

Lubov E.
Motorina

National Research
University, Russia

I. Kant on the Anthropological Era, Man and his Attitude towards the World¹

We live in the age of loss of the sense of meaning (according to V. Frankl): this is the basic content of the crisis of modern culture. The anthropological crisis is directly related to that of culture, for this is man who is its creator. Culture as the creative and formative power of man, which originally used to protect him from the elements of nature, has gradually turned into the element existing within culture itself, when the power of man over the things in existence exceeds possible limits. The basis of modern culture is an anonymous impersonal system, which has started to function and develop according to its own laws. A global contradiction between the creative essence of the man and the results of his creative work has emerged.

The power of man over the world (the things in existence) has reached a threatening scale, and now he has to be concerned about one thing: where should he gain the “power over this power?” In other words, as Heidegger put it, man seems to have taken over the world, and now he has to become captured by this world himself.

The loss of value of a separate identity and the personal principle in culture, its transition to impersonal system foundations generates important world outlook questions mankind should ponder over. Which supra-individual structure will be the carrier for such personal traits as responsibility, conscience, duty, dignity, etc.? These are the traits the life of mankind is inconceivable without. Can one still preserve one's face within the system of values for the masses in case of giving up one's personal culture? Is it possible to have a personal meaning in an impersonal culture? Will man be able to accept something he used to think of only in the abstract way as a part of his life?

The crisis of modern culture and the rapid development of human technologies focused on radically changing not only man's consciousness, but also his physicality, make anthropological subjects topical once again. However, the anthropological paradigm which used to dominate the 20th-century culture has started giving way to the post-anthropological paradigm, which includes

¹ This work has been financially supported by the Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation (project No 12-03-00029).

comprehending the *new status* of man, realizing that total domination over the things in existence is no longer possible. The post-anthropological paradigm aims to overcome the opposition of subject and object, man and culture, man and society, and man and nature. It opens the way to the environmental dimension of human existence, restoring its *integrity* and harmonious relations with man's own self, other people, and the world. Man can no longer exist outside of the world as its transformer (master) and user. He has to return to the world, coordinating his actions with the laws of nature to find a new home. Perhaps the world as a Universe and peace as a Union will become this new home.

When formulating the anthropological question, "What is man?" I. Kant apparently anticipated the contemporary anthropological crisis, considering the prospects of man in the relation between man and eternity (the Universe). Kant used to say that, throughout his life, two things awed him most: the starry sky above him and the moral law within². I. Kant regarded man as a creature belonging to the worlds at once: natural necessity and moral freedom. The general sense of Kant's anthropological question is that man himself must understand the secret of his own existence. According to Kant, in the first case, it is important to understand what nature makes of man, whereas in the second, one should realize what he can and should do for himself as a free moral being. M. Buber wrote, "A new universal home for man is no longer conceived; yet, as he is the one who builds houses, the awareness able to comprehend itself is required from him. Kant saw the era which was about to come in all its variability, as the era of self-denial and self-cognition, as an anthropological era"³.

Assessing the anthropology of his time (which developed primarily as the domain of natural sciences), Kant was setting the task of making anthropology acquire some philosophic nature. Since man keeps an endless dialogue with everything that surrounded him, studying man implies studying all the things in existence, in a sense. The way of asking an anthropological question depends on the researcher's attitude towards metaphysics, just like the state of metaphysics depends on the researcher's attitude towards the problem of man. Attempting to set man's total domination over the world was criticized already by I. Kant, who saw the limits of human cognition in the fact that, for some reason, it seems to man that the world only exists for him to study it and change it at his will. Man, according to Kant, does not know the real purpose of the world itself, and therefore cannot ask it the "right question". If man could ask the world the "right question", we would have learned much more about the world and ourselves from its reply.

² Belás, L.: Machiavelli's Civil Ethics and Contemporaneity. In: Philosophical, Scientific, Spiritual, and Moral Issues of Globalization. Moscow, 2009, pp. 80 – 81.

³ Buber, M.: The Problem of Man. Moscow, 1992, p. 43.

I. Kant's doctrine of the categorical imperative as a special "moral law within me" having a high moral strength acquires a certain methodological accent in modern conditions of human self-determination. Kant called this moral strength the "verdict of conscience". I. Kant stresses that there is something unusual about the boundlessly high appreciation of the clear moral law free of any benefit, in the form in which practical reason presents it to us to be observed.

The typical traits of Kant's moral theory include the fact that he examines the ethical problem regardless of any theological presuppositions. Morality, in his opinion, is rooted in the concept of man as a being who is related to the non-determinate laws by his reason. Man, according to Kant, does not need religion⁴; he is completely self-sufficient due to the pure practical reason. In *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant presented the most accurate formula of the autonomy of man, which is the starting point of his judgments. According to his formula, our freedom depends on the fact that the relation between the sensory stimulus and behavior does not have any traits of a direct need, yet it works as conditionality. In animals, an external stimulus causes an instinctive action, whereas in man, it results only in a desire of the satisfaction an instinctive action would lead to. Therefore, in an act of volition, the motivation is autonomous, and the determination of will is overcome by a sensory stimulus. The difference between an autonomously motivated behavior and the behavior determined by external factors is the distinction between human and animal levels of living. Kant refers to this difference to justify the higher ontological value of man as related to nature. As a creature capable of autonomous motivation, man is an "end in itself", while other animals are merely simple "means". This ontology is certainly valid only from the point of view of moral behavior.

In the introduction to *The Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant calls freedom the "reason of existence" of the moral law. Human behavior, according to the moral law, is motivated by the fact that the others, the ones my actions are directed at, demonstrate the same autonomy as I do; they are ends in themselves, but in no case the means for someone else's activity. Therefore, the categorical imperative formula which prescribes the content of moral behavior reads, "Act so that the *maxim of your volition* could always have the power of the *principle of universal legislation*"⁵ (the emphasis is mine. – L. M.). According to the formula found in *The Critique of Practical Reason*, the moral law requires the integrity of another person. It must be added to the formula of the moral law that the moral law is based on the duality of the natural human character and the responsibility derived from the fact that man is a being capable of taking a free decision, and due to

⁴ Nizhnikov, S. A.: V. Nesmelov and I. Kant: A Theistic and Transcendental Anthropology. In: VSHU Bulletin, № 1 (1) 2008. Kirov: VyatSU Publishing House, pp. 16 – 17.

⁵ Kant, I.: Critique of Practical Reason. Saint Petersburg: Nauka Publishing House, 2005, p. 83.

this fact, he is above nature. Moral conduct serves as a restriction for personal selfishness, which is derived from the instinct of self-protection.

Therefore, according to Kant, moral behavior is characterized by the fact that, on the one hand, it has the status of universality and necessity, whereas, on the other hand, it is motivated by human dignity. The moral law is a non-empiric law, for it is not the result of generalization of human behavior. It could not have resulted this way, because it deals with what should be rather than what actually is. It is based on the moral ontology, not the experience. Experience, actually, may even not give us any examples of moral behavior, because it can be ascertained from the outside whether one really acts according to the law, or his behavior only superficially complies with the behavior which would have the moral law as its basis.

Kant believes that knowledge of the law is not the problem. Everybody knows the law *a priori*, i.e., the knowledge of the law is not a result of education or upbringing; it is not even caused by direct cognition. Everyone sees the essence of human nature which is above things and animals and one's equality with the others without realizing it. A national of any state who is required to give some false testimony knows that he should not do that, and he knows it by himself. The untold knowledge of the law is a fact of our mind. Therefore, the moral law not merely comes from "reason", but it results from "pure reason", i.e., we know about it *a priori*.

While explaining the categorical imperative, Kant uses the examples to interpret civil society relations as examples of reciprocity, which cannot be breached without disobeying the moral law (examples of keeping one's promises or trust). If I want to lie or give false promises, I have to ask myself whether this *maxim of mine* can become a general "law", moreover, a "natural law". Our moral duty is not to breach human relations based on reciprocity and reflecting this reciprocity. In connection with the interpretation of civil and legal relations, Kant, following Plato and other philosophers, refers to the concept of civic virtue⁶. In the formula of the moral law as "natural natural law", "nature" as a term sounds paradoxical. "Nature" here refers not to the external reality independent from man, yet to the relations determined by the rules of the moral law and equally applicable to all people. As "nature", according to Kant, is understood as the "existence of a thing which is defined by the general law", he regards the reciprocity of promises and trust agreements as examples of "nature" itself. Promises and trust can only exist because there is a general agreement, rule, or the "law", which suggests that things in nature in the proper sense of the word can only exist due to natural laws.

⁶ Belás, L.: Power and Virtue in The Prince by Machiavelli. In: PFUR Bulletin. Philosophy Series. 2010, № 1, p. 52.

According to Kant, the moral significance of relations based on an agreement, which requires all the signing parties' compliance with it, results from the fact that the categorical imperative includes not only the limitation of one's selfishness, but also self-limitation. It is important not to destroy human society established on the basis of mutual relations such as contracts, agreements, promises, conservation, etc. Moral behavior pursues the only goal: preventing the other person from being hurt by my behavior, and keeping the shape of the human society as the "second nature".

The philosopher believed that the basis of moral consciousness (it follows logically from his system) is an *a priori* principle, according to which, the standards should be *universal* and *necessary* by nature. When choosing how to behave, man should be guided by universal human rules, which represent a categorical imperative (unconditional commandment) to him. Kant formulated the three main subjective *maxims*:

1. Act according to the rules which can become a universal law.
2. Your actions should be based on the fact that each and every man is the highest value; he can never be used merely as a means.
3. All the actions must be oriented towards the common good.

To what extent are Kant's subjective *maxims* related to the anthropological criterion, which is now considered a measure of what is human in man, when it comes to the development of human technologies aimed at modifying the nature of man? The notion of an *anthropological criterion* would only have *practical meaning* if modern man (and mankind as a whole) choosing behavioral strategies is guided by the idea of *universality and necessity of an action* which has the status of the *legislation*, when a certain life experience is considered and evaluated in the context of the universals of a particular culture. It must be kept in mind that often philosophical reflections on cultural universals simplify and schematize them, leaving many layers of life meanings (personal, local, regional, or global) beyond the borders of philosophical analysis.

Nowadays, the structure of the anthropological criterion keeps modifying in terms of reducing the individual and the local components while expanding the global one. The expansion of "self" by strengthening the "I" within the global (universal and necessary) parameters has both positive and negative impact. On the one hand, it extends the threat of the loss of man's "establishment" within a certain culture; on the other hand, expanding the component of globality within the "I-image" will contribute to *understanding the different aspects*, and, consequently, a more meaningful impact an individual has on the future global world. Generating the ideas that would help mankind choose a more positive development scenario is one of the issues of modern philosophical anthropology

which turns to the invaluable experience gained throughout the history of world philosophy. Only by co-participating and “collaborating” with the world, one can reveal its true “purposes” and, therefore, one’s own mission statement.

Zhrnutie

I. Kant o antropologickej epoche, človeku a jeho postoji k svetu

Článok sa zameriava na antropologickú krízu ako jeden z najvýznamnejších dôvodov globálnej krízy kultúry spôsobenej prudkým rozvojom moderných technológií vrátane ľudských technológií. Predstavuje obsah antropologickej paradigmy, ktorá dominovala kultúre v priebehu 20. storočia, jej podstatu, zredukovanú na totálnu nadvládu človeka nad svetom; odhaľuje metodologickú závažnosť Kantových antropologických ideí, ktoré sa týkajú antropologickej epochy, vzťahu človeka k svetu, a tiež jeho morálneho kategorického imperatívu. Autorka článku zdôvodňuje stanovisko, podľa ktorého sa postavenie človeka 21. storočia musí zmeniť, pričom antropologizmus ako svetonázor má dať prednosť post-antropologickej paradigme, ktorej podstatou je uvedomenie si nemožnosti ďalšej absolútnej dominancie človeka nad svetom. Nová paradigma je zameraná na prekonanie protikladu subjektu a objektu, človeka a kultúry, človeka a spoločnosti a človeka a prírody; otvára cestu enviromentálnej dimenzii ľudskej existencie navrátením jeho *integrity*, harmonického vzťahu voči sebe, ostatným a k svetu. Človek viac nemôže existovať mimo sveta ako jeho pretvárateľ (pán) a užívateľ. Musí sa do sveta vrátiť, zosúladiť svoje konanie s prírodnými zákonmi, aby našiel svoj nový domov. Azda bude tento nový domov opäť svetom v oboch významoch: svet ako Vesmír a svet ako Porozumenie.

Kľúčové slová: antropologické idey I. Kanta, vesmír, človek, antropologická epocha, kríza kultúry, morálny kategorický imperatív, post-antropologická paradigma, príroda, svet, integrita, harmonický vzťah človeka k svetu

Zusammenfassung

I. Kant über anthropologische Epoche, Menschen und deren Verhältnis zur Welt

In diesem Artikel wird die anthropologische Krise als eine der wichtigsten Grundlagen der globalen Krise der Kultur betrachtet. Diese Krise war durch heftige Entwicklung der gegenwärtigen Technologien einschließlich menschliche Technologien hervorgerufen. Der Autor beschäftigt sich auch mit dem Inhalt des

anthropologischen Paradigmas, das in der Kultur während des 20. Jahrhunderts dominiert und dessen Wesentliche läuft darauf hinaus, dass ein Mensch totale Herrschaft über die Welt hat. Im Artikel untersucht man auch methodologische Bedeutung der anthropologischen Ideen von Kant: über anthropologische Epoche, über das Verhältnis zwischen dem Menschen und der Welt, über den moralischen kategorischen Imperativ. Die These über die Änderung des Status eines Menschen im 21. Jahrhundert ist begründet; Anthropologistische Weltanschauung muss dem postanthropologischen Paradigma den Platz überlassen, in dessen Rahmen das Verständnis der Unmöglichkeit der weiteren totalitären Herrschaft des Menschen in der Welt sei. Das neue Paradigma ist auf die Überwindung der Opposition des Subjekts zum Objekt, des Menschen zur Kultur, des Menschen zur Natur gelenkt, sie öffnet den Weg zur ökologischen Dimension des menschlichen Seins, zur Wiederherstellung dessen *Ganzheit*, harmonisches Verhalten zu sich selbst, zu den anderen Leuten, zur Welt. Der Mensch kann nicht mehr außer Welt existieren als einfacher Reformator (als Herr) und Benutzer. Er muss in die Welt zurückkehren, seine Taten mit den Naturgesetzen vereinbaren, sein neues Haus finden. Vielleicht wird dieses neues Haus wieder die Welt in beiden seinen Bedeutungen sein: Welt als Universum und Welt als Zustimmung.

Schlüsselwörter: anthropologische Ideen von Kant, das Universum, ein Mensch, anthropologische Epoche, anthropologische Krise, die Krise der Kultur, moralischer kategorischer Imperativ, postanthropologisches Paradigma, die Natur, die Welt, die Ganzheit, harmonisches Verhalten zwischen Menschen und der Welt.

Summary

I. Kant on the Anthropological Era, Man and his Attitude towards the World

The article is focused upon the anthropological crisis as one of the most important foundations of the global cultural crisis caused by the rapid development of modern technologies, including human technologies; it demonstrates the contents of the anthropological paradigm which dominated the culture throughout the 20th century, its essence is reduced to the total domination of man over the things in existence; it reveals the methodological importance of anthropological ideas regarding the anthropological era, the relation between man and the world, and the moral categorical imperative as suggested by I. Kant; it substantiates the statement saying that man's status should be changed in the 21st century, while anthropologism as a world outlook should give way to the post-

anthropological paradigm, which includes the awareness of the impossibility of further total domination of man over the world. The new paradigm is aimed at overcoming the opposition of subject and object, man and culture, man and society, and man and nature; it opens the way to the environmental dimension of human existence, restoring its *integrity*, harmonious relationship with oneself, the others, and the world. Man can no longer exist outside of the world as its transformer (master) and user. He has to return to the world, coordinating his actions with the laws of nature to find a new home. Perhaps the world as a Universe and peace as a Union will become this new home.

Keywords: I. Kant's anthropological ideas, Universe, man, anthropological age, anthropological crisis, cultural crisis, moral categorical imperative, post-anthropological paradigm, nature, world, integrity, harmonious nature of man's relations with the world.

Аннотация

II. Кант об антропологической эпохе, человеке и его отношении к миру

В статье рассматривается антропологический кризис как одно из важнейших оснований глобального кризиса культуры, вызванного стремительным развитием современных технологий, включая гуманитарные; показано содержание антропологической парадигмы, доминирующей в культуре на протяжении XX столетия, суть которой сводится к тотальному господству человека над сущим; раскрывается методологическое значение антропологических идей И. Канта: об антропологической эпохе, об отношении человека и мира, о нравственном категорическом императиве; обосновывается положение о том, что в XXI веке статус человека должен быть изменен; антропологизм как мировоззрение должен уступить место постантропологической парадигме, в рамках которой развивается осознание невозможности дальнейшего тотального господства человека над миром. Новая парадигма направлена на преодоление противопоставления субъекта и объекта, человека и культуры, человека и общества, человека и природы; открывает путь к экологическому измерению человеческого бытия, восстановлению его *целостности*, гармоничных отношений с самим собой, с другими людьми, с миром. Человек больше не может существовать вне мира в качестве его преобразователя (господина) и пользователя. Он должен вернуться в мир, согласуя свои действия с законами природы, обретая новый дом.

Возможно, этим новым домом вновь станет мир в его обоих значениях: мир как Вселенная и мир как Согласие.

Ключевые слова: антропологические идеи И. Канта, вселенная, человек, антропологическая эпоха, антропологический кризис, кризис культуры, нравственный категорический императив, постантропологическая парадигма, природа, мир, целостность, гармоничность отношений человека с миром.

L. E. Motorina
Professor, Chair of Philosophy
Moscow Aviation Institute
National Research University
Russian Federation
lubov-motorina@yandex.ru

Л.Е. Моторина
Профессор кафедры философии
Московского авиационного института
Национального исследовательского
университета
Россия