

BalaPhiloKakEng

3rd edition expanded

- Love for wisdom
- Subject and parts of philosophy
- Variety of philosophical teachings
and directions

- Practical philosophy

- APPS

Controversial issues of philosophy

From correspondence about philosophy

Academy of Philosophy (project)

Philosophers, scientists and writers on philosophy

Moscow

Publishing and Trade Corporation "Dashkov and Co"

2023

UDC 1

BBC 87

B20

Reviewers:

O. V. Malyukova - Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,

Moscow State Law University

them. O. E. Kutafina;

A. D. Korolev - Candidate of Philosophical Sciences,

Senior Researcher, Institute of Philosophy RAS.

Balashov, L. E.

B20 What is philosophy? - 3rd ed., expanded. - Moscow: Publishing and Trade Corporation "Dashkov and Co", 2023. - 84 p.

ISBN 978-5-394-05503-4.

The book substantiates the idea of philosophy as a special type of culture, discusses the following topics: the difference between philosophy and science, the subject and "parts" of philosophy, the diversity of philosophical teachings and trends, the importance of practical philosophy.

For professional philosophers and for a wide circle of readers interested in philosophy.

In the appendices, some controversial issues of philosophy are considered, texts from correspondence about philosophy are given, a project of the Academy of Philosophy is presented, statements of philosophers, writers and scientists about philosophy are given.

Send feedback and suggestions to:

e-mail: lev_balashov@mail.ru

ISBN 978-5-394-05503-4 © Balashov L. E., 2023

CONTENT

1. Love for wisdom 4
2. The subject and "parts" of philosophy 12

3. Philosophical pluralism, diversity of philosophical teachings and trends 18

Materialism and idealism 18

Rationalism, empiricism, irrationalism 21

Dogmatists and skeptics 27

Subjectivists, objectivists, methodologists 28

Philosophers-"specialists" 29

Systematic Philosophers 29

4. Practical Philosophy (Sophology) 30

APPENDIX 1. Controversial questions of philosophy 37

Is there a fundamental question of philosophy? 37

What are philosophical statements? 40

Philosophy helps shape beliefs

and, if necessary, straighten them 41

Philosophers are sometimes like beginners or bad horse riders... 43

Nietzsche's aversion to the norm and the normal, or the narrowness of non-philosophical, non-categorical thinking 43

The Unprincipled Pluralism of Postmodernism 46

APPENDIX 2. Correspondence on Philosophy 49

Teaching philosophy in universities 49

On Philosophy, Ethics and Changes in the World 50

Particular and general questions in philosophy 51

Thought is individual? 51

Correspondence with Denis Romanyuk about practical philosophy and F. Nietzsche 52

APPENDIX 3. Academy of Philosophy (project) 59

Why is the Academy of Philosophy needed? 59

Goals and objectives of the Academy 60

To the draft charter of the Academy of Philosophy 64

Dream-fantasies 65

APPENDIX 4. Philosophers on Philosophy 68

Scholars and Writers on Philosophy and Philosophers 80

Bibliography 83

Books published by the author 83

1. Love for wisdom

The name "philosophy" comes from the Greek words "phileo" - love and "sophia" - wisdom, which means love of wisdom, wisdom. This literal meaning seems to be far from the real meaning of the concept "philosophy". However, this is only partly true. Wisdom still remains an essential definition of philosophical thinking. Philosophy is wisdom, but not of an individual, but of the united Mind of people. In other words, philosophy is collective thinking. What does it mean?

First, philosophy is precisely thinking, and not knowing, not feeling, not believing, not willing, not acting.

Secondly, philosophy is not simply thinking, but co-thinking, i.e., such thinking that presupposes the thinking communication of people or the thinking of people together. Philosophy is collective thinking just as science is collective knowledge, art is collective feeling, religion is collective belief, morality is politics - law is collective will, economics is collective production-distribution, etc.

Thirdly, the starting and ending point of philosophizing is not knowledge, not goodness, not beauty, but a thought that has meaning for many other people, primarily for the philosophers themselves. Of course, they think collectively in science, in art, in all other spheres of human activity. But this collective thinking is only a subordinate moment of scientific, cognitive, artistic, etc. activity. It is philosophical only to the extent that it is internally free, not directly connected with the production of knowledge, beauty, material goods, etc. In philosophy, collective thinking is self-sufficient, as far as possible from the solution of cognitive-artistic practical tasks. The element of philosophy is the element of pure, self-sufficient thought.

Philosophy is the highest manifestation of the ability of the living-human to delay the reaction, action, response in order to think about how best to act-act.

The most elementary behavior is unconditioned reflex, when there is a minimum distance between sensation and action (for example, pulling the hand away from a hot object immediately after touching). Human behavior century the more difficult, the greater the distance (delay) between perception and action, cognition and practice. Philosophers are such representatives of the human race who personify-materialize this delay to the greatest extent. To philosophy "we are prompted by a strange need to delay, linger, stop, reflect, do what a busy person sees as idle, pre-judgmental, scholastic, abstract reasoning from life" .

If philosophers offer something to non-philosophers, then it is by no means ready-made answers, recipes, but their semi-finished products. After all, a thought-idea is always a semi-finished product...

* * *

Previously, some philosophers, writers and scientists put forward the position of philosophy as a science of sciences. This position, while correctly emphasizing the special role of philosophy in comparison with the private sciences as a general worldview, methodological, ideological basis of scientific knowledge, at the same time suffers from a significant flaw. It declares philosophy a science and thereby establishes a rigid connection between philosophical ideas and scientific theories. In fact, philosophy is a special form of thinking. It includes an element of science, but is not limited to a scientific form of knowledge. Science is a form of collective knowledge, while philosophy is a form of collective thinking of people.

(Let us note in brackets that there is a certain confusion in the views on the relationship between philosophy and science [when philosophy is presented as a science], and in the question of the relationship between thinking and cognition, the former is often presented as a part, type or form of the latter. In fact, between thinking and cognition there is a significant difference, and not only in the fact that cognition also includes sensory forms of reflection. Thinking equally "participates" in both cognitive and control-transforming activities, i.e. is an ideal tool for cognition and control-transformation. The latter are opposite in their direction. Cognition is mainly a reflective activity that translates the material into an ideal plan (deobjectification). In cognition, the subject seeks to share that what is divided in the object, and connect what is connected in the object... On the contrary, the control-transformation activity carries out the "translation" of the ideal into the material plane [objectification]. In this activity, the subject seeks to separate what is connected, and to connect what is divided. Thought, on the ideal, mental level, carries out the interaction [mutual transition, mutual mediation] of these oppositely directed forms of activity. It is therefore not reducible to any of these forms of activity.)

In addition, philosophy, unlike science, cannot oblige, prescribe, indicate "how it should be", be a legislator. Its provisions have only recommendatory power in relation to other branches of human activity. The expression "philosophy is the science of sciences" reflects just an attempt to present philosophy as the legislator of sciences, dictating its will to them, how to behave.

The specified expression is also incorrect in the sense that it limits the relationship of philosophy with other branches of human activity only to the area of relations with the sciences. Philosophy as a form of collective thinking is directly related to science, and to art, and to material practice, and to the management of society, and to the individual experience of a person. It reflects on all these forms of activity, occupying the position of the center or focus in which all forms of human activity converge. In other words, philosophy is the focus, the center of all human strivings and darings.

* * *

In our country, philosophy has long been (and still is) strongly tied to the state and science. Philosophical research is carried out to a large extent within or under the auspices of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The non-differentiation of philosophy from science leads it to unjustified learning, a kind of

philosophical scientism. Scientific language in philosophical books and articles is a very common phenomenon. As a result, the same is expected from philosophical research-reflections as from scientific research. The reverse side of this approach, i.e., the desire to "teach" philosophy, is the expectation from it of some specific scientific results, ready-made answers to the questions posed by life. Since this expectation is not justified, there comes a disappointment with philosophy.

Science, as we have already said, is concerned with knowledge; philosophy knows nothing. It only comprehends the course and results of knowledge (and not only knowledge, but also practice, art, in general, all human experience). Science is scientific, and philosophy is philosophical! Science produces knowledge. Philosophy produces and develops ideas. No more. Philosophical ideas are ideas of ideas: scientific, artistic, practical, etc. Accordingly, philosophizing does not directly serve knowledge, practice, art, but rather indirectly.

Philosophy in our country should not find its own face and finally free itself from external fetters. No one, neither scientific authorities, nor statesmen, nor religious figures, should interfere in the affairs of philosophy.

An example of scientification, scientification of philosophy are the attempts of some philosophers and philosophical schools to express the basic philosophical provisions in the form of laws. Since laws are discovered in science, it means that it can be done in philosophy as well. The most striking example of the invention of philosophical laws are Marxist

laws of dialectics. From our point of view, only science can claim to discover and study the laws of the subject area. In philosophy, "law" is only

one of the categories, paired with the category "phenomenon", and to call some philosophical foundations by the same term is a logical mistake. Either we must admit that "law" is the highest category of dialectics, or we must admit that the word "law" in the case when it comes to the "law of dialectics" has a different meaning than when it denotes one of the categories of dialectics. In the second case, there is a danger of ambiguous use of the term "law", leading only to confusion of concepts and to various distortions in thinking.

One of the reasons for the use of the concept of "law" in Marxist philosophy in relation to some of its main provisions is precisely the voluntary or involuntary drawing of an analogy between philosophy and science.

I would like to draw attention to another aspect of the question of the laws of dialectics. Our world is a probabilistic world, and chance plays no less a role in it than necessity, regularity. The expression "laws of dialectics", whether we like it or not, focuses on the knowledge of regularity, orderliness of the real world and leaves in the shade another, directly opposite side of it: disorder, variety of phenomena, stochastics. And this creates a well-known bias towards mechanistic, Laplacian determinism, which absolutizes necessity, regularity, orderliness. A bias in philosophical thinking leads to a bias in any other thinking: political, economic, managerial ... Isn't this the reason why for decades a cult of the plan has been created in our country, a cult of command, administrative methods of management and underestimated the value of stochastic mechanisms, in particular, the market, the election system? We mostly talked about consciousness, organization, planning, and fought

against spontaneity. But spontaneity is to a certain extent just as important as planning and organization. Human society is a living system, and what it needs is not a rigid order that presupposes a system of rigid determination of people's behavior, but a living order-disorder that equally takes into account necessity and chance, unity and diversity, general and particular.

* * *

The lifelessness of the concept of the laws of dialectics is especially evident in the example of the law of negation of negation. The concept of this law imposes on us a rigidly unambiguous (almost in the spirit of Laplacian determinism) scheme of the direction of development, formation. It, in essence, excludes the element of chance in the emergence of the new, the multivariance of the ways of development, formation. The concept of the law of negation of negation is vulnerable in another respect. This law is usually defined as a law that characterizes the direction of the development process, the unity of the emergence of the new and the relative repetition of some moments of the old. Meanwhile, if you think about it, the law of negation of negation cannot fully characterize the direction of development. Indeed, in any development (becoming) the most important moment is the transition from the old to the new, that is, the constructive movement from one positive content to another. In the law of the negation of negation, the emphasis is on negation, even if it is a second negation that denies the first. Yes, indeed, the new denies the old. But this is only a moment of the relation of the new to the old. The new has another positive content, which is not (never was!) in the old, and this content is by no means fully revealed by the concept of negation. From the denial of the old, the affirmation of the new does not at all follow, otherwise the anarchists and all sorts of nihilist deniers would be right. Negation always remains a negation, no matter how you call it: subtraction, dialectical negation, second negation. (In Hegelian philosophy, negation had the meaning of a positive concept, since this philosophy is characterized by a circularity of ideas - the absolute, world spirit eventually returns to itself). In the concept of negation, if we evaluate it realistically, the negative content always comes to the fore. Otherwise, this concept would be denoted by a different word. Of course, there is a difference between negation as destruction-annihilation and negation as a moment of development. But this does not give us the right to consider dialectical negation as such a moment that makes development development, and becoming - becoming.

The "Law" of Negative Negatives ania reflects only the fact of denial and continuity between the new and the old. The relationship between the old and the new is fully characterized by the categories of development and formation. No artificial props, even in the form of a "law of negation of negation," are required to explain the meaning of these categories. If we talk about the disclosure of the content of the categories "development" and "formation", then it should be said that this content is revealed in a whole system of categories and concepts.

* * *

Speaking about the fact that philosophy does not know anything, we had in mind that the "ecological niche" of philosophy as a special type of culture is not knowledge, but

thinking. The purpose of philosophizing is not the comprehension of truth, but wisdom. After all, philosophizing is philosophizing (in the good sense of the word). Only science "has the right" to engage in cognition. This is her feature, her "bread". One might say: what about the expressions "philosophical knowledge", "philosophical science", etc.? We will answer this: the words "knowledge" and "science" in relation to philosophy are used in a different sense than when they talk about science as a type of culture and about knowledge as a branch of human activity. After all, even in theology, the expressions "theological knowledge", "theological science" are often used. But after all, no one considers "theological knowledge" scientific knowledge, and "theological science" is really a science like physics, biology, sociology.

When people talk about philosophical knowledge, they do not mean the knowledge that is acquired in the process of scientific knowledge. Philosophical knowledge and scientific knowledge are different "things". Scientific knowledge is the result of cognition of the real world, the world as an object of cognition. Philosophical knowledge is the result of intra-philosophical information flows going from one philosopher to another. If I read the writings of Plato and understood them, then I gained knowledge about the teachings of Plato, about his ideas, views, etc. The sum of philosophical knowledge is, first of all, knowledge of the basic philosophical teachings-ideas of the past and present. Philosophical knowledge is similar to scientific knowledge in the sense that, like scientific knowledge, it more or less adequately, respectively, reflects the subject, in our case, the doctrine, ideas, thoughts of another philosopher (other philosophers). A philosophically educated person is a person who has more or less adequately perceived and assimilated the basic ideas of philosophers of the past and present. Philosophical education is the basis of philosophical learning and philosophical professionalism. The words "scholarship" and "scientist" in relation to the philosopher mean only that the person thoroughly studied philosophy. Almost the same can be said about the words "scientific" and "science". In relation to philosophy, these words mean the teaching of philosophy. In addition, the word "science" in combination with the adjective "philosophical" (philosophical science) means one or another section of philosophy that has become a relatively independent philosophical discipline, a branch of philosophical knowledge. Philosophical sciences are called ethics, aesthetics, logic...

* * *

In recent decades, another extreme has made itself felt in our country: anti-scientism-irrationalism. This is definitely a reaction to previous decades of philosophical scientism-rationalism. The liberated philosophers suddenly spoke like theologians, mystics, clairvoyants, prophets...

Neither scientism nor anti-scientism makes a philosopher a philosopher. We, philosophers, must learn to speak with our own voice - without science-likeness and scientism, on the one hand, and without religious-mystical, prophetic rhetoric-affectionation, on the other.

2. The subject and "parts" of philosophy

Philosophers have been discussing the problem of the "parts" of philosophy, its structuredness, since the initial accumulation of philosophical ideas took place and the first systematic philosophers appeared. Here are some quotes from ancient authors:

Seneca (mid-1st century AD): "Most of those who wrote about it, and the greatest ones, argued that philosophy

divided into three parts: the moral, the natural, and the

dedicated to the human mind. The first brings order to the soul. The second examines the nature of things. The third tests the properties of words, their location, types of evidence, so that a lie does not creep in under the guise of truth.

Diogenes Laertsky (beginning of the 3rd century AD): "Finally, some philosophers are called physicists, for the study of nature; others - ethics, for reasoning about mores; still others - dialecticians, for the intricacies of speeches. Physics, ethics and dialectics are the three parts of philosophy; physics teaches about the world and everything that it contains; ethics - about the life and properties of a person; dialectics, on the other hand, is concerned with arguments both for physics and for ethics. Before Archelaus [inclusive] there was only one genus - physics; from Socrates ... ethics originates; from Zeno of Elea - dialectic".

Sextus Empiricus (late 2nd - early 3rd century AD): "Since philosophy is a motley thing, for the purpose of a harmonious and methodical study of each point, it will be necessary to consider at least a little about the parts of philosophy.

If you get down to business directly, then some, as you know, when consider it as consisting of one part, others - from two, and still others - from three. Of those who accept one part, some admit the physical part, others the ethical part, still others the logical part. And likewise, of those who divide it in two, some have divided it into physical and logical parts, others into physical and ethical parts, and still others into logical and ethical parts. And those dividing it into three parts respectively divided it into physical, logical and ethical" (p. 61).

"Perfect in comparison with them are those who said that one thing in philosophy is something physical, the other is ethical, and the third is logical. The initiator of this, in principle, is Plato ... The disciples of Xenocrates, the Peripatetics, and also the Stoics adhere most distinctly to this division.

Hence, not without probability, philosophy is likened to a fruitful garden, when the physical part is compared with the growth of plants, the ethical part with the ripeness of fruits, and the logical part with the strength of the walls. Others say that it is similar to an egg, namely, that the ethical part is similar to the yolk, which, according to others, is the germ, the physical part is similar to the protein, which, as you know, is food for the yolk [i.e. e.], and logical - with an outer shell. Since the parts of philosophy are mutually inseparable, the plants, on the one hand, are considered separately from the fruits and the walls are separated from the plants, then Posidonius considered it more appropriate to liken

philosophy to a living being, namely: the physical part is blood and meat , logical - to bones and muscles, ethical - to the soul "(p. 63-64).

As can be seen from the quoted quotations, the ancient authors were close to a correct understanding of the relationship between the parts of philosophy. Indeed, philosophy in its full form can be divided into three parts according to three "objects": the object of activity, the subject of activity and the activity itself, more precisely, its means-methods.

So, the content of philosophy is made up of the most general ideas about the world as a whole, its categorical structure, about a person and the society in which he lives, about the ways in which a person works or masters the world. Graphically, the subject of philosophy looks like this:

Three "parts" of the subject of philosophy can be distinguished:

1. The world as a whole (objective reality), its categorical structure (an objective system of categorical definitions of the world).
2. Man and society (subjective reality).

Man-society is a dual subject in which man plays a decisive role. Man is the primary subject, society is secondary. Man "shines" with his light, society with reflected light. On the other hand, these two subjects, like two Magdeburg hemispheres, are inseparable. Man for himself is a subject in all respects. Society is not a subject for itself, much less a subject in all respects. For a person, society is primarily an objective reality. Society in relation to nature is a subject; it acts, transforms nature, but in relation to man it is both objective and the essence of something dependent, which is part of man. For example, science, a part of society, cannot exist without individual scientists. The latter make science science! Or: philosophy, as collective thinking, on the one hand, seems to exist independently of the individual philosopher, and, on the other hand, does not exist outside the thinking of individual philosophers. It can exist independently of an individual philosopher, but it cannot exist independently of a multitude of individual philosophers.

The greatest reality is not in an individual person and not in society, but in something in between the one and the other: in man-society or in society-man. A man-society is a man living in a society; society-man is a society that realizes itself in an individual person, lives thanks to a person.

3. Activity, interaction of the subject with the object, methods and directions of activity (thinking, knowledge, practice, art).

According to the three "parts" of the subject, three "parts" of philosophy can be distinguished:

1. The doctrine of the world as a whole and its categorical structure is an ideological "part".
2. The doctrine of man and society - philosophical anthropology and social philosophy.
3. The doctrine of the forms and methods of activity - the methodological "part".

As a worldview, philosophy gives the most general idea of the world as a whole and its categorical structure. The subject of this "part" of philosophy is the objective reality, the world as it exists on its own, independently of man and humanity. The ideological aspect of philosophy highlights its objectivity, impartiality. In this "part" she aspires to the ideal of "scientific" philosophy.

As a doctrine of man and society, philosophy implements the principle of "know thyself" and orients the development of man and society in a certain direction. This aspect of philosophy could be called ideological. He discovers its active, active, subjective character, its partiality.

As a doctrine of the forms and methods of activity, philosophy serves as a general method of cognition and practice. It is not enough to have an idea about the world as a whole, it is not enough to know what a person wants, it is also necessary to develop issues of successful activity for the development (cognition and transformation) of the world. The subject of the methodological "part" of philosophy is human activity in its various forms, in other words, the interaction of the subject (man and society) with the object (objective world). Philosophical methodology includes:

1. The doctrine of creativity.
2. Teaching about thinking.
3. The doctrine of knowledge.
4. Teaching about practice.
5. The doctrine of gaming activity (art, sports).

In the doctrine of thinking, the question of the idea is central.

In the doctrine of knowledge, the question of truth is central.

In the doctrine of practice, the question of the good, the value, is central.

In the doctrine of art, the central question is the question of the beautiful, beauty.

Each of these "parts" of philosophical methodology has its own system of specific categories-concepts.

* * *

Philosophy, like any other branch of human activity, develops, becomes more complex, and, consequently, differentiates within itself. There is a process of differentiation of

philosophy and specialization of its individual parts. On the other hand, philosophical systems arise from time to time, "working" towards the integration of philosophical ideas. The differentiation and integration of philosophy are two sides of a single process of its formation and development.

A kind of division of labor between philosophers has long since developed. They were divided into specialist philosophers (specializing in any one area of philosophy) and systematist philosophers, striving to cover the whole wealth of philosophical ideas with a single mind's eye. Both those and other philosophers are needed by modern society.

Approximately the same situation is observed in the natural-knowledge. Thus, speaking in defense of Hegel, the physicist from the USA B. Steferding holds the idea that the historical misunderstanding between the natural sciences and Hegelian philosophy needs to be revised. According to him, Hegel, being a great philosopher, "set himself the same tasks as the theorists of natural science set themselves, namely, to bring known facts into a coherent system." According to him, "95% of all modern natural science research is aimed at expanding knowledge about the facts, and only a few of the natural scientists are concerned about bringing facts and data into an all-encompassing system."

D. Diderot expressed interesting thoughts about the philosophers-collectors of facts and systematists. He wrote: "On the one hand, to collect, on the other hand, to link facts - two very difficult activities; philosophers and distributed these activities among themselves. Some devote their lives to collecting materials, they are useful and industrious workers; others, proud builders, hasten to use them. But time has up to now overturned almost all the constructions of rational philosophy. Doomed to work in the dust, the worker sooner or later brings out of the dungeon, where he acts blindly, a block that is destructive for this architecture, invented in the head way; it collapses, and only piles of rubble remain, until another bold genius undertakes a new combination..."

We have distinguished two kinds of philosophy: experimental philosophy and rational philosophy. One is blindfolded, she always stumbles, she takes everything that falls into her hands, and, in the end, stumbles upon precious things. Another picks up this precious material and tries to kindle a torch from it; but until now this imaginary torch has served her worse than her rival's groping; this is natural. Experience infinitely multiplies its searches, it acts continuously; he is invariably looking for phenomena, while the mind follows the path of analogies. Experimental philosophy does not know what it will come across in the work and what will not be; but she works tirelessly. On the contrary, rational philosophy weighs the possibilities, pronounces its judgment, and falls silent..."

If we take the development of philosophy over long periods of time, we will see that from time to time all-encompassing systems of philosophy appeared. In ancient Greece, such an all-encompassing system was the philosophy of Aristotle. In modern times, every major philosopher claimed to create a system of philosophical knowledge. Systematic teachings left Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Locke, Kant. Hegel has truly become the Aristotle of modern times.

3. Philosophical pluralism, variety of philosophical teachings and trends

The variety of philosophical teachings and trends - from the variety of human types, characters and the variety of forms of activity. Even Aristotle noticed that the views of the philosopher are determined by what he does. About Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, he wrote: "... the so-called Pythagoreans, having taken up mathematics, were the first to develop it and, having mastered it, began to consider its beginnings to be the beginnings of everything that exists" . Fichte noted something else: "Which philosophy you choose depends on what kind of person you are."

materialism and idealism

The most famous division of philosophers is into materialists and idealists. It is also the oldest. Already Plato divided the philosophers in a similar way.

According to A.N. Chanyшева, Plato he was the first philosopher in the history of philosophy who realized that the history of philosophy is the history of the struggle between two types of philosophers (who later became known as materialists and idealists). Of the philosophers, "some draw everything from heaven and from the invisible to the earth ... assert that there is only that which allows touch and touch, and recognize bodies and being as one and the same," while others insist that that "true being is some intelligible and incorporeal ideas" (Sophist, 246 AB). At the same time, Plato speaks of the struggle between these two types of philosophers: the first of all those who say that there is something incorporeal is "poured with contempt", the latter do not recognize the body as being. "Regarding this (i.e., what to take for being: bodies or ideas. - A. Ch.) between both sides," Plato concludes his story about two types of philosophers, "a strong struggle takes place" (there same). Plato is on the side of the second philosophers. He calls them "the meeker ones" (246 AC)." - A. N. Chanyшев. From an unpublished manuscript on the history of ancient philosophy.

Materialism and idealism are different mainly because of the difference in their objects. The object of materialistic philosophy is nature, and everything else it considers through the "prism" of nature. The main object of attention of idealistic philosophy are the highest forms of human, spiritual, social life. If the spiritual life of human society is taken as the basis, then this is objective idealism. If the spiritual life of the individual is taken as the basis, then this is subjective idealism.

Materialists come from nature, from matter, and explain the phenomena of the human spirit on the basis of material causes. Idealists proceed from the phenomena of the human spirit, from thinking, and on their basis explain everything else. In short, the materialists go from the world to man and his mind, while the idealists go from man to the world.

Idealists try to explain the lower through the higher, while materialists, on the contrary, try to explain the higher through the lower.

Materialists view the ideal as a cast, a reflection of the real. Idealists, on the other hand, regard the real as a cast product of the ideal. Both of them are right in their own way. Materialists absolutize the cognitive ability of a person (after all, in cognition we translate the real into an ideal plan; the ideal obtained in the process of cognition only repeats the real, corresponds to it, separates what is divided in an object and unites what is connected in an object; in cognition we adapt to the world, we try to merge with it, to dissolve in it). Idealists absolutize the control-transforming ability of a person (in control-transformative activity we translate the ideal into a real plan; the real, obtained as a result of such activity, only repeats the ideal, corresponds to it; in control-transformative activity we adapt We bring the world down to our needs, we try to subjugate it, dominate it, humanize it, spiritualize it).

There is one more difference between materialism and idealism, about which A. I. Herzen wrote: that being one accident of essence is quite a bit. Idealism saw and recognized one universal, generic, essence, the human mind, estranged from everything human; materialism, in the same way one-sided, went straight to the destruction of everything immaterial, denied the universal, saw the separation of the brain, in empiricism a single source of knowledge, and recognized the truth in some particulars, in some things, tangible and visible; for him there was a reasonable person, but there was no reason, no humanity ... ".

It should also be pointed out that materialism and idealism are very different in their value orientations. "It is impossible to reconcile people, whose views on the origin and essence of the world are polar, because they come from fundamentally different worldviews, it is impossible to use logical arguments," L. N. Gumilyov rightly notes. Some perceive the material world and its diversity as a blessing, others as an unconditional evil..." One does not need to look far for examples. Here is Hegel's opinion: "... everything spiritual is better than any product of nature." The biologist R. Mayer was of the opposite opinion. "Nature in its simple truth," he wrote, "is greater and more beautiful than any creation of human hands, than all the illusions of the created spirit." He is echoed by the Russian poet K. N. Batyushkov:

What is our earthly language before wondrous nature?

With what carelessness and easy freedom

She scattered beauty everywhere

And diversity agreed with unity!

But where, what brush depicted her?

Barely one feature of her.

From the point of view of categorical logic, materialism and idealism contain a whole complex of absolutizations and one-sidedness. They are not just errors, but distortions of categorical thinking.

Their common mistake is monism. Materialism willingly or unwittingly reduces the entire diversity of the world to one category - matter. Idealism, on the other hand, reduces all the diversity of the world to the ideal, spiritual.

Further, if materialism gravitates towards reductionism, then idealism, on the contrary, endows the lower with the features of the higher, thereby complicating and mystifying it.

The most classical form of idealism: Hegel's idealism. He was characterized by such errors: absolutism, holism, infinitism, qualificationism, realism, systematism, non-cessism, panlogism.

Rationalism, empiricism, irrationalism

Another well-known division of philosophers is into rationalists, empiricists and irrationalists.

The word "rationalism" comes from the French "rationalisme", which in turn comes from the Latin "rationalis", and the latter from the Latin "ratio". One of the main meanings of the word "ratio" is reason. Accordingly, rationalism is often understood as a concept that affirms the supremacy of reason in human life. And irrationalism by contradiction is considered as a concept that rejects the supremacy of reason in human life. Who is right?

The indisputable authority of reason seems obvious and, on the contrary, it is strange why people, philosophers again and again attack reason, reject its claims to supremacy, etc., etc.

There is a contradiction in the fact that the mind controls a person, his behavior. On the one hand, it is clear that the main threads of human behavior control are concentrated in the mind. But, on the other hand, how can a "part" (and the mind is only a "part" of a person, albeit the main one, but still a "part") manage, "twist" the whole?

Yes, indeed, the mind is only a "part", but one that makes the whole whole. Reason is an integral "property" of a person that makes him whole, i.e., in a certain sense, he is both a part and a whole, is a link between the "parts" of a person and a person as a whole.

Rationalists love Cartesian "I think, therefore I am." Irrationalists are closer to Shakespeare's words: "There are many, friend Horace, in the world such that our wise men never dreamed of."

Rationalists focus on the supremacy of reason, and irrationalists - on its limitations, on the fact that the mind is smaller than the person himself, less than life, and therefore cannot be the supreme leader of life. Both are right in their own way. The truth, as always, is somewhere in the middle. A person, on the one hand, tries to be guided in his behavior by the arguments of reason, and, on the other hand, sometimes behaves like an extra-rational

being, devoid of reason, or even simply insane, as feeling, enjoying or suffering, as willing or limp, etc.

The difference between rationalism and irrationalism is not only in their relation to reason. They are logic and intuition, rationality and alogism, elevated to the rank of a philosophical concept or consciously accepted as methodological guidelines, paradigms.

Rationalists tend to order, love it and absolutize it. Accordingly, they absolutize knowledge, they try to interpret everything unknown from the standpoint of known, available knowledge.

Irrationalists, on the contrary, do not like the usual order of things, are prone to disorder, ready to allow anything. Irrationalists are lovers of paradoxes, riddles, mysticism, etc. They absolutize ignorance, the sphere of the unknown, the unknown, mystery.

One can distinguish between moderate and extreme rationalism, moderate and extreme irrationalism.

Moderate rationalism is quite self-critical about itself (for example: K. Popper's critical rationalism), rejects a purely rational, purely logical approach to assessing the phenomena of the world.

Extreme rationalism is rational, disgustingly logical, prudent like a computer, acts in such ideological settings as Laplacian determinism, mechanism, technocracy.

Moderate irrationalism emphasizes emotionality, uniqueness, individuality, disdainfully treats logic, loves paradoxes and riddles (example: S. Kierkegaard's philosophy, existentialism). In art, he appears in the form of absurdism, surrealism ...

Extreme irrationalism usually takes the form of mysticism. For him, everything is a mystery, everything is a miracle, any violation of the order (laws, rules, the natural course of events, life, etc.) is possible. Mysticism can be religious and non-religious or semi-religious.

Empiricism is the absolutization of experience, an intermediate (between logic and intuition) way of thinking, a probabilistic approach. It appears in two forms: sensationalism and pragmatism. Sensational empiricism focuses on sensory experience (sensus - feeling, feeling), sensory knowledge. Pragmatic empiricism focuses on the physical activity of a person, on physical and practical actions that lead to success. Sensationalism is passive, contemplative; pragmatism is active, active.

Empiricism occupies an intermediate position between rationalism and irrationalism. This is evident from the following.

First. It is clear that there is a deeper difference between rationalism and irrationalism than between rationalism and empiricism. And if we place the indicated philosophical-methodological positions-settings in one row, then rationalism and irrationalism will be extremely far from each other, and empiricism - the middle term.

Second. The intermediate character of empiricism is also indicated by the fact that it can gravitate towards rationalism, to be, so to speak, rationalistic, and towards irrationalism, to be irrationalistic. T. Hobbes and D. Locke were empiricist philosophers of a rationalistic persuasion, but J. Berkeley is an empiricist philosopher of an irrationalist persuasion.

Third. Empiricists reject the extremes of rationalism and irrationalism. They rather modestly evaluate both rational, deductive logic, and intuition, fantasy. Let us recall how F. Bacon, an empirically oriented philosopher, opposed the deductive logic of Aristotle. He opposed Aristotle's *Organon* with his "New Organon", in which he tried to substantiate the universal significance of induction as a scientific method. On the other hand, empiricists do not favor intuition (guess, fantasy, imagination). They oppose mysticism.

This, by the way, does not exclude the "friendship" of extreme empiricism with mysticism. Here is what, for example, F. Engels wrote about the flat empiricism of the biologist Wallace and the chemist Crookes: "But enough. Here we have clearly seen what is the surest path from natural science to mysticism. This is not the unbridled theorizing of natural philosophers, but the flattest empiricism, which despises all theory and treats all thinking with distrust (emphasis mine. - L. B.). The existence of spirits is proved not on the basis of a priori necessity, but on the basis of the empirical observations of Messrs. Wallace, Crookes and company. Since we trust the spectral-analytical observations of Crookes, which led to the discovery of thallium metal, or the rich zoological discoveries of Wallace on the islands of the Malay Archipelago, we are required to have the same trust in spiritualistic experiments and discoveries. both of these scientists. And when we declare that there is still a small difference here, namely, that we can verify discoveries of the first kind, while we cannot verify the second, the spirit-seers answer us that this is not true and that they are ready to give us the opportunity to verify and spiritual phenomena."

In general, empiricists are too modest in their assessment of human thinking and reason in particular. Empiricist sensualists favor sensory experience. Their most prominent representative - D. Locke - argued: "There is nothing in the mind that would not have been in the senses before." Think about these words: what, in essence, is the humiliation of reason! (Then what is the reason for, if there is nothing in it that would not be in the senses?)

Empiricists of the pragmatic direction give preference to action, practical experience.

Such a modest assessment of thinking and reason is quite consistent with the probabilistic nature of empirical thinking. After all, on the basis of experience, only probable conclusions can be drawn. In this case there is no place for deduction or intuition. And where there is no deduction and intuition, there is no Reason as the highest ability of thinking, uniting both. And one has to talk about thinking as a whole as about some convention, as about some kind of incomprehensible appendage to sensuality. Indeed, what is thinking without Reason, i.e. without Force and Depth?! And in general, is thinking possible without the interaction (in the broadest sense) of logic and intuition?!

One can distinguish between extreme and moderate empiricists. Extreme empiricists take the position that there is only that which can be touched and felt. "What you cannot take into your hands is not for you" (Goethe) - this is their credo. According to them, experience is the only source of knowledge. Extreme empiricism is also called creeping empiricism. He crawls through particular cases and does not try to break away from them, that is, he does not try to generalize. Creeping empiricism is not capable of flying.

Moderate empiricism in words is for experience as a source of knowledge, but in reality it is forced to take into account to some extent what lies outside of experience.

Moderate empiricists are like birds with clipped wings, or like chickens that are so heavy that they can only soar but not fly.

Below is a diagram of the relationship between rationalism, empiricism, irrationalism and "reasonism" (Fig. 2, right).

It is similar to the structural scheme of thinking (see Fig. 2, left). This allows not only to talk about the difference or opposition of these approaches, but to classify them, clarify their place and role in human culture.

It can be seen from the diagram that the most balanced position is the position of "reasonism". It covers all types of thinking (logic, intuition, probabilistic thinking) and avoids the extremes-one-sidedness of rationalism, irrationalism, empiricism. The term "rationalism" is not suitable for designating this position, since in Russian it can be understood both as "reasonism" and as "reasonism". This uncertainty in the understanding of the term creates a constant danger of interpreting it in a one-sided sense (as "reasoning"). This is first. Secondly, the one-sidedness of rationalism is, as it were, produced and set by the fact of the existence of the opposite position - irrationalism. The dispute between rationalism and irrationalism is, in essence, a situation of positional conflict, as in a court: between the accusation and protection. Accordingly, as in court, there must be a supreme arbiter between rationalism and irrationalism. It cannot be rationalism, since rationalism itself is one of the arguing parties.

(K. Popper tried to overcome the one-sidedness of rationalism and irrationalism in the concept of critical rationalism, and he did it, in general, not badly. Only the name of the concept is unsuccessful. Critical, and even rationalism! Popper did not take into account what he expressed. The term "critical rationalism" is rather vague, open to different interpretations, not only the one he gave. For example, "critical rationalism" can be understood as the recognition of criticism as the dominant way of thinking. Or it can be understood as rationalism, criticizing everything that is not rationalism, etc., etc.)

Dogmatists and skeptics

Philosophers are also divided into dogmatists and skeptics. Philosophers-dogmatists develop their own ideas or state others' ideas and defend them, i.e., they argue mainly in the spirit of positive, constructive, affirmative philosophizing. On the contrary, skeptical philosophers are tuned mainly to the wave of critical, destructive philosophizing. They themselves do not develop ideas, but only criticize others. The dogmatist philosophers are the inventor philosophers or expounder philosophers, and the skeptical philosophers are cleaner philosophers, garbage philosophers.

Critical philosophical reflection is very useful for defining and clarifying the boundaries of philosophizing, for clarifying what philosophy can and cannot. Pikes in philosophy are just as necessary as carp. That's what the pike is for, so that the crucian does not doze off - says the proverb. In antiquity there was a whole school of such philosophers.

Extreme dogmatists are no longer philosophers, but people who affirm and defend ideas in spite of any circumstances, without taking into account specific conditions. They do not tolerate any objection and do not tolerate any criticism. Extreme dogmatists are either fanatics or people with ossified rational thinking. Extreme skeptics are also no longer philosophers, but people who do not believe in anything, subjecting everything to crushing, annihilating criticism. These are either spiteful critics who do not like everything, or very suspicious people.

subjectivists, objectivists,
methodologists

The following division of philosophers also deserves attention: into subjectivists, objectivists and methodologists, depending on the main subject of philosophizing. Philosophers-objectivists focus on worldview problems, on understanding the external world. These include most materialists, natural philosophers, ontologists. Subjectivist philosophers focus on the problems of man and society. These include idealists, philosophers of life, existentialists. Finally, methodological philosophers comprehend mainly the forms and means of human activity. These are Kantians, positivists, neo-positivists, pragmatists, representatives of linguistic philosophy, philosophers of science.

Philosophers - "specialists"

In the last hundred or two hundred years, philosophers have appeared who, figuratively speaking, serve the connection of philosophy with other forms of culture. Philosophy does not exist in an airless space. As a part of culture, it is closely connected with its other parts. Human culture as such is united and diverse. If we imagine it as a discrete-continuous field, then some "areas" are clearly distinguished on it - science, art, practice, religion and, of course, our philosophy. These "sections" of the cultural field, on the one hand, are relatively independent, independent of each other, on the other hand, they are closely connected with each other and have many intermediate links-transitions between them. Philosophy, for example, smoothly passes into science, and science into

philosophy. On the one hand, scientizing philosophers work in philosophy (philosophers of science, philosopher-methodologists who specialize in the problems of scientific knowledge), on the other hand, philosophizing scientists work in science, developing problems of general scientific and particular scientific methodology. The same close connection can be seen between philosophy and art. There are philosophers who specialize exclusively in the philosophical understanding of art and literature, and there are philosophizing art historians and artists. Now, if we take philosophy and practice, we will clearly see, on the one hand, pragmatic philosophers, instrumental philosophers, for example, and, on the other, philosophizing politicians, statesmen, managers, inventors, engineers and other practical specialists. If we talk about transitional links between philosophy and religion, then there are also quite a few of them. There are theologians, religious philosophers, and there are philosophizing theologians and clergymen.

Taxonomy Philosophers

And, finally, there is a very small number of philosophers who are difficult to attribute to any one type, direction. These are the so-called pure philosophers, systematic philosophers, creators of comprehensive philosophical systems. I spoke about them in the previous section. These philosophers are omnivorous in a good way, their views are interests, likes and dislikes etc. residually balanced and it is they who deserve the title of philosophers to the greatest extent, that is, people striving for wisdom, sages.

4. Practical philosophy (sophology)

Our life is what we think about it.

Marcus Aurelius

The practical significance of philosophy stems from the fundamental fact that thought can directly influence action: either encourage a person to action, or, on the contrary, slow down, stop action, turn away from it. Needless to say, this also applies to practical philosophy as a branch of philosophy in general.

The purpose of practical philosophy is to induce with the help of thought to right, good actions and to turn away from erroneous, bad actions.

It must be kept in mind that practical philosophy is not the same as the practical role of philosophy. Philosophy as a whole has a certain practical impact on people's lives. And mostly indirectly, through science, invention, politics, economics, art, literature. Practical philosophy is that part of philosophy that tries to directly influence people's lives, through philosophical texts and speeches, through live communication between philosophers and people, through philosophical conversations between people.

Practical philosophy, in the exact sense of the word, was professionally practiced by a few: some sophists in ancient Greece and some philosophers who used philosophical argument in their individual and collective conversations for various practical purposes.

In a broad sense, practical philosophy includes texts and speeches by various authors containing philosophical arguments, thoughts about life, man, about the attitude to the world, addressed to all people and encouraging or averting action. These texts and speeches, as a rule, do not have the nature of research, but contain reasoning, individual thoughts and recommendations ... In this second meaning, practical philosophy has a rich history and traditions. Many philosophers of the past have left texts that have a practical philosophical meaning. And not only philosophers, but also other writers: poets, prose writers, scientists, historians, psychologists, politicians, etc.

Unfortunately, practical philosophy (in its basic meaning, like sophology) is still in its infancy. Society is only now beginning to realize that philosophy can directly (without intermediaries of various kinds) influence the affairs and destinies of people, that philosophers can work with people - like psychologists, psychoanalysts, doctors, priests.

Practical philosophy is often understood as a branch of philosophy devoted to human affairs aimed at achieving the good. This is how many philosophers, including Hegel, understood it. From my point of view, it is not entirely accurate to call the reflection of the good, of practical action, practical philosophy. By and large, practical philosophy differs from philosophy in general not so much in its content-subject as in its "ability" to directly influence the thoughts and deeds of people.

Such a philosophy is better denoted by a special term. I propose to call it sophology, and the practical philosopher a sophologist.

Of course, people (non-philosophers) most often turn to those sections of philosophy that are of interest to them in everyday, utilitarian-narrow-practical terms. But this does not mean that they are not at all interested in other sections of philosophy. For example, are they not interested in worldview questions, and do not these questions, or rather the answers to them, affect people's behavior? Influence, and how! Do they care what they think? Of course not! Any, even the most abstract (far from this or that everyday affairs) philosophical question can be of interest to a non-philosopher. As I have already said, in a precise sense, practical philosophy is a philosophy that directly connects philosophy with life, with non-philosophy. And a sophologist, a practical philosopher, is a philosopher who is able and able to establish contact with a non-philosopher, who, through intelligent conversation, can influence his thoughts and deeds. In the role of a sophologist, a practical philosopher, any philosopher can turn out to be, if he has ever productively and precisely as a philosopher talked with a non-philosopher. Practical philosophy can become the profession of a philosopher if the latter establishes constant lively communication with non-philosophers and receives remuneration for this ...

In the light of what has been said, it becomes clear that practical and worldly philosophy are not the same thing. The last is only part of the first. Everyday philosophy is the philosophy of everyday, ordinary life of a person. It is far from fundamental - philosophical, human and methodological - issues. And this is its limitation.

Sometimes instead of the word "worldly" in relation to philosophy, the word "vital" is used. A philosophy of life is a philosophy of life in general, of life as such. It can be very deep, affecting fundamental worldview and human issues.

(Increasingly in recent decades, the expression "applied philosophy" has been used. In the 80s, the British Society of applied philosophy and its publication - The Journal of Applied Philosophy. Applied philosophy is usually opposed to the fundamental problems of metaphysics as a reflection on the problems of real life, as a philosophy that is directly related to life decisions, primarily in the field of morality and politics. The topics of applied philosophy include topics that have a public resonance, such as: animal rights, lies and secrets in public and private life, euthanasia, the problem of sex, abortion, feminism, what is decent and what is obscene, etc.

How legitimate is the use of the expression "applied philosophy"? Are we not here trying to impose on philosophy a scheme for dividing certain sciences into theoretical-pure sciences and applied-technological experimental ones, or a scheme for dividing the arts into pure and applied ones? After all, philosophy is a special type of culture, not reducible to either the sciences or the arts. I leave this question open. One thing is clear: the topics of the so-called applied philosophy fit entirely into the mainstream of practical philosophy as its part-section).

So, practical philosophy (sophology) is a philosophy that aims to influence people with the power of thought through the word, persuasion - in the process of live communication (consultation-conversations, interviews, discussions, analysis of a specific situation).

A practical philosopher (like a practical psychologist, psychoanalyst, doctor, priest, lawyer) organizes a counseling-interview-confession service. His task: consulting and interviewing on the main issues of life, development, love, creativity, health ...

In more detail, the need for an institute of a practical philosopher is dictated by the following:

1. A philosopher, unlike representatives of other professions (psychologists, doctors, lawyers, sexologists, priests, etc.), considers a person holistically, in all his life manifestations. It is he who is able to talk to a person as a person, to take into account all aspects of human existence-experience and, as it were, to conduct all the tools of influence on a person. The psychologist-psychoanalyst is looking for a solution to human problems in the psyche, the doctor - in the restoration of health, the lawyer - in the effective use of legislation, etc. Only a philosopher can evaluate which remedy should be used in certain situations. And it is he who can offer the complex use of various means, that is, to coordinate and conduct.

2. In addition, the philosopher has such a means of solving human problems that no representative of any other human-oriented activity professionally has. That medium is thought. A professional philosopher is a person who has made thinking (reasoning,

argumentation, persuasion, criticism) his profession. And it is he, only he, who can professionally use thought-thinking as a means of influencing a person to solve his problems.

3. It must be borne in mind that philosophy is invisibly present in the minds of people, whether they want it or not. People discuss philosophical problems in one way or another, without calling them philosophical. These discussions are mostly unqualified and ignorant. A whole sea of pseudo-philosophical reasoning can be found in television and radio programs, in films, in books, newspapers and magazines. In addition, many human experts (psychologists, doctors, lawyers, priests, etc.), in addition to purely professional conversations and recommendations, conduct purely philosophical conversations with their clients and give philosophical advice. They work, essentially, in the field of practical philosophy. Naturally, all these discussions and recommendations in most cases leave much to be desired. It is clear that professional philosophers must work here. Practical philosophy just means that the philosopher directly works with people, together with them solves their fundamental questions of life. Not with the masses, not with the audience (as in the case of students or readers), but with everyone who wishes individually! The essence of practical philosophy is precisely this: in exclusivity, in targeting, in an individual approach.

4. Some philosophers believe that philosophy should not condescend to the individual. Such a view is due, on the one hand, to the understanding of philosophy as very far from a particular person, and, on the other hand, to the understanding of the problems of a particular person as insignificant for philosophy. In both cases, we are dealing with a kind of philosophical Platonism, that is, with the absolutization of the general-universal and the underestimation of the individual, the separate, the specific. Yes, indeed, philosophy deals with questions of ultimate generality. But after all, every single person thinks about such questions. There is no common without separate, singular, just as there is no single without common. Any most fundamental question is peripetic, situational, depends on the specific life of a particular person, on his characteristics and the characteristics of his life. Conversely, any specific vital the problem is connected by thousands of threads with the solution of general questions. The task of a practical philosopher: to constantly highlight, to show this connection between the general and the separate, the connection between fundamental philosophical and concrete life issues.

5. With the introduction of the institution of practical philosophers (so-phologists), a good ancient tradition is being revived. In ancient times there was already a similar institution of practical philosophers. They are sophists, teachers of wisdom, teachers of life. Among them were, however, those who taught false wisdom, idle talk, sophistry. Nevertheless, initially there was a rational grain in the activities of the sophists. With their conversations and wise advice, they really helped people.

Practical philosophy in the history of human thought. The works of practical philosophy include those that contain thoughts about life, man, about the attitude to the world, addressed to all people and having practical meaning, i.e., encouraging or repelling action. These works, as a rule, do not have the nature of research, but contain reasoning, separate thoughts and recommendations-advice. Confucius, many ancient philosophers, M.

Montaigne, F. Bacon, A. Schopenhauer wrote in the spirit of practical philosophy... In a certain sense, the books of the American Dale Carnegie and our Vladimir Levy can be attributed to the works of practical philosophy.

ANNEX 1

Controversial issues of philosophy

Is there a fundamental question of philosophy?

The concept of the main question of philosophy is from the category of categorical and logical errors called monism.

Marxist philosophers adhered to this concept. Here is what F. Engels wrote:

"The great fundamental question of all philosophy, especially of modern philosophy, is the question of the relation of thought to being. Already from that very distant time, when people, still not having any idea about the structure of their body and not being able to explain dreams, came to the idea that their thinking and sensations are the activity not of their body, but of some special the soul that lives in this body and leaves it at death - from that time on, they had to think about the relationship of this soul to the outside world. (...)

The highest question of all philosophy, the question of the relation of thinking to being, of the spirit to nature, has its roots, therefore, no less than any religion, in the limited and ignorant ideas of people of the period of savagery . But it could be put with all sharpness, could acquire all its significance only after the population of Europe woke up from the long winter hibernation of the Christian Middle Ages. The question of the relation of thinking to being, of what is primary: spirit or nature - this question, which, however, played a large role in medieval scholasticism, in spite of the church, took on a sharper form: was the world created by God or has it existed for centuries?

Philosophers have divided into two large camps according to how they answered this question. Those who asserted that the spirit existed before nature, and who, therefore, in the final analysis, in one way or another recognized the creation of the world - and among philosophers, for example, Hegel, the creation of the world often takes even more confused and absurd look than in Christianity - they made up an idealistic camp. Those who considered nature to be the main principle joined the various schools of materialism.

The expressions idealism and materialism originally mean nothing else, and it is only in this sense that they are used here. We shall see below what confusion arises when they are given some other meaning.

But the question of the relation of thinking to being has yet another side: how do our thoughts about the world around us relate to this world itself? Is our thinking able to cognize the real world, can we, in our ideas and concepts of the real world, constitute a true reflection of reality? In philosophical language, this question is called the question of the identity of thinking and being. The vast majority of philosophers answer this question in the affirmative" (F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of German classical philosophy).

It is not only Marxists who adhere to the idea of the fundamental question of philosophy. At the other extreme of philosophical thinking, the writer-philosopher Albert Camus came up with the same idea. He begins his essay "Myth Sisyphé" (section "Absurd Reasoning", paragraph "Absurdity and Suicide") with the words: "There is only one really serious philosophical problem - the problem of suicide. To decide whether or not life is worth living is to answer the fundamental question of philosophy. Everything else - whether the world has three dimensions, whether the mind is guided by nine or twelve categories is secondary. These are the conditions of the game: first of all, you need to give an answer. And if it is true, as Nietzsche wanted it to be, that a respectable philosopher should serve as an example, then the significance of the answer is understandable - certain actions will follow it. This evidence is felt by the heart, but it is necessary to delve into it in order to make it clear to the mind "(emphasis mine. - L. B.)

Where did A. Camus get that the problem of suicide is "left one really serious philosophical problem"? It is necessary to be absolutely ignorant in philosophical problems.

On the side of Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel and other great minds. After all, they were concerned with the world as such, with categories as such. It turns out, according to Camus, they dealt with secondary problems of philosophy, but here he, Camus, together with Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Jaspers, is engaged in a worthwhile business - the problem of suicide, life on the verge of death. Categories, categorical analysis - this higher mathematics of philosophy - for Camus is a secondary matter of philosophy. What poverty of thought and spirit!

Camus, like some other philosophers, simply "obsessed" on the topic of death. He even expresses positive ideas in the wrapper of this topic. Here are two examples:

"... It makes sense to die only for freedom, because only then is a person sure that he does not die entirely" (this phrase is placed on the last page of the cover under the portrait of A. Camus of the Russian edition of the collection of his works "The Rebellious Man". - M.: Politizdat, 1990).

Or: "Most of us, both in my homeland and in Europe, have abandoned this nihilism and moved on to the search for a new meaning in life. They had to master the art of existence in times fraught with a worldwide catastrophe in order to be reborn and begin a

fierce struggle against the death instinct that rules our history "(from a speech dated December 10, 1957 on the occasion of receiving the Nobel Prize).

It's hard to read Camus. Life in the face of death, murder, suicide - in a variety of perspectives. Most often in conjunction with another negative theme - the theme of the absurd. As if there are no other topics. As if a person only thinks about death and the absurd. A lot of honor - to drill the brain with these topics! If we consider the theme of life in relation to death as the most important philosophical theme, then by this willy-nilly we devalue life itself, we take out of brackets all its internal content, i.e. everything that happens inside life, from birth to death. In this case, we cease to perceive life normally, not life itself, but only its border, and in fact we become prisoners of this border-death. I recall in this connection the saying of Spinoza: "A free man thinks of nothing less than death, and his wisdom consists in thinking not about death, but about life" (Ethics // Spinoza B. Selected Works. T. 1. M., 1957. S. 576). Indeed, a free man thinks not about death, but about life. And the one who constantly thinks about death is truly its prisoner, that is, not a free person.

What are philosophical statements?

People say many different things. Mainly on those we have everyday life. They rarely talk about topics related to their work, profession. Even less often on abstract topics. And in all these cases, from time to time they make statements that are distinctly philosophical in nature, philosophical statements. Making philosophical statements is by no means the prerogative of philosophers. Almost everyone does this. Take, for example, the statement of the political scientist S. A. Karaganov "Man is imperfect." This statement is obviously philosophical. It concerns such an object as a person in general. It turns out that philosophy is invisibly present in the form of such statements everywhere and everywhere, in discussions and texts of different people, both simple and complex.

When they talk about the world in general, being-non-being, about life, about man in general, about good and evil, as such, about space, time, then the phenomenon of philosophicality arises.

In a word, this phenomenon arises every time when, explicitly or implicitly, there are place-nouns of the type "everything, everything, all, everywhere, everywhere, always" in statements. These pronouns are clearly present, for example, in such statements: "everything is relative", "doubt everything", "life is everywhere", "everything has its reason", "nothing happens by chance".

Usually philosophical statements are made to reinforce some particular theses, to justify or condemn something.

This is how S. A. Karaganov reasoned.

He was asked: "Who made such a rule that politics is a dirty business? Hasn't the old generation of politicians brought politics to the point where politics is a dirty business?"

- You know, a person is imperfect and managing him ... especially ... is a rather difficult task. To effectively manage, you have to use all methods. The older generation approximately began about four thousand years ago, when political power was born in its present form (...) therefore, old people, of course, old people in general ... all this was imposed on us, but what to do, but this is a man man is imperfect."

With the help of the thesis "man is imperfect", Karaganov tried to substantiate and justify both the opinion that "politics is a dirty business" and the idea that "the end justifies the means", saying "to manage effectively, one has to use all methods".

The truth of philosophical statements can neither be proved nor disproved. They can be somehow substantiated or questioned, criticized, but no more.

Philosophical statements are like axioms or postulates. They either accept Xia, or are not accepted, i.e., they agree or disagree with them.

Philosophy helps shape beliefs

and, if necessary, correct them

The general goal of philosophy classes is to instill in students a love for philosophy, or at least to interest them in philosophical problems, so that they feel a taste for philosophy, understand its need for themselves and so that they learn to think philosophically (abstractly and deeply) , analyze, reason, generalize.

1. I'll start with exam questions in philosophy. It is they who orient both the behavior of students and the behavior of teachers in one direction or another, set the tone for the entire educational process, and determine the requirements for all participants in this process. In Soviet times, the examination in philosophy focused almost exclusively on testing knowledge, more precisely, on assessing the degree of assimilation of a certain amount of information in the field of philosophy (on the history of philosophy and on Marxist philosophy).

At examinations in philosophy, it is necessary not only to check the presence of a certain amount of knowledge among students, but also their ability to think philosophically, to philosophize. Therefore, along with questions on the course of philosophy, it is necessary to ask students tasks and exercises in philosophy.

The main thing is to find out at the exams how interested the student is in philosophy and how capable he is of further self-education and development as a philosopher. Of course, one should not make professional philosophers out of students. But it is necessary, of course, to instill in them the skills of conscious philosophizing, since in life they will always face questions of a philosophical scale.

2. Accordingly, lectures on philosophy should be focused not so much on introducing students to philosophy, but on exciting and maintaining their interest in philosophy and philosophical problems. Lectures should become a real laboratory of thought, a real reflection of the philosopher aloud.

3. At seminars, it is necessary to abandon the vicious practice of student reports (four or five students speak during the lesson, and the rest only listen, as if at a lecture). Reports are possible, but as one of the forms of work of students in seminars. It is necessary to arrange discussions, debates, to encourage students to ask questions themselves and try to answer them.

4. Philosophy teacher, if he is really a teacher:

a) puts his soul into his subject, gives all the best at lectures and seminars in full (to the fullest). He tends to come out of the classroom like a squeezed lemon;

b) always to some extent an artist. His lectures and seminars are somewhat like performances and performances.

5. The student must show mental and cognitive modesty, for a while "forget" about his convictions and knowledge of philosophy, or at least move them to the background of consciousness. You can enter the world of philosophy only if you humbly bow your head. "If you want to learn, be prepared to be considered a fool and a dumbass" (from the movie).

6. Knowledge must be presented in the wrapper of thought. This should be done by both the teacher (in lectures) and the student in seminars and in written work. "In order to digest knowledge, you need to absorb it with appetite," said A. France. And in order for knowledge to be absorbed with appetite, it is necessary, firstly, for the teacher to present them "with feeling, with sense, with arrangement" and, secondly, students must have a good appetite, i.e., a desire to learn, absorb knowledge .

Philosophers are sometimes like beginners

or bad riders on horseback...

Philosophers sometimes resemble beginners or bad riders on a horse: they slide down to the right, then to the left side, then forward, to the horse's neck, then back, to its croup.

Our thoughts are horses, as one song says. And they can carry us to the wrong steppe. Sow a thought - you reap an action, sow an action - you reap a habit, sow a habit - you reap a character, sow a character - you reap a destiny!

Nietzschean aversion to the norm and the normal, or the narrowness of non-philosophical, non-categorical thinking

In the pamphlet book "F. Nietzsche is the Hitler of philosophy" I said that Nietzsche is the singer of the abnormal, everything that deviates from the norm-middle up to pathology. How does he understand the norm?

Here is how Yu. N. Davydov answers this question in the book "The Ethics of Love and the Metaphysics of Willfulness". Comparing the points of view of F. Nietzsche and F. M. Dostoevsky, he writes:

"According to Nietzsche, the conscience should not torment the "evil man", as soon as he committed this or that crime. It is a simple manifestation of the fact that the individual who committed it is a "strong person", and therefore cannot help transgressing the "norm" - moral or legal, because it was created according to the measure of "average", that is, "weak" people. . "The question in the Nietzschean formulation," continues Yu. N. Davydov, "is like this. Either the crime is rehabilitated "as such", as a violation of the "border" and "measure" committed for the sake of this violation itself ... Or the crime is not rehabilitated, and the object of public contempt remains the criminal, "genius", as transgressing any measure and limits too ... Moral norms, moral regulations continue to fetter "strong people", contributing to their degeneration into banal violators of law and order. Yu. N. Davydov, of course, is on the side of F. M. Dostoevsky: "As if anticipating the emergence of theoreticians of the Nietzschean type, Dostoevsky (like Tolstoy) all the time strives to prove and show precisely not "otherworldliness", but "this-worldliness" of the ideal (= moral, ethical) dimension of human existence, without which this existence inevitably ceases to be not only human existence, but existence in general... he considered the moral dimension inherent in man from the very beginning, as some essential property, without which in general, human coexistence is impossible. Morality in this sense is the ability of a person to coexist, to be-together-with-others.

Therefore, what appears to the German philosopher as "physiological degeneration", "decadence", from the point of view of Dostoevsky (as well as Tolstoy) is the norm (emphasis mine. - L. B.); a property without which a person cannot be considered quite normal. Without strong moral foundations (belief in the absoluteness of absolutes and the truth of moral truths ...), according to Dostoevsky, the normal existence of not only society as a whole, but also each individual person is impossible. Their destruction inevitably leads to a disease of the human spirit, which, as the Russian writer shows, is most often experienced as a mental, and sometimes bodily disease.

F. Nietzsche understands the social norm too primitively, as something average, average, tailored to the measure of an "average", "small" person. In fact, social norms are just as complex, diverse, and variable as the norms that ensure the health of an individual person. They are designed for both "small" people and "big" ones. From the point of view of social norms, a genius does not need to be a villain at all in order to manifest his genius. Moreover, genius and villainy are two incompatible things. Here, of course, A. S. Pushkin is right. Indeed, what is genius? This is a creative, and, therefore, constructive, constructive ability. Villainy, any villainy, is, of course, a destructive, de-structive act. Genius does not destroy, but creates. Evil does not create, but destroys. It is no coincidence that the literary images-symbols of evil - Goethe's Mephistopheles and Lermontov's Demon - brought death and destruction with them. In particular, Mephistopheles killed Margaret, and the Demon killed Tamara.

If genius and villainy are sometimes combined in one person, then this does not speak of their compatibility, but of the duality of this person as a person.

Nietzsche's view of the norm had a continuation. Even A.P. Chekhov noticed this addiction of a certain part of the intelligentsia to everything abnormal. Here is a snippet of his story:

"- And how do you know that brilliant people whom the whole world believes have not seen ghosts either? Scientists now say that genius is akin to insanity. My friend, only ordinary, herd people are healthy and normal. Considerations about a nervous age, overwork, degeneration, etc., can seriously disturb only those who see the goal of life in the present, that is, herd people.

— The Romans used to say: *mens sana in corpore sano* (a healthy mind in a healthy body).

"Not everything that the Romans or the Greeks said is true. Elevated mood, excitement, ecstasy - everything that distinguishes prophets, poets, martyrs for an idea from ordinary people is contrary to the animal side of a person, that is, to his physical health. I repeat: if you want to be healthy and normal, go to the herd."

This is how the ghost of the black monk answered Kovrin, who was in a hallucinogenic delirium. The latter is the hero of A.P. Chekhov's story "The Black Monk". The writer displayed in these few phrases the position of a certain part of the intelligentsia, infected with the poison of Nietzsche's philosophy. As you can see, he had a negative attitude to such a position. And now his younger contemporary, the writer Zinaida Gippius, spoke contemptuously about Chekhov: "He is too normal." Unfortunately, this spirit of Nietzscheanism spread in the 20th century like an infection. Until now, it makes itself felt in many cultural phenomena ...

That's what I heard in the American movie "Practical Magic". - Aunt teaches her niece: "When you finally understand that normality is not a virtue, but a lack of courage."

And here is what you can read about the norm in the book of the psychologist M. Norbekov: "The norm is what is accepted by the majority, isn't it? It twists a person into a ram's horn, drives the limits established by someone once and for all, blocks the path to creativity. This is a swamp where future geniuses, titans, creators die before they wake up. Because everything is predetermined, who and how should behave.

This is an extremely superficial and therefore unfair judgment about the norm. It demonstrates the narrowness of non-philosophical, non-categorical thinking. If M. Norbekov had thought a little about the fact that the norm is not only and not so much what is accepted by the majority, but a measure of the living and human, that without a person cannot take a single step in this world, that everything he does and everything he breathes and lives is based on the norm. Take health. After all, this is the norm, the normal state of the human body and the human spirit! Can you imagine that health, which is one of the particular forms of the norm, is "a swamp where geniuses, titans, creators die before they

wake up"? Absolute nonsense. And this nonsense is being replicated in hundreds of thousands of copies and poisoning the minds and souls of millions of people like a poison.

An avant-garde artist said at an art exhibition in London: "Everything has to be too much. Whoever does not understand this is a philistine."

The unprincipled pluralism of postmodernism

Postmodernists, shunning and avoiding any canons, standards, monism, unity, absolutism, etc., rush to the other extreme, namely, to the extreme of pluralism.

lisma, chaos, abnormal, relativism.

V. T. Tretyakov, journalist, in the program "What is to be done?" (Culture TV channel) cited such a caustic tale on the topic of the boundless, unprincipled pluralism of postmodernism: "A postmodernist is an actor who today plays a criminal in a crime television series, and tomorrow, speaking on another TV channel, he says, something we have a lot of crime and my children can not calmly walk down the street."

Postmodernism is a new version of moderate irrationalism, a very vague, broad line of thought. He whimsically combines the line of the philosophy of life-existentialism and Freudianism. The adepts of postmodernism include such philosophers as J.-F. Lyotard, J. Baudrillard, J. Deleuze, J. Derrida, M. Foucault.

Postmodernism is clearly one-sided, because, firstly, it brackets all previous philosophy, thereby violating the principle of continuity, and, secondly, it relies exclusively on artistic culture and some humanitarian disciplines (psychology, psychiatry, linguistics). He ignores the methodology developed by the natural sciences, mathematics, and that branch of philosophy that focuses on these sciences and science in general. Postmodernists clearly do not like exact knowledge, they ignore the achievements of scientific and technical thought.

Postmodernism is a foolish pretension to exclusivity. Calling everything that was before him "modernism", he opposes himself to everything. A purely teenage approach: to deny, destroy, break everything that was before you or was not done by you, by others. This is the same stupidity as if a person decided to give up his heart, lungs, head on the grounds that this is all old, trivial, tired, that it is from the past, "from the ancestors", not new, etc. and so on.

It is worth noting that postmodernism in its boundless pluralism is by no means new. Already at the beginning of the 20th century, such views were spreading. V. B. Gubin writes that the pluralist approach "also provides the opportunity to always justify one's own behavior. In one critical article in connection with Gorky's play *The Petty Bourgeois*, Leonid Andreev approximately characterizes the new for that time, "progressive" tradesman from

the merchants in this way: Peter was not so hardened intolerant of other people's opinions as his father; he not only allowed, but also respected other people's opinions in order to be able to shake hands with the scoundrel. At present, such a methodological trick is one of the foundations of the respectability of various ugliness of human society and personal behavior ... "

I am convinced that a modern philosopher should be a universal thinker and take into account, as far as possible, all human experience in his philosophical constructions.

APPENDIX 2

From correspondence about philosophy

Teaching Philosophy in Universities

I talked with an old comrade Anatoly Z. He has long been a doctor of sciences, a professor, and has published many books on management. Unfortunately, he completely departed from philosophy and spoke about it with some disdain, motivating this by the fact that now in the field of education, subjects that prepare a person for a specific profession-specialty are in demand. Philosophy is allegedly not needed by anyone; pragmatism dominates in educational policy. So he spoke. I tried to object, referring to philosophical questions that are significant for every person about the meaning of life, about good and evil, etc. He answered me: this is what religion does. If a person needs to understand these issues, then he goes to church, to the temple, turns to the priest. I said that the clergy, as a rule, have ready, unambiguous, simple answers to all questions (like "God created it this way"), and such answers are far from satisfactory for everyone. Believers-fanatics, perhaps, will limit themselves to these answers. But they are few. The bulk of believers, especially believing students, are trying to get a deeper understanding of the issues of being, and here the help of philosophers is just needed. Tolya agreed with this argument. However, he continued to talk about the uselessness of philosophy in the modern education system, that it is dominated by a pragmatic approach and curricula in philosophy are being reduced. Yes, indeed, in comparison with the Soviet period, curricula in philosophy have decreased. But can it be unambiguously stated that this is a consequence of the pragmatism of the current leaders of education? I think no. One of the main reasons for this state of affairs in the teaching of philosophy is the conservatism of many philosophy teachers. The state Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which was taught in the Soviet era, was largely out of touch with life, from the earth, and was presented mainly as a collection of quotations from the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, plus commentary texts and explanations. And now many teachers of philosophy implicitly continue this line. For example, they talk about the so-called laws of dialectics. Or they talk about the primitive communal system, reproducing in a certain sense the Marxist scheme of the historical process. The result is a conscious or semi-conscious rejection of such a philosophy in the field of education on the part of leaders. Such behavior of the captains of education, of course, is short-sighted. Together with the water, the child is thrown out of the bath. It is necessary not to reduce curricula in philosophy, but to change the composition of teachers of philosophy, to train new cadres of

philosophers, free from Marxist-Leninist clichés... I am sure that this time of relative neglect of philosophy will pass. Russia is a huge country in terms of territory and population, and it is doomed to be a philosophical country. The vast expanses of Russia largely determine the breadth of the Russian character. And the breadth of character is associated with the breadth of thinking. And this is a purely philosophical trait. A broad-minded person is certainly an elemental philosopher. Not to help him further educate himself philosophically is nonsense.

About philosophy, ethics and changes in the world

Konstantin from Kirovograd sent me the following letter (VKontakte):

Hello, Leo, I'm interested in your opinion - have the problems of philosophy changed with changes in the world? Do they reflect ethical issues?

I answered him:

Dear Konstantin! Philosophy has always dealt with the problems of ethics, since ethics is its organic part. True, there are and have been some philosophers and even philosophical trends (for example, positivism) who either completely ignore the problems of ethics, or castrate them and interpret them in a scientific spirit or as some kind of technical problems.

About the changes in the world. There have always been changes (the world is changeable), and philosophy, of course, reacts to changes. But how? It is not that everything old, everything of the past is canceled and begins, so to speak, from scratch. Philosophy considers everything as if from a bird's eye view and, in particular, evaluates our time as a time in a series of other times, the entire history of mankind and even the history of the world. The problems of philosophy, on the one hand, are eternal and unchanging, and on the other, they are concrete, situational, and therefore changing. Here, for example, are my books and texts (see the section "Books published by the author." - Ed.). They are about everything: I speak both on eternal topics and on the topic of the day. A philosopher is, after all, a universal thinker!

Private and general questions in philosophy

From a letter to Sergei Drogunov:

You are discussing private questions with me, including the question of the fate of mankind. These private questions have a certain methodology or technology for their analysis and discussion. This is about the same as if you wanted to check the correctness of the calculation of the cashier in the store, and for this you need to know the rules of arithmetic. If you do not know the rules of arithmetic, you will not be able to check the correctness of the cashier's calculation. So it is with private philosophical questions. It is impossible to correctly parse them if you do not own categorical logic, that is, if you do not own the categorical apparatus of philosophy (for example, about the relationship between quality and quantity, possibility and reality, necessity and chance, order and disorder, equality and inequalities, etc., etc.).

Thought is individual?

Nat Art Ant, in a review of my article in Proza.ru, examining the question of collectivism and individualism, threw out the phrase: "Thought is individual."

It seems to me that thought is not purely individual. The individual without the collective, the particular without the general, the individual without the universal DOES NOT EXIST! The fact of the matter is that philosophical questions, topics are PHILOSOPHICAL because they are always considered in the coordinates of more general categories. Otherwise, this is fiction-essay in the worst sense of the word, this is blah blah, la la, this is a conversation about nothing. On a private level, from phenomenon to phenomenon, one can say a million things, and all or almost all of them will be, figuratively speaking, "a finger to the sky" or simply FALSE.

Correspondence with Denis Romanyuk about
practical philosophy and F. Nietzsche

Denis:

Hello, I have read your books "Philosophy", "Entertaining Philosophy" and I am reading "Practical Philosophy", although, in spite of everything, I see no reason to single out practical philosophy from philosophy, while there is already ethics and psychology. ..

I myself study economics, but have long since lost interest in economic sciences, and more and more gravitated towards philosophy. I wrote down thoughts in an aphoristic style, then a couple of essays were added, and it turned out to be a small book of 130 pages. Mn It is not interesting to communicate with a real philosopher, although I do not share some of your views. But as Voltaire said: "Your opinion is deeply hostile to me, but for your right to express it, I am ready to sacrifice my life ...". I made some notes in the book "Entertaining Philosophy" especially in the section "Mosaic of Philosophical Stupidity". I consider thoughts that are logically correct, have facts under them, cannot be called stupid, no matter how evil or cruel they are, this is not evidence of their infidelity. Well, I understand that you are evaluating these thoughts from a practical point of view, and if such statements as "Love is a clinical form of life" or Nietzsche: "Death is a more significant moment than life", "Moral - this is a person's self-importance before nature "can be harmful - it means they are stupid ... So I am more of a theoretical philosopher - I don't like to limit my thought even to the practical consequences of these thoughts. In addition, thoughts that are unpleasant can be true, as Publius Syr said: "To save a person, you can also hurt him." But that's all... I would like to know, if it's not difficult for you to answer, at what age did you start writing? And which of the philosophers are your "favorites"?)

Answer:

Dennis, thank you for writing to me. Your response is precious to me, even if it is not entirely positive.

I am very glad that you are reading my books. It's a pity, you hurry with the conclusions.

In particular, you probably did not read my "Practical Philosophy" to the end. And I explain why the content of practical philosophy cannot be covered by ethics and psychology. Psychology you generally mentioned here in vain. Psychology is a science and it has its own specific empirical basis, like any other science, in the form of psychological observations, measurements and experiments. Philosophy has no such basis because it is not a science. This is a fundamentally different type of culture. Any modern science in one way or another relies on observations and experiments, has a specific technology of scientific research and discovery, in particular, measurement technology. Philosophy does not have such a technology and is not based on specific observations and experiments. Philosophy relies on the entire basis of human knowledge, personal and universal experience. And, besides, it relies on all the mental, emotional, value-practical baggage of man and mankind. Therefore, it is not a science in the modern sense. I wrote about this both in my textbook on philosophy and in a separate book, What is Philosophy? It is incorrect to somehow compare practical philosophy and psychology. They may have similar questions, but fundamentally different approaches, different tools for consideration and analysis. Philosophizing is thinking and only thinking. And modern psychology is, first of all, scientific (psychological) research, oriented, I repeat, to the consideration of specific psychological facts using quite specific methods and techniques. Therefore, there is a big difference between practical philosophy and practical psychology, as they say in Odessa. Practical psychology in its current form relies partly on the results of psychological research and hypotheses, partly on reflections of a philosophical nature. Here is the last part and misleading some people.

I said in my books that people of various specialties (primarily psychologists, psychoanalysts, clergymen, doctors) often work in the field of practical philosophy. And this is sad, because it gives rise to amateurism, both philosophical and in these areas.

Your expression "I see no reason to single out practical philosophy from philosophy" reveals self-confidence-arrogance in you, as if you are a professional philosopher and are well versed in the subject.

And as for the supposedly logically correct judgments, which I criticize in the section "Mosaic of Philosophical Stupidity" - you are mistaken. First, they are paradoxical and, therefore, far from being logically correct. Secondly, I evaluate a person's thoughts not only in terms of "logically correct-incorrect", but in a much broader context. Read my book How Do We Think?

And about "I do not like to limit thought even to the practical consequences of these thoughts." It's just a dangerous phrase. A person with such a mindset can commit a crime. You have a fuzzy moral and, more broadly, existential position. From such a fuzzy position there can be troubles in your life. Understand please! I constantly explain to my students the harm of shaky beliefs or lack of beliefs. Read, please, also my book Liberalism and Freedom. It seems to me that you are infected with this rotten Western philosophy of ultra-liberalism, when freedom is understood as something boundless, knowing no limits.

Remember: everything has its measure. And going beyond the limits of the measure is only justified when the measure as such is treated with due respect.

L. Balashov

Denis:

Yes, I really haven't finished reading your practical philosophy yet, your open hostility to Nietzsche slowed me down a bit and ... With your permission, I will indulge, because of my absurdity - a little absurd reasoning. But not only psychology has an empirical basis, I think everything is practical, it should have both an empirical basis and an applied character, be tested by experience, and if practical philosophy does not encourage practice to action, then these are all the same theoretical reflections . I also forgot to add religion to ethics and psychology as an alternative to practical philosophy. After all, it is also based on reasoning, and religion presents their conclusions as norms of behavior ...

I am not very self-confident in my knowledge of philosophy, but I talked with students of the philosophical university, they did not read even half of what I was honored to read, but this is certainly not an indicator, and I truly would like to be a professional philosopher ...

The trouble is that this conviction is not shaky for me, I have elevated immorality and nihilism to the principle of philosophy, at least, in the end, for a noble goal ...

Although sometimes I am tormented by doubts about the chosen path, but they are not long.

Denis:

Hello, sorry that I am writing to you, but I have no one else to share with those thoughts and ideas that seem to be philosophical... Due to social factors, I could not do my favorite thing - the study of philosophy...

Yes, I consider nihilism to be the basis of philosophy, since the very process of thinking is a doubt of certain statements. A person who does not doubt, but takes everything on faith, is an intellectual slave. Thought would not have been able to develop if it had not been preceded by "negation", a denial of the truth and value of social representations. Nihilism is a denial, and from this position, every philosopher is, to one degree or another, a nihilist, since by asserting something he inevitably denies the opposite point of view ...

I am sending you my first book. I've been having doubts lately, and I'm going through a stage where I think it's best to quit. In addition to this book, I have written two more. This book is a collection of my essays, which touch upon various aspects of human existence and describe my vision of existence from all sides. <...>

The second book, which I will also send you a little later, is a collection of my aphoristic thoughts in the style of Nietzsche, there are 200 of them. <...>

The third book, which I am about to finish, is, as it were, a self-instruction manual for philosophy. It is called "Tales of the Lovers of Wisdom." In it, I do not separate philosophy from the philosopher, I describe the possible characters of philosophers, their styles of speech, thinking, I give a short course in logic as a science, I recall the most famous philosophers, and I give an interpretation of the most necessary philosophical terms.

I have another book in my mind, which will be called The Relativistic Position in Philosophical Nihilism. But as I said, I already doubt the need to continue writing and generally discussing philosophical problems, I did not get into the right environment and now I am estranged from my peers and even a little asocial, which leaves a mark on my philosophy.

I would be grateful if you pay at least a little attention to this work of mine, I present this book to you for a fair trial, hoping for a lenient sentence ...

Answer:

Hello Denis! Thank you for your letter. It is very good that you continue to study philosophy and even try to express yourself. However, I see that you continue to "twist your line". It upsets me that you have not evolved in any way and have not perceived anything from mine. Your letter shows this. Why do you need me? You ignore my remarks.

I warn you: your Nietzscheanism (and nihilism) can ruin you. If you think that your thoughts do not affect your practical life in any way, then you are deeply mistaken. Do you know where Nietzsche ended his days of life?!

I looked at your selection of quotes on the VKontakte page. She is depressing. You can choke yourself from such a perception of life. Everything is wrong, everything is wrong! This attempt to turn everything upside down... I'm just afraid for your life.

I draw your attention to annoying grammatical errors in your texts. They greatly spoil the impression. You even managed to make a mistake in the title of your work: instead of existential, write "existential". Existential from the Latin word existence (existence). For a person who understands a little philosophy, this is an absolutely unacceptable mistake.

I will try to read your work, although it will not be easy for me to do so. Then I will answer.

Keep writing to me. Maybe something will come of it.

Sincerely, L. Balashov

Denis Romanyuk:

I agree with you, in my third and fourth books I will try to move away from my gloomy thoughts and deal with other problems. It is impossible for my pessimistic character to leave a mark on my philosophy, I need to be more objective ... But I will still like Nietzsche, he

created a unique original worldview and even attitude. I remember those evenings when I read his books ... I know how he finished, but it doesn't stop me guess he paid his price for his immortal masterpieces...

But I am not only interested in him, all philosophers from the ancient representatives of the Milesian school to Deleuze and Derrida form the circle of my interests.

Recently, I have not been "preaching" nihilism so much, I now want to improve a new kind of reasoning called "abduction", I consider it more effective than deduction and induction.

I want to write a philosophy tutorial so that everyone would be interested, and everyone could start philosophizing in their own way, using at least aphorisms to begin with ... I am also tormented by the idea of creating a universal language of philosophy, as Leibniz wanted to do it.

And I also don't like the fact that our university doesn't just have a philosophical department, but only a philosophical and theological department, there the bias is most of all on medieval philosophy, since it is there that philosophy is most connected with theology ...

Yes, with the word "existence" it turned out not convenient, along the way there in the book, this mistake will often occur)

I am grateful to you that, with all this nihilism and grammatical errors of mine, you did not turn away from me, there is not only nihilism there, but in the second book there is almost none of it, therefore, I will hasten to send you the second one by evening, and over the third I still need work...

Denis! I have looked at your Essays. On the one hand, it's good that you are trying to write large texts. On the other hand, I have to admit: there are a lot of grammatical mistakes (in particular, stylistic mistakes) and a serious philosopher simply will not read your texts. For example, with great difficulty I read several paragraphs to choose from. The text is, frankly, unreadable. Get it fixed right away. If education is not enough, learn. Treat yourself more strictly, with a greater share of self-criticism.

Your positive attitude towards Nietzsche still hinders our dialogue with you. By the way, you are also adopting Nietzsche's lightweight style of writing...

You certainly have the ability, but you still have a lot of work to do.

And further. I'm thinking: how can we continue the dialogue? Maybe it makes sense to send me ultra-short texts of two or three paragraphs in the form of a thesis and argumentation or in the form of questions to me. And I will comment as much as possible and answer your questions. Just try not to make grammatical mistakes.

Sincerely, L. Balashov

APPENDIX 3

Academy of Philosophy (project)

... Each people is the more civic and educated, the better they philosophize in it; therefore there is no greater good for the state than to have true philosophers.

Rene Descartes

Why is the Academy of Philosophy needed?

The intelligentsia, the intellectuals are the brain, the mind of the nation. Philosophers are the brain of the brain, the mind of the mind. Insufficient attention to philosophers on the part of society leads to the fact that the intellectual development of society is restrained or hampered.

The sleep of reason breeds monsters. A disdainful attitude towards philosophy and philosophers is a state close to the sleep of the mind. Russia is still experiencing monstrous upheavals. Is it not because, apart from everything else, it is in philosophical hibernation, does not have a developed philosophical culture?! It may be said: we have a history of Russian philosophy, there are dozens of outstanding names, thousands of professional philosophers are working. Yes, all this is good, but not enough! Philosophy in both tsarist and communist Russia developed under the vigilant eye of the state. Hence its religious orientation in the pre-October era and the Marxist-scientist - in the post-October. Not a single philosophical school has been created. Great Russia... but without great philosophers, without great philosophical traditions-standards. Isn't it sad? The sleep of reason breeds monsters.

It is not enough for us, philosophers, to publish books, journals, teaching at universities, high schools, secondary educational institutions in order to fully develop, create, actively and powerfully influence society and culture. A permanent independent philosophical institution is what we, Russia, and all mankind need. Philosophy, as a special branch of human culture, must finally acquire its own institutions, become institutionalized.

The Academy of Philosophy, independent of the state, science, religion, could serve the cause of the institutionalization of philosophy.

The Academy of Philosophy should become the first independent philosophical institution in Russia. Its creation will not automatically lead to the rise of philosophical reason in our country, but will serve as a powerful impetus to its development.

Now specifically about how I see the Academy of Philosophy. I will first outline the aims and tasks of the Academy point by point.

Goals and objectives of the Academy

1. The Academy is created with the aim of institutionalizing philosophy, ensuring its independent existence, development as a branch of human culture, elevation in the eyes of society.

The motto of the Academy is that philosophy must exist as an independent branch of culture, regardless of the state, science, religion.

[The independence of the Academy of Philosophy from the state does not mean that it will act as an isolated academic resolution. Business contacts with state institutions, financial and other assistance from the state are quite possible. The independence of the Academy will be ensured by the absence of its one-sided dependence, by the presence of various sponsors-donors independent of each other.]

The Academy should initiate the first philosophical school in Russia, that is, one of the goals of the Academy is to revive the ancient tradition of philosophical schools, as it was in ancient times. The Academy founded by Plato existed for almost 900 years, from 348 BC. e. before 529 AD e. The Peripatetic school founded by Aristotle also existed intermittently for several hundred years. As a result, we have a wonderful European culture. Here you can draw an analogy between the ancient Olympic Games and their revival in our era on a new basis. Now the Olympic movement is one of the greatest phenomena of human culture. Like the Olympic movement, the tradition of philosophical schools must be revived and developed!

2. Proclaimed and implemented philosophical pluralism, free thinking. Philosophers recognize no authority other than the authority of thought. The Academy supports the spirit of healthy competition of philosophical ideas.

3. In the dispute between science and religion, mysticism, parascience, the Academy takes the side of science. It is the knowledge obtained by scientists that serves as the main nutrient medium for philosophizing.

4. The Academy does not accept extreme views, rejects gullibility, inertness, abnormality, psychopathology. Her motto is: measure in everything, even in keeping the measure!

5. The Academy pays special attention to the development of the foundations, the beginnings of philosophy. At the same time, it strives for the all-inclusiveness of philosophizing.

6. The Academy provides special philosophical education - for youth (secondary), youth (higher) and postgraduate studies.

The Academy should lay the foundation for an organized, institutionalized philosophical education for children. Philosophy can be taught from an early age, as music is taught in music schools or military science in military schools. Children may well perceive and assimilate philosophy. On the other hand, the sooner a person gets acquainted with philosophy and the sooner he masters it, the more capable he will be as a philosopher, the faster and more powerfully his philosophical talent, and perhaps even genius, will develop.

Thanks to its independent status, the Academy will also open unprecedented prospects for the philosophical education of youth and adults. After all, what is philosophical education in our country today? This is the training of students at the philosophical faculties of universities and the training of graduate students in the philosophical graduate school of these faculties and in the system of the Russian Academy of Sciences (at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, at the Department of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, etc.). Here we see the dual dependence of philosophy - on the state and science. After all, universities and universities where there is training in philosophical specialties are mainly state universities and universities. Further, the philosophical specialty in these universities and universities is present among many other specialties, and they most often represent certain sections of science, scientific knowledge. Philosophical training, therefore, is under the strict control of state bodies and non-philosophical, scientific institutions. Take Moscow State University. In its composition, as we know, there is a philosophical faculty. In addition to this faculty, the university has a dozen or two other faculties - natural sciences and humanitarian sciences. Faculty of Philosophy - one of twenty! Of course, the educational policy at the university is determined not by him, but by the scientific faculties surrounding him. The Faculty of Philosophy has, however, relative independence. But still this is not the autonomy that a separate independent philosophical institution could have.

7. Broad philosophical education - for all those interested in philosophy.

8. The independent status of the Academy will also make it possible to ensure an independent (from the state and science) professional status of philosophers.

The current state of affairs is as follows: the professional status of philosophers is ensured by university diplomas, the award of scientific degrees of candidate and doctor of philosophical sciences, the academic titles of associate professor and professor, and, finally, membership in the Russian Academy of Sciences and similar institutions. In all these cases, the assessment of the professionalism of a philosopher depends on state officials and officials from science. This is most clearly seen in the example of the VAK (Higher Attestation Commission) and the Russian Academy of Sciences. The Higher Attestation Commission - being a purely state institution - dictates to philosophers who should be a high professional and who should not be. The Russian Academy of Sciences - in its composition is absolutely non-philosophical - at general meetings, where philosophers make up an insignificant percentage, it determines who should be an academician from philosophy and who should not be. In essence, it turns out that physicists, chemists, biologists, economists, jurists and other scientists decide which of the philosophers is worthy of being an academician. com, and who is not worthy.

They refer to the need for generally accepted standards of philosophical education and professionalism. Yes, I agree, such standards are needed in our time. But why should these standards be determined by the state? Is it possible that generally accepted standards can only be adopted by the state (through the Higher Attestation Commission, the Ministry of Education, the Russian Academy of Sciences, etc.)?! After all, there are examples when these standards are set by institutions independent of the state. Diplomas from Cambridge

and Oxford in England, Harvard University in the USA are valued all over the world as high standards of education, culture and scholarship. Generally accepted standards of philosophical professionalism can be generally recognized diplomas of an independent philosophical institution. Moreover, they can exist not in the singular, if there are several authoritative independent philosophical institutions.

Having won sufficient authority in philosophical circles, the Academy of Philosophy may eventually become a "trendsetter". Her diplomas of secondary and higher education, scientific degrees and titles can become generally recognized standards of philosophical education, culture, scholarship.

9. If the Academy of Philosophy is created, it will serve as a good example for the creation of similar philosophical institutions in other countries, will serve the cause of the institutionalization of philosophy throughout the world. And in Russia there should be more than one Academy of Philosophy. Healthy competition of philosophical schools is only for the benefit of philosophy.

10. The Academy should become the mental center of Russia or one of the mental (intellectual) centers of Russia, the world.

The task of the Academy as a mental center is to elevate philosophy in the eyes of society, to make the voice of philosophers as significant as the voice of politicians, scientists, cultural figures, media representatives, religious figures. People must eventually realize that philosophy is the mind of society. They should treat her with the same respect as they treat their mind.

To the draft charter of the Academy of Philosophy

1. The purpose of the Academy is to ensure the independent existence and development of philosophy as a branch of human culture.

2. The Academy has three departments:

- department of philosophical creativity
- department of philosophical education
- practical philosophy (sophology).

These departments should function in close contact. Pupils, students and graduate students participate, as a rule, in philosophical creativity and research, and professional philosophers - in the educational process.

3. The department of philosophical creativity has three directions:

- foundations, beginnings of philosophy;
- history of philosophy (philosophers about philosophers);
- applied philosophy.

4. The department of philosophical education has several levels:

- a stage of broad philosophical education - for all those interested in philosophy and philosophical problems

- stage of secondary education (students)

- stage of higher education (students)

- level of professional training (post-graduate students)

5. Structure of the Academy.

The academy is headed by a president elected for life. He appoints the Council of the Academy, which assists him in matters of administration.

The second and subsequent presidents of the Academy are secretly elected by the Council of the Academy after the death or, in exceptional cases, after the voluntary resignation of the previous president within three months.

The Council of the Academy consists of no less than four and no more than twelve members.

The Council of the Academy can perform the functions of a collegial governing body of the Academy with the written consent of the President of the Academy.

Members of the Council of the Academy, on the instructions of the president, as a rule, perform the functions of vice presidents.

Dreams-fantasies

How do I see the Academy of Philosophy?

In Moscow or the near Moscow suburbs - an academic town - two-three-story houses (research and educational buildings, a boarding house for students, students, graduate students and residential buildings for employees) on a site with a small park-garden, a winter garden, with walking alleys, gazebos, sports grounds, a swimming pool, treadmills.

Educational and research classes are held in the house/houses and in the park, in the alleys, in the pavilions.

The Academy has a good library and a reading room, a sports hall, workshops, and is equipped with computers and printing equipment. The Academy has a conference hall, where, in addition to regular events, academic evenings, music concerts, etc. are held.

The Academy operates a philosophical school-college for children from 7 to 17 years old.

The Academy publishes works, journals, writings of pupils and employees, writings of various philosophers.

A philosophical museum is organized at the Academy, a specialized philosophical theater operates.

The museum collects exhibits about the life and work of famous philosophers, works of art that have philosophical value.

Philosophical plays and plays from the life of philosophers are staged in the theater.

The Council of the Academy organizes the competition and awarding of scientific degrees and titles in various branches of philosophy.

Membership in the Academy should be the highest recognition of the merits of a philosopher. The membership status is two-stage: a corresponding member and a full member.

To encourage the most talented philosophers, the Academy establishes various awards.

The Academy organizes competitions for the best essays on selected topics, symposiums, conferences.

Every employee or student at the Academy must systematically engage in general developmental sports.

At the Academy, not only work or study, but also live. For pupils, students and graduate students — a boarding house. For employees - a residential building with apartments or separate residential buildings.

* * *

To implement the Academy's project in full, we need a lot of money, perhaps more than one million dollars. Therefore, it is quite possible that the creation of the Academy can stretch over several large stages (in the course of decades).

At first, an explanatory, propaganda campaign is needed to attract public attention to the project and, accordingly, financial resources for its implementation.

An Academy fund should also be established to accumulate financial resources.

At the first stage, for the establishment of the Academy and its functioning, it is enough to have-rent a small two-three-story building.

In the future, the architectural ensemble of the academic town should be built according to a special project. The architectural structures of the academic campus should not be gray, dull either inside or outside. Their purpose is not only functional. They should delight the eye with their unique beauty. In the rooms there are paintings by artists, portraits, busts of great philosophers.

I invite everyone who is interested in the idea of creating the Academy of Philosophy to express their suggestions, wishes.

I invite professional philosophers to cooperate in order to combine efforts to create the Academy of Philosophy. It is necessary to develop a manifesto and charter of the Academy, to prepare competing educational and research programs. Finally, candidates for co-workers of the Academy are needed.

I think we could start raising funds for the Academy Foundation. If anyone has any suggestions on this matter, please contact me (e-mail: lev_balashov@mail.ru).

Sponsors, get in touch! By assisting in the creation of the first Academy of Philosophy in Russia, you will become the new Tretyakovs and Mamontovs, inscribe your name in golden letters in the cultural history of Russia.

APPENDIX 4

Philosophers on Philosophy

"Pythagoras called his teaching wisdom (σοφία), and not wisdom (φύσις), Reproaching the seven wise men (as they were called before him), he said that no one is wise, for man due to the weakness of his nature, he is often unable to achieve everything, and one who strives for the disposition and lifestyle of a wise being can be appropriately called a philosopher (philosopher).

Aristotle:

"...so-called wisdom, by all accounts, deals with first causes and principles" (Metaphysics, 981b 25).

Aristotle:

"We should consider what are those causes and principles, the science of which is wisdom. If we consider the opinions that we have about the wise, then perhaps we will achieve more clarity here. First, we assume that the wise man, as far as possible, knows everything, although he does not have knowledge of each subject separately. Secondly, we consider wise one who is able to know the difficult and not easily comprehensible for a person (after all, perception by feelings is characteristic of everyone, and therefore it is easy and there is nothing wise in it). Thirdly, we believe that the wiser in every science is the one who is more accurate and more able to teach the identification of causes, and [fourthly] that of the sciences, wisdom is the greatest, which is desirable for its own sake and for knowledge, rather than the one that is desirable for the sake of the benefit derived from it, and [fifthly], the one that predominates, to a greater extent than the auxiliary, for the wise

should not receive instruction, but instruct, and not he the other must obey, and he who is less wise must obey him.

These are the opinions and this is how much we have about wisdom and the wise. Of the things indicated here, the one who has the greatest knowledge of the general must necessarily have knowledge of everything, for in a certain sense he knows everything that falls under the general.

Pseudo Plato:

"Philosophy is a constant thirst for the knowledge of being."

("Definitions")

Epicurus:

"Whoever says that the time for philosophy has not yet come or has already passed is similar to the one who says that there is no time yet or no time for happiness."

Cicero:

"Just as a fertile field without cultivation will not yield a harvest, so does the soul. And the cultivation of the soul is philosophy. She weeds out vices in the soul, prepares souls for the acceptance of sowing, and entrusts to her - she sows, so to speak - only those seeds that, when ripe, bring a bountiful harvest.

Belinsky V.G.:

"So, you take up philosophy! Good deed! Only in it will you find answers to the questions of your soul; only she will give peace and harmony to your soul and give you such happiness, which the crowd does not even suspect and which the outer life can neither give you nor take away from you. You will not be in the world, but the whole world will be in you. In oneself, in the innermost sanctuary of one's own ear you will find the highest happiness, and then your little room, your miserable and cramped office will be a true temple of happiness. From a letter to D.P. Ivanov dated August 7, 1837.

F. Bacon:

"Those who practiced the sciences were either empiricists or dogmatists. Empiricists, like an ant, only collect and are content with what they have collected. Rationalists, like spiders, produce fabric from themselves. The bee, on the other hand, chooses the middle way: it extracts material from garden and wild flowers, but arranges and changes it according to its ability. The true work of philosophy does not differ from this either. For it does not rest solely or predominantly on the powers of the mind, and does not deposit in

the consciousness untouched the material drawn from natural history and from mechanical experiments, but changes it and processes it in the mind. So, one should put a good hope on a closer and indestructible (which has not been so far) union of these abilities - experience and reason "(New Organon, XCV).

T. Hobbes:

"Philosophy is knowledge attained by means of correct reasoning (per rectam ratiocinationem) and explaining effects, or phenomena, from causes known to us, or productive reasons, and, conversely, possible productive reasons from known effects."

"Philosophy falls into two main parts. Anyone who begins to study the origin and properties of bodies is confronted with two completely different kinds of bodies. One of them covers objects and phenomena that are called natural because they are products of nature; the other - objects and phenomena that arose due to the human will, by virtue of the contract and agreement of people, and is called the state (civitas). Therefore, philosophy is divided into natural philosophy and civil philosophy. But since, furthermore, in order to know the properties of the state, it is necessary to first study the inclinations, affects and mores of people, the philosophy of the state is usually divided into two sections, the first of which, treating about the inclinations and mores, is called ethics, and the second, examining civic duties, is called politics or simply the philosophy of the state. Therefore, having previously established what relates to the nature of philosophy itself, we will first of all treat about natural bodies, then about the mental abilities and morals of people, and, finally, about the duties of citizens.

R. Descartes:

"First of all, I would like to clarify what philosophy is, starting with the most common, namely, that the word philosophy means the occupation of wisdom and that by wisdom is meant not only prudence in business, but also a perfect knowledge of everything, what a person can know; the same knowledge that guides our lives serves the preservation of health, as well as discoveries in all the arts. And in order for it to become such, it must necessarily be deduced from the first causes so that the one who tries to master it (and this means actually philosophizing) begins with an investigation of these first causes, called the first principles. There are two requirements for these first principles. First, they must be so clear and self-evident that on close examination the human mind cannot doubt their truth; secondly, the knowledge of everything else must depend on them so that, although the fundamental principles could be known besides the knowledge of other things, these latter, on the contrary, could not be known without knowledge of the first principles.

I. Kant:

"... the metaphysics of nature and morals, and in particular the preliminary (propaedeutic) criticism of the mind that dares to fly on its own wings, constitute, in fact, everything that can be called philosophy in the true sense. She connects everything with wisdom, but on the path of science, the only path that, once it has been laid, never overgrows and does not allow errors. Mathematics, natural science, and even the empirical knowledge of man are of great value as a means for mainly accidental ends, and if they eventually become a means for the necessary and essential ends of mankind, then this is achieved only through the knowledge of reason on the basis of mere concepts, which, however we may call it, is, in fact, nothing but metaphysics.

That is why metaphysics is also the completion of the whole culture of the human mind, necessary even if we ignore its influence as a science for certain purposes. Indeed, it considers reason in terms of its principles and higher maxims, which must underlie the very possibility of some sciences and the application of all sciences. As pure speculation, it serves more to prevent error than to increase knowledge, but this does not in any way damage its value, but rather gives it dignity and authority, like censorship, which ensures general order, agreement and even well-being in the world of science requires that its courageous and fruitful development should not be distracted from the main goal - from universal bliss.

Hegel:

"Philosophy can be predetermined can be generally considered as a thinking consideration of objects ... Since, however, philosophy is a special way of thinking, such a way of thinking, thanks to which it becomes knowledge, and at the same time knowledge in concepts, then philosophical thinking differs, further, from that thinking which is active in everything human."

"Boldness in the search for truth, faith in the power of reason is the first condition for philosophical studies. A person must respect himself and recognize himself as worthy of the highest ... The hidden essence of the Universe does not possess in itself a force that would be able to resist the boldness of knowledge, it must open up before him, unfold before his eyes riches and depths. the bins of his nature and let him enjoy them."

"Philosophy is in thought a seized epoch."

"The circle of life of a peasant woman is outlined by cows - Liza, Chernushka, Pestrushka, etc., son Martin and daughter Urshel, etc. The philosopher is just as intimately close to infinity, knowledge, movement, sensual laws, etc. And what for a peasant woman is her late brother and uncle, for a philosopher it is Plato, Spinoza, etc. One is just as valid as the other, but the latter has the advantage of eternity" ("Aphorisms").

Hegel:

"These (religious-philosophical. - L. B.) thoughts are based, therefore, on some premise, and not on thought; they are not so much philosophy in the proper sense, i.e., a

thought based on itself, but rather a representation that has already been firmly established in advance and is used to reinforce belief, and it does not matter whether it is used to refute other ideas. and philosophemes or for the philosophical defense of one's own religious teachings against them. Thought, therefore, does not recognize itself in them as the last, the absolute pinnacle of content, from within the thought that determines itself. If, therefore, the Fathers of the Church thought very speculatively within the limits of Church teachings...then the last justification for this content was not thinking as such, but the teaching of the Church. Here, the philosophical doctrine is enclosed in a firmly established dogma, and does not appear as thinking freely emanating from itself. In the same way, among the scholastics, thought is not constructed from itself, but is connected with prerequisites.; and, relying on them, it is true that it is already more based on itself, but at the same time it never contradicts the teachings of the church.

Hegel:

"Everyone agrees that no one can make shoes if he is not a shoemaker, although every man has a measure, feet, and, in addition, he has hands. Regarding philosophy, the supporters of direct knowledge (Jacobi and others - L. B.) are of the opinion that everyone, without any preparation, is a philosopher, can deny, criticize, as it comes to his mind, has a ready answer to philosophical questions.

L. Feuerbach after listening to Hegel's lectures:

"I understood what I wanted and what to strive for: I need not theology, but philosophy. I need not nonsense and dreams, I need to learn! What I need is not faith, but thinking! Thanks to Hegel, I became aware of myself, I became aware of the world. He became my second father, and Berlin became my spiritual homeland.

A. Schopenhauer:

"To reproduce in concepts in an abstract, universal and distinct form the whole essence of the world and, as a reflected snapshot, to present it to the mind in stable and always present concepts - this and nothing else is philosophy" .

A. Schopenhauer:

"None of the believers resorts to philosophy: he does not need it; no one who really philosophizes is religious; he walks without help - in danger, but freely.

E. Husserl:

Philosophy is "the universal science of the world". Philosopher - "functionary of mankind."

Karl Popper:

"We are all philosophers. And even those of us who don't realize it have our own philosophical preferences. Most of these premises are accepted unconsciously: they are absorbed from the cultural area or tradition. Even being the basis of practical action and life in general, they are accepted and preached without proper critical evaluation.

The fact that certifies the essence of professional and academic philosophy lies, in particular, in this need to critically evaluate the theories that have received such wide circulation.

B. Russell:

"Philosophy ... is something intermediate between theology and science. Like theology, it consists in speculations about subjects about which exact knowledge has hitherto been unattainable; but, like science, it appeals to human reason rather than to authority, whether tradition or revelation. All definite knowledge, in my opinion, belongs to science; all dogmas, in so far as they go beyond a certain knowledge, belong to theology. But between theology and science there is a No Man's Land open to attacks from both sides; this No Man's Land is philosophy. Almost all the questions that most interest speculative minds are such that science cannot answer them, and the self-confident answers of theologians no longer seem as convincing as they were in previous centuries. Once Is the world divided into spirit and matter, and if so, what is spirit and what is matter? Is the spirit subordinate to matter, or does it have independent forces? Does the Universe have any unity or purpose? Is the Universe evolving towards some goal? Do the laws of nature really exist, or do we simply believe in them due to our inherent propensity for order? Is man what he seems to the astronomer - a tiny lump of a mixture of carbon and water, helplessly swarming on a small and minor planet? Or is man what he seemed to Hamlet? Or maybe he is both at the same time? Are there high and low ways of life, or are all ways of life only vanity? If there is a way of life that is sublime, then what is it and how can we achieve it? Does good need to be eternal in order to deserve high praise, or does good need to be striven for, even if the Universe is inevitably moving towards death? Is there such a thing as wisdom, or is what appears to be so just the most refined stupidity? Such questions cannot be answered in the laboratory. Theologians have pretended to give answers to these questions, and very definite ones at that, but the very definiteness of their answers makes modern minds suspicious of them. To investigate these questions, if not to answer them, is the business of philosophy.

B. Russell:

Philosophy "is a reflection on subjects, knowledge of which is not yet possible."

Trying to outline the subject of philosophy in our time, Bertrand Russell wrote about philosophical problems as follows:

"...what is the meaning of life, if any? Does the world have a purpose, does the development of history lead somewhere, or are these all meaningless questions? ... is nature really governed by some kind of laws, or do we just think so because we like to see some kind of order in everything? ... is the world divided into two fundamentally different parts - spirit and matter, and if so, how do they coexist? What should we say about a person? Is he a particle of dust, helplessly swarming on a small and insignificant planet, as astrologers see it? Or is it, as chemists might imagine, a bunch of chemicals put together in an ingenious way? Or, finally, a person is such as he appears to Hamlet, basically noble, with unlimited possibilities. Or maybe a person - all this together? .. Is there one way of life - good, and another - bad, or does it matter how we live. And if there is a good way of life, then what is it or how can we learn to live by following it? Is there anything that we can call wisdom, or what seems to Us to be such is just empty madness?

V.S. Solovyov:

"The word "philosophy", as is known, does not have one precisely defined meaning, but is used in many very different senses. First of all, we meet with two main, equally different concepts of philosophy: according to the first, philosophy is only a theory, it is only a matter of school; according to the second, it is more than a theory, it is primarily a matter of life, and then of the school. According to the first concept, philosophy refers exclusively to the cognitive faculty of man; according to the second, it also corresponds to the highest aspirations of the human will, and the highest ideals of human feeling, thus, it has not only theoretical, but also moral and aesthetic significance, being in internal interaction with the spheres of creativity and practical activity, although different from them. For the philosophy corresponding to the first concept - for the philosophy of the school - only a mind developed to a certain degree, enriched with some knowledge and freed from vulgar prejudices, is required from a person; for the philosophy corresponding to the second concept, for the philosophy of life, it also requires a special direction of the will, that is, a special moral mood, and also an artistic feeling and meaning, the power of imagination or fantasy. The first philosophy, dealing exclusively with theoretical questions, has no direct internal connection with personal and social life, the second philosophy strives to become the formative and governing force of this life.

A. Schweitzer:

"Philosophy, by its calling, is the guide and guardian of the mind; it must educate us to fight for the ideals that lie at the foundation of culture."

P.S. Yushkevich:

"In the philosophical worldview, there is an attachment ... of the individual ... to the world whole. "I" and the Universe become face to face here. No matter how problematic this idea of the Universe is, no matter how illusory from a strictly logical point of view, but at a certain stage of development it inevitably arises as an ideal continuation and ideal quintessence of the surrounding world. Erasing all boundaries and boundaries, forgetting all the particulars and fragmentation established by the requirements of life and science, a person seems to circle around him with one broad gesture, uniting into one inseparable, compact whole, countless forms of the sensual world, and asking: "What is the All, captured by this gesture? What place do I occupy in it, not I - a merchant or some other numbered or labeled member of society, but I, in the totality of my innermost thoughts and desires, I, speaking as an equal with equals, with the Universe? ."

Philosophy is the reflection on things sub specie (from the point of view) of the "All"..."

O.G. Drobnitsky:

"Philosophy ... due to the extreme generality of the questions it solves, cannot claim to be a daily mentor of a person in private everyday situations. Consideration of the problems of being on the scale of humanity, history, which is part of the task of philosophy, should not be deduced to specific circumstances, deriving solutions for all occasions. In everyday situations, a person does not reason like a philosopher, and not only because it is impossible to raise the worldly consciousness of everyone to the level of ultimate abstractions, but because the life position of an individual in the vicissitudes of personal experience cannot always be directly derived from his worldview. Attempts in all cases to establish such a strict dependence can only lead to pedantic doctrinairism, which vulgarizes the very concept of philosophy" .

I.A. Akchurin:

"Without mastering the system of philosophical categories, without a general picture of the world in the head, a person will live in this completely new, complex and dynamic world with a feeling not far removed from the feelings of a Neanderthal in the face of a volcanic eruption, earthquake or tropical thunderstorm. More and more, the very dangerous feeling of an ant will grow in him, rushing about without any sense between the giant roots of trees, with the only difference where these trees are grown by him.

F. Engels:

"Naturalists imagine that they are freed from philosophy when they ignore or scold it. But since they cannot move a single step without thinking, logical categories are necessary for thinking, and they uncritically borrow these categories either from the ordinary general consciousness of the so-called educated people, who are dominated by the remnants of long-dead philosophical systems, or from the crumbs of mandatory university courses in

philosophy (which are not only fragmentary views, but also a hodgepodge of the views of people belonging to the most diverse and mostly the worst schools), or from uncritical and unsystematic reading all sorts of philosophical works, then in the end they still turn out to be subordinate to philosophy, but, unfortunately, for the most part the worst, and those who most abuse philosophy are slaves of just the worst vulgarized remnants of the worst our philosophical teachings".

* * *

Anyone who scorns philosophy, as a rule, becomes its victim. 12/10/2016

Scholars and writers on philosophy and philosophers

"As for philosophy, any modern natural scientist, especially every theoretical physicist, is deeply convinced that his work is closely intertwined with philosophy and that without a serious knowledge of philosophical literature, his work will be in vain. I was guided by this idea myself, trying to breathe it into my students as well."

M. Born. My life and views

"Philosophy can be considered to explain our knowledge to us, trying to find some meaning in the natural disorder of this knowledge. From this point of view, you can talk about the philosophy of anything - the philosophy of art, life, religion, education, society, history, science, mathematics, and even philosophy itself.

Philosophy is the process of polishing and ordering our knowledge and our judgments; it looks for connections between phenomena that usually seem completely unrelated, and discovers significant differences in such things that in everyday life we take for the same thing; philosophy is a theory that investigates the nature of any field of knowledge. In particular, the main task of the philosophy of mathematics is to streamline or rethink all that chaotic mass of mathematical knowledge that has been accumulated over the centuries.

G. Ives, K.W. Newsom. About mathematical logic

and philosophy of mathematics

"More ships have died because of ignorance of logic than because of ignorance of navigation," said the famous physicist Kelvin to supporters of a narrow specialization of students.

"It seems to me that all sciences should be grouped around philosophy as their common center, and that the service to it is their own goal. In this way, and only in this way, can the unity of scientific culture be preserved against the irresistibly progressing

specialization of the sciences. Without this unity, the whole culture would be doomed to death."

Max Laue. History of physics

"Philosophy is the queen of sciences. Among them, it occupies approximately the same place as the organ among musical instruments. She surveys them, brings them into a spiritual unity, systematizes and clarifies the results of research in all areas of science, thereby creating a picture of the world, a comprehensive and statutory synthesis that determines the meaning of life and the place of man in space."

Thomas Mann. Doctor Faustus

"He who is not a philosopher is not a man."

Pico della Mirandola

"We tried to show that in the study of infinity one cannot do without philosophy, although we do not at all share the point of view that infinity is within the competence of philosophy alone. We believe that philosophy cannot offer any solution apart from and independently of the observational and theoretical data of physics, astronomy, and mathematics. The role of philosophy should be to, relying on what has already been achieved by the exact sciences and generalizing it, to indicate to these sciences the direction and prospect of further searches, to protect them from possible groping and blind movement.

G.I. Naan. About the infinity of the universe

"There is a saying: "The scientist knows a lot about not-much; the philosopher, on the other hand, knows little, but knows much."

F. Frank

"They say that philosophers and true sages are indifferent. Untruth, indifference is paralysis of the soul, premature death.

A.P. Chekhov

"The main purpose of the philosophy of science is to make possible the scientific analysis of such phenomena that previously remained outside the competence of science. Historically, each new scientific direction arose as a result of the previous philosophical

analysis of the corresponding subject of research and research methods. Thanks to this, philosophy was called the "mother of all sciences". At the present time, philosophy is in a much better position to cope with this historical role. now we have a much deeper understanding of what science is."

R. Ackoff, F. Emery. About Purposeful Systems

Thinker, daring genius,
Carrying his forehead in the midst of fire and ice,
Ideas from many generations
Sometimes brings harmony ...
Emil Verharn. Thinkers

Bibliography

Grigoryan B. T. What is philosophy and why is it needed? // Question. philosophy. - 1985. - No. 6.

Zotov A.F. What is philosophy? - M., 1966.

Kopnin P. V. On the nature and features of philosophical knowledge // Vopr. philosophy - 1969. - No. 4.

Kuvakin V. A. What is philosophy? Essence, patterns of development and development principles. - M.: Publishing House of Moscow. un-ta, 1989. - 216 p.

Nikiforov A.L. The Nature of Philosophy. Fundamentals of philosophy. - M., 2001.

Ortega y Gasset H. What is philosophy? — M.: Nauka, 1991. — 411 p.

Heidegger M. What is metaphysics? // New technocratic wave in the West: collection of articles. — M.: Progress, 1986.

Books published by the author

The world through the eyes of a philosopher. (Categorical picture of the world). - M., 1997. - 293 p.

Practical Philosophy. - M., 2001. - 320 p.

Philosophy: textbook. - 8th ed. - M., 2023. - 625 p.

Ethics: textbook. - 8th ed. - M., 2023. - 382 p.

Entertaining philosophy: a study guide. - 9th ed. - M., 2023. - 452 p.

Entertaining philosophy. Audiobook. M.: Ardis, 2009.

Tasks and exercises in philosophy: textbook. allowance. - 5th ed. - M., 2022. - 48 p.

The science of love. - M., 2021. - 132 p.

Careful ethics. - M., 2023. - 464 p.

How do we think? - M., 1996. - 60 p.

Life, death, immortality. - M., 1996. - 96 p.

Mistakes and distortions of categorical thinking. - M., 2002. - 137 p.

Correspondences and anti-correspondences between categories. - M., 1998. - 51 p.

Golden rule of conduct. - M., 1999. - 23 p.

Criticism of Marxism and Communism. - M., 1997. - 69 p.

Liberalism and freedom. - M., 1999. - 19 p.

Russia and the world at the turn of the century-millennium. What was and what will. - M., 2001. - 28 p.

Humanist manifesto. - M., 2000. - 15 p.

Philosophy for life. Handbook for Practical Philosophy. - M., 2001. - 56 p.

About the dangers of drugs and the delights of life without them. Philosopher's Notes. - M., 2001. - 30 p.

Thoughts on religion. - M., 2001. - 28 p.

Negative life: anti-culture and anti-philosophy. - M., 2002. - 39 p.

In the publishing and trading corporation "Dashkov and Co."

The following books are available from this author:

1. Balashov L. E. Philosophy: a textbook (systematic course). - 8th ed. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2023. - 625 p.

2. Balashov L. E. Ethics: textbook. allowance. - 8th ed. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2023. - 382 p.

3. Balashov L. E. Entertaining philosophy: textbook. allowance. - 9th ed. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2023. - 452 p.

4. Balashov L. E. Tasks and exercises in philosophy: textbook. allowance. - 5th ed. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2022. - 48 p.

5. Balashov L. E. Science of love. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2021. - 136 p.

6. Balashov L. E. Entertaining ethics: textbook. allowance. - 2nd ed. - M.: ITC "Dashkov and Co", 2023. - 464 p.

Phone orders: 8-495-668-12-30

Popular science edition

BALASHOV Lev Evdokimovich

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

The book was published in the author's edition

Certificate of Conformity No. ROSS RU.AB51.HO5316

Signed for publication on May 25, 2023. Format 60x90 1/16

The press is digital. Offset paper No. 1. Conv. oven I. 5.25

Circulation 1000 copies. Order No.

Publishing and Trade Corporation "Dashkov and Co"

129347, Moscow, Yaroslavskoe shosse, 142, room 732

Tel.: 8 (495) 668-12-30, 8 (499) 182-01-58

E-mail: sales@dashkov.ru — sales department;

office@dashkov.ru — office; <http://www.dashkov.ru>

Printed by: T8 Publishing Technologies JSC

109316, Moscow, Volgogradsky p. prospect, 42, bldg. 5

Tel.: 8 (499) 322-38-30

AMENDMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTS TO THE 4TH EDITION

Take some texts from "Entertaining Philosophy"

Strength and weakness of the philosopher

Two legends are known about the first philosopher Thales, showing his strength and weakness as a philosopher.

The first is about how, foreseeing a good harvest of olives, he rented all the oil mills, began to dictate prices for the products of the oil mills, and thus became rich. This is how Aristotle describes it: "When Thales was reproached for his poverty, since, de facto, philosophy does not bring any profit, then, they say, Thales, foreseeing a rich harvest of olives on the basis of astronomical data, even before the end of winter distributed the small amount he had accumulated money as a deposit to the owners of all the oil mills in Miletus and Chios; Thales contracted the oil mills cheaply, since no one competed with him. When the time came for the harvest of olives, there was a sudden demand from many people at the same time for oil slaughterhouses. Thales then began to farm out the oil mills contracted by him for the price he wanted. Having collected a lot of money in this way, Thales thus proved that it is not difficult for philosophers to get rich if they wish, but this is not the subject of their interests "(Aristotle. Politics. 1259a).

The second legend is about how Thales, looking at the starry sky, fell into a hole (they say, he is hovering in the clouds, but he does not see what is under his feet) "They say," writes Plato, "that when he, observing the heavenly bodies and looking up, fell into the well, then some Thracian, a pretty and lively maid, laughed at him, that he strives to know what is in heaven, he does not notice the same that is near and under his feet. This mockery applies to everyone who spends his life in philosophy "(Plato. Teetet. 174a).

* * *

Philosophy

"Pythagoras called his teaching wisdom (□□□□□□□□□), and not wisdom (□□□□□), Reproaching the seven wise men (as they were called before him), he said that no one is wise, for man due to the weakness of his nature, he is often unable to achieve everything, and one who strives for the disposition and lifestyle of a wise being can be appropriately called a philosopher (philosopher).

* * *

Allegory of Philosophy

"Waking up from sad reflections, he saw before him a majestic woman with a face full of dignity and flaming eyes. It was difficult to determine her age: although she was in the color of her years, her eyes struck with a lively youthful brilliance and attractive power. It was also difficult to determine her height, for it seemed that she either rises to the heavens

and touches the sky with her crown, or does not exceed ordinary human sizes. She was dressed in clothes made of imperishable fabric, woven with sophisticated art from the finest threads. She held books in her right hand, and a scepter in her left" (Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, 524 AD).

This, as you understand, is an allegory. The majesty of a woman, her dignified face, and at the same time flaming eyes say that Philosophy has no age, that she can never grow old, because she combines wisdom and youth at the same time. Her growth, sometimes rising to the heavens, sometimes not exceeding human dimensions, testifies that with her knowledge she encompasses everything: from knowledge of higher things to knowledge of human things. Her clothes betray her high origin, and the imperishability of the fabric - the imperishability of those forms of thinking that she possesses. The scepter that she holds in her hand symbolizes wisdom and indicates that it is she, Philosophy, who should rule the world; and books are a symbol of enlightenment and knowledge.

* * *

The case of philosophy according to F. Bacon

Those who were involved in the sciences were either empiricists or dogmatists. Empiricists, like an ant, only collect and are content with what they have collected. Rationalists, like spiders, produce fabric from themselves. The bee, on the other hand, chooses the middle way: she extracts material from garden and field flowers, but arranges and changes it according to her ability. The true work of philosophy does not differ from this either. For it is not based solely or predominantly on the powers of the mind, and does not deposit in the mind untouched the material drawn from natural history and from mechanical experiments, but

changes it and processes it in the mind. So, one should put a good hope on a closer

and the indestructible (which has not been so far) union of these abilities - experience and reason (New Organon, XCV).

* * *

Why study philosophy?

1. Everyone philosophizes and everyone solves for himself vital, truly philosophical problems (about the attitude to the world, about the meaning and purpose of life, choosing a profession, about good and evil, etc.). So isn't it better, instead of wandering in the labyrinths of problems, to learn philosophy from others?!

Imagine that you are learning to ski. The snow is deep and loose - and you can hardly move your legs, but someone has laid a ski track nearby - and you stand on it, and it is immediately easier to move. You gradually master the technique of the move, and then you can already go on your own, your own way, but you already have much more prospect, 42, bldg. 5

Tel.: 8 (499) 322-38-30

AMENDMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTS TO THE 4TH EDITION

Take some texts from "Entertaining Philosophy"

Strength and weakness of the philosopher

Two legends are known about the first philosopher Thales, showing his strength and weakness as a philosopher.

The first is about how, foreseeing a good harvest of olives, he rented all the oil mills, began to dictate prices for the products of the oil mills, and thus became rich. This is how Aristotle describes it: "When Thales was reproached for his poverty, since, de facto, philosophy does not bring any profit, then, they say, Thales, foreseeing a rich harvest of olives on the basis of astronomical data, even before the end of winter distributed the small amount he had accumulated money as a deposit to the owners of all the oil mills in Miletus and Chios; Thales contracted the oil mills cheaply, since no one competed with him. When the time came for the harvest of olives, there was a sudden demand from many people at the same time for oil slaughterhouses. Thales then began to farm out the oil mills contracted by him for the price he wanted. Having collected a lot of money in this way, Thales thus proved that it is not difficult for philosophers to get rich if they wish, but this is not the subject of their interests "(Aristotle. Politics. 1259a).

The second legend is about how Thales, looking at the starry sky, fell into a hole (they say, he is hovering in the clouds, but he does not see what is under his feet) "They say," writes Plato, "that when he, observing the heavenly bodies and looking up, fell into the well, then some Thracian, a pretty and lively maid, laughed at him, that he strives to know what is in heaven, he does not notice the same that is near and under his feet. This mockery applies to everyone who spends his life in philosophy "(Plato. Teetet. 174a).

* * *

Philosophy

"Pythagoras called his teaching wisdom (□□□□□□□□), and not wisdom (□□□□□), Reproaching the seven wise men (as they were called before him), he said that no one is wise, for man due to the weakness of his nature, he is often unable to achieve everything, and one who strives for the disposition and lifestyle of a wise being can be appropriately called a philosopher (philosopher).

* * *

Allegory of Philosophy

"Waking up from sad reflections, he saw before him a majestic woman with a face full of dignity and flaming eyes. It was difficult to determine her age: although she was in the color of her years, her eyes struck with a lively youthful brilliance and attractive power. It was also difficult to determine her height, for it seemed that she either rises to the heavens and touches the sky with her crown, or does not exceed ordinary human sizes. She was dressed in clothes made of imperishable fabric, woven with sophisticated art from the finest threads. She held books in her right hand, and a scepter in her left" (Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, 524 AD).

This, as you understand, is an allegory. The majesty of a woman, her dignified face, and at the same time flaming eyes say that Philosophy has no age, that she can never grow old, because she combines wisdom and youth at the same time. Her growth, sometimes rising to the heavens, sometimes not exceeding human dimensions, testifies that with her knowledge she encompasses everything: from knowledge of higher things to knowledge of human things. Her clothes betray her high origin, and the imperishability of the fabric - the imperishability of those forms of thinking that she possesses. The scepter that she holds in her hand symbolizes wisdom and indicates that it is she, Philosophy, who should rule the world; and books are a symbol of enlightenment and knowledge.

* * *

The case of philosophy according to F. Bacon

Those who were involved in the sciences were either empiricists or dogmatists. Empiricists, like an ant, only collect and are content with what they have collected. Rationalists, like spiders, produce fabric from themselves. The bee, on the other hand, chooses the middle way: she extracts material from garden and field flowers, but arranges and changes it according to her ability. The true work of philosophy does not differ from this either. For it is not based solely or predominantly on the powers of the mind, and does not deposit in the mind untouched the material drawn from natural history and from mechanical experiments, but

changes it and processes it in the mind. So, one should put a good hope on a closer

and the indestructible (which has not been so far) union of these abilities - experience and reason (New Organon, XCV).

* * *

Why study philosophy?

1. Everyone philosophizes and everyone solves for himself vital, truly philosophical problems (about the attitude to the world, about the meaning and purpose of life, choosing a profession, about good and evil, etc.). So isn't it better, instead of wandering in the labyrinths of problems, to learn philosophy from others?!

Imagine that you are learning to ski. The snow is deep and loose - and you can hardly move your legs, but someone has laid a ski track nearby - and you stand on it, and it is immediately easier to move. You gradually master the technique of the move, and then you

can already go on your own, your own way, but you already have much more less likely to fall into the snow or stop. So it is in philosophy.

2. Philosophy is the collective mind of people. Being on "you" with the collective mind is as important as having a mind. And the mind is the concentrated expression of man. It is no coincidence that biologists call a person "homo sapiens", a reasonable person.

Thanks to philosophy, a person begins to feel like a citizen of the world, becomes, as it were, on a par with humanity and even with the world as a whole.

3. Philosophy helps a person to realize himself in the full sense of a person (not a man or a woman, not a representative of a particular nationality, religious denomination or professional specialist).

In particular, it helps the specialist to overcome his professional limitations, one-sidedness, i.e., it protects the specialist from what is called professional cretinism (limitation, narrowness). Recall what Kozma Prutkov said about this: a specialist is like a flux, his fullness is one-sided.

A person must be comprehensively educated, cultured, developed. This is achieved by studying the sciences in the specialty, reading scientific and educational, artistic literature, newspapers, magazines, developing musical and artistic taste, practical skills and abilities ... Philosophy is, as it were, in the center of this whole stream of educational and upbringing tasks.

In the 18th century, the Prussian minister Zedlitz "inspired respect for philosophy in his subordinates"; "The student must learn, the minister believed, that after completing the course of science, he will have to be a doctor, judge, lawyer, etc., only a few hours a day, and a person all day. That is why, along with special knowledge, higher education should provide solid philosophical training "(see: Gulyga A. Kant. M., 1977. P. 95).

4. Thanks to philosophy, the mental outlook is unusually expanded, the breadth of thinking appears and / or increases. The latter helps a person to understand, understand others, teaches tolerance, tolerance, teaches not to be afraid of someone else, that is, protects from xenophobia.

5. Philosophy instills a taste for abstract, abstract thinking, and no less than mathematics.

Philosophical abstraction, in contrast to mathematical, is filled with vital meaning; it is not an abstraction from the manifold, but the unity of the manifold. It is enough to mention such abstractions as "the world as a whole", "space", "time", "matter", "spirit".

6. Philosophy develops thought, the ability to think. The study of philosophy is a real school of creative thinking.

7. Philosophy teaches criticality, critical thinking. After all, the first condition of philosophizing: take nothing on faith. In this capacity, philosophy helps to get rid of prejudices and delusions.

8. Philosophy helps people develop beliefs and, if necessary, correct them.

We must remember: beliefs shape personality. Without them, a person is like a weather vane - where the wind blows, he goes there.

9. Philosophy communicates to a person what is called firmness, fearlessness of the spirit. Thanks to her, a person gets rid of the dangerous feeling of an ant, rushing about without any sense between giant tree roots.

* * *

Why do you need to know the history of philosophy?

The history of philosophy must be studied because it is interesting and no less than the history of art. We remember and love Homer, Shakespeare, Rembrandt, Beethoven, although they lived a long time ago. And philosophical ideas-creations - akin to works of art - have the greatest intellectual value. Many of them are timeless.

Here is an important moment. The history of philosophy is not just a collection of old ideas. It is rather a treasure trove of thought. Let us recall, for example, the idea of the atomic structure of matter put forward by Leucippus and Democritus two and a half thousand years ago. This idea remained an idea for more than two thousand years, until the end of the 18th century, when it finally found confirmation in the scientific theory of atoms. How many more such ideas are waiting for their implementation, confirmation or verification / refutation!

In addition, philosophical ideas expressed long ago continue to live their own lives, change, develop, acquire new features. Heinrich Heine once remarked: "Each era, acquiring new ideas, acquires new eyes and sees a lot of new things in the ancient creations of the human spirit."

In short, by studying the history of philosophy, we study philosophy.

* * *

Love and sage

Zeno, the philosopher, when someone once told him that love is a thing unworthy of a sage, objected: "If this is so, then I pity the poor beauties, for they will be doomed to enjoy the love of only fools."

* * *

Symbols of philosophy and wisdom

ATHENA - among the Romans MINERVA - the goddess of wisdom, the patroness of sciences, crafts, the daughter of ZEUS - among the Romans JUPITER - was born from his head in full military armor.

ATHENA was depicted as a stern and majestic maiden, most often in a long robe and fully armed, with a spear, shield and helmet. At the feet of the goddess, her bird, the OWL, usually sits.

MYTHOLOGICAL DICTIONARY

OWL - the bird of philosophers, a symbol of philosophy , wisdom. Why an owl? The fact is that she is the only bird that leads a nocturnal lifestyle. At night, everyone sleeps, rests, and she is awake, working. So is the human mind. It works (wise) best of all when a person feels-perceives minimally and acts minimally, that is, when he takes a break in his sensitive and motor activity. It is no coincidence that there is a saying "the morning is wiser than the evening."

A. P. Chekhov on philosophers

It is said that philosophers and true sages are indifferent. Untruth, indifference is paralysis of the soul, premature death.

Philosophy. Painting by M. A. Vrubel

August Rodin. Thinker

Thinker, daring genius,
Carrying his forehead in the midst of fire and ice,
Ideas from many generations
Sometimes brings harmony ...
Emil Verhaern