MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF CONSTRUCTION AND ARCHITECTURE

THE GENESIS OF PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT THROUGH THE PRISM OF PRIMARY SOURCES

Methodological Guidelines for Seminars

For first-cycle (Bachelor's) students of all specialties

Full-time, part-time, and distance learning forms

Kyiv 2026

УДК 141.7
Г34

Compiled by: N.M. Lakusha, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor;
O.S. Galushko, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor

Reviewer: K.M. Pokotilo, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor

Person Responsible for Publication II.V. Chornomordenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor

Approved at the meeting of the Department of Philosophy, Minutes No. 11, dated April 15, 2026.

Author's Edition.

The Genesis of Philosophical Thought Through the Prism of Primary Sources
Г34 [Electronic resource]: Methodological Guidelines for Seminars for first-cycle (Bachelor's) students of all specialties (full-time, part-time, and distance learning forms) / Compiled by: N.M. Lakusha, O.S. Halushko – Kyiv: KNUCA, 2026. – 40 p.

The guidelines examine the fundamental problems of modern philosophy, specifically the issues of human existence and being. A philosophical analysis of society is conducted based on primary sources. Intended for students of full-time, part-time, and distance learning forms.

Генеза філософської думки через призму першоджерел [електронний
Г34 ресурс]: методичні рекомендації до семінарських занять / уклад.: Н.М. Лакуша, О.С. Галушко – Київ: КНУБА, 2026. – 40 с.

Розглянуто основні проблеми сучасної філософії, а саме проблеми людини та її буття, проводиться філософський аналіз суспільства за першоджерелами.

Призначено для здобувачів першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти всіх спеціальностей очної, заочної, дистанційної форми навчання.

ЗМІСТ

1. General Provisions……...4
2. Problems of the Human Being in the Modern World…….....5
2.1. José Ortega y Gasset ……..5
2.2. Erich Fromm…….....11
2.3. Problem-Solving and Research Tasks……..14
References……...15
3. Current Issues of Social Philosophy.....……....15
3.1. Daniel Bell...……....15
3.2. Alvin Toffle .....……...19
3.3. Problem-Solving and Research Tasks ……...……....28
References …….....28
4. Being and Cognition……..29
4.1. Philosophical Ontology as a Theory of Being …….....29
4.2. The Concept of Cognition and Its Substantive Components…..31
4.3. Problem-Solving and Research Tasks……38
References ……38

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Studying and understanding philosophy through the prism of primary sources is not merely an acquaintance with texts, but a "living dialogue" with the author. While textbooks offer ready-made interpretations, original works allow higher education learners to witness the very mechanism of thought formation.

By working with the original text, the learner becomes a researcher rather than a mere consumer of information. The classroom should serve as an effective developmental environment — a platform for creative activity and intellectual inquiry. It is essential to learn how to read thoughtfully, analyze texts, provide arguments, express thoughts in writing, and engage in polemics.

In different social periods, philosophical texts have possessed the quality of "revealing" themselves anew. Certain issues that once seemed secondary (for instance, questions of ethics, ecology, or technology) are seen today in a highly relevant light. Referring to primary sources provides the opportunity to find answers to contemporary challenges.

The materials presented in these methodological guidelines—primarily primary sources and problem-solving research tasks in relevant fields of philosophical discourse (social philosophy, philosophical anthropology, epistemology, and ontology) — are intended to stimulate the engagement of higher education learners and foster their independent work skills and creative thinking.

2. PROBLEMS OF THE HUMAN BEING IN THE MODERN WORLD

2.1. José Ortega y Gasset – a Spanish philosopher closely associated with existentialism, who likened philosophy to intellectual heroism. He examined the interaction between the individual and society through the prism of personal responsibility.

His work, **La Rebelión de las Masas** (The Revolt of the Masses), remains highly relevant today. You have the opportunity to familiarize yourself with its core theses. Are the issues addressed by the author truly relevant in the modern world? Is it possible to influence the person of today to foster their "rebirth" and the establishment of a more humane future for humanity?

To live is to feel a fatal compulsion to exercise freedom, to decide what we will be in this world.

The representative of the masses is a person whose life lacks purpose and who simply drifts with the current. Consequently, they build nothing, even if their capabilities and potential are immense.

And it is this type of person who makes decisions in our time.

We shall find the key to our analysis when we ask ourselves: where did all these crowds come from that now overflow the historical stage?

Indeed, the average modern European is healthier and stronger in spirit than the European of the past century, yet far simpler. Therefore, they sometimes give the impression of a primitive person emerging in the midst of an ancient civilization. The schools, of which the past century was so proud, could teach the masses the techniques of modern life, but they failed to truly educate them. They were given the tools to live intensely but were not granted a sense of historical obligations; they were quickly inoculated with the pride and power of modern means, but not with the spirit. Consequently, this spirit is entirely alien to them, and new generations intend to take control of the world as if the world were a paradise with no traces of the past, devoid of traditional and complex problems.

What is this mass that now dominates public life? And why is it exactly as it is — that is, how did it arise?

The masses are interested exclusively in their well-being and at the same time distance themselves from the causes of this well-being. Since they do not see the benefits of civilization as marvelous inventions and constructions that can only be maintained through great effort and foresight, they believe they can

resolutely demand them as if they were a natural right.

Whereas in the past, to live meant for the average person to encounter difficulties, dangers, wants, limitations of fate, and dependence around them.

The person we are now analyzing grows accustomed to not appealing to any authority outside of themselves. They are satisfied with themselves as they are. Never would the mass-man appeal to anything outside of himself unless circumstances forcibly compelled him. Since circumstances today do not compel him, the eternal mass, according to its nature, no longer appeals anywhere and feels like the master of its own life. We encounter a mass that is stronger than in any other era, but, unlike the traditional mass, it is hermeticized within itself, incapable of submitting to anything or anyone, convinced that it is self-sufficient— in a word, insubordinate.

The primary traits of its soul are hermetism and insubordination; from birth, they are unable to pay attention to what is outside of them, whether facts or persons.

A person carries within them a certain repertoire of ideas. They decide to be satisfied with them and consider themselves intellectually perfect.

The innate hermetism of their soul prevents them from comparing themselves with other people, which would be a prerequisite for recognizing their own insufficiency. To compare oneself would mean stepping out of oneself for a moment and entering into one's neighbor.

Today, instead, the average person has precise "ideas" about everything that happens and should happen in the whole world. Therefore, they have lost their hearing. Why listen when they have everything they need within themselves? Now is not the time to listen, but the time to judge, to pass sentence, to decide. There is not a single question in social life where they do not intervene, blind and deaf, imposing their "views."

But is this not useful? Is it not a sign of immense progress that the masses have "ideas," that is, that they are cultured? In no way. The "ideas" of this average person are not actually ideas, nor is the possession of them culture. An idea is a check on the truth. Whoever wants to have ideas must first consciously strive for the truth and accept the rules of the game that it imposes. It is futile to speak of ideas or views when one does not recognize any authority that regulates them, no norms that can be invoked in a discussion. These norms are the basis of culture. It does not matter to me which ones. I only assert that there is no culture where there are no principles of civil legality to which our neighbors can appeal. There is no culture where there is no recognition of certain fundamental

intellectual positions to which one can refer in a dispute. There is no culture when economic relations are not subject to a commercial order that protects them. There is no culture where aesthetic polemics do not recognize the need to justify a work of art.

When all these things are lacking, there is no culture, but there is, in the narrowest sense of the word, barbarism. And it is precisely barbarism — let us not delude ourselves — that is beginning to appear in Europe under the gradual revolt of the masses.

The average person carries "thoughts" in their head, but they lack the capacity for thinking. They do not even suspect what a rarefied element it is in which ideas live. They want to have views, but they do not want to accept the conditions and assumptions without which there can be no views. That is why their "ideas" are, in fact, nothing but appetites in words, much like popular ballads.

To have an idea is to believe that there are grounds for it; hence, to believe that reason exists, that there exists a sphere of comprehensible truths. To think, to reflect — is the same as appealing to a certain authority, submitting to it, accepting its code and decisions; hence, to believe that the highest form of coexistence is dialogue, in which the justification of ideas is discussed. But the masses would be lost if they accepted discussion. Instinctively, they reject the obligation to recognize this supreme authority that lies outside of them. That is why it is "new" in Europe to "finish with discussions," and no form of coexistence is tolerated that by its very nature would involve the recognition of objective norms, starting with conversation and ending with parliament, including science. The masses renounce cultural coexistence, which is coexistence under norms, and return to barbaric coexistence. They abolish all normal processes in order to be able to directly impose their desires. The hermetism of the soul, which, as we have previously seen, prompts the mass to intervene in all public life, also leads them inexorably to the only method of intervention: direct action.

Civilization is nothing other than an attempt to limit force to ultima ratio (Lat. - The last argument). Now we begin to see this with great clarity, for "direct action" consists in reversing the order and proclaiming violence as prima ratio (Lat. - The first argument), properly as the only reason. This is the norm that proposes to cancel every norm, that destroys every mediation between our intention and its execution. This is the Magna Carta of Barbarism.

It should be recalled that whenever the mass, for one purpose or another,

has participated in public life, it has done so in the form of "direct action." Consequently, this has always been the mode of action inherent to the masses. The thesis of this essay finds vigorous confirmation in the obvious fact that now, when the intervention of the masses in the leadership of public life has ceased to be incidental and has become a normal phenomenon, "direct action" appears officially as a recognized norm.

Procedures, norms, courtesy, indirect customs, justice, reason! Why invent all this, why create such complexity? All this is summarized by the word "civilization," which in the concept of civis (citizen) reveals its true origin. The point is to make the city, the community, and coexistence possible through these means. Therefore, if we look inside each of these components of civilization that I have just listed, we will find the same core in all of them. All of them, in fact, presuppose a fundamental and gradual desire for each person to take others into account... Civilization is, above all, the desire for coexistence. People are uncivilized and barbaric to the extent that they do not take their neighbors into account. Barbarism is the tendency toward separation. Thus, all barbaric eras were times of human dispersion, swarming with small, isolated, and hostile groups.

Today, the dominant type of person is a primitive who has appeared in a civilized world. The world is civilized, but its inhabitant is not; they do not even see civilization within it, but use it as if it were nature.

Spengler believes that technology can continue to live even when interest in the principles of culture has died out. I do not dare to believe in such a thing. Technology and science are inseparable, and when there is no interest in pure science for its own sake, it ceases to exist; and such interest cannot exist when people cease to admire the general principles of culture. If this passion fades — as it is doing now — technology itself may survive for a while, namely, as long as the inertia of the cultural impulse that created it lasts. We live with technology, but not because of technology. It is neither self-nourishing nor self-breathing; it is not causa sui (Lat. - Cause of itself), but rather a practical, useful sediment of a superfluous, impractical occupation.

Therefore, I warn that the modern interest in technology in no way guarantees the very progress or further existence of technology. It is quite correct to consider technology as one of the most characteristic features of "modern culture," that is, a culture that includes a type of science that yields material benefits. That is why, when I summarized the entirely new face of life established by the nineteenth century, everything came down to these two

features: liberal democracy and technology. But I repeat, it surprises me how easily it is forgotten in discussions about technology that its internal engine is pure science, and that the conditions for its continuation are essentially the same conditions that make pure scientific activity possible. Has anyone thought about all those things that must be active in human souls for true "scientists" to exist? Is it seriously believed that as long as there are dollars, there will be science? This thought, with which many reassure themselves, is only further proof of primitivism.

This disregard for science as such is manifested, perhaps even more clearly than elsewhere, among the mass of technicians themselves — doctors, engineers, etc. — who have grown accustomed to practicing their profession in exactly the same spiritual state as if they were using a car or buying aspirin — without the slightest internal solidarity with the future of science and civilization.

Civilization is not something we "find" around us; it is not self-sufficient. It is artificial and requires an artist or a craftsman. When you want to enjoy the benefits of civilization but are not ready to maintain civilization... you will be disappointed.

The mass-man believes that the civilization into which he was born and which he enjoys is as spontaneous and primordial as nature, and thereby he turns into a primitive.

The gap between the complex sophistication of our problems and the quality of minds will widen. But now it is the human who is going bankrupt because they cannot keep pace with the progress of their own civilization. It is loathsome to hear relatively cultured people talk about the most elementary topics of the day. They resemble uncouth peasants who, with coarse and clumsy fingers, try to pick up a needle from the table. For example, political and social themes are handled with the tools of dull concepts that served two hundred years ago to approach situations that were, in fact, two hundred times simpler.

An advanced civilization is the same thing as difficult problems. Therefore, the greater the progress, the more it is threatened. Life is becoming better but, obviously, increasingly complex. It is clear that as problems become more complex, the means to solve them also become more complicated. But it is necessary for each new generation to master these means. Among them, specifically speaking, there is one that is quite clearly linked to the progress of civilization, namely: to have much of the past behind one’s back, much experience; in a word, history. Historical knowledge is a first-order technique

for preserving and continuing a developed civilization. It does not provide us with positive solutions for new life conflicts — life is always different from what it was — but instead, it allows us to avoid the mistakes of other times.

The average person, previously subject to authority, has now decided to rule the world. This decision to emerge at the social forefront arose in them automatically as soon as the new type of person to which they belong reached maturity. Studying the psychological structure of this new type of mass and its influence on public life, we find: 1) an innate and root conviction that life is easy, abundant, and without tragic limitations; therefore, every average individual is saturated with a sense of power and triumph, which 2) impels them to assert themselves exactly as they are, to consider their moral and intellectual assets as good and perfect. This self-satisfaction prompts them to reject any external authority, to listen to no one, not to question their own views, and not to take others into account. This internal sense of power constantly pushes them to impose their superiority. Thus, they behave as if, besides them and those like them, there is no one else in the world; therefore 3) they intervene everywhere, imposing their simplistic view without scruples, reflection, formalities, or reservations—that is, according to the principle of "direct action."

By the mass, as I warned from the very beginning, one should not understand only workers; this word defines here not a certain social class, but rather a kind of human being that can now be found among all social classes.

For previously, people could be divided simply into the educated and the uneducated, into the more-or-less educated and the more-or-less uneducated. But a specialist cannot be brought under either of these categories. He is not educated, because he literally knows nothing that lies outside his specialty; yet he is not uneducated, because he is a "scientist" and knows his own portion of the universe very well. One is forced to say that he is a learned ignoramus, and this is a very serious matter, for it means that this gentleman will behave in all matters he does not understand not as an ignoramus, but with all the audacity of a person who is an expert in their special field.

The polis arose not as a cluster of residential houses, but as a place for public assembly, a space designated for performing public functions. The city did not arise, like a hut or domus, for protection against the weather or for reproduction: it was intended not for personal and family affairs, but for public matters.

How can a person leave nature? Where will they go when the boundless "field" occupies the entire earth! It is very simple: they demarcate a patch of the

field with a wall, contrasting this enclosed, limited space with the rest of the formless and boundless space. This is the plaza (public square). It is not an "interior" covered from above like a house, or like caves that exist in nature; it is simply a pure negation of the field. Thanks to the walls that enclose it, the plaza is a patch of the field that turns its back on the rest, that does without the rest and opposes it. This rebellious patch of field, which has broken away from the boundless field and set itself apart from it, has thereby ceased to be a field and has become a new and entirely peculiar space: where a person frees themselves from all coexistence with plants and animals, leaves them outside, and creates a separate, purely human world. Thus arises the civic space.

The city is a "super-house," a transcendence of the "house," that is, the nest of primitive people; it is a more abstract and higher creation than the family oikos-hearth. It is the res publica, the politeia, consisting not of men and women, but of citizens. A new dimension opens before human existence, one that cannot be reduced to primary things related to animal life. And into this, those who were previously only humans will invest their best powers. Thus the "city" arises, from the very beginning as a state.

The state begins when a person seeks to break away from the natural community to which they belong by blood. Instead of blood, we could mention any other natural principle, for example, language. By origin, the state consists of a mixture of races and languages. It is the transcendence of every natural community. It is multi-ethnic and multi-lingual.

- The state is, first and foremost, a plan of action, a program of cooperation. It calls upon people to do something together.
- Therefore, we assert: for a human being, everything has meaning only to the extent that it is directed toward the future.

The mass rejects outdated norms not at all to replace them with new, better ones; no, at the center of its life plan lies the desire to live without obeying any moral commandments.

2.2. Erich Fromm – a German-American psychologist and philosopher, one of the founders of Neo-Freudianism.

Fromm's position is characterized by a sharp critical focus on modern society. He envisions the perspective of human development in the transformation of today's "sick society" based on creating conditions for self-improvement and the realization of a person's creative potential.

One of **E. Fromm's** most interesting works is **To Have or to Be?**, some excerpts from which are provided below.

THE NEW MAN AND THE NEW SOCIETY. PREREQUISITES FOR HUMAN IMPROVEMENT AND TRAITS OF THE NEW MAN.

The alternative of "to have" versus "to be" contradicts common sense. At first glance, it seems that to have something is a normal function of our life. To live, we must have things. Moreover, we must have things in order to derive pleasure from them. In a culture where the paramount goal is to have, and to have more and more, and in which one can say of someone that "he is worth millions of dollars," what alternative can there be between "having" and "being"? On the contrary, it seems that the very essence of "being" means "having"; and when someone has nothing, then he is nobody.

Yet, the great Teachers of Life made the alternative between "having" and "being" the central intrigue of their philosophical systems. Do you agree that our goal is to be much, rather than to possess much?

The function of the new society is to foster the emergence of a new Human, whose character structure will include the following traits:

– Willingness to give up all forms of possession in order to **fully be**.

– A sense of security, identity, and self-confidence based on faith in one's own existence and on the inner need for relatedness, interest, love, and solidarity; this faith should replace the desire to have, to possess, to dominate the world, and thus, to be a slave to one's property.

– Awareness of the fact that no one and nothing outside of us can provide meaning to our life; only complete independence (including from things) is a condition for productive activity aimed at serving one's neighbor.

– A sense of presence in the here and now.

– Joy derived from serving people, rather than from extortion and exploitation.

– Love and respect for life in all its manifestations, understanding that life and everything that contributes to its flourishing is sacred—not things, not power, not the dead.

– The endeavor to curb one’s greed and hatred, to free oneself, as much as possible, from the captivity of illusions.

– Living without idolatry and without illusions, since a state will be reached where illusions are no longer necessary.

– Development of the capacity to love, along with the ability to think critically and realistically.

– Freedom from narcissism and the awareness of the tragic limitations inherent in human existence.

– The comprehensive development of the human being and their environment as the supreme goal of life.

– Understanding the necessity of discipline and realism to achieve the stated goal.

– Understanding that no development can occur outside of a structure, as well as realizing the difference between structure as an attribute of life and "order" as an attribute of lifelessness and death.

– Development of imagination, not in the sense of escaping from unbearable living conditions, but as a means to put an end to these conditions and to recognize real possibilities.

– Refusal to deceive others and the desire not to be deceived oneself; one may gain a reputation for being simple-hearted, but not naive.

– Ever deeper and more comprehensive self-knowledge.

– A sense of one's unity with life and, accordingly, the rejection of the subjugation and exploitation of nature, its exhaustion and destruction; an attempt to understand nature and live in harmony with it.

– Freedom, not as arbitrariness, but as the possibility to be oneself: not a knot of greedy passions, but a finely balanced structure that at any moment may face the alternative: development or destruction, life or death.

– Understanding that evil and destructiveness are the inevitable consequences of incorrect development.

– Understanding that only a few will be fortunate enough to achieve perfection in all these points, and at the same time, the absence of an ambitious desire to "reach the goal," for it is known that such ambition is merely another manifestation of greed and an orientation toward possession.

– The happiness of all-encompassing love for life, regardless of what fate has in store for us, because life as such provides a person with such great satisfaction that it is not worth worrying about what one might or might not have achieved.

2.3. PROBLEM-SOLVING AND RESEARCH TASKS

1. Morality in its reality is freedom.
2. Man is condemned to be free, carrying on his shoulders the weight of the entire world; he is responsible for the world and for himself as a mode of being. (J.-P. Sartre)
3. We face an alternative: either enlightenment or illness... (E. Fromm)
4. The average person carries "thoughts" in their head, but they lack the capacity for thinking. (J. Ortega y Gasset)
5. What we must recognize as tragic or sad is not the absence of unlimited freedom, but its interpretation as arbitrariness, as a freedom that does not take the Other into account and is not ashamed of it. (E. Levinas)
6. One of the most difficult tasks of the modern era consists precisely in re-educating the "mass-man," making him capable of participating freely and independently in spiritual and social life. After all... a person dissolved in the "mass" is not a human being in the true sense of the word. (K. Jaspers)
7. Today, a human being is being tested on their ability to live the life of a free personality. The essence lies in the person's capacity for self-determination, the readiness to independently form a system of their own values, and to realize and fulfill their own purpose.
8. A person must have social and personal space for their choice—what they themselves strive for and in what way they will achieve it, without entering into conflict with other people who also claim their own space of freedom. (E. Levinas)
9. The varying sense of time depends not so much on the generation to which a person happens to belong, but rather on their knowledge of events past and present. (J. Huizinga)
10. People should seek the solutions to world problems within themselves. (A. Peccei)
11. Why do we not remember that an individual's narrowly focused mindset on a specific situation deprives them of the fullness of perceiving reality? (E. Fromm)

12. The heart is the center of a person's emotional and spiritual life. (P. Yurkevych)
13. The split between thought and affect leads to a common chronic schizophrenia, from which the new man of the technetronic era begins to suffer. (H. Marcuse)
14. Is the person of today capable of self-determination and of realizing their own purpose?

REFERENCES:

1. Fromm, E. (1976). To Have or to Be? Retrieved from https://giuseppecapograssi.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/erich-fromm-to-have-or-to-be-1976.pdf
2. Ortega y Gasset, J. (1930). La rebelión de las masas [The Revolt of the Masses]. Retrieved from https://monoskop.org/images/f/f6/Ortega_y_Gasset_Jose_La_rebelion_de_las_masas.pdf

3. CURRENT ISSUES OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

3.1. Daniel Bell – an American sociologist, futurist, and publicist, the founder of the concept of post-industrial (information) society. This concept was articulated in his work **The Coming of Post-Industrial Society**. D. Bell proposed considering a new model of societal development, namely: pre-industrial → industrial → post-industrial society. As these societal models change, there are shifts in technology, modes of production, forms of ownership, social institutions, political regimes, lifestyles, and the social structure of society.

The terms pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial society are conceptual consequences along the axis of production and the types of knowledge utilized within it. Depending on the axis, we can clearly illuminate similarities or differences.

DIMENSIONS OF THE POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

An analytical society can be divided into three parts: social structure, politics, and culture. Social structure encompasses the economy, technology, and the employment system. Politics regulates the distribution of power and makes decisions regarding the conflicting claims and demands of individuals and groups. Culture is the realm of expressive symbolism and meanings. Dividing society in this way is useful because each aspect is guided by a

different axial principle. In modern Western society, the axial principle of social structure is the principle of economizing — a way of allocating resources according to the principles of least cost, substitutability, optimization, maximization, etc. The axial principle of modern politics is participation, sometimes mobilized or directed from above, sometimes demanded from below. The axial principle of culture is the human desire for self-fulfillment and the enhancement of one's own significance. In the past, these three areas were linked by a common value system (and in bourgeois society, due to the shared character of the structure). However, under modern conditions, there is a growing disjunction between these three areas, and for reasons I will discuss in the final section, this gap will continue to expand.

The concept of the post-industrial society primarily concerns changes in the social structure, the way in which the economy is transformed and the employment system is reshaped, as well as the new relationships between theory and empiricism, especially between science and technology. However, I do not insist that these changes in the social structure determine corresponding changes in politics or culture. Rather, changes in the social structure pose questions for the rest of society in three ways.

First, the social structure — and specifically the social structure — is a structure of roles designed to coordinate the actions of individuals toward achieving certain goals. Roles divide individuals through certain limited modes of behavior inherent to a particular position, but individuals do not always voluntarily agree with the demands of the role…

Second, changes in the social structure of society pose "management" problems for the political system. In a society that is increasingly becoming conscious of its destiny and demands control over the favorable opportunities of its own development, the political order inevitably becomes the paramount factor. Since post-industrial society increases the importance of the technical component of knowledge, it prompts the priests of the new society — scientists, engineers, and technocrats — either to compete with politicians or to become their allies. Thus, the relationship between social structure and the political order becomes one of the cornerstone problems of power in the post-industrial society.

And third, new ways of life, which depend heavily on the primacy of cognitive-theoretical erudition, inevitably challenge cultural trends aimed at enhancing the significance of the human personality, which turn increasingly towards antinomianism and anti-institutionalism.

Creation of a Service Economy. About thirty years ago, Colin Clark, in his work The Conditions of Economic Progress, analytically divided the economy into three sectors — primary, secondary, and tertiary. The primary sector is mainly agricultural; the secondary is manufacturing or industrial; the tertiary is services. Any economy is a mixture of each of these sectors in varying proportions. However, Clark believed that as countries industrialized, an inevitable direction of movement would be observed, whereby, due to sectoral differences in productivity, a larger share of the labor force would move into manufacturing, and as national income grew, the demand for services would increase, leading to a corresponding shift in that direction.

By this criterion, the first and simplest characteristic of a post-industrial society is that the majority of the labor force is no longer employed in agriculture or manufacturing, but in the service sector, which is defined according to a residual principle — as trade, finance, transport, healthcare, recreation, research and development, education, and management.

Using the term "services" as a generic concept, we run the risk of making a mistake regarding the true trends in society. Many agrarian societies, such as that of India, are characterized by a high proportion of people employed in the service sector, but in a somewhat personal capacity (e.g., domestic servants), since labor there is cheap and, naturally, lacks demand elsewhere. In an industrial society, various types of services tend to grow due to the need for additional support for manufacturing, such as transportation and distribution. But in a post-industrial society, the emphasis is placed on different types of services. If we categorize services into groups such as personal (retail stores, laundries, garages, beauty salons); business (banking and finance, real estate, insurance); transportation, communication, and utilities; and healthcare, education, research and development, and management; then we will see the growth of the latter category of services, which is decisive for the post-industrial society. It is this category that embodies the growth of the new intelligentsia — in universities, research organizations, professions, and management.

The Primacy of the Professional and Technical Class. The second way of defining the post-industrial society is through the shift in occupational distributions—that is, not only through where people work, but also through the type of work they perform. Occupation is, to a large extent, the most important determinant of class and stratification in society.

The Primacy of Theoretical Knowledge ... What distinguishes the post-industrial society is the change in the character of knowledge itself. What becomes decisive for the organization of decisions and the direction of change is the centrality of theoretical knowledge — the primacy of theory over empiricism and the codification of knowledge into an abstract system of symbols which, as in any axiomatic system, can be used to illuminate many distinct and diverse areas of experience.

Nowadays, every modern society lives by innovation and the social control of change, attempting to anticipate the future for the sake of preliminary planning. This reliance on social control introduces into social practice the need for planning and forecasting. It is precisely the change in the awareness of the nature of innovation that makes theoretical knowledge such a decisive factor.

… The development of the modern economy has been made possible by the computer. Computers have bridged the gap between the foundation of formal theory and the large databases of recent years; from this stems modern econometrics and the political orientation of economics.

… In essence, theoretical knowledge is increasingly becoming the strategic resource of society, its axial principle. And universities, research organizations, and intellectual institutions, where theoretical knowledge is codified and enriched, become the axial structures of the emerging society.

Planning of Technology. … the post-industrial society may be capable of reaching a new dimension of social change — the planning and control of technological growth. Modern industrial economies became possible when societies proved able to develop new institutional mechanisms for creating savings (through banks, insurance companies, the capitalization of funds via the stock exchange, as well as government taxation, i.e., loans or taxes) and utilizing these funds for capital investment.

The Emergence of a New Intellectual Technology. … the methodological perspective of the second half of the 20th century is the management of organized complexity (the complexity of large organizations and systems, the complexity of theories with a large number of variables), the recognition and implementation of rational choice strategies in games against nature and games between individuals, and the development of a new intellectual technology, which by the end of the century may become as significant in human affairs as machine technology was for the middle of the last century. … What distinguishes the new intellectual technology is its effort to define rational action and to establish the means for achieving it.

The significance of the post-industrial society lies in the fact that:

1. It strengthens the role of science and cognitive values as the primary institutional necessity of society;
2. By transforming decision-making into a more technical procedure, it involves the scientist or economist somewhat more directly in the political process;
3. Due to the deepening of existing tendencies toward the bureaucratization of intellectual labor, it creates a complex of tensions for traditional definitions of intellectual pursuits and values;
4. By creating a technical intelligentsia and expanding its numbers, it raises crucial questions about the relationship between the technical intellectual and the literary one.

… the emergence of a new type of society raises questions about the distribution of wealth, power, and status, which are central to any society. From now on, wealth, power, and status are not dimensions of class, but values sought and achieved by classes.

3.2. Alvin Toffler – an American sociologist and futurist, one of the authors of the concept of post-industrial (information) society. According to A. Toffler, the development of science and technology occurs in leaps, or more precisely, in waves. Why are we entering the so-called information age today, and not a hundred years ago, he asks? Answering this and other questions, Toffler primarily refers to external factors: the rapid pace of change in general, and the distinct trend toward diversity in the economy and all of social life. It is technology and material production that determine all social factors; as a result, productive forces automatically and spontaneously generate new social relations. This is facilitated by the penetration of science and technology into all spheres of social organization.

In his work **The Third Wave**, A. Toffler attempted to present the future society as a return to pre-industrial civilization on a new technological basis. Viewing history as a continuous wave-like movement, Toffler analyzes the features of the coming world, the economic backbone of which, in his view, has become electronics, space production, the utilization of ocean depths, and bio-industry. This is the "Third Wave," which completes the agrarian ("First Wave") and the industrial revolution ("Second Wave"). Assessing the coming changes, he concludes that as a result of "informatization," certain problems will disappear.

Let us focus on the relevant ideas of A. Toffler, as outlined in his work The Third Wave:

"…Exploding in our midst, the information bomb …decisively changes our perceptions and personal behavior. Moving from the info-sphere of the Second Wave to the info-sphere of the Third Wave, we are changing our very souls.

…Before the advent of mass communication media, the ***First Wave*** child, growing up in a slowly changing village, built their model of reality using images obtained from a very small number of information sources — the teacher, the priest, a chief or official, and, above all, the family. As psychologist-futurist Herbert Gerjuoy noted: 'There was no television or radio at home, so the child had no opportunity to meet all sorts of strangers from different walks of life or even from different countries. ... Very few people ever saw a foreign city... The result [was that] people had only a few models before them whom they could imitate or take as an example. Their choice was further limited by the fact that those after whose model they could form themselves had limited experience of communicating with other people.' Thus, the range of images upon which the village child's world was built was extremely narrow.

Furthermore, the information he or she received was highly redundant in at least two senses: it typically came from everyday chatter, rich in pauses and repetitions, and also in the form of linked 'chains' of concepts that were confirmed by various informants. The child heard the same 'you must not' in church and in school. Both of these institutions confirmed the information poured out by the family and the state. Social consensus and strong pressure toward conformity acted upon the child from birth, further narrowing the range of acceptable images and behavior.

The Second Wave increased the number of channels from which the individual formed their picture of reality. The child began to receive images not only from nature or people but also from newspapers, mass-circulation magazines, radio, and later, television. The church, state, family, and school continued to speak mostly in unison, essentially saying the same thing. But now mass media became like a giant loudspeaker. And their power was used in regional, ethnic, tribal, and linguistic directions to standardize the images flowing in society's mental stream.

Some visual images, for example, were so widely distributed and rooted in the memory of millions that they effectively turned into icons. The image of Lenin with his jaw triumphantly thrust forward under a waving red flag became

for millions of people as much of an icon as the image of Jesus crucified on the cross …the wind-swept skirt of Marilyn Monroe, hundreds of mass media stars, and thousands of different commercial products that could be recognized everywhere — a bar of ivory-colored soap in the United States, Morinaga chocolate in Japan, a bottle of pear cider in France — all of this entered the standard universal catalog of images.

This centrally produced imagery, injected into the 'mass mind' by mass communication media, helps produce the standards of behavior required by the industrial production system."

Today, the ***Third Wave*** is decisively changing all of this. Accelerating within society, change causes a parallel acceleration within ourselves. New information reaches us, and we must revise our catalog of images faster and faster. Old images, based on past reality, must be replaced, because if we do not update them, our actions will become detached from reality, and we will become less and less competent. It is simply impossible to live otherwise.

This acceleration in our processing of images means that they are becoming increasingly temporary. Uniform art, standardized sitcom situations, instant Polaroid snapshots, photocopying, and accessible graphic visibility emerge and vanish. Ideas, beliefs, and thoughts flash through the mind and are immediately discarded, neglected, fade, and pass into oblivion. Scientific and psychological theories are condemned and replaced daily. Ideologies disintegrate. Celebrities fly through our awareness in swift pirouettes. We are continuously attacked by contradictory political and moral appeals.

It is difficult to navigate this whirlwind to understand exactly how the process of image production is changing. This is because the Third Wave does more than just accelerate our information flows; it transforms the deep structure of information upon which our daily actions depend.

Considering the emergence and formation of the Third Wave civilization, Toffler emphasizes the computerization of all spheres of life. And this process will be inevitable. In the future, all-encompassing computerization will lead to the emergence of a "mental environment." Toffler examines what role "Big Brother" will play in the life of every person and how it will influence all processes in the formation of a new type of society.

"…Today, by building a new info-sphere for the Third Wave civilization, we are endowing the 'dead' environment not with life, but with intelligence.

The key to such a revolutionary understanding is, of course, the computer. Representing a combination of electronic memory with programs that tell the

machine how to process stored data, computers in the early fifties were still a scientific marvel. However, between 1955 and 1965—the decade when the Third Wave began to wash over the United States—computers slowly started to penetrate the business world. At first, they were separate units of modest power, employed mostly in the financial sphere. Soon, machines of immense power began to appear at corporate headquarters and were used to perform a wide variety of tasks. From 1965 to 1977, according to Harvey Poppel, first vice president of Booz Allen & Hamilton, we were in the 'era of the large central computer... '

It represents the embodiment, the highest expression of machine-age thinking. It is its supreme achievement—a great supercomputer, hidden hundreds of feet deep under [in the center of] the hub, unreachable by bombs ... in an antiseptic environment ... serviced by a group of super-technocrats..."

These centralized giants so impressed the imagination that they soon became an integral part of social mythology. Filmmakers, cartoonists, and science fiction writers described the computer as a symbol of the future, constantly portraying it as a powerful brain—a massive concentration of superhuman intelligence.

This dispersion of computer intelligence is now moving forward with great speed. …Small, inexpensive machines that no longer require specially trained computer 'priests' will soon be as ubiquitous as typewriters. We are intellectualizing our work environment.

Moreover, outside of industry and government institutions, a parallel process is taking place, based on what will soon become a ubiquitous trifle — the home computer. Five years ago, home or personal computers were few. Today, it is estimated that 300,000 computers are humming and whirring in living rooms, kitchens, and bedrooms from one end of America to the other. And this is even before major manufacturers like IBM and Texas Instruments have launched their discount sales campaigns. Home computers will soon be sold for only slightly more than televisions.

These intelligent machines are already being used in the family for everything from calculating taxes to regulating energy use, games, storing recipe files, reminding their owners of scheduled meetings, and serving as "smart typewriters." This, however, is only a very brief glimpse of their potential.

…Users can send private messages to one individual or to a large number of people simultaneously and store all correspondence in electronic memory.

"The Source" will even facilitate the creation of what in the future may be called "electronic communities" — groups of people with identical interests.

The proliferation of home computers, not to mention their integration into extensive networks, is another step in the creation of a **mental environment**. But that is not all.

The spread of machine intelligence moves to another level with the emergence of microprocessors and microcomputers — those tiny microchips of compressed intelligence that soon, it seems, will become part of everything we produce and use.

Beyond their use in the production process and in business in general, they have already penetrated, or soon will penetrate, everywhere—from air conditioners and cars to sewing machines and scales. They will regulate and minimize energy consumption in homes. They will determine the amount of laundry detergent and the water temperature for every load in the washing machine. They will perfectly adjust the fuel injection system in a car engine. They will signal us when something needs repair. In the morning, they will turn on the radio time signals, the toaster, the coffee maker, and the shower. They will warm the garage, lock the doors, and perform a dizzying variety of other simple and not-so-simple tasks.

…Living in such an environment poses disturbing philosophical questions. Will machines take over power? Will intelligent machines, especially those linked in an internal communication network, outpace our ability to understand and control them? Could Big Brother one day plug into not only our phone but also our toasters and televisions, monitoring our every move and even our mood? What level of dependence on computers and chips can we afford? By pumping more and more intelligence into the material environment, will we blunt our own intellect? And what happens if someone or something pulls the plug? Will we still retain the capacity for survival?

To each such question, there are many counter-questions. Can Big Brother truly monitor every toaster and television, every car engine and kitchen appliance? When intelligence is widely dispersed throughout the entire environment, when it can be put into action by users in thousands of cities simultaneously, when computer users can communicate with each other without the help of a central computer (as they do in many distributed networks), can Big Brother still control the state of affairs? Rather than strengthening the power

of a totalitarian state, the **decentralization of intelligence** is more likely to weaken it. At the same time, will we be clever enough to outsmart the government? In John Brunner's brilliant, intricate novel *The Shockwave Rider*, the protagonist successfully sabotages government efforts to control thoughts through a computer network. Will our own minds be blunted? As we shall soon see, the formation of a mental environment could have the opposite effect. Will we, while inventing machines to carry out our orders, be able to program them so that they, like Robbie in Isaac Asimov's classic story "I, Robot," never harm humans? There is no answer to this yet, and while it would be irresponsible to ignore these questions, it is naive to believe the cards are stacked against humanity. We have intelligence and imagination that we have not yet begun to use.

However, it is absolutely clear that no matter how we imagine the future, today we are fundamentally changing our **info-sphere**. We are not just de-massifying the Second Wave mass media; we are adding a new layer of communication to the social system. The Third Wave info-sphere makes the Second Wave info-sphere, with its mass media, mail, and telephone, seem hopelessly primitive by comparison.

Considering the new type of civilization, A. Toffler touches upon the issue of the family. He emphasizes the emergence of new family forms. Before examining this issue, let us define what a **nuclear family** is. We call a family nuclear if it consists of a married couple and their children—one child or more. This type of family is characterized by the presence of representatives of no more than two generations. The author raises questions about family relationships, what they should be built upon, and the role the family plays in a person's life.

"The arrival of the **Third Wave**, of course, means the end of the nuclear family. …This rather means that the nuclear family can no longer serve as the ideal model of society.

…We observe an irrepressible growth in the number of people living together without bothering with legal formalities. According to official data, this group has more than doubled in the United States over the last decade. It has become such a common phenomenon… Etiquette observers write about how to address such 'partners,' and 'legal services for couples' has become a new professional type of service, alongside services for the married. …Another

important change has been the increase in those who consciously choose a lifestyle that can be called **'child-free.'** According to James Ramey, a senior researcher at the Center for Policy Research, we are witnessing a mass transition from the 'child-centered' family to the 'adult-centered' family.

When we look at those who have children, the decline of the nuclear family is even more striking due to the rapid growth of single-parent families. In recent years, there have been so many cases of divorce and separation, primarily in nuclear families, that today approximately one in seven American children is raised in a single-parent home, and in cities, the figure is even higher—one in four.

The growth in the number of such families increasingly proves that, despite serious problems, a single-parent family, under certain circumstances, may be better for a child than a nuclear family in which constant arguments occur. Newspapers and organizations now frequently defend single parents, raising their group consciousness and political influence.

…There has emerged the prospect of forming a **new family form** that reflects the high level of remarriage after divorce. In Future Shock, I call it the **'aggregate family'** (blended family), in which two divorced couples with children remarry, and both bring children (and adults) into the new family, expanding its form. It is already estimated that 25 percent of American children are, or soon will be, members of such family formations. According to Davidscha Maylis, such formations, with their 'poly-parents,' may be the main direction of tomorrow's family form. 'We are in an economic polygamy,' says Maylis, meaning that two combined family units transfer money to each other for child support and other payments. She asserts that the spread of this family form is accompanied by an increase in cases of sexual relations between parents and non-biological children.

Technologically advanced countries today have a complex network of the most diverse family forms: same-sex marriages, common-law marriages, groups of elderly people who have united to share costs (and sometimes sexual relations), tribal unions of certain ethnic minorities, and many other forms coexisting as never before. There are contract marriages, serial marriages, multi-family arrangements, and many intimate networks with or without mutual sexual relations, as well as families in which the father lives and works in one city and the mother in another."

When people ask, "What exactly is the future family?" they usually mean that the Second Wave nuclear family is losing its dominant position and will be replaced by some other form. However, it is most likely that in the Third Wave civilization, no single form will dominate for a long time. Instead, we will see a vast diversity of family structures. Instead of a mass of people living in families with an identical arrangement, we will see people moving through this system, choosing personalized or "customized" trajectories throughout their lives.

Again, this does not indicate the total elimination or "death" of the nuclear family. It only means that from now on, the nuclear family will be one of many socially acceptable and approved forms. As the Third Wave rolls in, the family system will become **de-massified** along with the production system and the information system of society.

…A First Wave person, searching for a mate, could quite reasonably ask: "Is my future partner a good worker? A good healer? A good educator for future children? Will we be able to work together? Will he (or she) carry the full burden, or shy away?" Rural families typically asked: "Is she strong, can she bend and lift heavy things, or is she sickly and frail?"

.. During the era of the Second Wave …the family no longer combined a production team, a school, a hospital, and a shelter for the elderly. Instead, its psychological functions became more important. Marriage was expected to provide companionship, sexual relations, intimacy, and support. Soon, these changes in family functions were reflected in a new approach to mate-seeking. They were summed up in a single word — **love**.

In the future …they may begin to insist on **love-plus** — sexual or psychological satisfaction plus mental abilities (just as their grandfathers once preferred muscular strength), love plus conscientiousness, responsibility, self-discipline, and other work-related advantages."

E. Toffler emphasizes in his work that the primary hallmark of the Third Wave is **globalism**. Information plays one of the leading roles in the process of globalization.

"The decline of the nation-state reflects the emergence of a new-style global economy that arose after the Third Wave began its movement. …Thus, the new global economy is managed by large transnational corporations. It is serviced by an extensive banking and financial industry operating at electronic

speeds. It generates money and credit that no state is capable of regulating. It is moving toward transnational currencies — not a single 'world money,' but a variety of currencies or 'meta-currencies,' each based on a 'market basket' of national currencies or commodities. It is torn by a world-scale conflict between resource suppliers and consumers. It is burdened by debts on a scale difficult to imagine. It is a mixed economy with private capitalist and state socialist enterprises forming joint ventures and working side by side. And its ideology is neither absolute freedom of enterprise nor Marxism, but **globalism**, the essence of which is that nationalism is obsolete and should be discarded.

The Third Wave promotes the emergence of groups whose interests transcend national ones. They form the base of a new ideology of globalism, sometimes called 'planetary consciousness.'

Globalism is something more than an ideology serving the interests of a narrow circle. Just as nationalism claims the right to speak for the whole country, globalism claims the right to speak for the whole world. And its appearance is seen as an evolutionary necessity — a step that brings us closer to a 'cosmic consciousness' that would also embrace the heavens." Unlike the previous one, **Third Wave civilization** must (and will) utilize a great diversity of energy sources, such as hydrogen energy, solar, geothermal, tidal energy, biomass energy, lightning energy, and perhaps thermonuclear energy and other energy sources that could not yet be imagined in the 80s. (Although some nuclear power plants will undoubtedly still operate, even if we experience several catastrophes, they will generally be regarded as an expensive and dangerous exception).

For the Third Wave civilization, the most fundamental raw material, which, moreover, will never be exhausted, is **information**, including creative imagination. Thanks to creative imagination and information, substitutes will be found for many of today's depleting resources, although this substitution, again, will often be accompanied by sharp economic fluctuations and deviations.

As information gains greater importance than ever before, the new civilization will rebuild education, redefine scientific research, and, above all, reorganize the means of communication. Today, mass media, both printed and electronic, are utterly incapable of coping with the load and providing the necessary cultural diversity for survival. Instead of a few culturally dominant mass media, Third Wave civilization will rely on **interactive, de-massified**

mass media, directing extremely diverse and often highly personalized thoughts and images either into the mainstream of society or somewhere beyond it."

The publication of E. Toffler's work The Third Wave is one of the most prominent events of the 20th century. To understand the modern world, its prospects, and its needs, one only needs to read this work attentively.

3.3. PROBLEM-SOLVING AND RESEARCH TASKS

1. The concept of post-industrial society is a grand generalization. Its meaning can be more easily grasped by precisely identifying the five dimensions or components of the term (D. Bell).
2. What role does knowledge play in the post-industrial society and in subsequent technological growth?
3. Analysis of the "wave front": The First Wave, the former industrial system of the Second Wave, and the Third Wave civilization in which we and our children will live.
4. Second Wave civilization created an entirely new image of reality based on its own characteristic features.
5. Third Wave globalism.
6. To make the Third Wave civilization both intelligent and democratic, we need to do more than just create new energy sources and introduce technology. We must do more than simply create a new community… (A. Toffler).
7. Act so that the consequences of your activities are compatible with the maintenance of truly human life on Earth (H. Jonas).

REFERENCES:

1. Bell, D. (1973). The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. Basic Books. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/comingofpostindu0000bell/page/n535/mode/2up
2. Toffler, A. (1980). The Third Wave. William Morrow and Company. Retrieved from https://ia902805.us.archive.org/23/items/AlvinTofflerTheThirdWavePdfT

KRG/Alvin%20Toffler%20-%20The%20Third%20Wave%20-%20pdf%20%5BTKRG%5D.pdf

4. BEING AND COGNITION

4.1. Philosophical Ontology as the Doctrine of Being

Ontology (Lat. *ontologia* from Ancient Greek *ōn*, genitive *ontos* — being, that which exists, and Greek *logos* — doctrine, science) is a branch of philosophy that studies the principles of being, the most general essences, and categories of the existent. The ontological function of philosophy consists in developing the most general theoretical foundations for human conceptions of the being of natural and social reality, as well as human activity.

Being (to be, to exist) is the primary philosophical category, signifying the existence of anything in general. Being encompasses all types of matter along with all types of ideas, views, feelings, and attitudes. It takes into account that while individual things, processes, and phenomena may emerge and vanish, the world as a whole exists and persists.

The first to philosophically formulate the problem of being was **Parmenides**, who in his philosophical poem *On Nature* wrote: "To be or not to be at all — that is the resolution of the question!" In the 20th century, **Martin Heidegger** established this issue as the fundamental problem of philosophy, while the Spanish philosopher **Ortega y Gasset** viewed the problem of being as the problem of life, considering the question of life to be the central philosophical issue.

The concept of being captures everything that exists — regardless of the nature of that existing (or **existent**): whether it is material or spiritual. The category of being signifies not every specific existing thing (the existent) or even their sum, but rather their common property — to be present, presence, existence.

Thus, **being** is a philosophical category signifying existence in general; it is both material and spiritual reality.

Being, as an all-encompassing concept, has a certain structure. **The primary forms of Being are:**

1. Being of things, processes, and states of nature. This divides the state of the nature of things into things that arose "before man" and things created "by man."

2. Being of the human being. On one hand, a human appears as a thing

among things, including the totality of physiological processes in their organism; on the other hand, the human emerges as a unique combination of the natural, spiritual, and social within nature.

3. Spiritual being. It consists of individualized (individual consciousness) and objectified (spiritual culture) being.

4. Social being. It includes the being of an individual in society and the being of society as a whole.

5. Virtual being. It is associated with the existence of virtual reality, which arises through the combination of the latest technologies and corresponding information.

The spiritual, i.e., ideal, foundation of all that exists (the existent) can be:

1. God, as the single and uncreated being that creates the rest of the world.
2. Numbers (Pythagoras and his followers).
3. Ideas (Plato and his followers).
4. Form (Aristotle).
5. Monads, as infinitely small spiritual entities (G. Bruno, G. Leibniz, M. Lossky).
6. World Spirit (World Reason) in Hegel's philosophy.

At the same time, humanity has realized that alongside the fact of the presence of things in the world, there is also the effect of absence. In actual reality, there are no ready-made objects that a person might desire to have, and already existing things sooner or later vanish into "nowhere." The category of **non-being** denotes the property of things and phenomena not to exist, to be absent. Every thing is initially absent from reality, as if hiding in non-being; then it enters reality and exists within it for a certain time; and, finally, it returns to non-being.

In general, three aspects of the problem of Being can be formulated:

1. The comprehension of the **contradictory unity of the eternal and the transient** Being of things, states of nature, society, and humanity.

2. The question of the **unity of the world**. That is, the world in its existence forms an inseparable integrity, a certain unity, and it is inseparable from the being of everything that exists in the world.

3. The awareness that the **world is an objective reality**. That is, reality acts as a cumulative integrity, and human life activity is a part of this reality.

4.2. Concept of Cognition and Its Content Components

Cognition (Knowledge acquisition) is a totality of processes, procedures, and methods for acquiring knowledge about the phenomena and patterns of the objective world. Cognition is the primary subject of the science of **gnoseology** (theory of knowledge).

Cognition is the highest form of reflecting objective reality, a process of producing valid knowledge. Initially, cognition was one of the aspects of human practical activity; gradually, in the course of the historical development of humanity, it became a distinct activity. In cognition, two levels are distinguished: **sensory cognition**, carried out through sensation, perception, and representation, and **rational cognition**, which proceeds through concepts, judgments, and inferences, and is fixed in theories (rationalism). A distinction is also made between everyday, artistic, and scientific cognition, and within the latter — the cognition of nature and the cognition of society. Various aspects of the cognitive process are investigated by a number of specialized sciences: cognitive psychology, history of science, sociology of science, etc. The general doctrine of cognition is provided by the philosophical theory of knowledge (gnoseology).

Scientific cognition is a research process characterized by its specific goals, tasks, and methods for obtaining and verifying new knowledge. It is intended to pave the way for practice and provide the theoretical foundations for solving practical problems. The driving force of cognition is **practice**; it provides science with factual material that requires theoretical comprehension and justification, creating a reliable basis for understanding the essence of the phenomena of objective reality. The path of cognition is determined from **living contemplation to abstract thinking**, and from the latter — to practice. This is the primary function of scientific activity.

Levels of scientific cognition:

- **Empirical level:** The process of accumulating factual material and collecting information about relevant facts occurs here.

- **Theoretical level:** The synthesis of knowledge in the form of a scientific problem, hypothesis, or theory takes place here.

To understand the problem of cognition, let us turn to the work of **Bertrand Russell**, **Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits**, excerpts of which are provided below.

"**Fact**," in my sense of the term, can only be defined ostensively. Everything that is in the universe, I call a "fact." The sun is a fact; Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon was a fact; if I have a toothache, my toothache is a fact. If I assert something, the act of my assertion is a fact, and if the assertion is true, there is a fact by virtue of which it is true, but there is no such fact if it is false. Suppose a butcher says: "I have sold out, that's a fact," and immediately after that a customer known to the butcher enters the shop and receives an excellent piece of young lamb from under the counter. In this case, the butcher lied twice: once when he said he had sold out, and a second time when he said that this sale was a fact. Facts are what make statements true or false. I should like to limit the word "fact" to the minimum that must be known in order that the truth or falsehood of every statement may follow analytically for those who assert this minimum. For example, if the propositions "Brutus was a Roman" and "Cassius was a Roman" each assert a fact, it cannot be said that the sentence "Brutus and Cassius were Romans" asserts a new fact. We have already seen that the question of whether negative and general facts exist is fraught with difficulties. This subtlety, however, is mostly of a linguistic nature.

By "fact" I mean something that exists regardless of whether it is recognized as such or not. If I look at a train timetable and see that there is a morning train at ten o'clock to Edinburgh, then, if the timetable is correct, there really is a train, which is a "fact." The statement in the timetable itself is a fact, whether it is true or not, but it only asserts a fact if it is true, i.e., if there is an actual train. Most facts are independent of our will; therefore, they are called "hard," "stubborn," or "irremovable." Physical facts, for the most part, are independent not only of our will but even of our experience.

All our cognitive life is, from a biological point of view, part of the process of adaptation to facts. This process takes place, to a greater or lesser degree, in all forms of life, but it is called "cognitive" only when it reaches a certain level of

development. Since there is no sharp boundary between the lowest animal and the most eminent philosopher, it is clear that we cannot say exactly at what point we pass from the sphere of simple animal behavior into the sphere that deserves, by its dignity, the name of "cognition." But at every stage of development, adaptation takes place, and that to which the animal adapts is the environment of facts.

Philosophy, like science, must realize that when complete precision is unattainable, some technique must be invented to help gradually reduce the sphere of the imprecise and the uncertain. No matter how flawless our measuring apparatus may be, there will always be segments about which we will doubt whether they are greater than, less than, or equal to a meter; however, there are no limits to the refinements by which the number of such doubtful segments can be reduced. Similarly, when belief is expressed in words, there are always some circumstances about which we cannot say whether they make the belief true or false, but the significance of these circumstances can be indefinitely reduced, partly through more perfect analysis of words, and partly through more perfect observation techniques. The theoretical possibility or impossibility of complete precision depends on whether the physical world is discrete or continuous.

I turn now to the definition of "**truth**" and "**falsehood**." Certain things are obvious. Truth is a property of belief and, derivatively, a property of the sentences that express belief. Truth consists in a certain relation between a belief and one or more facts other than the belief itself. When this relation is absent, the belief turns out to be false. A sentence may be called "true" or "false" even if no one believes it, provided that if someone were to believe it, that belief would be true or false, as the case may be.

All this, as I have already said, is obvious. But what is not at all obvious is: the nature of the relation between the belief and the fact to which it refers; the definition of the possible fact that makes this belief true; the meaning of the word "possible" as used in this sentence. Until these questions are answered, we cannot obtain any adequate definition of "truth."

Example Case. Jefferson held a belief embodied in the words: "There are mammoths in North America." This belief could have been true even if no one had ever seen a single mammoth; at the time he expressed his belief, there might have been a pair of mammoths in an uninhabited part of the Rocky Mountains,

and shortly thereafter, they might have been swept out to sea by a flood on the Colorado River. In this instance, despite the truth of his belief, there would not have been a single piece of evidence in its favor.

...The meaning of a sentence consists of the meanings of the constituent words and the rules of syntax. The meanings of words must derive from experience, but the meaning of a sentence does not require this. I know from experience the meanings of the words "man" and "wings" and, consequently, I know the meaning of the sentence: "A winged man exists," even though I have never perceived in experience that which this sentence denotes. The meaning of a sentence can always be understood, in a certain sense, as a description. When this description truly describes a fact, the sentence is "true"; if not, it is "false."

It is important, however, not to exaggerate the role of convention. As long as we consider belief rather than the sentences in which it is expressed, convention plays no role. Suppose you are waiting to meet a person you love but have not seen for some time. Your expectation may well be silent, even if it is complex. You may hope that this person will be smiling when you meet; you may recall his voice, his gait, the expression of his eyes; what you expect might be something that only a gifted artist could depict, and not with words, but in a painting. In this case, you are expecting what is known to you from experience, and the truth or falsehood of your expectation depends on the relation of the idea to the sensation: your expectation will be "true" if the sensation, when it occurs, is such that it could have been the prototype of your idea had the chronological order of events been reversed. This is what we express when we say: "This is what I expected to see." Convention appears only in the case of translating belief into language or (if someone says something to us) language into belief. Moreover, the correspondence between language and belief, except for abstract content, is usually never exact: belief is richer in composition and detail than a sentence, which selects only a few of the most prominent features. You say: "I will see him soon," but you think: "I will see him smiling, aged, friendly yet shy, with untidy hair and unpolished shoes" — and so on, with an infinite variety of details, half of which you may not even be consciously aware of.

...But when we pass to something that no one experiences or has ever experienced in their own experience — for example, the internal parts of the Earth or the world as it was before the beginning of life — then belief and truth become more abstract compared to the examples cited above. We must now

consider what can be meant by "truth" when the confirming fact has not been experienced by anyone.

Anticipating possible objections, I shall proceed from the premise that the physical world, which exists independently of perception, may have a certain structural similarity to the world of our perceptions, but it cannot have any qualitative similarity. When I say it has structural similarity, I assume that the ordering relations in terms of which structure is defined are the same spatio-temporal relations known to us from our own experience. Certain facts of the physical world — specifically those whose nature is determined by spatio-temporal structure — are, therefore, such as we can imagine. On the other hand, facts concerning the qualitative character of physical phenomena are, perhaps, such as we cannot even imagine.

Furthermore, while there is no difficulty in assuming that unimaginable facts exist, we must nevertheless think that, beyond ordinary belief, there can be no belief the facts of which are unimaginable. This is a very important principle, but unless it leads us astray, it requires only a little attention to the logical side of the matter. The first point of the logical side is that we can know a general proposition even if we do not know any specific instances of it. On a pebble-strewn seashore, you may say with probable truth: "There are pebbles on this beach that no one will ever notice." ...We understand the statement "All men are mortal" just as completely as we would if we could provide an exhaustive list of all men; for to understand this proposition, we need only grasp the concepts of "man" and "mortal" and the meaning of what constitutes a specific instance of these concepts.

Now take the statement: "There are facts that I cannot imagine." I am not considering whether this statement is true; I only want to show that it has a significant meaning. First of all, let us note that if it had no significant meaning, then the statement contradicting it would also have no meaning and, therefore, would not be true, although it would not be false either. Note further that to understand such a statement, the examples provided regarding unnoticed pebbles or numbers that are not thought of are sufficient. To clarify such sentences, it is necessary only to understand the words and syntax involved in the sentence, which we do. If all this is present, the sentence is intelligible; whether it is true is another question.

...The peculiarity of these cases is that we can imagine the general circumstances that could confirm our belief, but we cannot imagine the specific facts that are instances of the general fact.

...Belief pertaining to that which is not given in experience refers, as the above analysis shows, not to individuals outside of experience, but to classes, no member of which is given in experience. A belief must always be capable of being decomposed into elements that experience has made intelligible, but when a belief takes a logical form, it requires a different analysis that assumes components unknown from experience. If we abandon such analysis, which is psychologically misleading, we can say in a general form: every belief that is not a simple impulse to action has a pictorial nature combined with a feeling of approval or disapproval; in the case of approval, it is "true" if there is a fact that has the same similarity to the image believed in as a prototype has to an image; in the case of disapproval, it is "true" if no such fact exists. A belief that is not true is called "false."

This is the definition of **"truth"** and **"falsehood"**.

…Generally speaking, three methods have been proposed to deal with the difficulties of defining "**knowledge".** The **first**, and oldest, consists of emphasizing the concept of "self-evidence." The **second** consists of eliminating the distinction between premises and conclusions and asserting that knowledge consists of the coherence of every object of belief. The **third**, and most radical, consists of discarding the concept of "knowledge" altogether and replacing it with "belief that promises success," where "success" can likely be interpreted biologically. We may consider Descartes, Hegel, and Dewey as representatives of these three views.

Descartes maintains that everything I understand clearly and distinctly is true. He believes that from this principle, he can derive not only logic and metaphysics but also factual data, at least in theory. Empiricism has rendered this view impossible; we do not think that even the highest degree of clarity in our thoughts would help us demonstrate the existence of Cape Horn. However, this does not eliminate the concept of "self-evidence": we might say that what Descartes says pertains to the evidence of concepts, but that, in addition to this evidence, there is also the evidence of perceptions, through which we arrive at the knowledge of factual data. I do not think we can entirely dispense with self-evidence. If you slip on an orange peel and strike the back of your head against the pavement, you will feel little sympathy for a philosopher who tries to

convince you that there is no complete certainty as to whether you experienced a blow or not. Self-evidence also compels you to accept the proof that if all men are mortal and Socrates is a man, then Socrates is mortal. I do not know whether self-evidence contains anything more than a certain firmness of conviction; its essence lies in the fact that when it is present, we cannot help but believe. If, however, self-evidence is to be accepted as a guarantee of truth, then this concept must be carefully distinguished from others that bear a subjective resemblance to it. I believe we must retain this concept as it pertains to the definition of "knowledge," but not as something sufficient in itself.

Another difficulty with self-evidence is that it is a matter of degree. A clap of thunder is indisputable, whereas a very faint noise no longer possesses such certainty; that you see the sun on a clear day is self-evident, but a faint outline of something in the fog may be illusory; a syllogism in the *Barbara* mood is evident, but a complex step in a mathematical proof can be very difficult to "see." Only for the highest degree of self-evidence can we claim the highest degree of certainty.

Coherence theory and instrumentalism are usually presented by their advocates as theories of truth. As such, they are not immune to objections... Currently, I am considering them not as theories of truth, but as theories of knowledge. Understood this way, there is more to be said in their favor.

Let us leave Hegel aside and attempt to formulate the coherence theory of knowledge ourselves. We must say that sometimes, of two beliefs, both cannot be true, or at least that we sometimes believe this to be so. If I believe simultaneously that A is true, that B is true, and that A and B cannot both be true, then I have three beliefs that do not form a coherent group. In this case, at least one of the three must be false. The coherence theory in its extreme form maintains that there is only one possible group of mutually interconnected beliefs that constitutes the whole of knowledge and the whole of truth. I do not believe this to be the case; I am more inclined toward the Leibnizian multiplicity of possible worlds. But in a modified form, the coherence theory may be accepted. In this modified form, it would state that everything, or nearly everything, accessible to knowledge is more or less certain; if the principles of inference belong to the primary material of knowledge, then one part of primary knowledge can be derived from another and, therefore, possesses more plausibility than it would on its own account. Thus, it may happen that an entire group of sentences, each of which by itself has only a small degree of plausibility, can collectively yield a very high degree of plausibility. But this

depends on the possibility of varying degrees of inherent plausibility, and the entire theory thus becomes one of something other than pure coherence.

Regarding the theory according to which we should replace the concept of "knowledge" with the concept of "belief that promises success," it is enough to say that all its potential plausibility arises from its indecisiveness and lack of forethought. It assumes that we can know (in the old sense of the word) which belief promises success, because if we cannot know this, the theory becomes useless for practice, whereas its goal is the elevation of practice at the expense of theory. But it is clear that in practice it is often very difficult to know which belief promises success, even if we have an adequate definition of "success."

We have likely reached the conclusion that the question of knowledge is a matter of degree of evidence. The highest degree of evidence lies in the facts of perception and in the irrefutability of very simple proofs. The next degree of evidence is held by vivid memories. When any instances of belief are each individually plausible to some extent, they become more plausible if they are linked into a logical whole. General principles of inference, both deductive and inductive, are, of course, less evident than their examples, and psychologically these principles derive from the anticipation of their examples.

4.3. PROBLEM-SOLVING AND RESEARCH TASKS

1. What is being?
2. Is eternal existence possible?
3. What are the foundation and the goal of cognition?
4. Can there be consciousness without cognition?
5. In your opinion, are there differences between empirical and theoretical cognition? Name these differences.
6. What difficulties arise when attempting to define cognition? Are there ways to overcome them?

REFERENCES:

1. Russell, B. (1948). Human knowledge: Its scope and limits. Simon and Schuster. Retrieved from https://ia801504.us.archive.org/29/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.461169/2015.461169.Human-Knowledge_text.pdf
2. Sartre, J.-P. (1956). Being and nothingness: An essay on phenomenological ontology. Retrieved from https://www.philotextes.info/spip/IMG/pdf/l_etre_et_le_neant_tel_gallimard.pdf

Educational and Methodological Publication

THE GENESIS OF PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT THROUGH THE PRISM OF PRIMARY SOURCES

Methodological Guidelines for Seminars
For first-cycle (Bachelor's) students of all specialties
Full-time, part-time, and distance learning forms

Compiled by: **Lakusha Nataliia**
Galushko Oleksandr

Комп'ютерне верстання *А. П. Селівестрової*

Ум. друк. арк. 2,56. Обл.-вид. арк. 2,5
Електронний документ. Вид № 52/V-26.

Виконавець і виготовлювач

Київський національний університет будівництва і архітектури
Проспект Повітряних Сил, 31, Київ, Україна, 03037

Свідоцтво про внесення до Державного реєстру суб'єктів
видавничої справи ДК № 808 від 13.02.2002