



Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal.
Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 2(90)

Вісник Житомирського державного
університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 2(90)

ISSN: 2663-7650

УДК 159.923.2

DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.2(90).2021.144-155

THE PHILOSOPHER'S SELF-CONCEPT IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN REALITIES

V. O. Sabadukha*

The article deals with the place and role of philosophy and the philosopher in society starting from Plato to the present. The author distinguishes two main tendencies in the article. The first one focused philosophers on social activity (Plato, Voltaire, I. Kant, J. Fichte, K. Marx, M. Berdyaev, J. Ortega-i-Gasset), and the second one was formed in the postmodern era and was limited to gnoseological activity (M. Horkheimer, G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, J. Derrida, M. Merleau-Ponty and others). The second tendency has led philosophy to a crisis (postmodern uncertainty), and the human community to anthropological and global catastrophe. A metaphysical theory of personality has been formulated, which allows, on the one hand, to define being as a conflict of impersonal and personal principles, and, on the other hand, to call things by their proper names. A person in the process of individual growth may go through the following stages of development: dependent person, mediocre person, mature person and genius, or may stop at the lower stages of development. The spiritual rebirth of human society depends on philosophers' rethinking of the views of person and his/her destiny. The article grounds the philosopher's self-concept as an organic unity of inner qualities and social functions, which he/she has to perform in the society under modern conditions. Philosopher is meant to serve in the society as Diagnostician, Legislator, Educator and Methodologist. Only a philosopher who has reached the stage of a mature person is capable of such a function. The function of diagnostician requires the philosopher to call things by their right names: "Who is who" and "What is what?" The philosopher as legislator shall be the initiator of new laws oriented to eliminate the shortcomings of an impersonal society. The philosopher as educator shall bear the image of the mature individual, take care of the formation and shaping of a critical mass of individuals in society and guide a person and society toward the priority of the spiritual over the material. The philosopher-methodologist shall define concept system, paradigm, strategies for narrowing impersonal being, and the formation of the personal principles of being. Philosophers shall be conceptual characters of public being under the conditions of anthropological-global catastrophe.

Key words: philosopher's self-concept, metaphysical theory of personality, law of naming, impersonal paradigm of human being existence, personal paradigm of human being existence, responsibility.

* PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor.

(Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)
ukrainian_idea@ukr.net.

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9208-2661

Я-КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ФІЛОСОФА В ІСТОРІЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ ТА СУЧАСНІ РЕАЛІЇ

В. О. Сабадуха

У статті досліджено місце і роль філософії і філософа в суспільстві від Платона до сучасності. Виокремлено дві основні тенденції. Перша орієнтувала філософів на соціальну активність (Платон, Вольтер, І. Кант, Й. Фіхте, К. Маркс, М. Бердяєв, Х. Ортега-і-Гассет), а друга – сформувалася у постмодерну епоху і обмежувалася лише гносеологічною активністю (М. Горькаймер, Ж. Дельоз і Ф. Гваттарі, Ж. Деррида, М. Мерло-Понті та ін.). Друга традиція призвела філософію до кризи (постмодерної невизначеності), а людську спільноту до антрополого-глобальної катастрофи. Сформульовано метафізичну теорію особистості, яка дозволяє, з одного боку, трактувати буття як конфлікт знеособленого й особистісного начал, а з другого, – все називати своїми іменами. Людина в процесі свого становлення може пройти такі ступені розвитку: залежна особистість, посередня особистість, зріла особистість і геній, а може зупинитися на нижчих ступенях розвитку. Духовне відродження людської спільноти залежить від переосмислення філософами поглядів на людину і своє призначення. Обґрунтовано Я-концепцію філософа як органічну єдність внутрішніх якостей і суспільних функцій, які він має виконувати в суспільстві в сучасних умовах. Філософ має реалізовувати у суспільстві такі функції: діагноста, законодавця, вихователя і методолога. До виконання таких функцій здатний лише філософ, який сягає ступеня зрілої особистості. Функція діагноста вимагає від філософа все називати своїми іменами: "Хто є хто?" і "Що є що?". Філософ як законодавець має бути ініціатором нових законів, спрямованих на подолання недоліків знеособленого суспільства. Філософ як вихователь мусить бути втіленням зрілої особистості, дбати про формування критичної маси особистостей у суспільстві та орієнтувати людину й суспільство на пріоритет духовного над матеріальним. Філософ-методолог має визначити систему понять, механізми подолання знеособленого буття і формування особистісних засад буття. Філософи мають бути концептуальними персонажами суспільного буття в умовах антрополого-глобальної катастрофи.

Ключові слова: Я-концепція філософа, метафізична теорія особистості, закон найменування, знеособлена парадигма буття людини, особистісна парадигма буття людини, відповідальність.

The problem formulation. Self-concept in terms of its founders (E. Berns, A. Maslow, K. Rogers) – a look at oneself, his or her place and role in society. Despite the fact that philosophy is one of the oldest forms of social consciousness we must frankly admit that today it has lost its constructive influence on the development of human society, and because the holy place is not empty, it has been overshadowed by PR technologists. The need to transform the impersonal paradigm of human existence into a personal one requires new constructive philosophical ideas, aimed at redefining and rethinking the role and place of a philosopher in modern conditions.

The extent of the scientific development of the problem. The

problem of predestination of a philosopher in a society was the subject of reflection of greatest thinkers from ancient times to the present: Plato, Aristotle, T. Aquinas, T. Hobbes, I. Kant, J. G. Fichte, G. W. F. Hegel, F. Nietzsche, K. Marx, N. A. Berdyaev, E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, J. Ortega y Gasset, M. Horkheimer, M. Merleau-Ponty, J. Derrida and others. Despite the active debate on the mission of a philosopher and philosophy in the modern world the problem is not solved. Therefore, the aim of our study is the formulation of modern self-concept of a philosopher, which includes the following tasks: firstly, to analyse the views of eminent thinkers in their purpose in society, and secondly, to ascertain the causes of a loss of philosophers' positive impact on

development of human society, and thirdly, to establish the conditions under which philosophers can play a constructive role in the crisis situation of the impersonal paradigm of human existence.

Discussion and results of a research. To examine the current views in the history of philosophy on the place and role of a philosopher in society is a rather difficult and even defiant task, but the crisis of impersonal paradigm of human existence requires reconsideration of views of philosophers on their purpose in society. Based on the comparative method we choose figures of philosophers who represent a particular era in the development of philosophy and society.

Plato assigned philosophy and philosophers an active role in development. They own divine person (V. S.) skills, which have to own the state power in an aristocratic society [17: 181]. A philosopher in Plato is the personification of the interest of the state, truth and beauty [17: 170–171, 178]. It turns out that for 25 centuries ago Plato realized and analysed direct correlation between elite talent and the state power and formulated the ontological law of human history: any society in any era should be lead by the individuals that individuals are indeed, not in words, urged in their work with its interests. When a society lacks the elite individuals and is dominated by individuals of mediocre level, it starts to degrade, it is a philosophical alphabet, if it is ignored, it leads to tragic consequences. It is believed that Plato's views are significant constructive potential that hitherto unexplored.

In the Age of Enlightenment Voltaire tried to revive the active role of a philosopher in society and state, but these efforts did not work. Philosophical thought of modern times focuses on science and it seeks to be the science itself, and therefore the epistemological

and methodological problems come to the forefront.

Self-concept of a philosopher Kant reached aesthetic perfection. A philosopher in Kant's opinion is a free subject of activity who has to define clearly: "1. Sources of human knowledge, 2. The scope of possible and helpful application of any knowledge and, finally, 3. The limits of reason or knowledge. The latter is the most important ... and the most difficult" [10: 333]. These reflections show that the epistemological and substantive human activities have their limits. This conclusion of the classical scholar was ignored, so it is not surprising that humanity in the late twentieth century appeared in the state of anthropological global catastrophe.

To Kant's mind, the philosopher is a person who takes responsibility not only for the process of today's social life, and for the world as a whole. The responsibility for being generates necessity in Kant's categorical imperative. Philosophers still argue about the moral law of Kant and, unfortunately, few dare to live by the law, which is the deepest dimension of human existence.

I. Kant concluded that only personalities could rise to be encouraged by the categorical imperative [9: 413–414] and realized that the time of the moral law has not come yet. It can be argued from the height of the early twenty-first century that raised thinker on the moral law was ahead of time. To categorical imperative was the real motivation is necessary to the society there was an activity, that he presented. So, in the opinion of Kant, the subject, which represented the categorical imperative, was a philosopher. Kant's reflections on necessity of the categorical imperative were the brilliant thinker's predictions on coming into the world of a human of mass. A philosopher according to Kant has to move to a level of excellence in basic forms of life:

knowledge, practice and aesthetic activity, therefore, a philosopher becomes the embodiment of truth, goodness and beauty that is ideal. We consider that the categorical imperative is the essence of self-concept in the understanding of Kant.

Self-concept of a philosopher according to Fichte ensues from the self-concept of a philosopher of Kant and based on the unlimited power of the human "I" and the task of a philosopher is to change what is, because that is not the reason. In the writings of Fichte acts as "a tool of activity" of a philosopher and therefore he or she should be actively involved in solving social problems. Fichte would like a philosopher to be a teacher and educator of the human race, that is, "he/she must be the *morally correct and best* person of his/her age, he/she must represent the highest level of moral development possible in this age" [20: 512]. These requirements for the position of a philosopher according to Fichte is the norm as the categorical imperative of Kant was to Fichte very real, concrete encouraging activity and a life of a philosopher was to be its embodiment.

Self-concept of a philosopher according to Hegel is controversial. On one hand, it has an active epistemological character, on the other hand – socially passive. A philosopher is able only to explain what that is. "To comprehend what is is the task of philosophy, for what is, is a reason" [3: 16]; therefore, Hegel's position was actually to justify the activity. What is common in self-concept of a philosopher of either Kant, or Fichte, or Hegel is that a philosopher in these systems acts as a free subject, guided only by reason, but not the needs of a particular class.

Modern scholars refer philosophy of Marx and Engels to the German classical philosophy [11: 54, 69]. This unity is also reflected in the fact that Marx's self-concept a philosopher derives from self-concept Fichte. A famous Marx's thesis is

"Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it" [13: 4], reaches reflection Fichte. The latter said: "This Folly the wise man subdues, masters it freely and according to his own law, is the last ultimate goal of man..." [20: 487]. A Philosopher according to Marx is the embodiment of social activity of the masses, who is not integrated in society, but is only part of it, while a philosopher according to Fichte presents society as a body.

The victory of pragmatism and positivism was a defeat of a personal basis in philosophy and the beginning of domination in the social sciences of a human of masses. Criticizing the philosophy of positivism, Ortega y Gasset mentioned [16: 95]. The Spanish thinker advocated an active role of a philosopher in public life. He demanded of his fellow social and intellectual suspense. "A philosopher, who is ready to boundary intellectual danger, who openly expresses all his views must live out completely free..." [16: 95]. Among prominent European thinkers Ortega was almost the only one who defended the active role of philosophers in public life in 20-50s of the twentieth century.

K. Popper's approach is symptomatic for understanding purpose of philosophy in the twentieth century. Popper distinguishes two approaches: positive and negative. Positive understanding of philosophy came down to the statement that "All people were philosophers" [18: 28]. In the negative definitions of philosophy Popper unconstructively denied all existing approaches and emphasized: "The task of philosophy is not to eliminate errors, although such error elimination is sometimes necessary as a preparatory discussion" [18: 25]. In our view, these statements destroy philosophy. Finally, Popper brought philosophy to common sense, because he was in this position.

One of the founders of the Frankfurt School of Philosophy, Horkheimer also

denies the active role of a philosopher in society and its practical significance, and therefore he criticizes Ortega y Gasset. Horkheimer wrote that the simple fact that his philosophy was suitable for use widely, it had the pedagogical nature, destroyed it as philosophy [4: 142]. The German philosopher was wrong. The philosophy of Ortega was unfit for mediocre man is through its practical and anthropological orientation, because the reason in an era of capitalism was transformed into instrumental reason, which no longer needed philosophy.

Appointment of philosophy by Horkheimer is to "design truth" [4: 144], the "reconciliation" of material with the spiritual. German philosopher thus justifying the need to find this consensus. "The task of philosophy is not stubbornly to play the one against the other, but to foster a mutual critique and thus, if possible, to prepare in the intellectual realm the reconciliation of the two in reality" [4: 149]. Thus, it appears that a philosopher according to Horkheimer is the only subject of cognition but not the subject of active social activities.

Despite the fact that Horkheimer tried to combine material and spiritual elements of activity he was not able to do so he led philosophy to the role of the theoretical mediator in reconciliation of the material and spiritual. If a philosopher does not consider himself or herself as a subject of social activities, it automatically gives primacy of activity to science, technology, natural social powers, a man of the masses, i.e. those factors which, by their intellectual and psychological nature are not able to be conscious agents of social activity. Husserl very aptly spoke about the surrender of philosophy in the early twentieth century. He said: "We are literally overwhelmed by a flood of naïve and extravagant reformist projects. Then, why do the highly developed sciences of spirit refuse the services [to society] with which the natural sciences in their major

areas have been successful?" [5: 63]. Today the answer is obvious; philosophers have lost the status of an active player in social activities and priority given to science, PR technologists and image makers.

Among Russian philosophers, who actively opposed the passive role of philosophy, was Nikolai Berdyaev, who left the criticisms on scientific philosophy, "scientific" philosophy is a philosophy of negation, denial of originality [1: 34]. The Russian philosopher pointed out that philosophy should focus not on the object, and the man to help it find and formulate a sense of being: "The true philosophy that actually reveals something is not the one that explores objects, but the one that torments the meaning of life and personal destiny" [1: 41].

Under Soviet Union philosophy was not only a servant of Communist Party of the Soviet Union but a means of education of unanimity [12: 25]. Georgian philosopher M. Mamardashvili at the beginning of the restructuring proposed to change the paradigm of Russian philosophy. He believed that it should be a special form of "making sense of the world and ourselves in it; an act that gives us a certain generalized, universal knowledge, free from the everyday 'race to monitor developments'" [12: 29]. Pondering upon the events in European history and culture in the twenties and the thirties of the twentieth century Mamardashvili called this time capitulation of European intellectuals to "various diabolicalness" [12: 131], (consider surrender of a personality to the individual of masses, V. S.). Let us consider that this conclusion applies to the Soviet intelligentsia and Soviet philosophers in particular.

In the first half of the twentieth century European philosophers, except Husserl, Ortega y Gasset and Berdyaev leaves a sense of responsibility for historical events and they move on to the position of observers. Quite clearly it is

observed in the views of Merleau-Ponty, who equated a writer and a scholar to a philosopher. He wrote that a philosopher "like the writer or the scholar, has an attentive yet very simple gaze" [14: 33], which does not play an active role in public life, but studies it. Merleau-Ponty critically assesses the impact of modern philosophy on the processes of social life. "In general, philosophical life remains provincial, almost clandestine. The sacred fire is transmitted only from person to person, and we are facing, if I may say, an eclipse of philosophy" [14: 36].

Modern French researchers G. Deleuze and F. Guattari made a substantial analysis of the object and purpose of philosophy in social life at their work "What Is Philosophy?" Pondering upon the role of philosophy, they write: "Leibniz made the philosopher the Advocate of the deity..."; with the empiricists it served as an Investigator [6: 94]; "Kant made a philosopher a Judge, while reason was the tribunal" [6: 94–95]. Deleuze and Guattari admit that classical philosophy took away its essential roles, but they have not shared these views and felt that the epistemological function of philosophy is the ultimate, and therefore wrote: "The definition of philosophy as pure reason can be considered definitive" [6: 16]. In this position we see the refusal of postmodern philosophy from the essential purpose: to promote the solution of vital problems.

When philosophy is unable to investigate the reality, so can not show in word, the concept its essence, then there is not any choice but to analyze texts and concepts. A word begins to "eat" a word. J. Derrida finally focuses on the philosophy of structuring concepts and the task of philosophy he sees in deconstruction [7: 14]. Thus, postmodern philosophy finally breaks with the tradition identity of thought with being.

Summing up the views of philosophers on their purpose in society, we note that the history of philosophy revealed two main trends. The first one starts its existence from Plato and directs philosophers to active intellectual and social activities. Its supporters were Voltaire, Kant, Fichte, Marx, Berdyaev, Ortega y Gasset. Between philosophy and being are set mutual responsibilities. The second trend is finally formed in the postmodern era. The role of observer was assigned to a philosopher, a scientist, able only to gnosiological activity. At best a philosopher was regarded as the "designer" of concepts [6: 10]. Russian-American philosopher M. Epstein aptly wrote: "In philosophy there is nothing left but the persistent habit of writing, of leaving traces on paper whose meanings are incomprehensible and cannot be determined in advance" [23: 48]. So, philosophy came to postmodern uncertainty as to the anthropological reality of global catastrophe. This tradition must include Horkheimer, Deleuze and Guattari, Derrida, Merleau-Ponty and others.

Let us consider that the gradual loss of the philosophy's active role in public life due to the fact that it lost some important, but hidden idea. Such an idea, in our view, is the metaphysical theory of personality [19: 297–328]. This theory denies basic anthropological tenet of modernism and postmodernism: "every man is a personality". A person in the process of growth can move through a number of stages of intellectual and social psychological development: dependent person, personality, mature person, genius, and can stop at the first or the second stages. By this time, the priority in society belongs to the person of the average level of spiritual development, who has built an impersonal paradigm of being.

The theory leads to a fundamental conclusion. The whole history of the world of spirit is a process of interaction

of an impersonal principle with a personal one. Here are some arguments to put forward the thesis. In the history of religion, mythology, philosophy it is manifested as a struggle of a light deity Ahura Mazdā with a dark deity Angra Mainyu (Zoroastrianism), yin and yang (Chinese philosophy), Apollonian and Dionysian (Greek mythology), there are two circles of human development in the Indian philosophy of Mahayana ("long way") and Hinayana ("small way"), fighting of the devil with God (Christianity). Today we witness the struggle of a man of mediocre level of the essential force with a personality, to prevent the latest in active social activities and deny the very possibility of personal development paradigm of human existence. Anthropological global catastrophe is the direct proof that the human community priority is material and not spiritual.

N. Berdyayev somehow broadened this generalized approach to understanding the trends of world spirit. He saw human history as a process of constant struggle of Apollonian (personal, aristocratic) and Dionysian (impersonal, chaotic) [2: 56–57]. Let us consider that the reason for the loss of postmodern philosophy of their role in society lies in the fact that philosophers have not explored the hidden idea of the world spirit which is the concept of the four levels of the essential powers of a man, which formulates the fundamental position of ontological foundations of social life.

Loss of the idea of a hierarchy of individuals by philosophy in terms of motivation for life is also a consequence of the principle of "generalization" in the "body" of philosophy. The main task of philosophy was treated as a reduction of quality to the overall diversity of the world. (In the fourteenth century a postulate named after William of Occam began to act in philosophy: "Entities should not be multiplied unnecessarily" [23: 135]. Philosophy consciously and unconsciously tried to reduce the

multiplicity of phenomena of the world to a minimum entities, and ideas to a single (matter, Consciousness, God, freedom, existence, etc.).

Loss of the leading idea of the world spirit by philosophy had for the philosophy serious unfavorable effects. First, a mediocre man who has no clear conceptual thinking came in postmodern philosophy. Second, the process of vulgarization and chaotization in philosophy began; Ukrainian philosopher M. Shlemkevych clearly expressed his thought. "Anarchy of philosophical views was the first reason that philosophy became a problem for itself" [21: 668]. Developing his opinion, the Ukrainian philosopher said that the subject of philosophy should be "the last generalities of spiritual culture" [21: 686]. In our opinion, the boundary criteria are the right ontological characteristics of individual and social life, which helps formulate the concept of just four levels of the essential powers of man. Let us believe that the development of philosophy beyond the mentioned concept cannot continue to satisfy neither material nor spiritual needs of humanity.

Let us deepen philosophical analysis of the consequences of loss of philosophy the leading idea of the world spirit which in turn caused a lack of ontological criteria of individual and social being in human community. 1). Priority in all spheres of society went to the human of masses. 2). For the philosophical justification for his ruling position in society, this type of man formulated the relevant philosophical concept whereby everyone is proclaimed a personality. Last, in our opinion, has no scientific argument. The concept "everyone has a personality" is not alike a scientific concept (science, as you know, clearly fixes the limits of operation of the concept), but it expresses claims of a mediocre man at the level of their abilities. In this statement the current level of the essential powers of man

identified with the ideal weight. 3). A man of mediocre level built up impersonal paradigm of being in which no ontological criteria of individual and social life, dominated by irresponsibility, which naturally led to anthropological global catastrophe. 4). For approval of its dominant position in society, this type of person invented the appropriate social mechanism – democracy, which has no mechanism for resolving the problems but means of manipulation of the masses. 5). The law of "appellation" ceased its operating in a dominant position of a man of masses in the society. Mamardashvili figuratively expressed its meaning: "There is a law of being called by one's own name, a law of naming. It is a condition of historical force, an element of its form" [12: 181]. The mentioned law operates only when the priority in the society belongs to an individual whose personal level of the essential force is able to feel, understand, formulate truth and find the conditions of its implementation.

In a postmodern culture philosopher does not realize his or her original purpose and takes no responsibility for the direction and state of development of society. This decrease in significance of a philosopher in society very much seen in F. Nietzsche when he subjected Socrates and Christ to unfair criticism, and called them outcasts of humanity [15: 359]. Thus, postmodern philosophy is a form of escape for philosophers from being.

At the same time at the end of the 1970s in the West philosophical event took a place A Work of German-American philosopher H. Jonas "The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of Ethics for the Technological Age" that somehow changes the philosophical atmosphere in Europe. The author identifies and develops the responsibility of the person, a philosopher in particular, for the future of humanity; he formulates the foundations of new ethics in a technological civilization [8]. H. Jonas proves the need of a moral law for the

society. If the question of the categorical imperative raised by Kant was ahead of time, today the need of elaboration of new ethics is urgently needed.

We absolutely agree with Jonas that the problem of human responsibility, including a philosopher, before the world is becoming an urgent problem of social being, but unfortunately, the famous philosopher of our time did not link the problem of responsibility and foundations of new ethics with internal qualities of a person, his or her essential powers. Society will be responsible only if the priority it will belong to the individual – individual, the third level of the essential powers. Thus, in modern western philosophy is actively redefining the purpose of a philosopher in modern society.

M. Epstein offers an interesting direction of philosophy; he believes that a change in philosophical eras is primarily a change in the modalities of thinking [23: 53]. Based on this background the author formulates his understanding of the purpose of philosophy. "*Philosophy so far has tried to explain or change the world, whereas its own business is to add to possible worlds*" [23: 54], that philosophy should explore new ways of being human and society.

At the same time, the Ukrainian philosophical thought process of rethinking the predestination of philosophy, the place and role of a philosopher in society is very slow. Of course, there is a new problem, the circumstances in which a philosopher can return to it the essential purpose is to be a guide in society. Let us believe that this can happen only when philosophers analyze and bring to public consciousness the general cause of human misery, which is the domination of the world of a man of mediocre level of essential powers.

In our view, the spiritual rebirth of the human community and Ukrainian one in particular, depends on rethinking by

philosophers of their predestination. A philosopher has to perform in society function of a diagnostician, a legislator, an educator, a methodologist.

A philosopher as a diagnostician must keep abreast of trends in human development and society: what it is like personal or impersonal. To feel the direction of human development and society, a philosopher must be the embodiment of a personality, summon up his or her courage and be ready to the extreme intellectual insecurity. So, an American philosopher Leo Strauss writes: "The philosopher must move outside the closed and enchanted circle of the «initiated» if he intends to remain a philosopher. He must go to the market place; he will not escape the conflict with the politicians. And this conflict in itself, without mentioning its cause or its consequence, is a political action" [22: 180]. Awareness of problems and their solution matures in the process of a dialogue with the authorities of a philosopher.

A philosopher as an archon and a legislator initiates new legislation and is a civil society leader. The government is inherently tends to solving material problems. It is a hostage of pressure of unconscious masses on a personality. A politician becomes dependent on the masses under impersonal paradigm of human being. A philosopher understands that this dependence of politics on the masses sooner or later, but will finish with degradation of society and state, and so closely monitors the state of this dynamic process.

A philosopher as legislator appears to defend personal under pressure of impersonal. L. Strauss does not trust "mind" of politicians ("mind" of a man of masses), and therefore he states that legislative power in society should belong to philosophers [22: 249]. Belonging of legislative power to individuals of personal development level (wise men) acts according to L. Strauss, as a condition of functioning of homogeneous

state (personal paradigm of human existence), and therefore he said that "Constitutional powers should be given to...noble people..." [22: 179]. Modern philosophers not only have just separated from a political act, they have phobias concerning active social and political activity, and therefore the place of a leader in the development of society remained vacant and was occupied by figures of mediocre level of essential powers.

After these reflections it becomes clear why philosophers at all times were disliked. This fact was clearly written by Berdyaev. "Truly tragic is the position of the philosopher. Almost no one loves him. Throughout the history of culture, we find hostility toward philosophy, and from many different sides. Philosophy is the least protected part of culture" [1: 25]. There is some sense to find out the reasons for the negative attitude of the authorities and an average person to philosophers. The authorities usually represent a man of masses, and therefore they see in philosophers of personal level of essential powers their competitors or even enemies; they crucify philosophers, declared them insane, trying to bribe and if not, then dismiss, are send outside the state. A philosopher-person of figure denies vital functions of a man of mediocre level, he or she represents a personal paradigm of human existence, and therefore is perceived as an enemy. On the other hand, an average person does not like not only eminent philosophers, but also common ones.

Philosopher's active social and political activities are closely associated with educational function. A philosopher comes at agora not only in constructive dialogue with the government to solve problems, but also seeks future philosophers [22: 190]. Educational function of a philosopher, unlike a politician, is in aiming society at the priority of spiritual over the material. Let us consider that the rethinking of

modern problems must begin with awareness of leading tendencies of the world spirit: the struggle of impersonal and personal alphas in the history of philosophy and society.

L. Strauss found the real motive that leads a philosopher to engage in the process of education. "The philosopher <...> is endowed with the ambition to educate potential philosophers simply because he cannot help but love well-ordered souls" [22: 186]. A philosopher is able to raise only a philosopher, and this process can be realized only in the process of solving important social problems in the process of a dialogue with the authorities of a philosopher and the masses.

The denial by postmodern philosophers of responsibility for the world means a separation from the search for more organic forms of social being, the "true reality", which, to our mind, is the basic purpose of philosophical thought at all times.

A philosopher as a methodologist (fourth function) is the highest level of philosophical professionalism when he or she initiates a new paradigm, therefore, the new constants of human life and society. A philosopher Ortega y Gasset noted about this feature that philosophy has to provide new concepts for the disclosure of the nature of the human "I" and bring it into line with the world [16: 149], i.e. to offer new forms of social existence. Ortega considered the main task of philosophy as a science investigation of the relationship between the type of person and type of society [16: 57].

L. Strauss insists on an active role of philosophers in development of a homogeneous society (personal paradigm of human existence) and he wrote that just society is impossible without participation of philosophers in the political life. Thus, he argues in favour of the idea that society should consider "the proper upbringing of the philosophers as its most important task" [22: 230]. We believe that under this condition philosophy can become a means of

building a just society and play a constructive role and a philosopher can become the leading subject of the public work. According to Strauss, the mentioned above qualitative changes could happen in a society, if radical restructuring of the philosophy was done [22: 229]. Let us believe that the concept of four levels of the essential powers can contribute to qualitative changes both in philosophy and philosophers' outlooks.

The Renaissance of German nation began with rethinking by K. Jaspers his own civic and philosophical views on the appointment of a philosopher in a society. Jaspers as a philosopher led the movement for German national repentance for the committed sins [25]. Without doubt, this is a general pattern, so philosophers must start a new personal paradigm of being.

Conclusions and directions for future research. Building a personal paradigm of human existence is a chance to rehabilitate philosophers themselves because they moved away from sources of Platonist view of the role of a philosopher in society. If philosophers will be able to lead the movement to the personal paradigm of human existence, then dare to go this route and the best representatives of human masses because, as it was noted by Carl Jung, the first show a road to the others [24: 214]. The concept of personal existence is the return of philosophy to its original purpose as a philosopher should be a model of personal principles and the categorical imperative of I. Kant should be the only encouraging in life. Prior position of a philosopher in society is the ontological basis of human existence in conditions of global changes.

LITERATURE

1. Бердяев Н. А. Дух и реальность. Москва: АСТ; Харьков: Фолио. 2003. 679с.
2. Бердяев Н. Философия неравенства. Москва : ИМА-пресс, 1990. 288 с.

3. Гегель Г. В. Ф. *Философия права. Сочинения*: В 14 т. Пер. А. М. Водена; под. ред. и с пред. Ф. А. Горохова. Москва; Ленинград: Гос. соц.-эконом. изд-во, 1935. Т. VII. 380 с.

4. Горкгаймер М. Критика инструментального разума. Київ : ППС-2000, 2006. 282 с.

5. Гуссерль Е. Криза європейського людства і філософія. *Сучасна зарубіжна філософія. Течії і напрями*. Київ : Ваклер, 1996. С. 62–94.

6. Делёз Ж, Гваттари Ф. Что такое философия? Москва: Санкт-Петербург, Алетеия, 1998. 288 с.

7. Дерріда Ж. Позиції. Київ : Кобза, 1994. 158 с.

8. Йонас Г. Принцип ответственности. Опыт этики для технологической цивилизации. Москва : Айрис-пресс, 2004. 480 с.

9. Кант И. Критика практического разума. 1788. *Сочинения в шести томах*. Москва: Мысль, 1965. Т.4. Ч.1. С. 311–504.

10. Кант И. Трактаты и письма. Москва: Наука, 1980. 709 с.

11. Кушаков Ю. В. Нариси з історії німецької філософії Нового часу. Київ : 2006. 572 с.

12. Мамардашвили М. Как я понимаю философию... Москва: Прогресс, 1990. 368 с.

13. Маркс К. Тези про Фейербаха. *Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Зібрання творів*. Київ: Держ. вид-во політ. літ. УРСР, 1959. Т. 3. С. 1–4.

14. Мерло-Понти М. Интервью. *Логос. Философско-литературный журнал*. Москва : 1991. № 2. С. 31–40.

15. Ницше Ф. Автобиография (ЕССЕ НОМО). По ту сторону добра и зла. Москва : СИРИН, 1990. Кн. 2. С. 327–415.

16. Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Что такое философия? Москва: Наука, 1991. 408 с.

17. Платон. *Держава* / пер. з давньогрец. Д. Коваль. Київ : Основи, 2005. 355 с.

18. Поппер К. Все люди философы: Как я понимаю философию; Иммануил

Кант – философ Просвещения. Москва: АКИ, 2007. 104 с.

19. Сабадуха В. О. *Метафізика суспільного та особистісного буття: монографія*. Івано-Франківськ : ІФНТУНГ, 2019. 647 с.

20. Фихте Й. *Сочинения. Работы 1792–1801*. Москва : Ладомир, 1995. 656 с.

21. Шлемкевич М. *Сутність філософії. Український культурологічний альманах: Хроніка 2000*. Київ: 2000. Вип. 37–38. С. 667–690.

22. Штраус Л. Введение в политическую философию. Москва: Логос; Праксис, 2000. 364 с.

23. Эпштейн М. Н. *Философия возможного*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетеия, 2001. 334с.

24. Юнг К. Г. Структура психики и процесс индивидуации. Москва: Наука. 1996. 269 с.

25. Ясперс К. *Вопрос о виновности*. Москва: Прогресс, 1999. 146 с.

REFERENSES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Berdiaev, N. A. (2003). *Dukh y realnost [Spirit and reality]*. Moskva: AST; Kharkov: Folyo (in Russian).

2. Berdiaev, N. (1990). *Fylosofiya neravenstva [Philosophy of inequality]*. Moskva: YMA-press (in Russian).

3. Hehel, H. V. F. (1935). *Fylosofiya prava [Philosophy of law]*. Moskva, Lenynhrad: Hos. sots.-ekonom. yzd-vo (in Russian).

4. Horkhaimer. M. (2006). *Krytyka instrumentalnoho rozumu [Critique of the instrumental mind]*. Kyiv: PPS-2000 (in Ukrainian).

5. Husserl, E. (1996). *Kryza yevropeiskoho liudstva i filosofii [The crisis of European humanity and philosophy]*. Kyiv: Vakler (in Ukrainian).

6. Delëz, Zh, Hvattary, F. (1998). *Chto takoe fylosofiya? [What is philosophy?]*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg, Aleteiia (in Russian).

7. Derrida, Zh. (1994). *Pozytsii* [Positions]. Kyiv: Kobza (in Ukrainian).
8. Yonas, H. (2004). *Pryntsyp otvetstvennosti. Opyt etyky dlia tekhnolohycheskoi tsyvylyzatsyy* [The principle of responsibility. Ethics Experience for Technological Civilization]. Moskva: Airys-press (in Russian).
9. Kant, Y. (1965). *Krytyka praktycheskoho razuma* [Criticism of practical reason]. Moskva: Mysl (in Russian).
10. Kant, Y. (1980). *Traktaty y pysma* [Treatises and Letters]. Moskva: Nauka (in Russian).
11. Kushakov, Yu. V. (2006). *Narysy z istorii nimetskoi filosofii Novoho chasu* [Essays on the history of modern German philosophy]. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
12. Mamardashvily, M. (1990). *Kak ya ponyimaiu fylosofiyu* [How I understand philosophy]. Moskva: Prohress (in Russian).
13. Marks, K. (1959). *Tezy pro Feiierbakha* [Theses about Feuerbach]. Kyiv: Derzh. vyd-vo polit. lit. URSR (in Ukrainian).
14. Merlo-Ponty, M. (1991). *Ynterviu* [Interview]. Moskva: Lohos. *Fylosofsko-literaturnyi zhurnal* (in Russian).
15. Nytshe, F. (1990). *Avtobyohrafiya (ESSE NOMO). Po tustoronu dobra y zla* [Autobiography (ESSE NOMO). On the other side of good and evil]. Moskva: SYRYN (in Russian).
16. Orteha-i-Hasset, Kh. (1991). *Chto takoe fylosofiya?* [What is philosophy?]. Moskva: Nauka (in Russian).
17. Platon (2005). *Derzhava* [State]. Kyiv: Osnovy (in Ukrainian).
18. Popper, K. (2007). *Vse liudy fylosofy: Kak ya ponyimaiu fylosofiyu; Ymmanuyl Kant – fylosof Prosveshcheniya* [All people are philosophers: How I understand philosophy; Immanuel Kant is a philosopher of the Enlightenment]. Moskva: LKY (in Russian).
19. Sabadukha, V. O. (2019). *Metafizykasuspilnoho ta osobystisnoho buttia* [Metaphysics of social and personal existence]; monohrafiya. Ivano-Frankivsk: IFNTUNH (in Ukrainian).
20. Fykhthe, Y. (1995). *Sochyneniya. Raboty 1792–1801* [Compositions. Works 1792-1801]. Moskva: Ladomyr (in Russian).
21. Shlemkevych, M. (2000). *Sutnist filosofii* [The essence of philosophy]. *Ukrayins'kyy kul'turolohichnyy al'manakh Khronika 2000. Vyp. 37–38*. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
22. Shtraus, L. (2000). *Vvedenye v polytycheskuiu fylosofiyu* [Introduction to Political Philosophy]. Moskva: Lohos, Praksys (in Russian).
23. Epshtein, M. N. (2001). *Fylosofiya vozmozhnoho* [The philosophy of the possible]. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteiia (in Russian).
24. Yunh, K. H. (1996). *Struktura psykhyky y protsess yndyvyduatsyy* [The structure of the psyche and the process of individuation]. Moskva: Nauka (in Russian).
25. Yaspers, K. (1999). *Vopros o vynovnosti* [The question of guilt]. Moskva: Prohress (in Russian).

Receive: June 10, 2021
Accepted: October 09, 2021