



ARTÍCULOS

UTOPIA Y PRAXIS LATINOAMERICANA. AÑO: 24, n° EXTRA 5, 2019, pp. 57-64
REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE FILOSOFÍA Y TEORÍA SOCIAL
CESA-FCES-UNIVERSIDAD DEL ZULIA. MARACAIBO-VENEZUELA.
ISSN 1315-5216 / ISSN-e: 2477-9535

Prolegomenon to the ontology of neoclassical philosophy *Prolegómenos a la ontología de la filosofía neoclásica*

A.S. KRASNOV

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5828-901X>
anton-krasnov1987@yandex.ru
Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation

O.O. VOLCHKOVA

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9430-0415>
adelaida389@mail.ru
Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation

ABSTRACT

The situation into which modern philosophy falls today is fundamentally different. Conceptual changes and shifts in modern philosophical science concern not only the revision of the reality but also the explanation of new categories and principles. This paper aims to reveal the main content, reflective models and the potential of neoclassical philosophy in the context of the formation of a new ontology. For the objective to be achieved, the following tasks must be performed: to determine the modern type of determinism, to identify the fundamental principle of neoclassical philosophy, and also to determine its main category.

Keywords: Dialectics, Metaphysics, Ontology, Philosophy.

RESUMEN

La situación en la que cae la filosofía moderna hoy es fundamentalmente diferente. Los cambios sociales y conceptuales en la ciencia filosófica moderna se refieren no solo a la revisión de la realidad, sino también a la explicación de nuevas categorías y principios. Este artículo tiene como objetivo revelar el contenido principal de los modelos reflexivos y el potencial de la filosofía neoclásica en el contexto de la formación de una nueva ontología. Para lograr el objetivo, se deben realizar las siguientes tareas: determinar el tipo moderno de determinismo e identificar el principio fundamental de la filosofía neoclásica para determinar su categoría principal.

Palabras clave: Dialéctica, Filosofía, Metafísica, Ontología.

Recibido: 01-10-2019 • Aceptado: 02-11-2019



Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana publica bajo licencia Creative Commons Atribución-No Comercial-Compartir Igual 4.0 Internacional (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). Más información en <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

The postmodern form of philosophizing not only articulated apocalyptic intentions in the philosophical horizon through the explanation of “death of the autr”, “death of the subject”, “death of God”, peculiarly having continued the religious concept of the Apocalypse (Kosyakova: 2018, p. 400), etc., but also set doubt the very existence of philosophy, not only as an area of spiritual and practical activity, but also a worldview matrix through the methodological framework of “death of philosophy”. Despite the clearly negative intentions of post-structuralism that were apprehended by many researchers, it is nevertheless worth noting that the very post-structuralist paradigm was a kind of historical “response” to the “rational fascism” (P. Feyerabend) of the previous era, in which the representatives of post-modern philosophy traced epistemological beginnings of the First and Second World Wars. The conceptualization of radical humanism in the works by poststructuralists, despite its importance for the formation of theoretical justification for the culture of the new era, gave rise to a dialectical opposite, turning “rational fascism”, according to P. Feyerabend into “irrational fascism”.

The epistemological foundations of the post-structuralist paradigm have also fundamentally changed the approach to philosophy and philosophical work, in accordance with its internal correlations between methodological settings. And if the classical philosophy of the modern era preceding poststructuralism was wrapped in a scientific form, then thanks to postmodernists’ ability, philosophy turned out to be reduced to the literary genre, with all the aspects and forms of expression characteristic of it. After-postmodernism, as a late (modern) stage in the development of postmodern philosophy, closes the hermeneutic circle of post-structuralist rhetoric in the context of the classical attitudes of the philosophy of the postmodern era, articulating the general methodological setting - “death of the subject”, as the “crisis of the subject” and the need for its “resurrection” through various variations within the post-structuralist discourse itself. There, the cognitive circle of poststructuralism closed on its basis, making itself, once open postmodern discourse, enclosed.

1. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Despite the fact that in modern Russian philosophy, the main reflective and methodological vector of studies of the fundamental foundations and various fluctuations is poststructuralism and after-postmodernism, with their inherent methodological settings of anti-system, paralogy, irrationalism and general post-apocalypticism, in modern philosophical discourse a new request for the formulation and development of a new philosophical system begins to form.

2. RESULTS

The development of civilization cannot be grounded and ontologically associated only with the development of philosophy. Philosophy is always a reflective return to an era, its mirror, in which processes and phenomena acquire not only the status of speculative categories and concepts but also serve as the basis for constructing a universal explanatory model that combines the essential elements of a picture of the world. Classical philosophies explicate a world view in a concrete historical period of formation and development in logic consistent with time itself, with all its ontological characteristics.

The classical picture of the world was characterized by the presence of rigid causal relationships, a generating linear nature, which led to the identification of cause and effect, total retro-predictability and predictability (Demitrievskaya: 1994). As a vivid example of an enclosed predetermined picture of the world, one can cite a schematic representation of being from the manuscript book of the 12th century *Thorney Computus*. In the center of the universe there is a man, which is indicated by the first four letters agglutinating

into the words "ADAM", which also symbolize the geographical sides of the world. The diagram shows the four main elements – Terra, Aqua, Aer, Ignis, zodiac signs, wind directions and moon cycles and various stages of human aging.

Despite the epistemological gap between the eras of Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the New Age, there is no need to talk about the fundamental differences between these pictures of the universe, since each of them is rigidly determined by the Absolute, expressed in the Cosmos, the will of the Gods, the figure of the demiurge, the Christian God, the figure of Jesus Christ. The picture of the world, proposed by scientists and philosophers of the New Age, does not fundamentally differ from previous variations since the figure of the Absolute in the form of God is still present, but it has a different role that is most consistent with the stagyrite *primum mobile* than the religious God.

The world, presented and proved as a complex and ingenious mechanical system within the framework of general mechanistic logic, could not be the beginning of itself, and could not function without the first impulse. The doctrine of mechanistic creationism, of course, represented the very world to be more complex and complete in comparison with Antiquity and the Middle Ages, rationally comprehended and predictable, but still could not exclude in the ontological sense the mystical figure of the Absolute. This was the next step, but in that time period, the knowledge of philosophy and science did not allow for this. In a certain sense, mechanism and mechanistic intentions in philosophical doctrines were also intrinsic to brilliant dialectic G.V.F. Hegel and K. Marx, F. Engels and the entire Frankfurt school.

Postmodern philosophy rather vividly responded to ontological issues, which was clearly expressed in classical philosophy, although it did not have a built-up post-structuralist conceptual ontology, which is determined by the internal structure and epistemological principles of postmodern reflection itself. In the framework of the dialectical approach to the historical process, it is simple enough to imagine poststructuralism to be the antithesis of the previous era. Post-structuralist philosophy is characterized by a semiotic explication of the objective reality *per se*, its extrapolation in a cultural, artistic, hyperbolic and metaphorical sense. J. Derrida articulates being as something transcendently signified, which deprives the very existence of its existential status. In general, poststructuralism decisively destroys any approach to the problem of being through its concepts and methodological guidelines of "empty sign" (R. Barthes), "onto-theo-teleo-phallo-phono-logocentrism" and the "metaphysics of absence" (J. Derrida). The elimination of ontological principles, the destruction of the horizons of objective reality, was designated by the being of every man.

The radical humanism of poststructuralism, in the manner peculiar to it, radicalized the figure of "human", indicating a new "anthropological turn". Metaphorically post-structuralist conditional "ontology" and "picture of the world" can be compared with a broken mirror, which the very person peers into. He fails not only to notice the whole picture in these fragments, but also observes in them only his distorted, not-top-to-bottom reflection. This gives rise to a new turgor of creative energy, total freedom, but already limited by the framework and conditions of irrationalism, any rationalism could be recognized as retrograde. Thesis and antithesis, according to dialectics, in their unity and struggle give rise to synthesis. The result of this synthesis is a neoclassical picture of the world which underlies the ontology of neoclassical philosophy.

The neoclassical philosophical picture of the world is not based on the principle of the ontological gap between the old and the new, thereby delimiting itself from previous eras, their ideas, and attitudes, which was characteristic of previous philosophical models. The epistemological formation of the neoclassical picture of the world is based on the synthesis of the entire heritage of the past, as well as modern achievements in the field of natural science. The Gordian knot of articulation of a new epistemological matrix appears to be a synergistic approach, as a more developed form of dialectics. One of the immanent principles of the neoclassical philosophical picture of the world is a conscious rejection of the rational and irrational "fascism", both in the ontological and anthropological aspects. There is a "dis symbolization of the Absolute" (Krasnov: 2017, pp. 734-738), a full realization of the uniqueness and oneness of a person – the total

objectification of “unhappy consciousness” (Hegel: 1913), but on the scale of the whole being.

Being itself within the framework of a neoclassical cognitive strategy does not seem finite and predetermined, open or closed. Being itself, represented as a complex, unified system, where all the elements of an inorganic and living nature (from the vacuum level to the mega level; from the molecular to the biosphere level) are in a constant and inextricable relation to each other. The issue of “closeness” and “openness” of both the whole picture of the world in a theoretical and epistemological mode, therefore, of all being and of individual elements of being from infinitesimal to infinitely great, is solved by neoclassical philosophies as follows.

Being itself is described as a system of “open-closed” type. First of all, we note that from the methodological viewpoint, the postulation of a system of such an antinomic nature means the rejection of one-vector / one-dimensional thinking, which was characteristic of classical West European metaphysics, as well as the philosophy of poststructuralism. The theoretical potential of the categorical link of “openness” and “closedness” is seen, first of all, in the fact that each element of being is articulated as individually existing, in all its integrity, uniqueness and interconnection with other elements. Each phenomenon of the universe is simultaneously “closed” and “open”.

A new model of thinking is being conceptually formed: any phenomenon, essence, phenomenon is simultaneously “open” to each other, in the aspect that they are all in constant and continuous “interaction – relation” with each other, but at the same time, preserving their temporally unstable integrity in the process of movement and development, constant formation in one way or another, are articulated as “closed”. The cognition of being as the dominant methodological installation of the philosophy and metaphysics of the new time acquires a truly philosophical significance, but not in cognition that appeals to the total emancipation of the mind and its dictate, but in understanding the very causality of being, determination (O’boyle & McDonough: 2015)

The preceding types of determinism in the history of philosophy and natural science were determined by the prevailing picture of the world, the cognitive potential of science itself, and the belief in the inexhaustible power of reason. A consistent criticism of such an ideology was first discovered in the metaphysics of I. Kant. The poststructuralist type of determinism is conditional since any theoretical and logical “rigidity” of the speculative construct contradicted the fundamental foundations of the philosophy of the postmodern era, but the development of poststructuralists in this area found its application in neoclassical philosophy: “... recognizing the existence of “determination sites” (plateau) in the general course of “indeterminate process”, this lays some foundation for the theory ... of the modern neoclassical type ...” (Menchikov: 2014, pp. 10-17).

Poststructuralism in the logic of its eternal contradiction with classical philosophy began the development of immanent determinism. At the heart of the neoclassical type of determinism, several modal attitudes are revealed – fractality of being and realism. The concept of fractal and fractality as a universal property of nature came to the philosophical theoretical and methodological tools from the works by French mathematician B. Mandelbrot (Mandelbrot: 2002), who proved the possibility of extrapolating the fractal theory not only to the objects of nature and natural processes, but also to socio-economic phenomena (Mandelbrot: 2005). Fractality, as a fundamental principle and ontological property of all elements of being, extends the understanding of the emergent properties of the entire whole system. Mandelbrot set, a fractal is revealed in the ontology of neoclassical philosophy in the context of understanding the self-similarity of a part to the common whole.

Here you can see that the general features of the theory of fractality are combined with holistic tendencies in classical ontologies (Aristotle, G. Hegel, K. Marx, F. Engels, J. Smarts, J. Haldane, E. Husserl and others), and get further development within the framework of neoclassical philosophy. Note that fractality, as a general cognitive principle, also allows for taking a different look at the existential human nature of a person, for example, in the field of creative realization, in which a person in the process of creation objectifies his self into an object-subject of his creative work (MacGregor:2015).

Today, within the framework of the theory of fractality, several general approaches are found within the framework of which an understanding of the mechanism of internal interaction, the correlation of the very fractals is being developed: "... autopoiesis" (the phenomenon of the reproduction of life inherent in being); "clinamen" (the phenomenon of deviation of atoms from its vertical line by nothing outside, the phenomenon of self-motion at the micro-level); "anthropic principle" (accidental indispensable presence of a human phenomenon)." Fractality allows one to think of being itself as a self-conscious, rational, objectified, infinite, uncreated whole. In this vector of thinking, one can find an interpretation of the ancient **νοῦς**, to which Anaxagoras, according to Aristotle, "attributes both qualities: cognition and movement" (Eksmo: 2015, 448).

A realistic "turn" in understanding the neoclassical type of determinism overcomes the antinomic oppositions of transcendence and immanentism, governed by the principle of self-organization of being, as an independent self-moving single system, conditioned by the very synergetic picture of the world, in which the binary ontological opposition of "external" and "internal" is also destroyed. The properties of which can be (only conditionally) attributed to finite objectified temporally stable (but relatively stable) phenomena, in which, like the whole being, self-propulsion is inherent (Menchikov: 2016, pp.14-16). And if we refuse the omnipotent power of the mind in respect of the methodological aspect, thereby avoiding super-rationalistic intentions, then we are forced to admit that being is "necessary-random".

A methodological nerve of the synergetic picture of the world lies in this ontological link "necessity-randomness", because by introducing the properties of being "necessary-random", we find it in conjunction with other concepts of synergetics – fluctuation, attractor, bifurcation, nonlinearity, dissipation. Metaphorically this property of being can be expressed in this way: everything random is necessary, everything necessary is random, after the manner of the famous Hegelian expression "Everything real is rational, everything rational is real" (Hegel: 2007, p. 464). Otherwise, we refuse self-determination to beingness itself and again find ourselves in the methodological impasse between transcendentalism and immanentism. So, the human genesis in being is "necessary and random" at the same time. P. Teilhard de Chardin, aphoristically remarked that "Man entered the world silently" (Chardin: 1965, p. 296).

The existence of man in the world was not a shock to the world itself. Man has always been a natural part of the universe, he is not the crown of Creation but has his own uniqueness like every element of being. All elements of being are in a relationship, which we have mentioned several times, their mutual mediation and co-existence cannot but cause various changes in each other. Being, as noted by M. Heidegger, appeals to man, and man, even by the fact of his observation of individual elements of the universe, influences them. This is evidenced by the anthropic principle, developed until recently, mainly in cosmology by A.L. Zelmanov, G.M. Ildis, B. Carter. The fundamental thesis of the anthropic principle in its strong formulation reads: "Observers are necessary for gaining the Universe of being" (Wheeler: 1977, pp. 27-43).

The very fact of the importance of the observer is shown by quantum physics – the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox (EPR). It is connected with the experiments in understanding the mechanism of wave-particle dualism. The essence of the paradox itself is outlined as follows: the screen is bombarded with elementary particles through a plate with a slit. Without observing the very elementary particles, an interference pattern formed on the screen, i.e. particles behaved like waves, but when observing the passage of the particles themselves through the gap, the particles themselves behaved as single isolated elements.

One of the most common theories in physics explaining such a strange phenomenon that does not fit into the classical determination laws of natural science is the Copenhagen interpretation by N. Bohr and V. Heisenberg. The EPR paradox which challenged the truth of quantum mechanics but was ultimately refuted by J. S. Bell's theorem. For our study, this observation is enough to suggest that the observer himself is fundamentally important for life, and even the fact of simple contemplation, observation of individual elements of the universe is sufficient to influence the whole system. Thus, a person within the framework of neoclassical philosophical reflection is "...an involved observer. The involvement of the observer is manifested in the observer's being inseparable from the observed. Since man is a creation and extraction of

the same post-existent being, then being, in fact, observes itself through man" (Menchikov: 2016, pp. 14-19).

CONCLUSION

Man is ontologically important not only for himself but also for beings. From this perspective, the clarification of the new ontological status of a person raises the question of his "thinking" as a unique and complex system. And, if we represent uniqueness as a qualitative characteristic into the very being of a person, his ontological significance and importance but at the same time recognize him as an equal element of being, answering his "call" (M. Heidegger), then the existential side of human beings becomes fundamentally important in the framework of neoclassical philosophy. But along with the existential dimension, another question arises – the identification of the nature of life as a fundamental category of the neoclassical ontology (Loux & Crisp: 2017).

As the main prolegomenon to identify the essence of the phenomenon of life, of the living, it should be noted, first of all, that thinking in the context of binary oppositions is "animate-inanimate", although it is attractive in its recognizability and simplicity of methodology and thinking, however, it is not true for neoclassical philosophy. Being as a complex constantly transforming the system, within the framework of which an uncountable number of interactions occurs at each moment of time, the "animate" and "inanimate" are temporally unstable and transforming into "their different" phenomena. Rigid determinative thinking can lead either to biological pan determinism or to religious creationism.

The essence of the animate is that "... the signs of the animate show that the animate is eternal (tantamount to being), but exists in its various levels, forms and conditions: from a minimized living or seemingly dichotomous approach to an absolutely unfolding living – of man" (Krasnov: 2017, pp. 734-738). Thus, the very being appears before us in the form of a constant transition from the living and nonliving states, while pointing out more and more to the central nerve of the whole ontology of neoclassical philosophy – the problem of life not only in its ontological, essential dimension, but also as an existential problem. Until the 20th century, the existential angle of philosophical reflection had not been so clearly expressed. Of course, the source of the very idea of existentialism in philosophy was the theme of "unhappy consciousness" by G. Hegel, articulated first by him in "The Phenomenology of the Spirit" (Hegel: 1913, p. 376).

This topic is relevant to this day. L. Heide did not indisputably but quite convincingly suggested that the theme of G. Hegel's unhappy consciousness directly correlated with the Hegelian idea of "death of God" (Heide), implying a complete loss of illusory, transitory ideals, a new openness of human consciousness to the world and society, in which it, comprehending its loneliness, must take responsibility for itself. This topic is directly connected with a new form of objectification of the phenomenon of unhappy consciousness, and not within the framework of the social, but on the scale of all being. The existential dimension, once inherent only to man, is revealed as inherent in all being. This is in keeping with the fundamental ontology of M. Heidegger, in which the German philosopher directly pointed out that the theme of existence and being are inextricably linked: "man is a pastor (shepherd) of being" and "man is the gleam of being" (Heidegger: 2003, p. 503). And if we consider a person to be equal to all being, the existential dimension, firstly, becomes the universal property of the whole universe, secondly, existential needs are understood as the force that drives a person, and thirdly, the universality of existentialism and the themes of the living and anthropic principle in the respect of theoretical aspect give rise to the change in the fundamental question of philosophy: the ratio of being and nonexistence (Barrow: 2007).

Modern technologies are at such a level that they can destroy the planet in a matter of minutes. The global problems of our time are also not the fruit of speculative thinking, but every day they are gaining more and more piercing and terrifying forms and scales. Therefore, a person who is conscious of himself, identifying

himself with the entirety of being, must assume responsibility and solve not only existential problems of a personal nature but the problems of being itself, the source of which, among other things, is human life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARROW, JD (2007). "Anthropic Definitions". *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*. p. 146.
- CHARDIN, P (1965). Teilhard de, Human Phenomenon. Foreword by Roger Garaudy; Translated from French by N. A. Sadovsky. Progress. p.296.
- DEMITRIEVSKAYA, IV (1994). "Ontological Models of the World and the Problem of the Reality of Consciousness". *The Philosophy of Consciousness of the 20th Century: Problems and Solutions*.
Collected Scientific Papers of the Ivanovo State University. *Ivanovo*, p. 5-18.
- EKSMO, M (2015). Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. p. 448.
- HEGEL, GVF (1913). *Phenomenology of the Spirit*. translated under the editorship of E. Radlov. St. Petersburg. p. 376.
- HEGEL, GVF (2007). *The Philosophy of Law*. The World of Books. p. 464.
- HEIDE, L. "Autonomy and Unhappy Consciousness. God is Dead", (Electronic resource) Retrieved from http://www.ruthenia.ru/logos/number/1999_09/1999_9_01.htm
- KRASNOV, AS (2017). The essence of living in the context of neo-classical understanding. Vol.28, P.734-738.
- LOUX, MJ, & CRISP, TM (2017). *Metaphysics: A contemporary introduction*. Routledge
- MANDELBROT, B (2002). *Fractal Geometry of Nature*. Institute for Computer Research. p. 656.
- MANDELBROT, B (2005). (Dis) obedient Markets: A Fractal Revolution in Finance. "Williams". p. 400.
- MENCHIKOV, GP (2014). "The Problem of Determinism and Its Solutions: Three Types of Determinism, Fractal Determinism". Part I. *Bulletin of the KSUC*. Issue 1. pp.10-17.
- MENCHIKOV, GP, & KRASNOV, AS (2016). "Anthropic principle and" observer of neoclassical type" in contemporary social theory". *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 20, pp.14-16.
- MENCHIKOV, GP &, KRASNOV, AS (2016). "Anthropic principle and «observer of neoclassical type « in contemporary social theory". *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications, and Conflict*. Vol.20, Is.SpecialIssue3. P.14-19.
- MACGREGOR, D (2015). "The Communist Ideal in Hegel and Marx (RLE Marxism)". Routledge.
- O'BOYLE, BRIAN, & MCDONOUGH, T (2015). The state of nature and natural states: Ideology and formalism in the critique of neoclassical economics. In *What is Neoclassical Economics?* pp. 214-234. Routledge.
- WHEELER, JA (1977). Genesis and Observership, Foundational Problems in the Special Sciences. *Dordrecht*, P. 27 – 43.

BIODATA

A.S. KRASNOV: Anton Sergeevich Krasnov. He was born on 06/21/1987. In 2009-2012 he got a postgraduate education degree from Kazan State University. V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin, Faculty of Philosophy. In 2004-2009 graduated higher education at Institute of Economics, Management, and Law, Faculty of Law. Knowledge of languages: German (Fluency), Italian (Elementary), English (Fluency). He is an Associate Professor (Associate Professor) at KFU, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, and Department of General Philosophy (main employee).

O.O VOLCHKOVA: Olga Olegovna Volchkova. Was born on 04/24/1993. In 2015-2017 was graduated higher education at Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Philosophy. Studied Master's degree in 2011-2015 at Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Political Science. He is a bachelor and Assistant for BS at KFU, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Department of Religious Studies (main employee).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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