

HUMAN ESSENCE: THE NEOCLASSICAL UNDERSTANDING

^aGENNADIJ PAVLOVICH MENCHIKOV, ^bANTON SERGEEVICH KRASNOV

Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan 420008, Russia
e-mail: ^amenchikovgp@mail.ru, ^banton-krasnov1987@yandex.ru

Abstract: The article analyzes the understanding of human essence in three types of philosophical outlook: classical, non-classical and neoclassical. The purpose of this study is to clarify the historical-comparative increase in understanding that there is a human as a human. It is proved in the work that a functional approach has been implemented and is still being implemented to human in the classical and non-classical types, due to the prevalence of absolutist outlook in them and on the basis of identification of human nature and essence. In the neoclassical type, by virtue of a fundamentally different, non-creationist worldview, a distinction between the human essence and human nature, a non-functional understanding and definition of human essence begins to be implemented, which reveals at least a little of its uniquely understood uniqueness. The latter is manifested through persistent, essential generic signs that there is a human; moreover they are realistic and not yet repeating in anybody in space and the universe accessible to mankind. The gradual overcoming of creationism, the non-identification of human nature and essence, a functional approach, the identification of constant generic characters of the human essence begin to eliminate and reduce the human essence to animal essence, and, which is important, the inadmissible attitude of human to human, human to himself/herself.

Keywords: creationism, closed and open systems, classics, neoclassics, human essence and nature, existential determinations, sense of life.

1 Introduction

The problem of the human essence - that a human is just as a human - is not simple to this day, while its solution has a decisive vital significance. Especially when we find ourselves in a situation of questioning and answering the ontological call of being or in the situation of the ontological transition experienced by mankind (II Axial Time), the need to acquire new basic semantic supports, or in a situation of existential confusion and existential turn of mankind (Stenger, 2000). Today, in accordance with the classical, non-classical and neoclassical types of philosophy (Menchikov, 2013), three types of understanding of the human essence have been developed: classical, non-classical and neoclassical (is formed). They interpenetrate each other, have a long history of development. The methodological setting here is the closedness/openness of the systems, the historical-comparative approach and the "deterministic evolution" deep in it (Menchikov, 2015, p. 20): the concept of the world (of the determinism of the universe) is changing - the concept of the human essence is also changing (Knyazeva, 2015, p. 94) Let us compare them.

In classical philosophy - (or in the philosophy of modern - early-middle-late-modern; mid-III millennium BC - mid-XIX century) during the philosophy of antiquity (ancient India, ancient China, ancient Greece), - everything came from the fact that the world, the universe was seen as a closed system, and the Absolute seems to be the dictator, which was considered a kind of mystified "Nature", then God, then the Absolute Spirit, Mind, Idea. Due to this generally absolutist worldview, thinking and behavior of mankind (linear, dichotomous, hierarchical, conflict), the human essence was interpreted in the naturalistic-polytheistic unity of human with Nature. This meant that without coincidence with a certain Absolute (a certain Supernatural God-Nature) you are not a human - you are not a support for yourself, but there is an application, a function, a means, a puppet of the fatal forces surrounding you (fusion nature, space, created from the outside and set by the Absolute).

In the philosophy of the Middle Ages, the Absolute changed its form: "God" became it, but the essence (already monotheistic) as an Absolute remained. Without God, especially now, who is the incomprehensible and otherworldly, mystical, you are not a human - you are not a support for yourself just as before. The human essence began to be seen in the fact that human is the function of a more clearly expressed Absolute - the absolute of God or the transcendently understood Spirit. Human, as before, remained a function, a means, an instrument of fatum: either an instrument of the will and retribution granted to him/her from

outside, "divine" power over other people (this is "power from God", and not from me) as if prolonged from above, or the executor of His will, trembling creature, servant of God. The predestination from above remained, and taking into account the emerging institution of the inquisition and indulgences, it was even more clearly revealed.

In the philosophy of modern times, the Absolute Spirit, Reason, Idea began to be seen as the main Absolute-determinant. The world appeared to be a rationally-mechanically understood Order, an otherworldly prescribed Order, Rightness, "Right Eternity". (Chaos was still not seen to be existential, ontological property of being and was assessed rather by the manifestation of only subjective oversight of a human). The basis for understanding the human essence was formed, as before, by a closed picture of the world — rationally mechanical with an admixture of the old and acquired science-like mysticism. The rationalistic, mechanistic view of human began to dominate. The human essence mainly began to come down, to be identified with the cognitive mechanism, the epistemological machine (Descartes), or with the most intelligent machine (Lametri). Although the human essence was explained in different ways, the "inhuman" (which did not notice the human himself/herself as a human) concepts still prevailed: naturalistic, rational-mechanistic, romantic-idealistic, and religious-mystical. Thus, especially in the late classical time the functional approach (as we would call it) to a human was most clearly revealed - a look at a human as a function, a means, a thing, a tool, an instrument, an animal, a screw in someone else's hands. (Alas, even today, often in textbooks, we read the "classical" definition of the human essence - a human is a bio-social being, that is, an application to instincts and environment, which we will dwell on below). Since everything turned out to be more complicated in life, it was legitimate and not accidental that a revision of such previous functional "extra-human" concepts began in the non-classical period of the philosophy development, and such a radical one, up to ignoring the historically valuable in the past.

In non-classical philosophy (early-middle-late-postmodern; mid-XIX – 70s of XX century), the Absolute radically changed its form - Chaos (Nietzschean message about the death of God, the death of Rightness, the death of Order) became now absolute. The Absolute seemed to be different - Chaos, but it remained as an Absolute: the world, as before, has arisen, has been created, begotten and governed from the outside, but already by the Absolute-Chaos, the "Wrong Eternity". The universe is still a closed system; again - fatalism, but now turning into voluntarism, the madness of capitalist social being. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008).

Under the influence of non-classical discoveries and social changes of the postmodern era, the universe began to be seen, of course, more complex, situational, dynamic, including virtual; moreover, as if from the "inside out", reverse side of being (N. M. Soloduhov (Soloduhov, 2011, p. 7). But preconceived distrust arose towards classical rationality and the Order of Being, agnosticism, absolutization of the relativistic, nihilism revived.

2 Methods

In the neoclassical philosophy (70-80s of XX century - beginning of XXI century) - especially in connection with the discovery of synergetics - the world first appeared without the Absolute. Without confusing the "Absolute" with the "ideal", the world was discovered realistically as a universe-left-to-itself-rather than something otherworldly for the first time (Gennadij et al, 2016). Today, a modern neoclassical understanding of the world and thinking are generated, and a neoclassical understanding of the human essence is formed with it. Its essence is that the "human essence" is no longer confused with the "human nature": its generic nature is not identified with its origin from nature, as it has happened and is happening in the classical and non-classical worldview. A fundamentally different approach is also applied to understanding the human essence — a non-functional or realistic

approach, and there is a gradual parting with the Absolute - "symbolization of the Absolute".

If earlier a human was considered "usefully", in a consumer sense (as a thing, a means, a tool, an instrument, an animal, etc., as a function of something, someone), now a human is opened as an ontologically self-existing being, as an end in himself/herself and as the intrinsic value of being, as co-being - complex, unusual, but self-existing (Aksenov, 2015, p. 55). The cornerstone of neoclassical understanding of the human essence was laid by the works of K. Jung, E. Fromm, A. Schweitzer, I. Prigozhin (Prigozhyn & Stengers, 2013). The main developers of this understanding are V. Frankl, K. Rogers, A. Maslow, R. Assagioli, S. Grof, M. Heidegger, I.T. Frolov, M.K. Mamardashvili, G.K. Saikin et al. The essence of neoclassicism in understanding the human essence consists in the following: it is a turn to human as to a unique creature of being, to his/her unique all-pervading existential side of essence; it was discovered that the existential determination is not the only one, but the dominant form of determination in any human being (Heidegger, 2009).

3 Results and Discussion

The problem of the sense of life is the basic determination. Its understanding begins with the assimilation of the fundamental foundations of being: what is being, existing; living; life; human life; life of a human. (Modern studies show and prove that the living is the root cause of being and it is eternal in the universe; it exists in a different form, but absolutely inanimate does not exist. There is only a relatively "inanimate", which is the decay products of the living, its reduction. Living, reducing fractally (fringed, in all directions), is absolutely not eliminated (viruses, phages, varions; or plants, animals, people). Living is not dichotomous to the "inanimate", the latter is correlated with the living species within itself and relatively to inanimate, which we perceive as absolutely inanimate. In understanding living, it is important to distinguish a) life as such, in any form and level, as a basic phenomenon of being (ontos), universal philosophical category; b) its prebiological minimized meaning; c) its biological unfolding meaning; d) the life beyond the biological meaning of life - human life; and e) life of human. Life is a special form of being, it is a different measure of the indissoluble unity of matter and spirit in being, the essence of which consists in any constant self-emergence, self-reproduction, preservation of oneself and transgressive expansion of its borders (Arshynov, 2011, p. 83). Life manifests itself as a "causal work of desire", as a "horme" - an internal motive force, originally inherent in all living things, where "all living things have a cause in themselves, and everything else is outside" (Gennady et al, 2015). Living is self-arising and the transition of any kind of esteem from one state to another, continuous growth, expansion of the properties and boundaries of oneself, renewal. This is a natural, causal, but fractally causal process of being (and not acausal and not only linear, and nonlinear causal (Urmantsev, 1993).

But the problem is that human is living, but not an animal: when everything has already happened in an animal, everything only begins in a human. The search for the sense of life is peculiar only to human (consciously or unconsciously - to any human), and therefore accompany human life throughout his/her existence. However, today the existential issue is acquiring a special, pivotal significance; especially in conditions of, for example, mass precariate (mass unemployment). And "this is not just unemployment, but the deprivation of humanity of the fundamental sense of existence" (Fomin, 2018, p. 48).

The problem of the sense of life is a problem of a peculiar shortage, incompleteness, non-integrity, non-eternity, it arises only in a human. It arises especially in non-eternity. It follows from the fact that, like no living creature, human knows in advance about his finiteness (biological death) and, in this regard, about some unrecoverable "imperfection" of the world. The knowledge of this sometimes shocks a person so much that he/she lives in perpetual confusion. The solution to this issue is the initial basis of the "line of life", subordinating the actions of different levels. Hence the question "why; to be or not to be?" is the

essence of the problem expression. Take this world as your home of being, stay in it, build, protect, ennoble it and/or just fight and suffer, not accept it from the beginning, leave this stepless, alien word, or vegetate and whine, do nothing in it and just take offense at it, or destroy it, take revenge on it in order to somehow "come true", "show", "shout" and "prove" to this world, to all people: "people, I am; I am still in it". The fact is that it is not so simple to come true, become, be and stay a human (Saykina, 2012).

4 Summary

Thus, the following discovery is finally made in neoclassic: the meaning of life is the main determinant of our life as a human being, a human can live normally as a human without languishing and not "psychoing" only when his/her life makes sense, when he has not lost the sense of life and can somehow implement it. All this indicates that a human is not only a reflexive animal, but above all a reflexive being (but again, we do not confuse "reflex" and "reflexivity"); human is not a puppet in the hands of instincts and society, not a cognitive machine, as he/she was most often seen in such a way by classical philosophy, and not a mystical-demiurgical creature, as he/she is seen by all kinds of mystical points of view. Without rejecting either instincts or an innate predisposition, or the influence of the external environment, a neoclassical understanding of the human essence proves that all these determinants determine human behavior, but are not its causal determination. The environment and instincts influence, but do not determine human behavior, even in the most adverse or satiated conditions of existence.

The modern neoclassical view of the human essence is based on the fact that life of a human cannot be approached from a utilitarian point of view, usefulness-worthlessness in principle, it is unacceptable to approach as a means, things, functionally (Vorontsov, 2017, p. 162). This is admissible for things, to a certain extent - for animals, but not for a human, if in any circumstances we understand a human as a human. Human life is worthwhile, it justifies itself by its existence, life is a task, there is a human's mission to live as a human (Derrida, 2005). Of course, it is not so simple.

It follows from all this neoclassical philosophy that the human essence is not represented by the fact that he/she is a bio-social being, not the smartest animal or the most intelligent machine, but is an originally cultural being or subject-object of culture. The human in his/her essence does not need any predicates and compliments, neither the best nor the worst, even to the fallen of us. He/she is basically different. One of the discoveries of neoclassical philosophy consists precisely in the understanding that the human nature (his/her origin) and the human essence (his/her substantiality) are not the same thing.

5 Conclusions

Let us summarize some of the results. What the former classical and non-classical worldview did not understand in human and what the neoclassical world began to understand is as follows:

- human is a being, driven mainly by existential determination, sense of life; from here begins, although it does not end, the understanding that a human as a human is not an animal, not a machine, not a puppet, not an angel or a beast, but this is creature that is difficult to understand - a human; a creature fundamentally different, special in being, capable of being much better and much worse, more monstrous than them;
- human is a unique creature of the universe and his/her uniqueness lies in the fact that this creature is supernatural, cultural, no matter how it sounds naive; consequently, in principle, an unacceptable attitude towards him/her is unacceptable;
- human is a creature with a spirit, spiritual reality that cannot be reduced to any part of it, a creature that ultimately decides and answers for himself/herself, possessing freedom (as self-causality, self-causation) from external determination due to the meanings and values with which

he/she is guided when making a choice, a decision and the actions;

- human is a creature constructing objects and images of reality, reality itself and himself/herself through his/her work; such an understanding of humanity comes slowly, painfully and dramatically;
- human nature is initially aristocratic; let us recall that Greek "aristos" means a creature irresistibly striving beyond its borders, to overcome its so-called shortage (-incompleteness-non-integrity-non-absoluteness-non-authenticity), striving "for the better", "for something bigger than it is" (for aristocracy understood in its own way, to the best of its abilities and opportunities);
- as it turns out, such a feature is inherent only to human, because his/her spirit is "capricious", insatiable, original, and therefore does not reflect, but comprehends, displays, interprets and "represents" - constructs reality.

If we talk about the definition, then human is a cultural being, the subject-object of culture as the third house of being. Its main essential features include: transcendence, incompleteness and lack - need and access to the metaphysical; in the end - another, existential determinism; presence of spiritual reality (and not just consciousness); passion to be different (aristos, ambivalent "arrogance" of the earthling, "fervor"); ability to any kind of activity (creative - creativity, "to come true", vital, adaptive, "to survive", but also destructive - "to come true at least somehow" in this world); freedom of decision and responsibility; humanity; beauty; and love. Such signs are not inherent in any of the living creatures of the universe.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Literature:

1. Gennadij, P., Menchikov, A., Krasnov, S.: Anthropic Principle and "Observer of Neoclassical Type" in Contemporary Social Theory. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*. Volume 20, Special Issue 3, 2016. P.14-19.
2. Gennady, P., Menchikov and Bulat, Z., Sharifullin.: Global Evolutionism and Heterarchical Thinking. *The Social Sciences*, 10 (6), 2015. P.1250-1254.
3. Stenger, V.J., *Timeless reality: symmetry, simplicity, and multiple universes*. Prometheus Books, Amherst, New York, 2000. P. 340.
4. Aksenov, G.P.: Desymbolisation of the Absolute, *Issues of Philosophy*. No. 8, 2015. P. 53-65.
5. Arshynov, V.I.: Synergetics converges with complexity, *Issues of Philosophy*. No. 4. 2011. P. 73-85 (P. 83)
6. Vorontsov, V.A.: The nature of the first mask and its role in anthroposociocultural genesis. *Philosophical Anthropology*. V. 3 No. 1. 2017. P. 151-167.
7. Deleuze, J., Guattari, F.: *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. - Yekaterinburg: U-Faktoriya, 2008. P.672.
8. Derrida, J.: "Finally learning to live". *Issues of Philosophy*. No. 4, 2005, P. 133-144.
9. Knyazeva, E.N.: Universal evolutionism, or Big History. *Philosophical Sciences*. No. 3. 2015. P. 90-103.
10. Menchikov, G.P.: Determinism of XXI century: problems and solutions. M.: Sputnik+, 2015. P. 17-22.
11. Menchikov, G.P.: Neoclassical philosophy: essence, content, meaning. *Scientific notes of the Kazan State University*. V. 155, Book 1. Humanitarian Science. 2013. P. 110-116.
12. Prigozhyn, I., Stengers, I.: Order out of chaos. M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. P. 201-206.
13. Saykina, G.K.: It is hard to be a human... (Metaphysical routes of human). Kazan: Kazan university, 2012. P.428.
14. Soloduh, N.M.: Methodological principles for constructing a situational picture of the world. *Situational studies*. Kazan: KGTU, Issue 4. 2011. P. 6-11.
15. Urmantsev, Yu.A.: On the forms of comprehension of being, *Issues of Philosophy*. No. 4. 1993. P. 89-105.

16. Fomin, M.V.: Transindustrialism, the upcoming social reality. *Issues of Philosophy*. No. 1. 2018. P. 42-54. (P. 48.)

17. Heidegger, M.: Contributions to philosophy. From Events. *Journal of Philosophical Translations*. No. 1. 2009. P. 56-94.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AA, AO