues that dual citizenship can represent a “new Swedish identity” through the inclusion of immigrants, and also shows the connection between official citizenship(s) and social construction of self-identity (Gustafson, 2002).

Thus, the article aims to identify the trends of transformation of the phenomenon of active citizenship in the era of globalization in the conditions of competition between national and globalization discourses of active citizenship.

Globalization as a metaphor and research tool

First of all, it is necessary to deal with the concept of globalization because it is one of the most used terms of modern socio-humanitarian discourse, but at the same time, one of the most difficult to define. Many researchers agree that globalization, as it exists today, arose at the end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st centuries (Robertson, 2000; Beck, 2000; Alba-Meraz, 2018). This is true because at each historical turn, the integration of countries and regions of the world grew until, at the end of the 20th century, the number of these relationships changed to a new quality.

According to Lukas von Ramin: “It has become difficult to escape the concept of globalization. Not only does it consistently shape the media and academic discourse – our lives are also directly affected by the consequences of globalization. However, more detailed inquiries reveal that the phenomena to which globalization relates vary widely. This is true for everyday use, as well as for scientific use: a uniform definition of globalization does not exist” (Ramin, 2018: 379). We agree that there cannot be a single definition of globalization, as this phenomenon has different manifestations in different social spheres and different regions of the world.

Nevertheless, globalization is one of the most popular concepts in the modern socio-humanitarian discourse: “In philosophy, approaches to globalization are formulated primarily from the point of view of ethics. The existing philosophical theory of globalization predominantly consists of a critique of modern globalization, which is based on a theory of equal distribution of goods and guided by universal ethical principles” (Heilgendorff, 2018: 47). Indeed, the ethical component is one of the key dimensions of globalization processes because they change the scale of moral dilemmas in politics, business, culture, mass media, education, etc. What could previously be considered from the standpoint of the local experience of a specific culture, and, accordingly, at the same level receive an ethical evaluation, from now on has access to the planetary level, which means it must be evaluated from the standpoint of universal human values.

Any research related to the global is also related to the national because the reception of global influences is different in different cultures. Therefore, global and national interact as a totality and individuality. Omar Acha writes: “With globalization, theoretical ‘actuality’ reaches a new challenge because we can understand, in the face of the failure of the analytical capacities provided by postmodernism to account for what is happening, the need for a re-

composition of an understanding to which totality and particularity do not constitute an irreducible opposition” (Acha, 2018: 97).

At the end of the 20th century, in some places, one could find the opinion that globalization is not a new phenomenon. But over time, the voices of skeptics of globalization gradually subsided. Back in 2000, the famous sociologist Ulrich Beck clearly denied that globalization does not bring anything new to the already integrated (at that time) world. The author writes: “What is new is not only the everyday life and interaction across national frontiers, in dense networks with a high degree of mutual dependence and obligation” (Beck, 2000: 12). It is worth emphasizing that the modern economy and social relations are increasingly changing and radically different from those that existed in the 19th or 20th centuries.

In contrast to the last century, today’s society is experiencing severe social upheavals. It is under increasing pressure from those forces who have long understood that power cannot be built based on exclusively national elements but must be based on a global “agenda.” In the same context, the well-known globalization researcher Robert Robertson emphasizes the following: “Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole. The processes and actions to which the concept of globalization now refers have been proceeding, with some interruptions, for many centuries, but the main focus of the discussion of globalization is on relatively recent times” (Robertson, 2000).

Since its appearance, the concept of globalization has been accompanied by many myths and prejudices. One of the common myths is that the concentration of world power in the hands of the USA and other rich countries is one of the main ideas of globalization. Under the influence of this myth, there is a change in the internal “trend” in different countries, and the interests of not so many ordinary people are affected, but those who are connected to and have access to power. This creates the illusion of danger to the centuries-old social order, but the “concentration of power” itself provides only a simulacrum of the state. We agree with the following approach: “The global world that exists in the mass consciousness is the G7 countries, and then “with a stretch.” There is another world that is only on the path of globalization, or even going in the opposite direction” (Terepyschyi & Kostenko, 2021: 134).

In 2022, we can talk about the crisis of the globalization of order in the modern sense of the word, but its main characteristics are repeated to some extent. First, it is about the crisis of real and nominal political power, which are often incompatible. Secondly, the desire for “statehood” is even more vital in many countries. In many countries, the so-called “traditional authoritarianism” has emerged and strengthened, i.e., a regime in which a weak government seeks society’s agreement with the existing order by creating certain laws and principles (quite often, this works even against the wishes of society). This aspect is related to the need to support a particular political course. However, even traditional societies cannot avoid changes. Thus, the famous futurologist Francis Fukuyama, analyzing the future of such countries as Libya, Turkey, Brazil, Tunisia, and Egypt, writes: “The survival of the political systems of all these countries will depend critically on the degree to which they can adapt to new social landscape created by economic growth” (Fukuyama, 2014: 6). In our opinion, he is talking about both the economic and political consequences of globalization, which inevitably determine the fate of the political systems of many almost all the national states.

Active citizenship concept through the lens of the global / national contradictions

As we can see, the impact of globalization on society is mediated by civil society, and in the prism of research optics, theoretical problems related to active citizenship rightly arise. In a philosophical sense, a developed civil society as a complete, legal form of morally determined life is almost the ideal product of the history of civilization. We see that human rights in a civilized society gradually move from the sphere of law to the sphere of ethics and become a factor affecting morality. Therefore, active citizenship becomes necessary to develop a new quality of social life, and its adequacy to the spirit of the times. This concept contains the full range of civil and socio-cultural qualities of an individual. A natural question arises about how active citizenship is transformed in the past and modern globalization era. And if they are different, what transformation trends can we distinguish right now?

First, let's turn to the normative definition of the basic concept and note that the European Commission understands active citizenship as follows: "Active citizenship is an umbrella term for the acquisition and exercise of rights for civic and political participation. As such, it includes citizenship and residence, membership in (political) organisations, voting, running for office, volunteering or participation in political protest" (European Commission, 2022).

Let's remember that the most common form of an individual's social status is the place of work and activity. But work itself creates a personality. At the same time, in practice, the nature of a person's activity can be formal, ideal, optional, opportunistic, etc. This question is the basis for a conversation about the role of an active citizen. According to this approach, it turns out that a citizen's most important social status is the economic role. This role is manifested in certain actions and attitudes performed by a person in accordance with the spirit of the times. A truly active citizen at every level of life is the bearer of one's economic role in society. One can conduct it unconsciously or consciously and speak and act accordingly. All this is quite complicated, but we are discussing not violating the laws regulating the economy. And although the bearer of any socio-economic situation is always an individual, no one can be it arbitrarily. Therefore, economic liberalization is the first trend in the transformation of active citizenship.

The second feature that determines changes in active citizenship is political pluralism. Here, citizenship is not only a theoretical concept but also has symbolic, affective, and moral dimensions: "Academics for their part have reflected this growing political interest by rediscovering citizenship as a theoretical concept, going well beyond its formal legal meaning into discussions about its symbolic, affective and moral dimensions: citizenship as membership or belonging; citizenship as participation or duty" (Favell, 2010: 173). Therefore, citizenship is not only a formal legal status; it belongs to a community, active participation in its life, and fulfilling a duty to the community, for example, defending the state against aggression.

A person is influenced by the social system in which he lives and works, and if a tough, indomitable person comes to power, it is not difficult to imagine who will then come to the forefront of life. These are adaptations, unable to defend either their interests or social rights. Therefore, we cannot unequivocally call them citizens due to personal interest, will, faith, personal creative attitude to life, etc. On the other hand, an active citizen who has a formed system of values and usual rules of life is very useful for society. But working normally in a new place was enough to become an expert in the chosen field of activity. For this, it is still necessary to learn to bear social responsibility.

It follows from this that an active citizen is a minority, which in some forms of the state should be provided with rights corresponding to the conditions of such a regime. On the one hand, an active citizen is, first of all, an individual with a job, a salary and a financial situation capable of ensuring the realization of his goal – to be useful to society and defend his rights. On the other hand, an active citizen is an active person who manages to convince himself that he can do anything if he clearly adheres to one's values and attitudes, takes into account the interests of others, and fulfills one's obligations to oneself. As active citizens become part of the ruling class, their scope of freedom increases.

We solidarize with Alejandro Roberto Alba-Meraz's approach: "Citizenship as a complex phenomenon on admits the presence of a deep global logic in identity processes – besides the meanings generated by transnational and imaginative political practices" (Alba-Meraz, 2018: 24). Indeed, active citizenship not only recognizes the presence of global logic but in many ways shapes it. The identity is born of meanings that are translated by international economic and national political practices.

Active citizens control the basis of the activity of the modern state. In these conditions, the control function of the institution of citizenship becomes extremely important for the stable existence of political regimes and for achieving political stability. But this is only one aspect of the problem arising from the state's and citizens' political interaction. In this context, like any expansion of the limits of human freedom, globalization inevitably turns society into a hyperdynamic system that lives according to its own laws.

But the very fact of the existence of "partial globalization" already gives a person a wide choice. In the end, activities aimed at expanding its powers and obtaining the greatest benefit from possessing those resources controlled by its subject are outside the sphere of control of institutional, ideological, historical, and other regulators. An active citizen under the conditions of globalization is forced to rely only on oneself since public authority, legislation, different social norms, and the nation-state organization prevent him from acting freely as the "sovereign" of his life. In this context, Per Gustafson notes: "The nation-state is at the same time too small and too big: too small as its political power and legitimacy are undermined by global economic forces, and as increasing human mobility reduces the importance of national belonging and national identification; too big as it cannot adequately represent the ethnic, cultural and regional diversity often present within national boundaries" (Gustafson, 2002: 463).

In general terms, the values of a globalized society can be formulated as follows: freedom, justice, equality, and human dignity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples, free exchange of capital and information. In addition, globalization assumes that its primary goal is the preservation and development of the diversity of human culture. But at the same time, with this goal in globalization, the development of a single "civilizational platform" is underway. This does not mean that globalization should become a means of ideological construction of national history. Instead, it is a cultural task to be solved jointly with other cultures in general. Globalization will inevitably affect the economic and demographic aspects of national life. And at the same time, many aspects of national life will not be able to be controlled entirely or successfully. They will rather be directed against the trends of globalization. The role of active citizenship in this process cannot be assigned to governments or parliaments, depending on the size of the contribution of these states to the development of the globalized world. But the participation of active citizens in these processes is not possible in the whole without the involvement of the state authorities. On the one hand, state power is already used in a familiar territory, where national structures are

equal. On the other hand, this management, which coordinates processes of a global nature, must be supplemented by state control over them.

It follows that another trend in the transformation of active citizenship is the growing role of the state in global processes. All international organizations and institutions are coordinated and controlled within the framework of state constitutions, the governmental role becomes more essential, and the development of democracy and freedom becomes more and more relevant. In addition, an active citizen participates in economic exchange, which in itself is a component of globalization. This is manifested in the growth of the country's financial resources, as well as in the expansion of consumption, the growth of production, and the improvement of the quality of life.

In our opinion, two different approaches to the problem of protecting freedom should not be confused: human freedom and freedom of citizens. In the first case, we are talking about the system of state institutions and individuals who are responsible for observing the agreement and implementing its terms. The second refers to a highly organized set of political and social institutions which can relate to one's territory and way of life. The real difference between these two positions is that, according to the first approach, freedom is achieved by agreement between all people. In the second case, freedom is achieved due to the delegation of political power in a hierarchical or another way. Therefore, we are in solidarity with Per Gustafson's opinion that is: "The real as well as symbolic importance of national citizenship today may differ very much between countries, depending on past and present migration, policies of naturalisation, rights and obligations associated with national citizenship, notions of national culture, and geopolitical situation" (Gustafson, 2002: 478).

These ideas give the grounds for distinguishing two levels of transformation of active citizenship in the era of globalization. The first one is interiorization, and the second is exteriorization. The goal achieved at the first level is, on the one hand, ensuring each person's personal freedom; on the other hand, establishing such an order in society under which it can function and perform its functions without interfering with other people's lives. At the second level, the social action of active citizens is mediated by political, social, and economic necessity. However, political and economic necessity makes political problems and solving economic contradictions necessary for citizens and society. From the standpoint of social philosophy, there is a direct parallel between norms and regulation. This does not mean that they are completely identical and that social control is the same social sign. Norms enabling social control are not the same as norms ensuring it. First of all, concepts express attitudes toward other people. Therefore, active citizenship is not only a social connection of people but also a way of existence characteristic of any civilized human community.

Conclusions

Having considered the trends of transformation of the phenomenon of active citizenship under the influence of globalization, it is shown that active citizenship becomes necessary to develop a new quality of social life and its adequacy to the spirit of the times. In the conditions of political pluralism, active citizenship is not only an intuitive status: it is belonging to a community, active participation in its life, and fulfilling a duty to the community, for example, in the matter of defense against military aggression.

Although an active citizen is a minority in society, active citizenship not only recognizes the presence of a global logic but, in many ways, shapes it because identity is born from meanings broadcasted by international economic and national political practices. An active

citizen under the conditions of globalization is forced to rely only on oneself since public authority, legislation, other social norms, and the organization of society prevent him from acting freely as a “sovereign” of his life. Participation of active citizens in these processes is not possible to the full extent without the involvement of state power. Therefore, one of the key trends in the transformation of active citizenship is the growth of the role of the state in processes of a global nature.

In our opinion, two different approaches to the problem of protecting freedom should not be confused: human freedom and freedom of citizens. In the first case, we are talking about the system of state institutions and individuals responsible for observing the agreement and implementing its terms. The second refers to a complexly organized set of political and social institutions that can relate to one’s territory and way of life.

Therefore, we identified two levels of active citizenship transformation in the globalization era. The first is interiorization (directed inward), and the second is exteriorization (directed outward). The goal achieved at the first level is, on the one hand, ensuring each person’s personal freedom; on the other hand, establishing such an order in society under which it can function and perform its functions without interfering with other people’s lives. At the second level, the social action of active citizens is mediated by political, social, and economic necessity.

In our opinion, active citizenship is a mechanism for preserving human freedom in conditions of economic inequality and specialization in the realities of globalization. In a more general form, globalization is a way of overcoming large countries’ institutional alienation. It is called the “Western way of life” or liberalization. Although Western society also acts as an instrument for protecting human freedom, it is still different from the most organized part of society, the traditional East.

References

- Acha, Omar (2018) The Places of Critical Universalism: Postcolonial and Decolonial Approaches in Context. In *Philosophy of Globalization*, 95-106.
- Alba-Meraz, Alejandro Roberto (2018) Complex Citizenship and Globalization. In *Philosophy of Globalization*, 17-31.
- Beck, Ulrich (2000) *What Is Globalization?* Available online: <https://eportfolios.macaulay.cuny.edu/maciuika14/files/2014/01/Beck-What-Is-Globalization.pdf>
- Confucius (1997) *The Analects of Confucius*. Translation and notes by Simon Leys. New York: W.W. Norton.
- European Commission website (2022) *Active citizenship*. Glossary. Available online: https://home-affairs.ec.europa.eu/pages/glossary/active-citizenship_en
- Favell, Adrian (2010) Citizenship and immigration: pathologies of a progressive philosophy. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 23., No. 2, 173-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.1997.9976585>
- Fukuyama, Francis (2014) *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Girox.
- Gustafson, Per (2002) Globalisation, multiculturalism and individualism: the Swedish debate on dual citizenship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, No. 28(3), 463-481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830220146554>
- Heilgendorff, Franz-Josef (2018) Conceptualizing Capitalist Globalization. In *Philosophy of Globalization*, 47-61.

-
-
- Hoskins, Bryony L., and Massimiliano Mascherini (2009) Measuring active citizenship through the development of a composite indicator. *Social indicators research*, Vol. 90, No. 3, 459-488. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9271-2>
- Kester, Kevin (2022) Global citizenship education and peace education: toward a postcritical praxis. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2022.2040483>
- Magnette, Paul (2005) *Citizenship: the history of an idea*. Ecpr Press.
- Plato (2007) *The Republic*. Penguin Classics.
- Ramin, Lucas von (2018) Globalization as a Symbolic Form: Ernst Cassirer's Philosophy of Symbolic Form as the Basis for a Theory of Globalization. In *Philosophy of Globalization*, 379-393.
- Robertson, Roland (2000) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Shafir, Gershon (1998) *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Terepyshchyi, Serhii, and Anastasiia Kostenko (2021) Media Literacy and Information Security in Education. *Studia Warmińskie*, Vol. 58, 133-141. <https://doi.org/10.31648/sw.7010>
- Yossi, Harpaz (2019) Citizenship 2.0. Dual Nationality as a Global Asset. In *Princeton Studies in Global and Comparative Sociology*. Princeton University Press.

Part 3:

COSMOS AND HISTORY

Divine Immanence in the Panentheistic Cosmology of Arthur Peacock

Igor Gudyma

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Mariupol State University (Cherkasy, Ukraine)
E-mail: igorgudyma67@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6053-216X>

Gudyma, Igor (2023) Divine Immanence in the Panentheistic Cosmology of Arthur Peacock. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 97-104. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/9>

This brief article examines the features of the panentheistic cosmology of the Protestant theologian Arthur Peacock, with particular attention to the conceptualization of divine immanence in his theological system. In addition, it reveals the organic connection between the categories of “faith” and “miracle” in Protestant theology, and shows the place and role of a miracle in the theological constructions of panentheism. All main conceptualizations of the philosopher and theologian Arthur Peacock are reduced to the so-called “panentheism formula”, according to which God is immanent in the universe, truly omnipresent, but his Being is not entirely reduced to natural, God is greater than nature and his Being surpasses nature. Having laid down the initial principles of his panentheistic cosmology, Peacock deductively deduces all the further key provisions of his concept, namely: the doctrine of the nature of the relationship between God and the world, the question of a miracle as a personal manifestation of the divine, etc. In the author’s worldview, the world acts as an arena and an instrument for achieving God of large-scale cosmic goals. However, in the ideas about the interaction of God with the world, the theologian also singles out the symbolic aspect, the main content of which is the initiative of God to reveal his Personality and demonstrate to man his divine nature. In other words, we are talking about the relationship of God with the individual and the human community, which reflects the creative essence of God and presupposes the existence of events that reveal important religious truths. In general, it should be recognized that the theorists of panentheism, including Arthur Peacock himself, made a significant contribution to the dialogue between religion and science, which was noted by

© Gudyma, Igor, 2023

researchers. However, wishing to preserve the intellectual respectability of their conceptualizations, the ideologists of panentheism bypass or extremely carefully and extremely correctly touch on individual complex problems of theology, the features of divine immanence, incl. and the question of miracle. All cases of the relationship between God and man, including the most extraordinary and super-intense experience of interpersonal communication, can, in their opinion, be more convincingly described in ordinary terms within the framework of their model of “downward influence” on the world, mediated by the components of this world.

Keywords: panentheism, theology, God, faith, science, miracle

Received: 7 July 2022 / Accepted: 17 August 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

Formulation of the problem. In modern public consciousness, one can clearly see signs of understanding that the picture of the world offered by science runs counter to the content of religious faith, or at least does not coincide with it. Such a situation actualizes the already acute questions of religion: whether and to what extent reasoning about God is justified, whether there is a correlation between theological concepts, categories, concepts and ideas with the existing state of reality. These and similar related questions concerning the status of theological terminology are indicative in terms of reflections on the internal nature of religion and its ability to reflect and interpret reality. On the other hand, the increased interest of philosophy in recent decades with traditional religious and theological issues has exposed the unconvincing assertions about the complete meaninglessness of the “question about God”, the facts of religious experience, which were formulated at the time of evaluating religion from the standpoint of logical positivism. Among these general metaphysical problems associated with the doctrine of God, a number of issues of particular value to theology, which improves the criteria of reasonableness, validity and evidence, as a response to the powerful challenges of the secularized world, are noteworthy, namely: the doctrine of the nature of the relationship between God and the world, the question of a miracle as a personal manifestation of the divine, etc.

Any philosophical and theological judgments about God, no matter how they are established, will certainly refer to the question of the presence of God in reality created by him, the ways of his self-disclosure in the world, and in the human heart. They acquire a special significance in light of the provisions of modern science, which significantly changes the nature and status of the corresponding theological reasoning. Philosophical and theological knowledge of God, in its theoretical interpretations of the means through which God expresses the nature of his plans for man and the world, proceeds from certain well-established ideas about the nature of God and his specific relationship with the world. In a variety of approaches to the issue of the relationship between the divine and the earthly, the following main types of its understanding are distinguished: theism, deism, pantheism and panentheism.

Particular attention in the modern intellectual climate is attracted by the theology of panentheism, whose representatives are trying to find new convincing and demonstrative conceptual resources for modeling the interaction of God with the world. *In this case, certain aspects of the work of one of the most gifted modern representatives of panentheism, Arthur Peacock, will be considered.* Peacock was and, even after his death, remains a prominent figure among academically minded scientists, a specialist in the field of physical biochemistry.

By the will of fate, having connected himself with theology, he devoted himself entirely to the issues of the connection between science and religion, the study of the specifics, role and place of theology in the age of science (Peacocke, 2004a; 2004b; 1993).

Presenting main material

It should be noted that the issues of divine immanence, and manifestations of God's participation in the destinies of the universe, are correlative to the specific doctrine of God, individual elements of which determine specific statements about the miraculous. On the other hand, the doctrine of a miracle is representative of the plan for establishing judgments about the nature of God, his relation to creation, etc. Peacock tries to establish what lies behind judgments about divine immanence, whether a miracle is a genuine act of faith or whether its originality and uniqueness are revealed exclusively in the plane of interpretation of faith. There are good reasons to believe that the desire to clarify the mode of reality of a miracle is extremely important for the theologian. Like every experienced theologian who builds his original religious and theological system, Peacock is well aware that by avoiding the "question of a miracle," each author runs the risk of seeing his work as incomplete and fragmentary, where, moreover, there are no separate significant internal connections.

The main and initial principle of Peacock's conceptualizations, which organically connects and synthesizes all other elements into a coherent and harmonious theoretical complex, is the so-called "panentheism formula". According to its content, the entire universe is permeated with the Being of God, so that every element of the universe exists in God, but the Being of God is greater than the universe and is not limited by it. God is recognized as absolute reality in his transcendence and relative reality in his ability to be omnipresent in the world, its processes, events and phenomena. The theoretical basis of Peacock's concept is also based on a number of basic ideas thematized in the provisions on divine being and becoming.

Traditionally, theologians (including the theologians of panentheism) make a distinction between the essence of God, what he is (his "being"), on the one hand, and his active aspect, that is, what he does (his "becoming"), with another. Such a distinction, according to the theologians themselves, is very arbitrary, if only because when formulating judgments about the essence of God, we inevitably turn to his manifestations in the visible, phenomenal world, proceed from how we understand his impact on the universe. However, the recognition of the causal connection between God and the world, which makes it possible to enrich static theology with dynamic metaphors, makes it possible for theology to infer the conclusion from the nature of the world to the essence of God. Thus, the position on the cognizability of the world gives grounds for recognizing the rationality of God; the sequence and orderliness of the processes of the universe indicates God's adherence to established laws, and the continuity of these processes indicates the constant immanent creative presence of God in the world. The researcher Willem B. Dree said very well about this way of thinking: "If God's presence is the starting point, the divine reality is somehow "showing through" in our ordinary reality. A religion along this line could be called mystical; the aim is to establish contact with that divine reality. It suggests the possibility of an inductive apologetic argument from science to theology" (Beginning with the end, 1999: 237).

In addition, an integral component of the speculative constructions of the ideologists of panentheism, developing its initial theoretical premises, is the concept of vulnerability voluntarily imposed on itself by God and the concept of His kenotic (self-limiting) nature. God, having made possible the openness of creation to various development options, voluntarily limited his omnipotence and kenotically outlined his omniscience in the name of

the true freedom of creation. Self-limitation in relation to the omnipotence of God, according to theologians, may mean that in the world created by God, there are spaces where he deliberately does not use his omnipotence (in particular, in relation to the free will of man); the same sign applied to omniscience may indicate that in the world at certain moments the existence of systems is possible, whose state in the future is unknown even to God, since they are fundamentally unknowable.

The natural inability of a person to comprehend a phenomenon from the point of view of its generative cause leads theists to postulate the activity of God in unpredictable situations, for the theological legitimization of the concepts of the presence and activity of God, a miracle. Hence, this idea is designed to fill the existing epistemic gap. However, such theological constructions turn out to be completely unacceptable for adherents of pantheism, which is especially evident in the work of Peacock. The use of the idea of the “God of white spots”, in his opinion, is always threatened by time, with the passage of which God is gradually being replaced by the development of science, this is first. And secondly, modeling the picture of the world, where God acts in situations that are unpredictable for humanity, does not fundamentally differ from traditional monarchical models of divine actions, where God, interacting with the world, “intervenes” in a rigidly determined order, ideas about which have developed thanks to the provisions of Newton’s physics. The dissimilarity between these two concepts of divine actions remote in time, and the cultural atmosphere turns out to be only in the interpretation of the degree of manifestation of the consequences of actions: God’s creativity in unpredictable situations would always be unobvious for a person, while God’s intervention in the cause-and-effect chains of a strictly determined world (the monarchical model) would certainly reveal itself in certain events, in a miracle that would violate the established laws of the universe.

Assessing the teaching of Christianity about divine immanence, about the presence of God in the realm of creation, it should be said that this teaching is extremely difficult to understand, difficult to argue, and in some places even completely paradoxical. Researchers of Arthur Peacock’s work drew attention to this: “The Christian understanding of divine presence in the world is complicated and paradoxical” (Brodrick, 2012: 12). However, in this regard, especially in terms of the doctrine of divine immanence, pantheism is more promising and looks to the future of theology. And this is despite the fact that some provisions of pantheism still require an additional evidence base, a broader argumentation. And here, in overcoming important problems of Christian theology, special merit belongs to two prominent theologians, Arthur Peacock and Jurgen Moltmann. This is also obvious to scholars of pantheism: “Particularly with its suggestion that God is present in the world and in every part of it, pantheism seems more promising, and, at least in the form presented by Peacocke and Moltmann, appears capable of surmounting these problems. Yet pantheism encounters problems of its own” (Attfield, 2019: 167).

The very idea of God’s intervention as a way to accomplish a miracle is questioned by pantheist theorists. According to them, God more convincingly proves his commitment to the world by maintaining the laws laid down in his (the world’s) foundation, rather than by interfering in the same initiated chains of cause-and-effect relationships. The idea of intervention, according to Peacock, leads us to the need to imagine God, who acts in a relatively deistic way, i.e. in a sense, staying outside the universe created by him and from time to time returning to it to realize his plans. In addition, the theologian argues, the position of God as the guarantor of rationality and order is blurred by the idea that God himself can revise previously made decisions and act logically inconsistently in relation to the

world and man, invading the laws laid down by him at the foundations of the universe. The comprehension of the eternal moral question – if unexpected interventions of God do take place, then why does he not interfere in earthly affairs to prevent catastrophes and dramas of human existence – makes the theses about God's intervention very doubtful. And finally, the immanence of God, which manifests itself in the form of a general unceasing activity to preserve the unchanging order established in time immemorial, annihilates the need for any special acts of God associated with the need to violate the laws established by him.

The ideas of the invasion of God, which, according to popular belief, were a legacy of the domination of the mechanistic cultural paradigm, at one time performed an important function of protecting theism from deistic ideas about God, who does not interfere in the development of the universe. The theoretical justification and substantiation of the idea of the continuous and varied influence of God on the way he established were intended to affirm God in all the fullness and integrity of his creative possibilities, which were catastrophically narrowed down by representatives of deism, belittling the role of God in nature. A common place for theologians is the opinion that a God who does not carry out direct creative acts and powerful miraculous deeds, a God who does not enter into direct contact with a person and does not bring to his attention a unique Revelation, loses contact with man.

And yet, the intervention of God in the order created by him and miracles cause a very cautious attitude among the ideologists of panentheism. They doubtfully refer to the classical theistic models of God's interaction with the world, where the idea of special divine actions dominates, directing, and even unexpectedly changing events, as a result of which such events stand out in everyday life. Particularly vulnerable, in their opinion, is the idea of the "mechanisms" of such an impact, of the point of concentration of God's efforts, since the focus of his attention to the world in a special providence and a miracle, according to theists, is focused on causal chains. However, modern science, offering a picture of the world supposedly closed to external causal intrusions, creates difficulties for theists in explaining how God can realize his special providence without invading his own created sequences of events, subordinating them to his new plans.

Peacocke, constantly creatively supporting the dialogue of science and theology, does not oppose them to any images. Despite the fact that a number of modern thinkers draw a pronounced divide between these ways of comprehending the world (Barbour, 2003). Here Peacocke, like every academically minded scientist, pays tribute to scientific knowledge, his knowledge of objectivity, consistency, and evidence, but, meanwhile, he recognizes that levels of the adequate are also inherent in religion (Peacocke, 2004a: 37-38). Moreover, in later periods of his work, Peacocke increasingly emphasizes the indispensable need for a dialogue between faith and knowledge, religion and science (Peacocke, 2004b: 174). And even what researchers pay attention to, seeks to isolate in religion the signs of objectivity inherent in science: "Arthur Peacocke discusses various similarities (as well as dissimilarities) between science and religion, but is much more adamant that religion/theology must be brought into the scientific fold" (Pietersen, 2014: 2159).

Thus, the modern scientific picture of the world suggests that the causal relationships of the world order are closed to the intrusion of external causal agents. The nomological structure of the universe proposed by modern science, which is expressed in its most fundamental laws, is inconsistent with the postulation of external forced causality. This is a rather serious challenge to current theistic cosmology, which is pointed out by a contemporary author, professor at the University of Pittsburgh, Adolf Grünbaum, in his discussion with the famous Orthodox theologian Richard Swinburne: "It is precisely this rootedness of the laws of nature

in the very fabric of the universe, which makes them ontologically inseparable from its fabric, that adds to the burden of proof assumed by the traditional theist who claims to explain the nomic structure of the world by what God, as a causal agent, willed or had the intention that she be exactly the way she is” (Grünbaum, 2004: 587).

Arthur Peacock recognizes the attractiveness of the picture of the world, where theoretically, God can call to life a new reality, canceling the laws and connections created by him. However, Peacock develops, as it seems to him, a more acceptable, in the modern intellectual climate, picture of God’s world government. According to Peacock, God should be presented as the absolute basis and source of regularity and, at the same time, as a great and original improviser, in whose power is chance. Establishing only for him a driven harmony between necessity and chance, God takes risks in his creativity when resorting to something new. The physical world performs an instrumental function in relation to God, since it acts for God as a means of realizing deep transcendental goals. God holistically (universally) influences the world as a system of systems, moreover, through the influence of the world system on its individual elements, God achieves the desired results that meet his plans. The principle of personal participation is an integral component of the theological model of the “God-world” relationship that Peacock proposes. In his opinion, God enters into a relationship with a person by communicating with him through the elements of the world (for example, through religious experience), filling individual events with special meaning. In the model of such an ontological connection between God and the world system, the possibility of specific, unexpected actions of God in the world is not directly denied, although the probabilistic rational basis of relations is substantiated, where God influences the general state of the system holistically, without intrusion and violation of the laws inherent in the system. The fundamental possibility of special divine actions (miracles) that would help the world and humanity to get out of crisis situations is not completely denied here, however, the specific understanding of God, who achieves the realization of his plans in other effective ways, pushes this kind of God’s providential concern for the universe to the periphery of his divine activity.

Critics of panentheism see the reason for its popularity in the meticulous development by representatives of panentheism of an acceptable way to comprehend the actions of God in the world. However, these thinkers nevertheless note that individual authors have not achieved noticeable success in this field because of the main obstacle – the conceptual position laid as a cornerstone in the basis of panentheism leads in the end to the following unacceptable consequences – or God is too sensitive to changes in history, or the world is extremely dependent on divine manipulations. With regard to Arthur Peacock as a thinker, theologian, straightforward and rather sharp criticisms were made regarding the excessive rationality of his concept and, at the same time, the pronounced anemic nature of his theology, the insufficiency of his appeal to the Christian religious tradition, and his unwillingness to rely on the richness of Revelation – “Peacocke’s scientific-rationalist sentiment overshadows his theology, which seems bleak and anemic in comparison to theologies more affirmative of traditional doctrines” (Engel, 2008: 44).

However, religion and its intellectual expression, theology, cannot completely abandon the idea of a miracle. The idea of a miracle is the most important element of the religious worldview. A miracle is a visible expression of God’s omnipotence. God who does not work miracles, according to the well-known expression of Epicurus, is weak and insignificant. Rather, therefore, a direct discussion of the likelihood of miracles is accompanied by a number of reservations in Peacock’s theorizing. First, our identifications of events as

“miraculous” depend, according to the author, on the peculiarities of our understanding of historical facts. The latter is entirely due to the initial principles for evaluating events that are commonly regarded as miraculous. At the same time, as it seems to the theologian, God, in the realization of his global transcendental intentions, would be forced to remove from himself the voluntary restrictions of omnipotence, imposed by him earlier. Trying to get out of essentially tautological explanations, the author is forced to admit that it is difficult to name events that fully satisfy all the signs of the concept of “miracle”, although this possibility should not be completely discarded.

Peacock’s earlier conceptualizations of the “God-world” relationship concerned the model of the “instrumental” type of such interaction, the model in which the world acts as an instrument for God to achieve large-scale cosmic goals. However, in the ideas about the interaction of God with the world, the theologian further also singles out the symbolic aspect, the main content of which is the initiative of God to reveal his Personality and demonstrate to man his divine nature. In other words, we are talking about the relationship of God with the individual and the human community, which reflects the creative essence of God and presupposes the existence of events that reveal important religious truths. In general, this kind of interaction between God and the universe is presented by Peacock as a kind of downward influence of God on the world, mediated by various components of the world. Such contacts between God and man become possible, according to the theologian’s explanations, through a mediated religious experience in which individual components of everyday life are endowed by God with a special meaning and meaning that is different from others. In essence, this kind of interaction can be considered, Peacock argues, as interpersonal communication, the driving mechanism of which is the initiative of God to enter information descending from him – God to man (Peacocke A. R., 1993: 59).

Here again, the theologians of panentheism face an important theological problem – whether God, being the omnipotent Creator of all things, can deprive himself of any restrictions with which he previously regulated his relations with the world order. In other words, can we assume the existence of a number of initiatives of God through which direct communication between God and man would be carried out, bypassing natural means (components of the world)? And do we need to recognize that a person has such a level in the structure of his personality, which would have the ability to enter into direct contact with God, without using any traditional mediating tools? In this case is clear too, the theologian’s reluctance to recognize the possibility of God’s miraculous acts, i.e. special, completely different ways of God’s contacts with human consciousness.

Conclusions

In general, it should be recognized that the theorists of panentheism, including Arthur Peacock himself, made a significant contribution to the dialogue between religion and science, which was noted by researchers. However, wishing to preserve the intellectual respectability of their conceptualizations, the ideologists of panentheism bypass or extremely carefully and extremely correctly touch on individual complex problems of theology, the features of divine immanence, incl. and the question of miracles. All cases of the relationship between God and man, including the most extraordinary and super-intense experience of interpersonal communication, can, in their opinion, be more convincingly described in ordinary terms within the framework of their model of “downward influence” on the world, mediated by the components of this world. In general, the attempt to intellectualize the relationship “God – the world”, undertaken by them, inevitably led to the demystification of the miracle, the loss

of its authentic, proper religious content. If in the well-known formula of the divine presence, a miracle – “incredibly, impossible, but a fact” to remove their essential characteristics – incomprehensibility, surprise and, at the same time, the actual factual content, then having overcome the limit of the essential in relation to a miracle, we will not talk about a miracle, but something else.

References

- Attfield, R. (2019) Panentheisms, Creation and Evil. *Open Theology*, No 5, 166-181.
- Barbour, I. (2003) Science and Religion, Models and Relations. *N.R. Howell and J.W. Van Huyssteen, eds.: Encyclopedia of science and religion*. New York: Macmillan Reference.
- Beginning with the end. God, Science, and Wolfhart Pannenberg* (1999) Edited by Carol Rausch Albright and Joel Haugen Open Court Chicago and La Salle, Illinois.
- Contingency, Time, and the Theological Ambiguity of Science. Willem B. Dree. March 26, 1999, 217-247.
- Brodrick, R. (2012) *From Divine Action to Divine Presence: The Next Step in an Integrated Cosmology of Science and Theology*. Lumen et Vita. Vol. 2, 1-15.
- Engel, T. W. (2008) *Speaking of God in an Age of Science*. REL-3901: Masteroppgave studieretning i teologi Institutt for religionsvitenskap Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Grünbaum, A. (2004) The Poverty of Theistic Cosmology. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 55 (4): 561-614.
- Herman J. Pietersen. Professor, University of Limpopo (2014) Science and Religion in Meta-Perspective – Part II. Turfloop Campus 0727, Republic of South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol 5. No 20. September 2014. 2151-2163.
- Peacocke, A.R. (2004a) *Creation and the world of science: The re-shaping of belief*, 2nd paperback edition ed., original publication: 1979. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peacocke, A.R. (2004b) *Evolution, the disguised friend of faith?* Selected essays Philadelphia; London: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Peacocke, A.R. (1993) *Theology for a scientific age: being and becoming – natural, divine, and human*. 1st Fortress Press ed., original publication: 1990. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wilhelm Dilthey's Rethinking of Hegelianism

Iryna Liashenko

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: iryna_liashenko@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3912-2075>

Liashenko, Iryna (2023) Wilhelm Dilthey's Rethinking of Hegelianism. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/10>

This article presents the main results of the rethinking of Hegel's philosophy and Hegelianism, which Wilhelm Dilthey carried out in The History of Hegel's Youth. This study is based on the author's translation from the German of Wilhelm Dilthey's work Die Jugendgeschichte Hegels.

Hegel's philosophy became one of the foundations of the picture of the natural world, the world of man, culture, and history, which even now functions as a paradigm of world philosophy and has a significant influence on modern intellectual culture and our image of the world. The article includes an analysis of the methodology developed by Wilhelm Dilthey for understanding Hegel's philosophy, the central element of which is a personal approach. It reveals the intellectual background of Wilhelm Dilthey's rethinking of Hegel's philosophy and analyses the influence of Dilthey's interpretation of Hegel's philosophy on the transformation of the picture of the world of European culture, which is related to Hegel's philosophy. The author proves that the cosmological model of Hegel's philosophy is based on the personal experiences of the philosopher in his youth, which allows us to interpret Hegel's philosophy as mystical, irrational, and pantheistic.

Keywords: Wilhelm Dilthey, history of philosophy, Hegelianism, The History of Hegel's Youth, hermeneutics, philosophy of life

Received: 4 December 2022 / Accepted: 6 January 2023 / Published: 5 February 2023

Methodological Foundations of Dilthey's Studies in the History of Philosophy

Studies in the history of philosophy are an essential part of Wilhelm Dilthey's works and are associated with his hermeneutical conception and philosophy of life. The history of philosophy is the basis of Dilthey's *Critique of Historical Reason* programme. The content of the hermeneutical method is revealed in relation to the history of philosophy, and not only as a text (unlike traditional hermeneutics). The way in which the history of philosophy is known as one of the sciences of the spirit is not only a reading of the text, a description, but also a living and experiencing of life. From this follows the significant workload of Dilthey's

© Liashenko, Iryna, 2023

interpretation of biographical and personal worldview analysis methods in historical and philosophical research. Biography interests the thinker not as the external conditions of a person's life but as a way of revealing the "creative laboratory" of an outstanding figure of the past. The "personal worldview" approach limits schematisation in historical and philosophical research, although its elements are an integral part of the latter.

Wilhelm Dilthey uses the method of cultural analysis in the history of philosophy as a condition for understanding the inclusion of the historical and philosophical process in the general culture of humankind, and in "life" as a whole. Therefore, all studies by Wilhelm Dilthey contain a detailed analysis of the "non-philosophical" context. The application of this method can be seen especially clearly in Wilhelm Dilthey's works *The Life of Schleiermacher* (Dilthey, 1970) and *The History of Hegel's Youth* (Dilthey, 1905). According to Wilhelm Dilthey, the dominant genre of the history of philosophy should be biography, and history should be understood as a stream of individuals. In fact, history is made by people who pursue their own different goals. Wilhelm Dilthey's project is reduced to the selection of those individuals who can cause experiences.

The primary purpose of Dilthey's studies on history is to analyse the personal worldview aspect of the historical development of philosophy. According to Wilhelm Dilthey, the main task of historical and philosophical research is a critical review of the understanding of the historical and philosophical process as an "anarchy of systems" and the possibilities of its schematisation. Unlike Hegel, Wilhelm Dilthey proposes understanding the history of philosophy as an integral part of historical science and the sciences of the spirit as a whole, within which it is necessary to abandon problem-categorical schematisations and depersonalisations.

In his concept of the history of philosophy, Wilhelm Dilthey singles out "categories of life" and "categories of history". The categories of life are designed to interpret the lives of individuals. According to Dilthey, the way of cognition of life is the analysis of the understanding of its higher forms, which requires a particular specialised art of interpretation. According to Wilhelm Dilthey, interpretation is a set of mental efforts and their rules, as well as an intellectual effort to understand the inner spiritual meaning of one or another of its external expressions. Interpretation becomes interpretation when the external expression becomes verbal: a text.

The categories of history reflect historical reality, which acts as a "living". Dilthey often uses the concepts of life and historical reality as identical: History is only life, viewed from the point of view of holistic humanity.

Dilthey defines the categories of the history of philosophy in the semantic field of the "philosophy of life." The categories of history of philosophy express the trinity of the *experience* of certain life states and processes, *expression* ("objectification of life") and *understanding*, which, in their theoretical content, reflect the level of the method of giving historical experience (including historical and philosophical) and the conditions for the possibility of its construction and cognition.

Thus, Wilhelm Dilthey developed the draft *Critique of Historical Reason*, which he associated with Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, the main question of which was "how is history possible?" Dilthey interprets history not as a descriptive discipline (historiography) but as a science about the fluid world of human creations (about the world of "spirit"). Considering the sphere of spirit as the sphere of the objectification of human life, Wilhelm Dilthey gradually became closer to Hegel, developing the concept of the "objective spirit" he used in his later works.

Wilhelm Dilthey's ideas in the history of philosophy are presented in the works *Descriptive and dismembering psychology* (1990, *Ideen zur einer beschreibenden und zergliedernden Psychologie*), *Introduction to the sciences of spirit* (1883, *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften*), *Building the historical world in the sciences of spirit* (1910, *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*), *Types of worldview and their detection in metaphysical systems* (1974, *Die Typen der Weltanschauungen ihre Ausbildung in denaphysis Systemen*). *The Essence of Philosophy* (1907), *Das Wesen der Philosophie*, *A View of the World and the Study of Man from the Renaissance and the Reformation*, *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung. Lessing, Goethe, Novalis, Holderlin* (1905). They had a significant influence on the formation and development of other schools, trends, and directions of European history of philosophy of the twentieth century (new historicism, phenomenology, neo-Kantianism, cultural-historical monadology, analytical philosophy of history, philosophical hermeneutics, etc.).

Wilhelm Dilthey could rightly be considered the founder of a *new historicism* with his *Critique of Historical Reason* project. Historicism excludes the position of the immanent inclusion of cognition in the process of comprehending history. According to Wilhelm Dilthey, the methodological clarity of the basis of historical cognition is to distance oneself from the cognitive procedures of the natural sciences. Therefore, understanding is opposed to explanation as a rational construction of theoretical schemes. Dilthey highlighted two vectors in the history of philosophy: the historical vector of understanding the past and the communicative vector of understanding the present. Both vectors are based on the procedure of "use" and "sympathy" from the study of consciousness. It is as difficult for the historian to capture the initial impulse of the act of the communicative partner as it is to reconstruct the era. Both in the first and in the second case, there is a unique situation, a fundamentally single event, "non-explanatory", because what is explained is summed up under the general, or, to put it simply, "stick labels"). To understand the other, both communicatively and historically, is to see the situation through his eyes, to think like him.

Historical background of Dilthey's rethinking of Hegelianism

Among the researchers of the evolution of young Hegel's thinking, the most famous are Karl Rosenkranz, Rudolf Heym, and Hermann Nohl. They appealed to the first periods of his philosophy and still had enough material. The first researchers of Hegel's philosophical evolution were motivated by a desire to show his real historical sources. The very first start to write a biography of his teacher fell to Eduard Gans.

In the same year, this task was taken over by Karl Rosenkranz (1805-1879) – the author of *The Life of Hegel* (*Hegels Leben*), which was published in 1844. This work resulted from work on family archives and a complete set of Hegel's manuscripts. He believed that the life and creative path to Hegel's system of absolute idealism (Hegel) had been defined since his first studies. The primary task that Karl Rosenkranz set for himself was to set out Hegel's path to his system as a development that did not have significant deviations. Therefore, he unconsciously searched for outlines of the system already where it did not yet exist, thereby ignoring the independent significance of other ideas. However, due to certain inaccuracies and errors, this work still has significant historical and philosophical significance, including the establishment of an essential significance in the formation of the Hegelian philosophy of the so-called Frankfurt period – the time of cooperation with Friedrich Hölderlin. Karl Rosenkranz can be considered the second, more noteworthy achievement of Rosenkranz's

work, the formulation of the idea of the entire philosophy of Hegel, as such that “there is no more incorrect and superficial idea of Hegelian philosophy than that which sees in it only criticism or only logic... Hegel’s system is most likely a philosophy of spirit in the sense that it has the concept of spirit alone and makes possible the concept of nature and ideas” (Rosenkranz, 1843, p. 100). Thus, according to Rosenkranz, Hegel’s philosophy is not only not as logical as a specific doctrine of a particular *spirit*. It became so thanks to Hegel’s Protestant-religious studies. “Hegel’s philosophy is essentially Protestant.” Therefore, according to Rosenkranz, spirit, not an absolute idea, is the basis of Hegel’s philosophy.

A new stage in the study of Hegel’s youth was the work of Rudolf Haym (1821-1901) – *Hegel and his time* (1857, *Hegel und seine Zeit*). Rudolf Haym was an advocate of historicism and psychologism, the foundations of which he tried to find in Hegel’s philosophy, criticising his desire for systematisation and the methods on which he based his criticism. Denying all Hegel’s systematic constructions as obsolete, Rudolf Haym reduced them to psychological motives and movements of the soul. But already, the young Hegel wanted to see anything systematic. In his work, Rudolf Haym highlighted a critical attitude towards Hegel and his philosophy: “I want to give first of all an objective *history of this philosophy*” (Haym, 1962). Haym’s book was such a huge success that by the end of the nineteenth century, it had defined a critical attitude towards Hegel’s philosophy, responding to the sentiments that had taken root in philosophy at that time, and remained popular for almost 100 years.

The revival of interest in Hegel’s philosophy from the depths of the philosophy of life is all the more interesting. The turning point in the understanding of Hegel’s philosophy was made by the work of Wilhelm Dilthey, *The History of Hegel’s Youth* (*Die Jugendgeschichte Hegels*) in 1905, where he found a related idea of history as historical *life* in Hegel’s philosophy. Working on Hegel’s manuscript heritage, Wilhelm Dilthey, in 1902, attracted the cooperation of twenty-two-year-old student Herman Nohl, who was actively involved in Dilthey’s research. Fulfilling the wishes of his teacher, in 1905–06 Hermann Nohl undertook the systematic processing of the manuscripts of the young Hegel, and in 1907 published the work *Theological Works of the Young Hegel* (*Hegels theologische Jugendschriften*) (See: Nohl H., 1907), where all the manuscripts of Hegel from 1790 to 1800, except abstracts, sermons, and political works, were published. This work is still the main source of all research on Hegel’s youth period. Here is how Hermann Nohl characterised the appeal of Hegel for Wilhelm Dilthey: “Both the history of metaphysics, and especially the history of evolutionary–historical pantheism, and the history of the emergence of historical consciousness and the structure of the spiritual world were to meet in the task of comprehending Hegel’s place” (Nohl, 1959: 5).

Wilhelm Dilthey tried in his work to show how ideas related to this subject are formed in his mind through reference to Hegel’s theological texts. *The History of Hegel’s Youth* is a rather “late” work by Wilhelm Dilthey. Usually, Wilhelm Dilthey’s appeal to Hegel is explained by the fact that he needed it for the completeness of historical understanding, for understanding the “origins of German idealism and the concept of historical life developed in it.” After all, Hegel puts the category of life in the foreground. He will talk about the spirit and the idea much later. Wilhelm Dilthey convincingly showed that life for the young Hegel (as well as for Wilhelm Dilthey) is richer. “Life experience” is not reduced to reason and is, therefore, irrational. Therefore, Wilhelm Dilthey demands an irrational worldview. “Here is the limit of logical thinking about the basis of the world, and mysticism is given to reflect its living essence” (Dilthey, 1911).

Wilhelm Dilthey began his career as a Kantian. But when confronted with a certain limitation, he increasingly turned to Hegel's philosophy, which guided him to new studies of the "objective spirit" and also provided a methodological compass for his analysis. There were signs of Hegel's early influence on Wilhelm Dilthey. First of all, we can recall one of the first philosophical teachers, Kuno Fischer, whose courses he attended at the theological faculty of the University of Heidelberg, and Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg, whose seminars in the history of philosophy he attended at the University of Berlin. Wilhelm Dilthey himself tried to find what he had in common with Hegel.

Already Hans-Georg Gadamer at the time drew attention to the fact that "[...] in the later years, Wilhelm Dilthey is becoming more and more loyal to Hegel and talks about the *spirit* where he had previously said "life". He repeats the conceptual development that Hegel has already gone through in the same way. In light of this fact, it becomes remarkable that Wilhelm Dilthey is obliged to familiarise himself with the theological manuscripts of the young Hegel. From these materials on the history of the development of Hegelian thinking, it follows with complete clarity that the "pneumatic" concept of life is the basis of the Hegelian concept of spirit" (Gadamer, 2011).

Wilhelm Dilthey began to work on the early manuscripts of Hegel around 1900–1901. His interest in Hegel was so deep that in 1899–1900, Wilhelm Dilthey is the initiator of the competition for the Academy of Sciences Prize for the best research on the topic: "The history of the evolution of the Hegelian system is historically interpreted using manuscripts stored in the Royal Library in Berlin." Only one anonymous paper was submitted to the contest. This did not satisfy Wilhelm Dilthey, and he immersed himself in the study of the manuscripts of the young Hegel. The result of this was the work *The History of the Hegel's Youth* (*Die Jugendgeschichte Hegels*), which was first published in 1905, and later supplemented in Volume IV of *Collected Works* by Wilhelm Dilthey (1924 and 1958) with manuscripts from the archive.

To understand the attitude towards Wilhelm Dilthey's work, we would like to quote the German neo-Hegelian Hermann Glockner: "It was a work that opened up new ways. It can be said that the restoration of Hegelianism originates not in the pedantically systematic monograph of Kuno Fischer but in the genius of the modern, youthful image of him that Dilthey skillfully portrayed" (Glockner, 1940).

Obviously, it was too resonant a work in the world of European Hegelianism, so it was always under consideration and, of course, criticised, as a rule, not quite fairly. In Marxist Hegelian literature, for example, the treatment of *The History of Hegel's Youth* was entirely unacceptable. It was either ignored or disregarded. A rather unfair attitude to Dilthey's *The History of Hegel's Youth* can be considered to have begun with György Lukács, a Hungarian Marxist philosopher, historian of culture and philosophy, who encroached on Hegel's "objective" history with "Young Hegel and the problems of capitalist society". Beginning with Lukács, Wilhelm Dilthey has been unanimously accused of rationalising or theologising Hegel's thinking and stylising or interpreting his philosophical views in the spirit of the philosophy of life. Since then, Wilhelm Dilthey's accusation of Hegel's "irrationalist falsification" has become the norm and has been repeated from one reference edition and textbook to another.

Of course, one can blame Wilhelm Dilthey and the Neo-Hegelians for rationalising young Hegel's thinking. However, it can be assumed that this "irrationalism" and even Hegel's mysticism was an attempt to overcome the enlightening form of rationalism.

The History of Hegel's Youth contributed to the revival of neo-Hegelianism. It still has not lost its importance. It allows for a deeper understanding of the creative path of the philosopher and, therefore, his whole teaching. Hans-Georg Gadamer did not exaggerate at all when he praised Wilhelm Dilthey as “an outstanding historian of philosophy” (Gadamer, 1979).

Irrational background of Hegel's Philosophy of the World, Spirit and Logic Hegel's rationalism on the mystical background

The History of Hegel's Youth, according to Hans Gadamer, opened a new era in the study of Hegel” (Gadamer, 2011). From now on, Hegel becomes modern and the source of almost all new topics, ideas, and problems. The philosophical system, which was finally formed in the Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences, grew out of the romantic-poetic, irrationalist, and theological searches of an outstanding young German philosopher. This convincingly proves the analysis of his early notes and works.

Wilhelm Dilthey tried to solve the Hegelian question: “How to explain the ‘miraculous revolution?’ in which Christianity triumphs over the religions of ancient peoples. This problem has not been solved by rationalist historiography, and here flows one of the living sources of historical contemplation, one of those that are then combined into one broad stream of his *The Phenomenology of Spirit* and *The Philosophy of Spirit* (Dilthey, 1905: 32-33).

For example, Hegel understands the disintegration of Greek religiosity through political change and finds in this disintegration an explanation that the nation had to seek restoration—a new unity in the Christian consciousness. Greek religiosity did not give way to Christianity, as falsehood gave way to truth; it had to disappear along with the conditions under which it was effective. Devotion to the state gave way to the care of the individual for his private life; when the freedom of the classical peoples collapsed, their gods could not provide them with a substitute for this loss and could not console them. The Greeks and Romans, therefore, found the realisation of their needs, aimed at the absolute, in Christianity. “The miserable and miserable condition of the oppressed Romans made them prone to expect the rapid destruction of the world and the appearance of the Messiah.” Just as the religiosity of the Jews after the internal disintegration of their state and their culture into parties and sects, with the decline of Greek state life and the Roman republican order, the spiritual life contained in them began to decay. “When men realised the dominance of their ideas over objects, genius separated itself from humanity” (Dilthey, 1905: 179-180). Here, Wilhelm Dilthey is talking about a historical essay that could be attributed to Jena times, developing it in a way that resembles *The Phenomenology of Spirit* and its three forms of self-consciousness – stoicism, scepticism, and unhappy consciousness.

Let us analyse Dilthey's argument. An outstanding idea in world Hegelian studies is Dilthey's substantiation of the thesis that the Hegelian philosophical system has its roots in mystical pantheism. Dilthey proceeds from the fragments expressing the then Hegelian mystical pantheism most clearly, the time of which can be determined from the outside, and tries to establish the context of mystical ideas manifested by Hegel even when he was in Frankfurt and during his study of theological problems. Further, in this context, Dilthey organised individual places located in the theological fragments of this period.

Already in the mature period of his work, Hegel said about the correlation of dialectics and mysticism: “Regarding speculative thinking, we must also note that this expression should be understood as the same thing that previously applied mainly to religious consciousness. And it was called mysticism. When in our time they talk about mysticism, as a rule, they use this

word in the sense of the mysterious and incomprehensible and, depending on the education received, and the image of thoughts, some look at this mysterious and incomprehensible as something real and true, and others see it as superstition and deception. We must, first of all, observe that the mystical is undoubtedly something mysterious, but it is mysterious only to the understanding, and this is simply because the principle of the understanding is abstract identity, and the principle of the mystical (as a synonym for speculative thinking) is the concrete unity of those definitions that the understanding recognises as true in their separateness and opposition.” And further: “It is reasonable we, accordingly, should be called mystical, saying only that it is beyond reason, and not that it should be considered in general as inaccessible to thinking and incomprehensible” (Hegel, 2014).

In general, it must always be borne in mind that German mystics greatly influenced Hegel. Already in Bern, he carefully outlined Meister Eckhart and Johannes Tauler. Later, he studied Jakob Böhme. Sympathy for mysticism did not leave Hegel throughout his life. Even in adulthood, the great rationalist sympathises with Franz Xaver von Baader (1756–1841). It was in the mystics, perhaps not first of all, that Hegel drew the idea of the coincidence of opposites, which implied all his dialectics.

The matter is more complicated regarding the *pantheism* of early Hegelian philosophy, but not as hopeless. Listen to Hegel again. “Pantheism, in general, comes down to dismemberment and systematisation. Where it is in the form of representation, it is a drunken life, a Bacchic contemplation that does not allow it to act as a dismembered single form of the universe. However, this view constitutes, for every healthy nature, a *natural starting point, especially in my youth [...]*” (Hegel, 2014a). Pantheism was the “natural starting point” of the young Hegel. And in the mature system, as Karl Marx pointed out in *The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism* (*Die heilige Familie, oder Kritik der kritischen Kritik*. Gegen Bruno Bauer & Consorten), pantheism (in Spinoza’s version it was, along with Fichte’s self-consciousness, an immanent component of absolute idealism). Hegel more than once classified Spinoza as a “true” pantheist, openly and unequivocally. And even when he considers spirit to be the highest definition of the absolute, and when he finds more precise definitions of his philosophical views and doctrine, Hegel will never betray his youthful pantheistic admiration. The concept of pantheism will be filled with only a more specific meaning.

Dilthey believes that from the earliest works, Hegel applied a method that will appear only later in a more mature form in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Hegel comprehended the concepts of the transition from one general mental order (as in Judaism) – through various moments – to another (as in the religion of Christ). By applying this method under the influence of Immanuel Kant, Hegel understood the transition from the outer church faith to the religion of reason. “Hegel had previously experienced his own liberation struggle against theology through Kantian science... and now the same thing has happened; the new experience that has occurred in him has been the rejection of the abstract separation of the general moral rule from the drives of life, the transcendent deity from the human soul, the great realms of reality from one another, as has happened in the new pantheism, and through this experience, he has now understood the genesis and essence of Christianity. Both ways of representing the genesis of Christianity have in common that the transition from Judaism to Christianity is depicted through the internal connection of concepts” (Dilthey, 1905: 184).

Criticising Kant, Hegel publishes the article “Natural Law” (“Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, oder Naturrecht und Staatswissenschaft im Grundrisse”), the content of which is further distributed in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. In “Natural Law”, Hegel depicts and

criticises the moral point of view. It emphasises, as valuable in the practical sense of Kant, that he transfers the absolute to the sphere of freedom: practical reason is distinguished by the nature of the infinite, but a finite set of empirical stimuli limits it. Thus, the real becomes alien to the ideal, being in a frozen antithesis. The striving of sensibility for a reason, the limitation of sensibility through the autonomy of moral reason, is, in fact, contained in general experience. However, the isolation of these aspects of life is, in fact, the abolition of morality. It embodies the essence of the mind as the inner-only interconnection of diversity with unity, empirical with ideas, and drives with reason. This corresponds to the fact that, in the ethical theory of Kant (Immanuel Kant), a general formula and a definite duty cannot be put into any internal relationship with each other. Here too, in the leading opinion of Kant's criticism (Immanuel Kant), it is said that the opposition that separates matter from form, the maximum from the general formula, determined from the general, makes the system of morality impossible. Kant's power is in recognising the autonomous unconditioned in man, which finds its highest expression in the practical mind. Its limitation lies in the fact that he sees the unconditional only in the form of opposition of the one, the general to the plural and the special (Dilthey, 1905: 86-87).

Next, Dilthey reveals the development of the spirit presented by Hegel from moral awareness to love and a beautiful soul, and from them to religion. It also contains the first essay on the history of the development of moral-religious consciousness: "From the opposition of morality, which realised its infinity, should lead to reconciliation, to the awareness of the unconditional, which includes the connection of the individual, plural with the singular, general and necessary" (Dilthey, 1905: 88).

Looking more closely at these theses concerning religion, the works of the young Hegel emerge. First of all, the work "Differences between the systems of philosophy of Fichte and Schelling" (1801, "Die Differenz des Fichteschen und Schellingschen Systems der Philosophie") of 1801 proclaims the task of philosophical thinking to restore the broken harmony of spirit: reason opposes the infinite, spirit-matter, soul-body, faith-reason, freedom-necessity; it fixes a split: "To remove such frozen contradictions is the only interest of reason." Wilhelm Dilthey observes here how "the separation, the limitations, the rigid contradictions in the Kantian system, and thus the whole work of this mighty discernment in establishing order and clarity through distinction, Hegel perceived as unhappy and unbearable, full of suffering, a state of consciousness. His mystical and aesthetic spirit is frantically torn towards the realisation of the unity of the universe. But this unity does not stand in front of contradictions for him, but carries a contradiction in itself. This interest of reason, in order to remove the fixed contradictions, has no meaning, as if it were opposed to opposition and limitation; for the necessary separation is the only fact of life eternally formed through opposition: and wholeness, in the highest vitality, is possible only through restoration after the highest separation" (Dilthey, 1905: 109-110). In *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, "the Absolute Spirit gives itself forms of self-consciousness". And here, Dilthey noticed how the concept of reflection appears as an activity aimed at division and opposition, which Hegel further applied in his work "Differences between the systems of philosophy of Fichte and Schelling" (1801, "Die Differenz des Fichteschen und Schellingschen Systems der Philosophie") and in the article "Faith and knowledge, or reflexive philosophy of subjectivity in the fullness of its forms..." ("Glauben und Wissen, oder Reflexionsphilosophie der Subjektivität in der Vollständigkeit ihrer Formen als Kantische, Jacobische und Fichtesche Philosophie"), which forms the basis of the entire image of previous philosophical epochs. Consequently, here Wilhelm Dilthey notes how concepts arise in these works of Hegel, which are then more

generally formulated in his first works, thereby acquiring a more accurate philosophical form (Dilthey, 1905).

Studying the works of the young Hegel, Wilhelm Dilthey draws a conclusion about how Hegel, in his painstaking, hard work of those times, turned into a metaphysician. He abandoned the pure philosophical method based on the Kantian analysis of science. At the stage of metaphysics, which he had reached from critical idealism, he had to discover that the centre of philosophy was in some higher logic, but along with the pure analytical method, he at the same time lost the way of thinking to solve this problem. However, because metaphysics now relied on the cognised interconnection of the spirit, a new view of historical life was opened to him from this new height. In this new metaphysics, the process was opened in its historical variability, fluidity... In the historical world around him, he saw a play, which he always followed equally tensely: the tireless restructuring of the French state, under their influence – changes in other countries, among which he persistently studied those that took place in Germany – the most excellent example of the historical process in its unceasing turmoil of those that have ever experienced a thinker-historian. With the help of his metaphysics, he plunged into the deepest depths of history. He reveals historical categories of a special type. He experiments, trying to solve his problem using a real dialectical method. The most important and confident achievement that he developed during this period was to delve into the inner essence of the historical world, which goes far beyond all previous historiography. It was clear that Hegel had penetrated it through religiosity, which was decisively the greatest thing he had done for European science. He stands alongside Niebuhr, whose political genius and historical criticism created the first history of political unification, as the founder of the history of the inner life of the human spirit. He brought properties of the rarest type, first of all, a combination of experiences in the minds, in which he is very close to his friend Friedrich Hölderlin. From this came his realisation that not only does this or that achievement of a certain era inherit another, but the entire spiritual constitution, as somewhat experienced, preserved, and eliminated, is a condition of the following state. From this latent depth of spirit, which never scatters itself in the world, came to him the energy of experiencing the spiritual movements around him, which enabled him to make the past alive again to its last inner essence – with everything: with disconnection, with suffering, with lust, with bliss. What he received then in relation to a concrete understanding of historical reality created the basis of his *The Phenomenology of Spirit*: often, it determines every word in this most powerful Hegelian work (Dilthey, 1905: 173-174).

Based on this foundation, according to Dilthey, Hegel began to improve the art of presentation of development. Religious and historical categories of separation, association, poverty, diversity, and division express formal relations in religious states and are ultimately based on the relationship between the whole and its parts. For Hegel, they have a means of conceptually depicting being in certain religious states because they are connected with the religious-historical categories of law, domination, obedience, conviction, love, and religiosity. Thus, he can reveal religious development through the immanent process of historical cognition, with the exclusion of external measures. This is where his philosophy of history comes in. Since the given concepts are put into logical connections, a look at the stages of the structure of the spirit arises, and ... thus, Hegel receives in them the measure of the development of values that is inherent in history itself. This closes the circle of his methodological ideas. This period also prepares *The Phenomenology of Spirit* and *The Philosophy of History* (*Philosophie der Geschichte*), as well as other outstanding historical ideas for which we are indebted to Hegel” (Dilthey, 1905: 198-199).

Conclusions

Based on the presented material, the following conclusions can be drawn. Dilthey's studies in the history of philosophy significantly impacted the formation of the historical and philosophical science of his time and the development of the main directions of historical and philosophical research in the European philosophy of the twentieth century.

Dilthey's concept of the history of philosophy, presented in the works *Descriptive psychology*, *Introduction to the sciences of the spirit*, *Building the historical world in the sciences of the spirit*, *Types of worldview and their discovery in metaphysical systems*, *The essence of philosophy*, and had a significant influence on the development of other philosophies, as well as on the philosophy of European philosophy, philosophy, philosophy, philosophy, philosophy, philosophy, and the new philosophy of European philosophy.

With his project of *Critique of historical reason*, Wilhelm Dilthey could be considered the founder of the new historicism. Historicism contrasts with the position of immanent inclusion of cognition in the process of history. The methodological clarity of the basis of historical cognition, according to Dilthey, is a distancing from the cognitive procedures of the natural sciences. Therefore, understanding is opposed to an explanation as a rational construction of theoretical schemes. There are two vectors for understanding the history of philosophy: the historical vector of understanding the past and the communicative vector of understanding the present. Both vectors are based on the procedure of "use" and "sympathy" from the cognising consciousness. It is as difficult for the historian to capture the initial impulse of the act of the communicative partner as it is to reconstruct the era. To understand the other, both communicatively and historically, is to see the situation through his eyes, to think like him. As noted above, the post-Diltean development of historicism is realised in the following directions: the neo-Kantian direction, the cultural and hermeneutic direction, the neo-Hegelian direction and the modern linguistic and analytical direction of "meta-historical analysis".

An outstanding idea in Hegelian studies is Dilthey's substantiation of the thesis that Hegel's philosophical system has its roots in mystical pantheism. The thinker proceeds from the fragments expressing the then Hegelian mystical pantheism most clearly, the time of which can be determined from the outside, and tries to establish the context of mystical ideas that manifested in Hegel, even during his time in Frankfurt and during the study of theological problems. Further, Wilhelm Dilthey organised individual places in this period's theological fragments. He believes that even from the earliest works, Hegel already applies a method that only later in a more mature form will appear in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Hegel comprehended in concepts the transition from one general mental structure (as in Judaism) through various moments to another (as in the religion of Christ). Dilthey reveals the development of the spirit presented by Hegel from moral awareness to love and a beautiful soul, and from them to religion, and also contains the first essay on the history of the development of moral-religious consciousness.

Dilthey's *The History of Hegel's Youth* became the impetus and theoretical basis for the whole direction of research of Hegel's philosophy in the twentieth century, which is represented by the works of such outstanding scholars as Hermann Glockner, Jean Wahl, Jean Hyppolite, Richard Kroner, Jonas Cohn, Artur Liebert, Johannes Flügge.

 References

- Dilthey, W. (1905) *Die Jugendgeschichte Hegels*. Berlin.
- Dilthey, W. (1911) *Die Typen der Weltanschauung und ihre Ausbildung in den metaphysischen Systemen*, trans. W. Kluback and M. Weinbaum, *Types of Worldview and their Development in Metaphysical Systems*, in *Dilthey's Philosophy of Existence*, New York: Bookman Associates, 1957.
- Dilthey, W. (1970) *Leben Schleiermachers*. *Gesammelte Schriften: 21 Bände. 1914-1997* (Vol. 13). Hrsg. von Martin Redeker, 3. Auflage.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1979) *Die Aktualität des schönen: Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Philipp Reclam Jun.
- Gadamer, H.-G., and Figal, G. (2011) *Wahrheit und Methode*. Akademie Verlag.
- Glockner, H. (1940) *Hegel* (Vol. 1-2). Stuttgart.
- Haym, R. (1962) *Hegel und seine Zeit*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (2014a) *Enzyklopädie der Philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse: 1830: Teil 3. Die Philosophie des Geistes*. Suhrkamp.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (2014) *Enzyklopädie der Philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse: 1830: Teil 1. Die Wissenschaft der Logik*. Suhrkamp.
- Nohl, H. (1907) *Hegels theologische Jugendschriften nach den Handschriften der Kgl. Bibliothek in Berlin* Herausgegeben von Herman Nohl, Tübingen.
- Nohl, H., and Dilthey, W. (1959) Vorwort. In *Gesammelte Schriften* (Vol. 4). Preface.
- Rosenkranz, K. (1843) *Aus Hegels Leben*. *Literarhistorisches Taschenbuch, 1*.
- Rosenkranz, K. (1944) *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegels Leben*. Berlin.

The Concept of *Zhonghua* in Modern Chinese Philosophy and its Cosmological Implications

Sergii Rudenko

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology (Maoming, Guangdong Province, China); Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: rudenkosrg@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9069-0989>

Rudenko, Sergii (2023) The Concept of *Zhonghua* in Modern Chinese Philosophy and its Cosmological Implications. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 116-124. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/11>

This article presents the results of a study of both Western and Far Eastern narratives of philosophical cosmology. The task of the study was to analyse the essential characteristics of philosophical cosmology in both Western and Far Eastern paradigms. This was made possible by clarifying the distinction between astronomy and cosmology, on the one hand, and philosophy and philosophical cosmology, on the other. The Greek word “κόσμος” is both etymologically and semantically different from the concept of “space.” If space has only one characteristic, it is an extension, and then the cosmos, being a phenomenon that is not static but dynamic, has internal forces and a movement towards self-organisation and harmonisation. A person does not live in space, but in the world; such is the point of view of philosophical cosmology, which means that different cultures may have their own cosmology, which will need to be different. It is in this difference of philosophical cosmologies that the richness of philosophy is seen; by studying other cosmological worldviews, one can better understand one's own. Scholars, including Weimin Sun, Robert Cummings Neville, and others, agree on the need to intensify interest in Chinese cosmology and its basic concepts. One such concept is Zhonghua. Modern Chinese philosophy is a combination of Marxist philosophy, traditional Chinese philosophy, and Western philosophy. One of the tasks of a modern researcher in China is to find possible points of contact, and common features in order to demonstrate the possible well-functioning cooperation of these currents. In addition, common features are found primarily in cosmology.

Keywords: The Concept of Zhonghua, Chinese Philosophy, Chinese Cosmology, Chinese Marxism, Cosmos, World

Received: 19 November 2022 / Accepted: 22 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

One of the modern sciences, astronomy, has a subsection: cosmology. This scientific discipline studies theories of the origin and development of the world. The question is that the concept of the world cannot be reduced solely to the universe in terms of astronomy. To designate the space of the universe in English, the term “space” is used, which is devoid of any characteristics other than extension. This stretch can be in the usual three dimensions or, mathematically speaking, in more or fewer dimensions. From an astronomical point of view, outer space is quite rightly called space because it contains an almost negligible amount of baryonic matter. Almost all matter that can be interacted with is baryonic, non-baryonic matter, neutrinos, free electrons, dark matter, supersymmetric particles, axions, and black holes (Shull et al., 2012). Predominantly, all space is emptiness. However, in this case, the philosophical consideration of the world must recognise the absurdity of its own questioning because all existential questions would be addressed to the void. Thus, philosophical cosmology originated in antiquity and was engaged in the study of the physical aspects of the world and its metaphysical essence (Bazaluk, 2022). One of the first philosophical problems in the history of philosophy was the search for the primary element; the ancient sages wondered about the origin of the world. In their studies, they came to different versions; some of them were purely metaphysical, such as the appearance of the first exclusively theoretical construct – *Apeiron* (ἄπειρον), and others were on the border of the physical and metaphysical, such as the natural philosophy of the five elements. Asking the question about the origin of the world, the ancient sages, in fact, put human at the centre of philosophising. Human was perceived as a logical element of the universe; he was like an element of a complex and harmonious system. The ancient Greeks deified nature; they saw in it signs of harmony. For example, a broken amphora made by human hands will not reassemble itself from the parts into a whole, but in nature, everything is restored on its own. A new tree grows in place of a felled tree; it is an oak that grows from a planted acorn. Everything in nature is harmonious and logical.

A person exists not just in space: a person is not a geometric point that has coordinates; rather, a person lives in the world, and this world is harmonious. In philosophy, to refer to this phenomenon, the concept of “cosmos” is used; this is a world that exists harmoniously due to laws and principles. It is not limited to physical manifestations; it contains various spheres of being. That is why philosophical cosmology deals with the study of the world as a cosmos. That is why for philosophical cosmology, the astronomical concept of the cosmos is obligatory, but not an exhaustive concept. John D. Barrow, Frank J. Tipler, Claus Beisbart, Gianfranco Bertone, Hooper Dan, Joseph Silk, and many others succeeded in exploring the philosophical principles of cosmology. Today, it is a popular scientific direction, the purpose of which is interdisciplinary research using the conceptual apparatus and methodology of physics, astronomy, and cosmology, as well as philosophy, cultural studies, and history. In this regard, research is not limited to the Western scientific paradigm but goes beyond it into the field of transdisciplinary research. This, in turn, makes it possible to study the cosmos from different angles, not only in the sense of its Greek etymology, but also taking into account other non-Western cultures.

In his article *New Projects in Chinese Philosophy* (2010), researcher Robert Cummings Neville believes that cultural diversity is necessary for a complete understanding of the philosophical meaning of being:

“the global philosophical situation needs the contributions of Chinese philosophers. Contemporary cosmogony needs the Chinese emphasis on creativity as novelty and on understanding as moving from the simple or indeterminate to the complex or determinate. Contemporary cosmology needs the Chinese emphasis on the value of nature and the understanding of human society as part of nature. The contemporary understanding of the origins of human nature needs the Chinese emphasis on ritual in semiotics such that we can understand the evolution of the human as a matter of learning, as well as success at passing on genes. Contemporary practices of global philosophy need the Chinese understanding of ritual to bring together incommensurate cultures. The contemporary political and moral situation needs a Chinese analysis of its conflicts as functions of adequate and inadequate rituals, with the invention of more civilised rituals that make living with conflict possible. These are all urgent philosophical needs, in somewhat different senses of urgency” (Neville, 2010: 54).

The fourth and fifth projects in his article concern cosmogony and philosophical cosmology. The representative of the Boston Confucian movement, Robert Cummings Neville, is known as an American philosopher and theologian. He is currently Professor of Philosophy, Religion, and Theology at Boston University. He is the author of books such as *God the Creator: On the Transcendence and Presence of God* (1968), *The Tao and the Daimon: Segments of a Religious Enquiry* (1982), *The Cosmology of Freedom* (1995), *Boston Confucianism: Portable Tradition in the Late-Modern World* (2000), *Seasons of the Christian Life* (2016), and many others. In his book *God the Creator: On the Transcendence and Presence of God* (1968), Neville tries through the dualism of essence and existence to explain the problematic nature of the concept of space for philosophical cosmology: “Within cosmology, both what is to be explained, the cosmos, find what explains, the axiomatic system, do not recognise any difference between their determinate natures and their reality. If a substance, for instance, has a distinction between its essence and its existence, then the principles of the cosmological system should account for both elements – essence and existence, or nature and reality” (Neville, 1992: 161).

Weimin Sun, in his article *Features of Chinese Cosmology* (2012), both agrees and disagrees with the views of Robert Cummings Neville, analysing point-by-point his theses on Chinese philosophy and Chinese cosmology: “This does not imply that I agree with Neville on how these issues are classified or how they should be tackled. I do think these issues are important, and I agree with Neville that a good understanding of Chinese cosmology and cosmology is not just valuable for understanding Chinese culture, but also for resolving many contemporary challenges we face today, whether in Chinese culture or other cultures” (Sun, 2012: 133). Despite the similarities and differences in the ideas of Weimin Sun and his colleague Robert Cummings Neville, both clearly saw the prospects for development and the growing interest in Chinese cosmology. Weimin Sun writes that his research aims to “identify some unique features of Chinese cosmogony and cosmology, and to outline some directions for future research on these issues. As a result, many details will be omitted. Hopefully, we’ll see a comprehensive and systematic explication of Chinese cosmogony and cosmology in the near future” (Sun, 2012: 133).

Zhonghua’s structure and conceptual model

Linda Jaivin, in her book *The Shortest History of China: From the Ancient Dynasties to a Modern Superpower—A Retelling for Our Times* (2021), creates a unique mosaic of such

diverse events in Chinese history, and does it concisely but very richly. This 2021 study has received many positive reviews from scholars of Chinese history and Chinese mentality: “Chinese history simmers with larger-than-life characters, philosophical arguments and political intrigues, military conflicts and social upheavals, artistic invention, and technological innovation. It progresses in twists, turns, leaps, and returns. Chinese historical records are long and deep, stretching back at least 3,500 years. Their themes and lessons, as well as the memories of wounds and triumphs, pulsate under the surface of contemporary Chinese life, language, culture, and politics” (Jaivin, 2021: 1).

The word “China” first appeared in the English language in the 16th century, through Portuguese. The word apparently derives from references to the ancient Qin dynasty. The word “Qin” (秦) is the name of the dynasty that unified China; the state existed for many centuries. “In Chinese, the most common expression for China in the sense of a nation is *Zhōngguó* 中國 (中国 in simplified characters – more on those shortly). This expression dates back three thousand years to the ancient compilation of poetry, *The Book of Odes*, *Shījīng* 詩經. *Zhōng* 中 means middle or centre. The second character, *guó* 國, contains a mouth, *kǒu* 口, representing the people, and a dagger-axe, *gē* 戈, signifying defence, within an enclosure, *wéi* 隹. *Guo* originally referred to a fortified city, only later coming to mean a kingdom and finally a nation-state” (Jaivin, 2021: 5). *Zhongguo* is regularly translated as “Middle Kingdom.” *Zhong* initially referred to the centre of the kingdom or city rather than indicating that the kingdom was at the centre of the world. However, there is another meaning of this term, which Linda Jaivin mentions. “Another popular way to refer to China is *Zhōnghuá* 中華. *Huá* 華 can signify splendour, radiance, or prosperity... *Zhonghua* is less about a specific territory than a civilisation, encompassing notions of myth, legend, history, and culture... The outline maps that appear in this book are not of the PRC but of territory that either is now or at one time has been part of something understood as *Zhongguo* or *Zhonghua*” (Jaivin, 2021: 5).

Based on the etymology of these two terms, it becomes obvious that the Chinese worldview in different periods of history with different intensities was characterised by ideas about its central position. Moreover, this central position was determined not only geographically, in the sense that China was at the centre of the civilised world, surrounded by less developed peoples, but also at the centre of culture, politics, and philosophy. *Huá* 華 means radiance, and like any radiance, it must have a source, a point from which the rays emanate. This principle created a binary picture of not just politics, but the whole world order; it determined the existence of a certain order of things in the world which is quite logical to define the concept of space. Depending on the historical context, Sinocentrism can refer either to the ethnocentrism of Han society and culture or to the modern concept of *Zhonghua minzu*. This concept ceased to exist in the 19th and 20th centuries.

However, in the 21st century, these ideas have gained new relevance, as R. James Ferguson and Rosita Dellios write in their book, *The Politics and Philosophy of Chinese Power: The Timeless and the Timely* (2016). There are a great many ethnic groups and nationalities in China, and such a large number is necessarily accompanied by some problems: “With these ongoing challenges, it is not surprising that the PRC has had to mobilise both inclusive and reactive patterns of nationalism and ‘Chineseness’ (*Zhonghua minzu*) in its modern narratives” (Ferguson and Dellios, 2016).

This worldview largely determined the development of science in Chinese society. It is known that Chinese astronomy is one of the oldest sciences in the world. Astronomical observations are mentioned in the famous *The Book of Documents* (*Shūjīng*) (Sun and

Kistemaker, 1997). Researcher Sun Xiaochun, in the chapter *Crossing the Boundaries Between Heaven and Man: Astronomy in Ancient China*, in the book *Astronomy Across Cultures. Science Across Cultures: The History of Non-Western Science* (2000), writes about the peculiarities of Chinese astronomy and cosmology. These features are associated with a different worldview, which must always be taken into account, and which is very important for understanding the structures of thinking of representatives of other cultures. “The main purpose of Chinese astronomy was to study the correlation between man and the universe. The universe was conceived not as an object independent of man but as a counterpart and mirror of human society. There is a certain harmony and proportion between the heavens and man; the order and pattern of the universe prevails in the world, and changes in the heavens are correlated with changes in the world. This cosmological view made Chinese astronomy the most highly regarded science by state rulers. Astronomy in Ancient China thus had a heavy political component” (Sun, 2000: 425). Chinese astronomy is essentially closer to cosmology as it is closely connected with culture, philosophy, and politics. “In the global conversation, there are three main strategies for answering this question, nearly all of which find representative expressions in most of the major philosophical and religious cultures. One is that the cosmos, under whatever description science gives it, is created by a God who is not part of that cosmos in any ordinary sense. This strategy has had little play in Chinese philosophical discussions, since the worship of Shangdi gave way to awe at Heaven and its partner Earth back in the time of the Zhou. Many Chinese philosophers today, however, are friendly to Western process philosophy, whose God is very much a determinate being who is conceived to account for the order of things, as the Confucian idea of Heaven was supposed to do.” (Neville, 2010: 49).

Zhonghua's Concept in Chinese Marxism and Fundamentals of the Belt and Road Initiative

In modern science, the attitude towards astrology, alchemy, and other sciences that are traditionally considered unscientific is changing. This is primarily due to a change in attitude towards the historical heritage of scientists of the past, and their research in the field of astrology is perceived as a logical stage in the development of scientific knowledge. The Greek natural philosophy of the Pre-Socratics, from the point of view of modern experimental science, looks like nothing more than alchemy, but the teachings of these ancient Greek philosophers are considered a valuable heritage of science. “Chinese cosmology was highly philosophical, but it was conceived on the basis of correlative thinking, not on the analytical and logical thinking of modern science. Thus, it inevitably limited the development of Chinese astronomy. The cosmology could not produce useful geometrical models for calendrical astronomy. Chinese calendrical astronomy remained observational and empirical; astronomical calculations were based on arithmetic and algebra” (Sun, 2000: 452). It is worth mentioning Christopher Cullen’s *Astronomy and Mathematics in Ancient China: The Zhou bi suan jing* (1996), in which the author describes the mathematical and observational principles of ancient Chinese astronomy during the Han dynasty (Cullen, 1996).

On the one hand, Chinese cosmology is closely connected with national culture and traditions, but on the other hand, China is open to becoming acquainted with the philosophical heritage of the rest of the world, in particular Europe. “Of course, contemporary Chinese philosophers have looked out the window at Western philosophical traditions, as their predecessors did at South Asian traditions a millennium and a half earlier. In fact, one of the most important twentieth-century dynamics was the rejection of the Chinese traditions

in China in favour of the Western philosophy of Marxism. As a result, however, many contemporary Chinese philosophers have turned back to the classical Chinese traditions in order to show them to be better than the Western, or to reprimatinate them so that they can compete in contemporary global philosophical discussions” (Neville, 2010: 46-47).

Philosophical discourse in China demonstrates a unique commitment to tradition and an interest in modern achievements, but this state contains a number of conflicting principles. For example, the traditional teachings of Confucius were perceived, at different times, as an important legacy. This doctrine is adjacent to the European philosophical trend of Marxism, representing a unique combination. “Early Chinese Communist Party (CCP) founders once deemed traditional political philosophies such as Confucianism and Legalism as inappropriate for building a modern, democratic China. Under Mao Zedong, Confucianism was first extolled, and then it gradually became an object of condemnation to be purged from society. Since the 1980s, Confucian studies and ceremonies began to revive, and today’s CCP has taken one step further to seek to implant Confucianism into its official ideology, Marxism” (Lam, 2018: 47).

Modern Chinese philosophy includes three main aspects: Marxist philosophy, Chinese traditional philosophy, and Western philosophy. “The history of Marxist philosophy is seen as a linear process of development, namely, the founding period of Marxist philosophy (Marx, Engels) – the period of dissemination during the Second International (Kautsky, Bernstein) – Soviet Russian Marxist philosophy (Lenin, Stalin) – Chinese Marxist philosophy (Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping). Such a unilinear narrative model excludes many unorthodox Marxist philosophers of different historical periods, and its unquestionable theoretical attitude prevents us from properly judging the thoughts of these Marxist philosophers” (Zhou and Ye, 2022: 52). In recent years, Chinese philosophers have been working to integrate the core principles of Marxism with traditional Chinese culture. This became a kind of philosophical strategy. Within this general trend, the interaction between Marxist philosophy and traditional Chinese philosophy is a promising direction. Researchers Hongyin Zhou and Jiabin Ye in their article *Doing Philosophy Comparatively in China: Constructive Engagement between Marxist, Western, and Chinese Traditional Philosophy (2000-2022)* (2022) point out the themes common to these two areas, the first of which is cosmology and Zhonghua. “Many scholars in the discipline of Marxist philosophy have conducted in-depth discussions on the similarities between Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy. Here are some examples: (1) Similarity in cosmology. He Zhonghua (何中華) argues that Chinese traditional philosophy emphasises ‘the unity of Heaven and man’ (天人合一), while Marxist philosophy emphasises the unity of the ‘naturalisation of man’ (人的自然化) and the ‘humanisation of nature’ (自然的人化)” (Zhou and Ye, 2022: 56). In this context, the authors refer to the work *He Zhonghua: How the Integration of Marxism and Confucianism Becomes Possible* (2018).

One Belt, One Road (OBOR, 一帶一路) is China’s global infrastructure development initiative, adopted by the Chinese government in 2013. This initiative provides for investments in almost 70 countries around the world. It is fair to say that this project largely determines the foreign policy of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, Xi Jinping. The initiative was included in the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China in 2017. “In 2016, the BRI was further integrated into China’s national economic blueprint. It was designated as the leading programme for the new vision of China’s opening-up policy outlined in China’s 13th Five-Year Plan (2016–2020) in March. There is one chapter in the plan that focuses exclusively on the BRI (NDRC 2016). Four months after the first BRF was held in May 2017, the BRI was written into the constitution of the Communist Party of China

at the Party's 19th Congress in October 2017. This action implied that the BRI is one of the key foreign policies in the Party's long-term grand plan, and that politically it will be carried out even after President Xi is no longer in power" (He, 2019: 5).

The Chinese government calls this initiative an attempt to improve regional ties, promote the development of culture and the economy, and quite heuristic goals – to bring a brighter future. The project has a completion date of 2049, marking the 100th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. The OBOR has both supporters and critics; some experts tend to think that this plan is aimed at creating a Sinocentric international trading network. Sinocentrism grew out of Asiacentrism, which was intended to be an alternative to Eurocentrism. Despite numerous controversies surrounding it, and numerous attempts to get rid of its influence, Eurocentrism retains its influence, shaping the ideas of historians about world history and the historical and cultural achievements of different peoples. Although modern Eurocentrism is radically different from the Eurocentrism of the 19th and 20th centuries, largely due to its tolerance and loyalty to other cultures, it still exists in the scientific narrative. In addition, this is even though there are all prerequisites for establishing an alternative to Asiacentrism. "Asiatic paradigm was introduced to China in the 1920s when the dominant Eurocentric theories concerning Chinese ethnogenesis and the origins of Chinese civilisation marked West Asia as the cradle for human civilisation and maintained that the Chinese were descendants of migrants from the 'West'" (Yen, 2014: 588).

The existing OBOR initiative is designed, in addition to obvious economic reasons, to form a new worldview paradigm: the philosophy of Sinocentrism. It contributes to the establishment in the minds of the people of the image of China as a kind of political, economic, cultural, spiritual, and philosophical centre – the centre from which, like the rays of the sun, the rays of trade and cultural routes diverge. In this context, the important philosophical question about the place of humans in the world and their relationship sounds completely different. Being at the centre of the economic initiative, China is bringing *Zhonghua's* philosophy back to life.

Discussion and conclusions

The word *Zhong* 中 refers to the centre of the kingdom or city, and *Huá* 華 can signify splendour, radiance, or prosperity. That is why *Zhonghua* is a specific territory rather than a civilisation, encompassing notions of myth, legend, history, and culture. This is a philosophical concept that explains the universe and the location of man in it. In contrast to Eurocentrism, which has its roots in ancient times in which man was perceived as something different from nature, nature itself was perceived geometrically and mathematically. In other cultures, the development of philosophical thought followed a different path, such as in China, where, like in ancient Greece, there was astronomy and its own cosmology. It differed from the European in its close connection with the metaphysical world, spiritual culture, and politics. If the legacy of ancient Greek philosophy gave science the concept of *Ecumene* (οἰκουμένη), literally meaning the inhabited Earth, the world – that is, the lands known to mankind as a whole. We also found a similar concept in non-Western cultures, such as the concept of *Zhonghua* (中華). This is a cosmological term different from the Western type of cosmology, and accordingly, any anthropocentrism will be interpreted differently. However, in this cultural and philosophical pluralism lies the value of universal spiritual heritage, since together they enrich universal civilisation. Such steps forward are fixed in mutual interest by cultural, political, and philosophical heritage. Modern Chinese philosophy combines features of traditional Chinese philosophy, the philosophy of Marxism, and modern Western

philosophy. In addition, initiatives like OBOR are capable of changing the perception of the world, changing accents, and adding multipolarity, not only in economics and politics but also in culture and philosophy.

References

- Bazaluk, Oleg (2022) Philosophy of the cosmos for a discursive “thinking through” of the chronology of the universe. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 28. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/28/1>
- Cullen, Christopher (1996) *Astronomy and Mathematics in Ancient China: The Zhou bi suan jing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, R. James and Rosita Dellios (2016) *The Politics and Philosophy of Chinese Power: The Timeless and the Timely*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- He, Alex (2019) The Belt and Road Initiative: Motivations, financing, expansion, and challenges of Xi’s ever-expanding strategy. *CIGI Papers*, Volume 225, 1-26.
- He, Zhonghua (2018) How the Integration of Marxism and Confucianism Becomes Possible. *Literature, History, and Philosophy*, Volume 2, 5-30.
- Jaivin, Linda (2021) *The Shortest History of China: From the Ancient Dynasties to a Modern Superpower—A Retelling for Our Times*. New York, NY: Experiment LLC.
- Lam, Willy Wo-Lap (2018) *Routledge Handbook of the Chinese Communist Party*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Neville, Robert Cummings (1992) *God the Creator: On the Transcendence and Presence of God*. Albany, NY: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.
- Neville, Robert Cummings (2010) New Projects in Chinese Philosophy. *The Pluralist*, Volume 5, 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1353/plu.2010.0000>
- Shull, J. Michael, Smith, Britton D., and Charles W. Danforth (2012) The Baryon Census in a Multiphase Intergalactic Medium: 30% of the Baryons may still be Missing. *The Astrophysical Journal*, Volume 759. <https://doi.org/10.1088/2F0004-637X/2F759/2F1/2F23>
- Sun, Weimin (2012) Features of Chinese Cosmology. *Journal of East-West Thought*, Volume 2, 133-144.
- Sun, Xiaochun (2000) Crossing the Boundaries Between Heaven and Man: Astronomy in Ancient China. In: Selin, H., Xiaochun, S. (Eds.) *Astronomy Across Cultures. Science Across Cultures: The History of Non-Western Science, Volume 1*. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4179-6_15
- Sun, Xiaochun and Jacob Kistemaker (1997) *The Chinese Sky during the Han – Constellating Stars & Society*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yen, Hsiao-pei (2014) Evolutionary Asiacentrism, Peking Man, and the Origins of Sinocentric Ethno-Nationalism. *Journal of the History of Biology*, Volume 47, 585-625. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10739-014-9381-4>
- Zhou, Hongyin and Jiabin Ye (2022) Doing Philosophy Comparatively in China: Constructive Engagement between Marxist, Western, and Chinese Traditional Philosophy (2000-2022). *Comparative Philosophy*, Volume 13, 50-61. [https://doi.org/10.31979/2151-6014\(2022\).130208](https://doi.org/10.31979/2151-6014(2022).130208)

The Phenomenon of Cosmological Ideas in Early American Puritan Philosophy

Yaroslav Sobolievskiy

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: yasobolevsky@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8251-2744>

Sobolievskiy, Yaroslav (2023) The Phenomenon of Cosmological Ideas in Early American Puritan Philosophy. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 124-132. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/12>

The purpose of this article is to offer a specific perspective on Puritan philosophy. Most of the early American philosophy of the Puritans dealt with theological issues, the main topics of philosophical speculation were the ideas of God, salvation, freedom, and others. However, there were some ideas, the presence of which is an important factor, which until now has been little taken into account. This factor is the genuine interest of the Puritans in the natural sciences. Both in England and in America, there were favorable conditions for the new natural philosophy proclaimed by Francis Bacon, this natural philosophy offered a new type of thought. The English philosopher struggled with obstacles in the way of research, one of which was infallible authority, for example, the authority of Aristotle. One of the most curious facts about the colonial life of American settlers is the construction of Harvard College, which from the first days, preserved and increased knowledge. Among the sciences taught was astronomy, which indicates the interest of the Puritans in the study of space. The most important change in the scientific worldview of the times of the first colonies in North America was the adoption of the heliocentric system of Nicolaus Copernicus to replace the geocentric system of Ptolemy, which had existed for many centuries. Among the first books printed in the colonies were mainly religious texts, but there were also scientific ones, for example, astronomical almanacs and catalogs appeared. The information in these books helped in observing the heavenly bodies, for which the first optical instruments, telescopes, were used. Several decades after the first settlers in Plymouth, the first telescope appeared in America thanks to John Winthrop Jr. Taken together, these facts show that in addition to religious reflections, American Puritan thinkers were also interested in cosmological problems.

Keywords: American philosophy, early American philosophy, Puritan philosophy, Puritans, Cosmology.

Received: 17 November 2022 / Accepted: 19 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

To consider the phenomenon of cosmological ideas in the early American philosophy of the Puritans, it is necessary to begin by emphasizing the contradictory views on the origin of the term “Puritans.” The origin of this term, as well as its semantic load, is a topic for a separate discussion. In this study, Puritanism in general and Puritans, in particular, are considered in a comprehensive manner. Unlike other Protestant currents, Puritanism did not receive institutional development but acquired defining features. In his book *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (2009), Francis J. Bremer argues that opponents of the Puritans themselves originally used the term “Puritan”: “Among the most fundamental yet disputed aspects of the subject is the definition of puritanism... It was a movement defined in part by the selfidentification of men and women who referred to themselves as ‘godly’ or ‘professors’ and partly by their enemies, who scorned them as ‘precisians,’ and ‘hypocrites.’ The actual label ‘puritan’ was originally a term of opprobrium used by their enemies, though eventually adopted by the members of the movement” (Bremer, 2003: 2).

Common to the Puritans was strictness in life and faith; this was manifested in strict rigorism and special ethics. The way of life was directly related to their vocation, his profession, which was likened to serving God, determined a person. Hard work, determination, and thrift were considered virtues, and the minimum set of needs reached asceticism. In such conditions, special values arose, for example, chastity and strict morals were extolled, which in turn led to many prohibitions and fading aesthetic forms. Spiritual qualities were considered beautiful, important, and interesting, but not worldly ones. That is why the attitude of the Puritans to the world is mainly understood through the prism of these ideological guidelines, for quite a long time in the humanities it was believed that the world for the Puritans was nothing more than the scene of the biblical story. However, it would be a mistake to assume that all Puritans thought this way, because they did the attempts to explore the world, as natural philosophers did.

The amalgamation of rigorism and natural philosophy in the worldview of American Puritans

In order to understand how the worldview of the Puritans, devout Christians who sought to purify their faith, way of life, and thoughts, were able to accept the cosmological ideas of natural philosophy, it is necessary to define the very term “Puritans.” The introduction argues that the term is polysemic and controversial, too complex to be definitively defined. Probably, such attempts are meaningless, in the sense that this concept, albeit contradictory, has existed in the narrative for four centuries and successfully defines a special historical phenomenon. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, in *Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700* (1996), describe this problem in more detail: “Attempts to define early-modern English ‘puritanism’ and to agree on a common usage for the noun and adjective ‘puritan’ have been going on for well over 400 years. Contemporaries set about the task almost as soon as the religious phenomenon made its appearance in the wake of the sixteenth-century Reformation crisis, and historians and other scholars have continued their efforts, generating a lively academic controversy which shows no sign of abating. The central reason why the debate has gone on for so long is that it has proved exceptionally difficult to reach any common ground” (Durston & Eales, 1996: 1).

It is important to emphasize the difference between astronomy and cosmology, for example, astronomy deals with the experimental study of cosmic phenomena, while

cosmology has a transdisciplinary character, it borders on both astronomy and philosophy. In more detail about the nature of philosophical cosmology, researchers Oleg Bazaluk and Larysa Kharchenko described in their article *The Philosophy of the Cosmos as the New Universal Philosophical Teaching about Being* (2018). “The cosmos in the philosophical understanding is the absolute One¹⁰ that is much wider than the scientific understanding of the cosmos as the Universe. In the cosmos as the One, the idea ‘Those Who Transform the Universe’ is already present as the cause of all that is happening in the world. The cosmos as the One is the absolute unity of the human ontology (Intelligent Matter) and any other state of matter in the ontology of the cosmos” (Bazaluk & Kharchenko, 2018: 11). If this definition is used as a methodological setting, it will allow studying the astronomical views of the Puritans as part of the philosophical heritage.

Puritans were distinguished by piety, courage, perseverance, confidence in their exclusivity, asceticism, and prudence in economic matters. Julie Spraggon in *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War* (2003) describes the particular aesthetic of the Puritans, which largely determined their way of thinking: “The Puritan aesthetic valued plainness and simplicity over ornament and luxuriousness, the aural over the visual, and discipline and a literal adherence to biblical injunctions over the wanderings of the human imagination” (Spraggon, 2003: XIV-XV). Another important feature was inherent in the Puritan temperament: “...the importance of zeal and of the willingness to act upon ones godly duty, and the desire to cleanse and purge all that was ungodly from both the church and society at large” (Spraggon, 2003: XV). Minimalism in aesthetics often leads to scrupulousness in the search for the essence; the thought of the puritan was not distracted by the temporal but turned to the eternal. This feature, in turn, influenced the interest of Puritan thinkers in astronomy and cosmological ideas.

The well-known German sociologist, historian, and philosopher Max Weber (1864-1920), in his famous book *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (*Die protestantische Ethik und der “Geist” des Kapitalismus*, 1905), notes that Protestants were the holders of capital. A feature in the Protestant ethic justified the possibility of getting rich. The philosopher notes that the Reformation was accepted mainly by rich and economically developed countries. The reason for this, according to Max Weber, lies in a special worldview, which contributes to the greater economic rationalism of the Protestants. In addition, this is a very important aspect, since the key word here is not “economic”, but “rationalism.” While the Catholics were rather indifferent to earthly goods, in the Protestants asceticism was bizarrely combined with wealth. “We thus take as our starting-point in the investigation of the Relationship between the old Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism the works of Calvin, of Calvinism, and the other Puritan sects” (Weber, 1930: 89). Speaking of capitalism, Max Weber defines it in terms of the principle “time is money”, which goes back to Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790). Despite the fact that Benjamin Franklin was not a puritan, in his own words, he was a deist; the ideas of the importance of Christian ethics and the natural picture of the world were successfully combined in the views of the educator. In his view, the world was like a mechanism, all the elements in it are like gears in a watch, and God is like a master who launched this amazing mechanism. “God was now the great clockmaker, His creation hugely complex in structure, but intelligible simply as matter in motion” (Hoskin, 2003). This picture of the world was not new in America; there were similar ideas in the 17th century.

Dorothy Stimson, in *Puritanism and the New Philosophy in 17th Century England* (1935), argues that the natural sciences were more than characteristic of the Puritan type of thinking and that the philosophy of the New Age was of interest to various thinkers both in England

and in America. “In 1600 England showed little indication that modern experimental science was already under way. By 1687 Harvey, Boyle, Halley, Christopher Wren, Hooke and a great group of less well-known workers had already advanced far along that path and Newton’s *Principia* was on the printing presses, thanks to the urgency of his less able but deeply appreciative friends” (Stimson, 1935: 321).

The era of the reign of Queen Elizabeth is remembered for the expansion of trade and commerce. This, in turn, contributed to the enrichment of the elites, who were interested in popularizing education. Enlightenment ideas determined the future direction of the development of education. Sir Walter Mildmay (1523-1589), who was a Puritan, founded Emmanuel College, Cambridge in 1585. One notable alumni of the college is John Harvard (1607–1638), after whom a college in America would be named. The voyages of sailors began to give way to the migration of settlers, and the stimulus of new opportunities in the new world stirred the minds of the people. At this time, the philosophy of Giordano Bruno (1548–1600) about the plurality of worlds encouraged to dream of other planets. “Robert Recorde had discoursed upon the Copernican theory even before Elizabeth came to the throne, and Thomas Digges and his followers were giving publicity to the Copernican system and to the idea of an infinite universe years before Gilbert gave to both his conspicuous support? Wilkins writing in 1638 was illustrating his little book with Galileo’s pictures of the moon and was bolstering up his defence of the Copernican theory against the denunciation of the Church with many a reference to Kepler, Descartes, Mersenne and other Europeans absorbed in the problems of the new science...” (Stimson, 1935: 322).

The current scientific belief that the Puritans were predominantly bigots and radically devout people is a hasty generalization. Most Puritans were educated at the University of Cambridge, and in founding Harvard College in New England, they drew heavily on the Cambridge tradition. There are examples in history of astronomical and cosmological ideas being accepted by Puritan thinkers. Harvard’s first president, Henry Dunster (1609 (baptized)–1658), wanted to create an institution similar to Eton College and Cambridge University. At that time, astronomy was studied at Harvard according to Ptolemy’s theory of a flat Earth and celestial spheres along which celestial bodies move. However, gradually, advanced discoveries in astronomy penetrated Harvard, and as one of the most famous historians of this institution, Samuel Eliot Morison, states in the first volume of *Harvard in the Seventeenth Century* (1936): “Astronomy, the fourth part of the medieval Quadrivium, was the only subject in which the College made some contribution toward the advancement of learning, in the seventeenth century” (Morison, 1936: 214).

In his *The first Americans, 1607-1690* (1927), Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker (1927) describes how Henry Dunster organized the first courses at Harvard: “The course of study included logic, physics, ethics, geometry, astronomy, Greek, Hebrew, rhetoric and Latin... It is improbable that these high standards were rigidly adhered to, and we know that the attempt to compel conversation in Latin among the students failed. About 1670 Copernican astronomy, it appears, was getting a little foothold in Harvard, a century after its promulgation in Europe, but it was not formally taught until much later” (Wertenbaker, 1927: 248). Henry Dunster continued to teach the geocentric system, but it is known that Harvard also knew about the heliocentric system. “Although Henry Dunster, who became the first president of Harvard College in 1640, taught the Ptolemaic cosmology from Johannes Magirus’ *Physiologia peripatetica*, Bridgen’s essay implies that the Copernican hypothesis was being taught at Harvard prior to 1659” (Yeomans, 1977: 415).

The German natural philosopher Johannes Magirus (1560-1596) wrote an Aristotelian treatise in 1597 entitled *Physiologiae Peripateticae libri sex* (1597). This treatise was used at Harvard to educate students on the cutting edge of science. The text of the treatise describes the teachings of Aristotle about four causes, mentions the ancient Greek philosophers Anaxagoras, Empedocles, there are references to Plato's texts, including the *Timaeus* dialogue. The treatise describes the celestial spheres, on which the heavenly bodies are placed, with the center – the Earth.

A big problem for the natural philosophers of the 16th and 17th centuries was the undisputed authority of Aristotle, whose teaching had a tremendous impact on the minds of European philosophers. If Aristotle believed that the movement in a circle is an ideal movement, since it has neither beginning nor end, then the orbits of the planets must also be circular. And even when empirically, thanks to astronomical observations, it became known that the orbits had a different shape – the shape of an ellipse, astronomers and cosmologists continued to defend circular motions, introducing complex systems of epicycles.

American Puritan Cosmological Concepts and Copernican Astronomy

Probably, Thomas Harriot made the first recorded astronomical observation in North America in 1585. This attempt was made during Virginia colonization. This astronomical observation made little scientific sense and was associated with a solar eclipse. The mathematician tried to connect two facts, namely, the death of the local population and an astronomical phenomenon. In the process of acculturation, the settlers were acquainted with the wisdom of the indigenous population of America; it can be assumed that there was some exchange of worldview guidelines. Although the missionaries sought to bring the Christian faith and Christian worldviews, ethnocentric and mythological pictures of the cosmos would later complement Western scholarship (Rudenko & Sobolievskiy, 2020). Therefore, for example, modern ecosophy and ethnocentrism are relevant largely due to the influence of the wisdom and philosophy of the indigenous people.

In essence, these cosmological reflections have the character of astrological conclusions. Nathaniel Mather (1630-1697) was born in England, as the second son of Richard Mather (1596-1669). In 1635, his father took him to New England for several years; he graduated M.A. at Harvard College in 1647, and then went back to England. He is the author of *The Righteousness of God through Faith* (1694). In a letter to his brother Increase Mather (1639-1723) he wrote: "...and all the priviledges and spirituall mercyes that in New England you enjoye. But I fear they are not long lived. The method of these, & the last years Theses is in my judgment better than an[y] I have seen formerly. But the grammar of some of [them] might bee mended, e.g., in Thes. 2... it should have been *producant*, not *producerent*; & I think some of the others arc paradoxical!, e.g. Thes. 11, & 22 Phys., to say nothing of Thes. 21. But I perceive the Cartesian philosophy begins to obteyn in New England, & if I conjecture aright the Copernican System too" (Massachusetts Historical Society, 1868: 63).

Copernican cosmology was not popular, however, was often preached by Puritan thinkers that God at the center of the world created the Earth; nevertheless, it was taught at Harvard. The proof that the Puritans in New England were studying the new cosmology is the astronomical almanacs. "Astronomical knowledge found its way to the people at large mostly through the almanacs, which in this period were still mere slender compilations of tables, with none of the literary embellishments which were to make them an element of popular culture a generation later" (Adams, 1927: 124).

One of the earliest known evidence of the American Pilgrims' interest in cosmological problems may be the surviving copy of *An Almanack of the Cælestial Motions for This Present Year of the Christian Aera 1659: Being (in Our Account) Bissextile or Leap-Year and from the Creation (According to Truest Computation) 5608: Whose Vulgar Notes Are Golden Number 7 Cycle of the Sun 16 the Epact 17 Dominical Letter B: Fitted to 315 Degrees of Longitude the (Supposed) Meridian of the Massachusetts Bay Where the Pole Artique Is Elevated 42 Gr and 30 Min and May Without Any Sensible Errour Be Applied to Any Part of New-England* (1659). This long title contains the geographical coordinates of Massachusetts, which indicates the possibility of using the information from this almanac by skywatchers in New England. This book describes astronomical events, but not only the content is important, but also the style of presentation of thought. This style indicates an attempt to look at the world from the outside, as a modern scientist does, who builds an unbiased relationship with the subject of research. This special style is felt in some accents, such as instead of mentioning the name of the Earth, the text refers to the planet on which we all live. "There will be four Eclipse this year. Twice shall this Planet whereon we live, and it's concomitant the Moon, widow each other of their Sun-derived luster. The two of which Eclipses, by reason of the infra-terranian fire of the Luminaries will disappear in our Hemisphere" (Brigden, 1659: 1). The text details astronomical events, such as the appearance of the star Aldebaran, the brightest star in the constellation Taurus, or the appearance of the constellation Orion. The last pages of the Almanac contain a description of the system of the world. The author describes the Sun in the center of the Universe; he claims that thanks to the telescope, the rotation of the star around its axis along sunspots was established. He goes on to describe a system of planets where the closest planets to the Sun, Mercury, and Venus, follow in front of the earth. This is due to the peculiarities of observation, these planets are always visible near the Sun, respectively, and their orbits should be closer and smaller. The planets Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn, known at that time, remain beyond the orbit of the earth. "This is the true and genuine System of the World" (Brigden, 1659: 22). This Almanac is perhaps one of the earliest astronomical tests used by Puritan thinkers in New England.

The Puritan minister Samuel Danforth (1626-1674) is remembered for his interest in astronomy, he published three almanacs (for 1647, 1648, 1649), which are the earliest surviving American examples of the form. He also authored *An Astronomical Description of the Late Comet* (1665), this book is sometimes called the first astronomical in America. Samuel Morison, in his article *The Harvard School of Astronomy in the Seventeenth Century* (1934), confirms the fact that astronomy and cosmology were important disciplines in New England: "The Puritan clergy, instead of opposing the acceptance of the Copernican theory, were the chief patrons and promoter of the new astronomy, and of other scientific discoveries, in New England" (Morison, 1934: 13). Dorothy Stimson is of the same opinion: "It is small wonder that the keenly intellectual leaders in the Puritan world, men willing to sacrifice much for their religious and political beliefs, men like John Winthrop the younger, Robert Boyle and Christian Huygens, were glad to join in this fascinating pursuit and to feel that their days were not unprofitably spent even with all the press of other cares upon them. That experimental science spread as rapidly as it did in seventeenth-century England seems to me to be in part at least because the moderate Puritans encouraged it" (Stimson, 1935: 334).

The Modern age is called Modern since it was the era of new ideas, new geographical discoveries, new political regimes, etc. Something amazing happened in the minds of people that they were able to look at the usual picture of the world from a different angle. A fatal emergent leap took place in the development of human culture, science, and philosophy.

“Galileo’s demonstration that God was not the present source of astral energy; Copernicus’s proof that the earth spun on its own axis and revolved about the sun; Gassendi’s assault on astrology and his theory of atomic energy; the revelations of the microscope and of Harvey and Huygens as to the physical resemblances between mankind and lower organisms; all these undermined the philosophical explanation of reality which had been generally accepted from the time of Plato, and of which Aristotle had been the acknowledged authority” (Morison, 1934: 4).

John Winthrop Jr. (1606–1676), the eldest son of the first governor of the Massachusetts Colony, John Winthrop (1587–1649), probably brought the first telescope to America. John Winthrop Sr. was a famous Puritan philosopher and author of *A Modell of Christian Charity* (1630). His views were full of rigorism and theocracy, he believed that God created people unequal, and this manifests the omnipotence of God. God created this world and all possessions belong exclusively to God, therefore personal enrichment is impossible, but enrichment of the church is possible. These ideas of collective enrichment made possible the costly voyage to the New World, from which one can conclude that the Puritan ethic contributed to the colonization and development of new territories. His son, John Winthrop Jr. was passionate about the sciences; such an assessment can be given because he studied a lot. At one time, he studied at Bury St. Edmunds grammar school, King Edward VI School, and Trinity College, Dublin, and he studied law at the Inner Temple, London. “The first colonial telescope was probably introduced by Winthrop around 1660” (Yeomans, 1977: 415-416).

In his letter, dated October 25, 1660, to Samuel Hartlib, he wrote about his telescope. It is known from the letter that John Winthrop Jr. had a 10-foot telescope and observed the planets. It is not known whether he himself made it, or whether someone made it for him, but there is a mention of the presence. “That optically lanthorne wilbe very usefull, I shalbe glad to heare it perfected: I long much to heare of the manner of the fabrique of that new Telescopium in holland, I hope he will describe, if hath not already in his *Systema Saturnium*. my Telescop: of about 10 foot doth shew little of Saturne” (Winthrop et al., 1957: 62). This letter was written in 1660 when John Winthrop Jr. was governor of the Connecticut colony, which means that as early as the middle of the 17th century, astronomical observations of the starry sky were being made in America. Perhaps these observations were of little scientific value, but the fact itself proves that the Puritan style of thought had an inherent interest in natural philosophy, cosmology, and astronomy.

The second telescope in America is known from another correspondence of John Winthrop Jr., Ronald Sterne Wilkinson suggests in his article *John Winthrop, Jr., and America’s First Telescopes* (1962) a fragment of one letter: “A letter from Winthrop to Benjamin Worsley, F.R.S., dated October 27, 1670, states: ‘I seldom looke upon the Constellations of the heavens, or the planetts, especially Jupiter, with my telescope, or the glorious Constellation of Orion, but the most grateful memory of yourselfe is fresh to my thoughts & soule.’ The letter has led historians to suggest that the little glass was a gift of Worsley during Winthrop’s stay in London” (Wilkinson, 1962: 520).

It may seem that a couple of almanacs, several telescopes, and studies at Harvard, that is all phenomena of interest in cosmological problems. However, it is necessary to place the accents correctly. In conditions of strict rigorism and a puritanical worldview, which had a total and overwhelming effect, even the appearance of certain phenomena is essential. Changes in the worldview accumulate gradually, from single phenomena, these changes are subsequently realized in leaps and bounds. Thus, from the first telescopes, which brought the

infinitely large closer, from the first microscopes, which discovered the infinitely small, from these first steps great leaps of humanity began, great revolutions in consciousness.

Conclusion

There is a belief that Puritan philosophy in early American philosophy was dominated by harsh religious rigorism, theocracy, meager aesthetics, and absolutized Christian ethics. In the 17th century, philosophy was perceived ambiguously, from a synonym for education to natural philosophy and experimental science. With the advent of the new methodology of Francis Bacon and Cartesian philosophy, interest in experimental sciences is growing in Europe. In turn, the Copernican heliocentric system is gradually becoming popular, which was accepted by some thinkers as a new truth, and rejected by others as heresy. In 17th century America, Puritan thinkers mainly specialized in theological reflections, but also showed interest in new sciences and a new image of the world. Thomas Harriot, Nathaniel Mather, John Winthrop Jr., and others were interested in cosmology and engaged in astronomical observations both with the naked eye and with the help of the first telescopes that were in America in the middle of the 17th century. In addition to the availability of tools, evidence of interest in cosmological mysteries: astronomical almanacs and calendars, in which both heliocentric and geocentric systems could exist in parallel.

References

- Adams, J.T. (1927) *Provincial society 1690-1763*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bazaluk, O., and Kharchenko, L. (2018) The Philosophy of the Cosmos as the New Universal Philosophical Teaching about Being. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 21, 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/21/1>
- Brigden, Z. (1659) *An Almanack of the Cœlestial Motions for This Present Year of the Christian Aera 1659: Being (in Our Account) Bissextile or Leap-Year and from the Creation (According to Truest Computation) 5608: Whose Vulgar Notes Are Golden Number 7 Cycle of the Sun 16 the Epact 17 Dominical Letter B: Fitted to 315 Degrees of Longitude the (Supposed) Meridian of the Massachusetts Bay Where the Pole Artique Is Elevated 42 Gr and 30 Min and May Without Any Sensible Errour Be Applied to Any Part of New-England*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Printed by Samuel Green.
- Danforth, S. (1665) *An astronomical description of the late comet or blazing star as it appeared in New-England in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and in the beginning of the 12th moneth, 1664: together with a brief theological application thereof*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Printed by Samuel Green.
- Durston, C., and Eales, J. (1996) Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700. In: *Durston, C., Eales, J. (eds) The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*. London, UK: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24437-9_1.
- Hoskin, M.A. (2003) *The History of Astronomy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Massachusetts Historical Society (1868) *Collections of the Massachusetts historical society. Volume 8.Fourth Series*. Boston, MA: Published for the Society by Wiggin and Lunt.
- Morison, S.E. (1934) The Harvard School of Astronomy in the Seventeenth Century. *The New England Quarterly*, Volume 7, 3-24.

-
-
- Morison, S.E. (1936) *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rudenko, S.V., and Sobolievskiy, Y.A. (2020) Philosophical Ideas in Spiritual Culture of the Indigenous Peoples of North America. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, Volume 18, 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.221428>
- Spraggon, J. (2003) *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War*. Woodbridge Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press.
- Stimson, D. (1935) Puritanism and the New Philosophy in 17th Century England. *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, Volume 3, 321-334.
- Weber, M. (1903) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Wertenbaker, T.J. (1927) The First Americans, 1607-1690. In: *Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon R. Fox (eds) A History of American Life. Volume 2*. New York, NY: Macmillan Company.
- Wilkinson, R.S. (1962) John Winthrop, Jr., and America's First Telescopes. *The New England Quarterly*, Volume 35, 520-523. <https://doi.org/10.2307/363448>
- Winthrop, J., Hartlib, S., and Turnbull, G.H. (1957) Some Correspondence of John Winthrop, Jr., and Samuel Hartlib. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Volume 72, 36-67.
- Yeomans, D.K. (1977) The Origin of North American Astronomy–Seventeenth Century. *Isis*, Volume 68, 414-425.

AUTHORS

Valerii Akopian is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associated Professor, and Professor of the Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education, and Education Policy Department of the Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University. He is the author of more than 60 publications. His research interests include globalization studies and the philosophy of education. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: avgmaster1958@gmail.com

Oleg Bazaluk is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor. His research interests include philosophy of the cosmos, philosophy of neuroscience, philosophy of education, and political theory. To date, he has published 17 books and over 170 articles. He is the Editor-in-Chief of the *Philosophy and Cosmology* journal and the Director of the *Belt and Road Initiative Center for Chinese-European studies* (BRICCES), Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology (China). Maoming (China).
E-mail: bazaluk@ukr.net

Lesya Chervona is a Ph.D. in Philosophy, Senior Researcher, and Head of the Department for Integration of Higher Education and Research of the Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. Her research interests include the philosophy of global social transformations, social responsibility issues, and the philosophy of education. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: l.chervona@ihed.org.ua

Kseniia Fedorova is a Ph.D. student at the Department of Philosophy, Odesa Mechnikov National University (Ukraine); visiting Ph.D. student, University of Luxembourg (Luxembourg). She is the author also works in the FNR INTER project AAA – Augmented Artwork Analysis, obtaining the position of research and development specialist. Her research interests include interdisciplinary studies in the fields of Philosophy, Digital Humanities, Philosophy of Technology, Philosophical Anthropology, and Philosophy for children. In addition to academic work, she is a facilitator of philosophical discussions for children (Junior Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Ukraine), Society for the Advancement of Philosophical Enquiry and Reflection in Education (United Kingdom), “Les Petites Lumières” (France). Odesa, Luxembourg (Ukraine, Luxembourg).
E-mail: kseniia.fedorova@uni.lu

Igor Gudyma is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences (D.Sc.), Professor, Department of Philosophy and Sociology, Mariupol State University. His main research interests include the philosophy of science, logic and methodology of scientific knowledge, philosophy of religion, and modern Christian theology. Igor Gudyma is a member of the editorial board of the scientific journal of the Melitopol State Pedagogical

University “Humanitarian paradigm” and head of the Cherkasy regional branch of the Ukrainian Association of Religious Studies. Cherkasy (Ukraine).
E-mail: igorgudyma67@gmail.com

Nataliia Krokmal is a Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Professor of Management, System Analysis and Eurointegration Department of the Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Ukraine). Her research interests focus on the following topics: self-organization and self-regulation of social systems, sustainable development management, philosophy of education, management of educational institutions, social responsibility issues, system analysis in education management, social philosophy, and philosophy of history. She is also the head of the research laboratory “State and Public Administration of Education.” She was an expert in the QS World University Rankings (2021, 2022). Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: nkrohmal73@gmail.com

Iryna Liashenko is a Candidate of Philosophical Sciences (Ph.D.), an Associate Professor, and an expert in Education and History of Philosophy. Her research interests include studies in the fields of Philosophy, Education, History of Philosophy, History of Ukraine, and Applied Ethics. To date, she has published over 20 research articles. Also, she has invented and developed a new educational training system for the students of comprehensive school, whom want to continue their education at Ukrainian universities. Her Education methodology is implemented at the Preparatory Department for Ukrainian citizens at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Dr. Liashenko is currently an Associate Professor, Head of the Preparatory Department for Ukrainian citizens at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine).
E-mail: iryna_liashenko@knu.ua

Lesya Panchenko is a Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor, Senior Researcher, Academic Secretary of the Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University, Member of the Central European Philosophy of Education Society (CEUPES), and Member of Bronisław F. Trentowski Society of Philosophy of Education (Poland). Her research interests include the philosophy of education, social philosophy, philosophy of history, and philosophy of culture. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: rada@npu.edu.ua

Oleg Rafalskyi is a Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Academician of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, Vice President of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Director of the Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies. He is an Editor-in-Chief of the scientific journal “Political Studies,” Deputy Chairman of the Editorial Board of the “Great Ukrainian Encyclopedia,” and a member of the editorial boards of a number of domestic and foreign scientific publications. Author of numerous scientific publications, including more than two dozen individual and collective monographs, encyclopedias, textbooks and manuals. Editor and compiler of collections of scientific papers, legislative and regulatory acts. His research interests include political and ethno-national processes in Ukraine, the theory and history of political thought in Ukraine, nation-building and state formation, theoretical and

applied issues of modern political science, ethno-political science, and civilizational processes in Ukraine. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: office@ipiend.gov.ua

Sergii Rudenko is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, and Senior Researcher at the “Belt and Road Initiative” Research Institute for Chinese-European studies, Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology (China). His research interests embrace the studies in modern Chinese philosophy and culture, Ukrainian philosophy and culture, East European Philosophy, History of Marxism, Philosophy and Cosmology, and Higher Education Administration. Professor Rudenko is a member of the *International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology* (ISPC). He is a Co-Editor-in-Chief of the academic journal “Future Human Image,” a member of the editorial board of “The Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Philosophy” and “The Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Public Administration” academic journals. Kyiv (Ukraine).
Personal page: <https://sergiirudenko.academia.edu>
E-mail: rudenosrg@gmail.com

Zoreslav Samchuk is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Research Fellow, Honored Worker of Science and Technology of Ukraine, and Chief Researcher of the Department of Political Culture and Ideology, Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). His research interests include the systemic functioning of society, theoretical-methodological and applied problems of the socio-political sphere, socio-cultural and civilizational conditioning of political processes, political analysis, effective management decisions, features of the development and modernization of science, etc. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: warrier1@ukr.net

Yaroslav Sobolievskyi is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Philosopher, and Historian of Philosophy. His research interests include interdisciplinary studies in the fields of philosophy, history of philosophy, Early American philosophy and cosmology. To date, he has published over 50 articles. He is also the Editor of the academic journals *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Philosophy*. He is a member of the *International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology* (ISPC). He is currently an Associate Professor of the Department of History of Philosophy, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: yasobolevsky@knu.ua

Larysa Soroka is a Doctor of Law, Professor. The major research interests include space law, administrative policy in various spheres, the administrative and legal status of subjects of public administration, and European administrative law. She is the author of more than 80 scientific works. Currently, Dr. Soroka works as the Deputy Director of Research at the Scientific Institute of Public Law (Ukraine) and Director of the Analysis Center of Air and Space Law (Ukraine). Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: lsoroka_kw@ukr.net

Denys Svyrydenko is a Doctor of Philosophical Sciences (Dr. Hab. in Philosophy), Professor, and Deputy Director of the Belt and Road Initiative Institute for Chinese-European Studies at Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology (Maoming, China). He is a Vice-President of the *International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology (ISPC)*. His sphere of academic interests includes the following: social transformations in the 20th-21st century and one's influence on educational policy; education for peace-building; philosophy of education; cultural studies. He is a member of the editorial board of *Philosophy and Cosmology*, *Ukrainian Policymaker*, *Studia Warminskie*, and *Education Discourse* academic journals and is an author of more than 90 research papers. He is also editor-in-chief of the academic journal *Future Human Image*. Maoming (China).
E-mail: denis_sviridenko@ukr.net

Viktoriya Timashova is a Doctor of Political Sciences, Associated Professor, and Professor of the Department of International Relations and Humanitarian Studies of the Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University. She is the author of more than 70 publications. Her research interests include humanism studies, policy studies, and multiculturalism theory. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: tavitum2020@gmail.com

Shishi Xu is a Ph.D. student of the Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Education Policy Department of the Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University. Her research interests include philosophical issues of active citizenship, challenges of globalization for citizenship, citizenship theory for the 21st century, and citizenship in Western and Eastern philosophical traditions. Kyiv (Ukraine).
E-mail: super_shishi@ukr.net

Philosophy and Cosmology, Volume 30, 2023

Academic Journal

Філософія і космологія, Том 30, 2023

Науковий журнал

Коректура, комп'ютерне верстання — Панченко Н.В.

Макет обкладинки — Кулинич Є. А.