Sukhanova N.A.
Binding links in anthropological philosophy

*The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy
and Public Administration (RANEPA)
(Russia, Moscow)*

doi 10.18411/gq-30-03-2019-13
idsp sciencerussia-30-03-2019-13

Abstract

The article elucidates the issue of interaction of anthropological philosophy and philosophy proper in the variety of issues, such as body and soul, human being and human existence, covering such phenomenon as morality, consciousness and substance as the common features in the world outlook.

Key words: human, existence, anthropology, ethnographic field, society, mind and body, nature, substance.

We would probably never dare to think of separating philosophy from the subjects such as anthropology, language, psychology, sociology, whilst assigning a substantial role to it. But we might hear such outspokenness about philosophy as something outdated, sunk down in the annals of history and being replaced by some fashionable approaches intermixed with digital theories. No one, however, could ignore the fact of existence of *human* and *human s perceived by humans*, described and understood *by human* as an inseparable unity consisting of a body, soul and spirit. The core of the phenomenon is, obviously, *human*, a personality that comprises morality, ethics, belief, cognition, emotions. When the issue comes to the concept of anthropology as part of philosophy, we might evoke in our minds the neatly tied up network of a human, being a body with all its integrated parts as brain, eyes, hands, legs, without which the complete and comprehensive human would not be assessed as human. One of the ancient Christian philosophers Augustine of Hippo was cited by Husserl, by Heidegger and some other philosophers as a personality with anthropological views and deeply involved in body and soul issue, underlying at the same time they were metaphysically different. Descartes preferred to go deep into the body and soul issue in his philosophical compositions. The idea is not the new one.

Thus we can judge that taking away anthropology from philosophy, dismembering the whole system of thoroughly knitted pattern, could awfully disarrange the functioning of the integral unity. Philosophy would mean nothing without a human, anthropology would never exit without a human. According to Heidegger, the very *being* of humans introduces the idea of a structure of possibilities of being, when a human has freedom to choose one way or another of his mode of living. Wilhelm Wundt wrote that human rationality strives for a uniform, i.e. non-contradictory, explanatory principle for being and consciousness, for an ultimate reasoning for ethics, and for a philosophical world basis. In his understanding the phenomenon of humanity is the measure of assessing our actions and the entire human history must be viewed in correlation with humanity. Emile Durkheim, who was under a great influence of Wundt's works, became an ardent advocate of structural functionalism, emphasizing at the same time that sociology and anthropology must form a basis for a future research. In his attempt to combine elements of rationalism and empiricism, he argued that some aspects of logical thought were the same to all humans but they were products of social life and that is why the content of the categories were different from society to society. Posing a question, how the society is created, or what hold humans together, Durkheim put forward his idea, that humans are inherently egoistic, but the way of living, beliefs and values form the moral basis of the society, thus creating social integration. In the end he stated that collective consciousness, if such, is the bone structure in the society, that is the function

without which a society is unthinkable. Through collective consciousness human beings become aware of one another as social beings, not just animal creatures. Durkheim was keen on studying the cultural diversity and the existence of diversity, nonetheless that fails to destroy the society. He wrote that any cultural diversity is overridden by a larger, common and generalized cultural system, and the law. In the works published by Emile Durkheim we see a vivid example how different views or different approaches belonging to different disciplines form what could constitute a mixture of sociology, anthropology, philosophy and etc.

Philosophy would lead to a better understanding of a human nature against the background of anthropological concept. Nevertheless, Foucault in his criticism of Kant's idealism, comes against an anthropology as it tries to give a metaphysical account of man. To a challenging question "What is man?" Foucault answers that in the field of philosophy the trajectory of issue reaches its end, praising it and disarming it. As we single out Michael D. Jackson from the whole array of prominent philosophical anthropologists, we will see that he concentrates on the subject of a human being in the world, and in his *Existential Anthropology* he describes a human anthropomorphizing inanimate objects around him, his target is entering into interpersonal relationship. Thus, humans believe that they can exert control over situations attributing to them the ability to understand a human, his language and feelings. The methodology of Michael D Jackson is different from the methods of traditional research in anthropology as he focuses on the first person experience based on ethnographic field work. It is worthwhile noticing that in Germany, for instance, philosophical anthropology searched for its own way through such disciplines as epistemology, ethics, metaphysics in its attempt to become a philosophical discipline. Existentialism picking up the fit-in methods from the experience of human nature within human history and combining it with the experience of philosophical exploration of the philosopher himself move in the direction of assessing the values that exist, a certain correlation between human and the nature surrounding us. Among different philosophical approaches to the issue of human nature we may choose the issue of the human soul. The primitive tribes were understood as part of the human being, attributing to it the substance that makes our living organism movable. The debates focusing on the human's soul were prominent in the philosophical thought in different centuries. Rene Descartes and his followers put a strong emphasis on the *way of ideas*, contemplating on the issues of the models of mind. Descartes, being a mathematician and a philosopher at the same time, the scientist called the father of analytical geometry, is best known for his words "I think, therefore I am", rejected the previous existing theories and put forward the idea of applying the mathematical method to philosophy. *Thinking* for Descartes meant every activity of a person about which the person is conscious. Being an advocate of a deduction method, Descartes argued that the difference between body and mind, or soul, make the two ontologically distinct. In his *Principles of Philosophy* he asserts that we can perceive a substance apart from the mode, but we cannot conversely understand the mode part from the substance. In order to perceive a mode part from its substance what is needed is intellectual abstraction, or considering a shape without thinking of the substance. As we see some philosophers did not try to alienate philosophical anthropology from Christianity.

N.A. Berdyaev in his composition *My Philosophic World-outlook* clearly described the task of philosophy as the discipline or science, concerning the soul. At the same time, according to his understanding, the science concerning the soul is however the science concerning *human existence*. *Being* manifests itself through the subject, not through the object. Philosophy is anthropologic and anthropocentric, according to him. Berdyaev believed that philosophic cognition cannot abstract itself from the human existence. The problem of *man*, as he wrote, stands at the core of philosophic activity. He would hardly do in his deliberations without considering the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of history, social philosophy and ethics taken logically as one closely-knit unity. As we dwell on the

issue of what is human, the idea of adding a human to a sum of other individuals will organically spring to the fore. For Berdyaev the fundamental problem in the world is the problem of the relationship between the person and society. Society in its turn presents itself as the objectivisation of human relationships. Further on he develops the idea saying that society is not an organism and that reality of human society defines itself by the reality of the human community. Berdyaev adds that an objectivized society, suppressing the person, comes from the dissociation of people, from their sinful egocentrism. What is more, as Berdyaev thinks, in such a society we can witness a communication between people, with no actual community. He is fully assure that technical advances rends the integral wholeness of the human being and transforms it into function. Another Russian historian, philosopher and ethnographer L.N. Gumilyov in his criticism of philosophers of his time, asserted that their ideas were based on philological misunderstanding, as they could not obtain raw material from the translations they used for their further processing. Writing on the phenomenon of ethnos, the kernel of the system of anthropology, and which is a natural phenomenon in its forming, he proposed that the basis for studying it can only be the philosophy of science, i.e. dialectical materialism. He dwelled on the subject saying at the same time that historical materialism is targeted at disclosing the laws of social development rather than the history of nature which lies in men's bodies.

As Herbert Spenser wrote, there existed a natural mechanism in human beings, human beings exhibited a natural sympathy and concern for one another. According to his views philosophy aimed to be synthetic. He was adherent to the universality of the natural law, to the human mind as well as to the rest of the world.

With all the varieties of views existing on the subject we would probably have the right to assert that anthropology is interwoven with philosophy so closely that it could be absurd to differentiate them, not however belittling the significance of any of them. Alongside these deliberations another thing is important. When we speak about anthropological philosophy we should not bypass interpersonal relations as it seems it might add to understanding the behavior of humans as beings within social environments and creators of their own values. Despite criticism on the part of some authoritative philosophers in the West, many of them laid the foundation for the philosophical anthropology as a philosophical discipline. Philosophers, like Wundt, claimed that philosophy is a general science and has the task of uniting disciplines as humans seek for a uniform, explanatory principle, for a world basis of knowledge.

1. Barth Frederik. Models of social organizations. London, Royal Anthropological Institute, 1966.
2. Berdyaev N.A. My philosophic world-outlook. Trans. Janos Fr. S. 2000.
3. Descartes Rene. Discourse on the Method and Principles of Philosophy. Essay.
4. Duncan David. The life and Letters of Herbert Spenser. 1993.
5. Durkheim Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. 1912.
6. Foucault Michel. Introduction to Kant's Anthropology. Los Angeles, 2008
7. Gumilyov L.N. Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere. Published by ProQuest LLc 2014.
8. Heidegger Martin. Being and Time. New York, 2008.
9. Husserl Edmund. Phenomenology of internal Time-Consciousness. Trans. James S. Churchill, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1964.
10. Jackson Michael D. Being of Two Minds. Existential Anthropology., 2012.
11. Medicus Gerhard. Being Human - Bringing the Gap between the Sciences of Body and Mind. Berlin: VWB, 2015.
12. Spenser Herbert. Political Writings. Cambridge, 1993.
13. Wilhelm Wundt. The Principles of Morality and the Departments of the Moral Life. Trans. Washburn, M.F., London
14. Yolton John W. Realism and Appearances: An Essay in Ontology. Cambridge University Press, 2000.