

## Education of Specificity of Methodological Principals of Philosophical and Anthropological Investigation of Life-Meaningful Intentionality of Person's Existence

Andrey M. Roudenko

Victoria V. Kotlyarova

Marina M. Shubina

Institute Services and Entrepreneurship, Don State Technical University  
Email: amrudenko@list.ru

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s1p443

### Abstract

*The problem of the specificity of philosophical and anthropological investigation of life-meaningful intentionality of person's existence is observed in this article with the aim to find out the most appropriate methodological principals of investigation in this subject area. The authors suggest that the most adequate study of human rights in modern conditions was made possible by the synthesis of psychological, sociological, biological data using the philosophical-anthropological and socio-cultural practices. This approach is consistent with the existence of an integrative model *sotsioivitalnoy*, showing a man in the necessary completeness and consistency. If truth is related to non-human dimension *cogito* being exists because it depends on the objective content of the subject, however Existence correlates with human-to-be for us, because it is subjectively meaningful content. As the result of analyzing the authors sum up that the specificity of philosophical and anthropological understanding of life-meaningful intentionality of person's existence is being revealed during the following the most relevant heuristic basis of person's conceptualization : anthropogenic investigation, limitation of search for life meaning with person's existence, adoption of subject –personal, specifically-personal way of analysis in the context of specifically-historical, social-cultural reality*

**Keywords:** philosophical anthropology, person, existence, life meaning, intentionality;

### 1. Introduction

During the process of studying the problem of philosophical and anthropological knowledge it is becoming obvious that in comparison to how well ontology and gnosiology are developed, philosophical anthropology - the most important part of linguistics - suffers from unformed specialized doctrine, amorphous structure and absence of proved methodology. Despite outstanding achievements of B. Pascal and M. Montaigne, W. Schelling and I. Kant, L. Feuerbach and W. Dilthey, F. Nietzsche and S. Kierkegaard, A. Geleen and G. Plessner, M. Sheller and E. Fromm, T. Chardin and N. A. Berdyaev, it is very difficult to distinguish philosophical anthropology as independent philosophical discipline, especially in the form it was introduced by Otto Kasman (1562-1607), the author of "Psychologia antropologica" (1594), the founder of philosophical anthropology. Of course, M. Sheller's works (1874-1928), especially his "Man's position in space" (1927) introduced a certain basing of philosophical anthropology as philosophical discipline covering real person's existence in its entirety. In the preface, missing by translators Sheller writes : "Questions : Who is a person and what is his place in being? – interested me from the moment my philosophical consciousness has been awoken and seemed me more substantial and central than any other philosophical questions." (Sheller, M., 1988.). In the beginning of his work he says: "...I have started it to give a new experience to philosophical anthropology. Just some moments, concerning human essence in comparison to animals and plants and special metaphysical position of a person, are stated below and a few results which I had are shown" (Sheller, M. 1988.). But nevertheless this work is just a short summary of the work "Essence of a person, a new experience of philosophical anthropology " he wanted to write and publish not later than 1929 but he didn't finish it because of sudden death.

Explication of human existence requires the integration efforts of scientists from a variety of traditionally considered opposing areas of knowledge. Contrary to the established position of the modern scientific community is an extrapolation of natural and socio-cultural, we tend to assume that the sociocultural systems and human culture, despite its qualitative uniqueness generally immersed in nature, or rather in the nature. In this case, the total phylogenetic and historical

experience proves that nature is more powerful system than the culture, no matter what the power of the human mind. According to the same synergistic paradigm, more powerful system has the ability to absorb elements less strong. Anyway, it proves the existence of close interaction between the natural and the social and cultural systems. Therefore, the "demarcation established between the biological sciences and humanities through the separation of natural and cultural human existence, in fact, equivalent to the separation of subhuman and the actual human condition, it is extremely unfortunate. This dividing line is equally experiencing difficulties and biologists, and the humanities, as the first interesting and modern man undergoes morphological changes, and the second, virtually nothing adds appeal to the fossil record humanoids. Obviously, the most adequate human study in modern conditions is made possible by the synthesis of psychological, sociological, biological data using the philosophical-anthropological and socio-cultural practices. Such an approach is consistent with the integrative model *sotsioitalnoy* existence, revealing a man in the necessary completeness and consistency. Otherwise, one-dimensional, for example, only biological explication of human nature not only leads to negative social consequences, creating racial myths, but is methodologically unfounded, since the biological reductionism does not discern anything in the person of a specific. Is imperfect and psychological model of human consideration due to too narrow scope of its subject: psychic phenomena in it are regarded as an independent sphere of subjectivity, and, in addition, the categorical apparatus of psychology can not be considered a significant part of the fundamental issues relating to human existence.

It should also be noted that in existence there is no rigid dichotomy of "truth - a lie" as a sufficient basis of recognition of something is not a demonstration, and positive *aksiologizatsiya*. It is not just a truth discourse, but also value-presumptive, not protocols, and the fullness of experience. It is not to deny the truth, and a completely new substantive content of this concept, which, however, the notion of a strictly scientific sense is not, as characterized by not limiting the degree of formality essential, but rather value fullness of uncertainty. Truth *cogito* is related to non-human dimension being in itself, because it is independent of the subject's objective content. Truth *existenz* correlates with human-being for us, because it is subjectively meaningful content. Truth is the first kind transfers ownership to reality. The truth of the second kind transmits involvement in the fullness of life.

Most modern philosophical and anthropological researches suffer from reductionism i. e. they are characterized by "transferring of not human cognitive contexts of into human ones". (Il'in, V.V., 2008). Though there is a tendency to implement anthropological with the help of non-anthropological is traced during long period of history of philosophy and science. On the one hand, "intension for incorporation into antropologistics the methods of cognition of objectification of "exact" sciences – Giotius, Wolff, Spinoza, Volney, Turgot, Lemmer, Lamertti, Durkheim, Wundt"(Il'in, V.V.2008); on the other hand, "intention to reorganize antropologistics according to the standards of separate systems of knowledge: geographism (Hippokrates, Herodotos...), kosmism (Ratzel...), technism (Leroi-Gourhan, Servan-Schriber), mechanicism (Hobbes, Holbach...)"(Il'in, V.V.2008). On this list also :naturalism, organismism, physiologism, chemism, etism, physicalism, biologism, sexualism, behaviorism, teleologism, providencialism, eschatologism, finalism, subjectivism etc. But for philosophical and anthropological researches we need not only reductionism but acceptance of self-sufficiency of person's origin.

## 2. Methodology

Method of theoretical modeling has a special role in present research. Methods of comparison, analogy, analysis, synthesis and others are widely used in the work, as well as, scientific principals of structural properties, systemacy, integrity, historism, causality, comprehensiveness and concretion(Kotlyarova, V.V., 2009).

Phenomenological method (Hildebrand, D., 1999) lets investigate phenomena of human existence at the level of reflection, and in the light of acts of its intentionality in modern social-cultural events and processes.

Using of interpretation method (phenomeno-hermeneutic) let the authors to analyze existence through understanding category "difference" and come to understanding life-meaningful intentionality from position of philosophical anthropology. Hermeneutic method makes possible to aim not only to explanation but understanding too. All acts of interpretation are submitted to understanding (main hermeneutic procedure) and they contribute to the process of fathoming the depth of meaningful text structure as interpreting means process from evident sense to hidden one. The last thing demanded using method of reconstruction in working with texts of modern foreign and domestic philosophers and thinkers.

The main method used in this research is interdisciplined theoretical analysis of philosophical and anthropological, postmodernist, cultural, physiological etc. foreign and domestic literature. Also theoretical generalization and systemic classification are used. (Kotlyarova, V.V., 2009).

One of the highest necessity of social-spiritual needs is necessity to find the answer to the question about meaning

of life. Attempts to this detailed research have been conducting during the whole human existence and nowadays are being continued in the works of modern Russian scientists. L.N. Kogan, A.A. Kolchin, N.S. Rybakov, N.K. Gavrushin, V.P. Tugarinov, A.R. Abdulin, V.Y. Antonov, A.V. Balaeva, G.V. Petrov, I.N. Vazovskaya, E.E. Vahromov, V.I. Merenkov, A.V. Maslihin, E.I. Nikolaeva, V.E. Chudnovskiy (Roudenko, A.M., 2012.) and many other philosophers and scientists set their opinions and share with their moral and intellectual experience. We shall try to analyze specialty of philosophical and anthropological explication of life-meaningful human intentionality and reveal the principals they are based on.

### 3. Results

Conducted research in compliance with methods listed above, showed that the first main methodological principal of investigation of life-meaning problematics in the frame of philosophical anthropology is anthropogenic characteristic and refusal from theogonic conception. "Only a man and the God can have sense of their own existence - philosopher G.V. Petrov writes - they are two sense poles. Existence of the rest can only have sense towards these poles i.e. towards a man or the God" (Petrov, G.V., 2002). Out of two possible conceptions in the frame of philosophical anthropology the relevant conception is an anthropogenic one, introduced by Protagoras: "A man is a measure of everything", as G.V. Petrov noticed the idea of the God is contradictory.

The next methodological principal is limitation of human life-meaning search with his life existence i.e. time frames from birth to death and refusal to carry it over limits of earth life, acceptance the value of life itself. Life is the biggest value for a man – this is an obvious fact, the truth, based on life instinct. If there is no life, there is no a man, no sense. Nevertheless, there is lasting tradition to carry life-meaning over limits of life. Zarathustra, Buddha, Confucius, Plato, Ecclesiastes, Jesus Christ, Mohammed introduced exactly such conceptions, which found their adherents, and certainly can be respected for it. But addressing to them in attempts to prove philosophical and anthropological conception will not be productive as they will level its specialty and will not have probative force. "Sense of human actions is set in its borders. Objectifications in spirit of Platonism, postulating some external sense of human manifestations, anthropology does not observe" (Il'in, V.V., 2008), - V.V. Il'in notices.

The third methodological method is acceptance of subject – personal, specifically-personal way of analysis and refusal from transpersonal, as every person who thinks about life meaning, solve this problem through his own personality. We are interested in individual life of every person, exactly saying, life-meaningful intentionality of a person: determination of human life, which gives it sense and meaning. "Intentionality is something which characterizing consciousness in wide sense, and which proves flow of experience as flow of sense and union of single sense", - E. Husserl thinks (Hildebrand, D., 1999). In this connection G.V. Petrov notices: "Choice of life-meaningful conception, I insist on this, presupposes self-investigation of this problem at the level a person can conduct this investigation" (Petrov, G.V., 2002). In reality, observing the question about life meaning in personal context is not productive (at least in our research). Great Dietrich von Hildebrand truly calls the idea that impersonal being is more subjective than personal one false. We agree with his idea that, "personal being is hierarchically higher than any impersonal being and if a person pays attention to special qualities of personal being, he understands deeper being and metaphysics too" (Fromm, E., 2000). N.A. Berdyaev wrote the same thing. It is necessary to trust more own experience, consider more to own intellectual and emotional "strings of the soul", checking one or another conception with the aim to find out its closeness to internal human nature.

Finally, finding of meaning of a human life in the context of specifically-historical, social-cultural reality and refusal from timeless analysis is the fourth main condition of philosophical and anthropological explication of life meaning. "Behind every individual "I" there is complete history of the mankind" (Petrov, G.V., 2002). Human consciousness is always formed in a definite historical reality and can't be free from it, so any human values and senses are connected with the conditions of this reality, which begets universal life-meaningful values. Universal values are not complete idealization, they can't be fabricated or imposed, they are created and apprehended by people to have sense and aim in everyday life and this way universal values have existential fullness (Kotlyarova, V.V., 2009)

Therefore, sense of life itself as general systematic quality of life-meaningful values of a definite person is born and related to the reality where he lives. Just the loss of with relation causes loss of life meaning. Of the matter A.N. Shishmintsev points to consequences of this loss: "Left alone a person is in mess, he does not know what to devote himself and ways of egoism lead to the dead end. This person's condition is truly called neglect, loneliness, left to his own resources – one of the key conditions of modern person" (Shishmintsev, A.N., 2004.). in our view, there are many ways out of these conditions, but the main one is understanding his own personal potential and his active creative self-realization with general constructive tendencies of specifically-historical reality he lives in. Search of life meaning in this connection is the search of the unique niche in social-cultural and historical reality where a person can self-actualize

himself as a personality correlating his existence with ontological basis of social whole without disappearing in the kingdom of consumism and mass intentions, total unification of needs and wishes. Just this modern mass culture imposes on a person. Even E. Fromm wrote about people, having lost originality of thinking and wishes, this way: "At school everybody wants to have good marks; later, having grown up, try to succeed in life, get everybody's recognition and get his part of prestige, buy a car, build a house etc. But if only they could stop their fussy activities and look around, they'll be able to ask themselves: "What's after that? What sense is in that? Does this game worth these efforts? Am I chasing something which will give me just a minute pleasure?" These questions frightens and charm as they touch the base of a human activity..."(Roudenko, A.M., 2010). But we have to ask these questions ourselves because vectors of life-meaningful intentionality depend on these answers.

#### 4. Discussion

Our results of education of methodological principals of philosophical and anthropological investigation of life-meaningful intentionality of person's existence supplement researches of other modern researchers, analyzing this problem. The most competent Russian philosopher and anthropologist P.S. Gurevich, for example, says: "We can note to one unique personal quality: openness, incompleteness of him as a creature. Dissimilar to other creatures he can surpass his own generic limitations, being the part of natural world and be on a higher level. All these peculiarities are surprising and important originality of a person"(Gurevich, P.S., 1991). We should add that this idea was discussed by other classic anthropologists - A. Geleen and G. Plessner, M. Sheller.

On the other hand, along with the idea of openness, starting from ancient times, the idea of unchangeability of human nature have been appearing, "one of the basic philosophical and anthropological ideas of early mass psychology"(Shishimintsev, A.N., 2004), the main argumentation of this idea is that the same motives lead to similar actions, as D. Hume noticed that actions of all people of all times are of the same type, for example, ambition, egotism, vain, etc. were, are and will be the source of person's actions. Despite the sound reasoning there are the opponents of this idea. American philosopher D. Burroughs considering philosophy as the theory of liberation of the mankind, says: "Doctrine of unchangeability of human nature, except concealment of crimes of government, pursue more important aim - defense of existing social structure. As there is capitalist system in many countries of the world, this theory tries to prove that this form of social structure is inevitable"(Burroughs D., 1961). And after illustration this position on the examples concluded ironically: "Now, when all arguments are beaten, we can say our last word to them. The problem is not we can not change human nature. The problem is human nature can not change you"(Burroughs D., 1961). Of course we are not so categorical about this problem but a certain level of unchangeability of human nature we can seduce from the same organic needs. If take into account that social-spiritual needs are differentiated more, this idea stops being opposite idea to openness and incompleteness of human nature and supplements it. "A person is a living being, who can (surpassing and excluding impulses of own attractions, refusing to feed them with images of perception and notions) have ascetic attitude to his life, filling him with terror. In comparison to animals, which always say "yes" to present being, even if frighten and run, a person is a one who can say "no", "ascetic of life", eternal protestant against any reality. At the same time, in comparison to animals, which existence is incarnation of philistinism, a person is an eternal "Faust...", never calming down in present reality, always aiming to break the limits of present being and world around him including reality of own "I"..."(Sheller, M., 1988.), - M. Sheller underlines. Moreover, a person can transform, sublimate organic and sexual needs into social-spiritual ones.

At the same time these ideas do not contradict each other but supplement systematically and organically the results we got.

#### 5. Discussion

So as a result of our research the authors concluded that main methodological principals of philosophical and anthropological investigation of life-meaningful intentionality of person's existence during process of education of more relevant heuristic basis of human conceptualization are:

- anthropogenic way of research;
- limitation of life-meaning search with human existence;
- acceptance of subjective-personal, specifically-personal way of analysis in the context specifically-historical, social-cultural reality;
- orientation for life-meaning search of a person in the context specifically-historical, social-cultural reality and refusal from timeless analysis.

## References

- Sheller, M. 1988. Position of a man in space. Transl. A. Filippov // Problems of a man in western philosophy: Translations / Composed and afterword P. S. Gurevich; Edited by of Y. N. Popov. - M.: Progress.
- Il'in, V. V. 2008. Philosophical anthropology. 2nd edition. M.: KDU
- Gurevich, P. S. 1991. Unique creation of the universe? // About human and a man / Edited by I. T. Frolov. - M.: Politizdat.
- Shishimintsev, A. N. 2004. Philosophical analysis of vital functions of a modern mass person: Dissertation of the Dr. of philosophy : 09.00.13 – Rostov-on-Don.
- Burroughs D. 1961. A man against myths. Translated by N. Krotovskaya, V. Bibihin and A. Sobolev. M.: Foreign literature.
- Petrov, G. V. 2002. Philosophy of life meaning. Pskov: Publishing house PGPI.
- Husserl E. 2009. Ideas to clear phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy. The first book / Translated from German. M.: Academical prospect.
- Hildebrand, D. 1999. Metaphysics of love. Translated from German. A. I. Smirnov. - SPb.: "Aletya", TO "Stupeni".
- Fromm, E. 2000. Flight from freedom; A man for himself / Translated from English Minsk: Popurri.
- Roudenko, A. M. 2010. Life-meaningful intentionality of a person : specificity of philosophical and anthropological investigation // The humanities and social-economical sciences. №5.
- Roudenko, A. M. 2012. Socio-vital conception of life-meaningful intentionality of a person 's existence: Dissertation of the Dr. of philosophy : 09.00.13 – Rostov-on-Don.
- Kotlyarova, V. V. 2009. Values : traditions and axiological paradigm of modern times. Shakhty: Publishing house SRSUES.