

Prolegomena to the Methodology of Verification of Irrational Systems

Vadim Kortunov

Russian State University of Tourism and Service, Moscow, Russia

Abstract: It is considered that the reference to the irrational problematic is provoked in the era of social crises, when people give up their hope to organize the society on the basis of common sense. There is a widespread opinion that irrationalism and mysticism present themselves as a sort of capitulation of the reason to the complicated issues that life puts before them. In this sense, irrationalism is often estimated as a reflection of the deep pessimism, as a certain philosophical depression, for which it is typical not to search for the answers to the questions, but to avoid them. We are speaking out exactly against this position, proving that irrational ideas not only carry a constructive, creative meaning, but also are capable of expanding the worldview horizons of man by enriching his inner world with a whole range of mechanisms of comprehension and understanding of reality.

Key words: Methodology • Logic • Irrationality

INTRODUCTION

Irrational ideas, without denying and bringing into discredit the achievements of the rationalistic thought, only expand the problem field of science by offering new approaches to the solution of the issues of ontology and epistemology, of ethics and aesthetics, of anthropology and axiology.

In this connection, we need to clear first, what are the place and the meaning of various irrational systems (and of *irrationality* in general) in the real being of man: in his scientific, socio-cultural and everyday practice, in his spiritual and subject-utilitarian activity, what significance gains the irrationality in his social, existential and cosmic being [1, 2, 3]. The answer to this question is to be followed by identification of the main principles of the scientific-rational and irrational-mystical world-attitude and by discovering of the archetypical paradigms of the Eastern and Western consciousness in its cultural-historical retrospective (as the most prominent forms of the manifestation of the irrational-mystical and rational-scientific *models* of world-attitude). All this taken together inevitable leads to the revision of the traditional correlation between the scientific-rational model and the artistic-aesthetic image of the world; it will make it possible to interpret the development of Western metaphysics as a form of the cultural-historical reflection

on the overall evolution of the rationalistic worldview. Finally, this analysis will help to justify a new and, we believe, quite original solution to a number of problems, which are paramount for philosophical science. Among them we will emphasize the problem of correlation between *spiritual-historical* and *civilizational-pragmatic* values, the problem of deformation of the modern worldview, caused by the rational-monetarist and liberal-economical trends, the problem of the possible verification of religious-aesthetical experience as a form of *irrational* world-attitude, which serves as an effective foundation of overcoming of the narrow-mindedness of rationalistic worldview by expanding its epistemological, ontological and axiological semantic field.

Problem of the Subject Identity:

Reality constructed by man may meet his plans, aims and objectives or not according to the content of his own self-consciousness.

In other words, in order to define the degree of correspondence between the evolution of the modern world and a person's aims and ideals, one should understand a man's perception of his inner substance and also the meaning he implies into his

humanity. If a man has turned out to be capable of measuring himself and his environment, it would be quite logical to venture that his global aim is creating such an existence that would provide him the conditions for optimal self-affirmation and self-expression (i.e. realization of his inner substance).

Hence, a man constructs himself and the world in terms of self-identification.

Different cultural traditions have different approaches to defining a man's position in the system of existence on the assumption of directly historical understanding of the essence of man and his socio-cultural value. In turn, a man's identification as well as his self-consciousness formation process became the central and the main factor to define the current of cultural, economic and socio-political processes. The global revision of man's socio-cultural identification has always resulted in the shift in ideology, hierarchy of values and finally has brought fundamental transformations in human development, which gives us the basis to speculate about the change of historical ages and various cultural and historical traditions.

Man has faced the questions of self-consciousness and self-identification as the principal problems of a spiritual being. A subject comes to be from the moment the thought "I exist" forms in his consciousness. Kant justly states that the notion "I exist" ("transcendental apperception") is the deepest and ultimate stratum of self-consciousness of a subject through which all the consciousness activity is possible. The "I exist" notion brings up the psychological division of the world into *Me* and *Not-me* as the self-perception presupposes the existence of an external world. Eventually the "I exist" notion also gains the axiological aspect, thus transforming into "what am I?" After this moment the self-existence becomes a problem for a man and here is where the matter of self-identification (i.e. subjective identity) appears.

Annex. Even though this egocentrism in form of subjective self-consciousness is inherent to the very nature of man, still it doesn't predestine the necessity of any relations between a man and the world. On the contrary, subjective self-consciousness, having once appeared, has only brought up the problem of relations between *Me* and *Not-me*, which could only be resolved through the urge towards coalescence of the two or vice versa by aiming at accepting them as the contradictory notions. The matter is essential for the variety of

cultures, but, even being a universal problem, it doesn't presuppose an absolute solution. Therefore the western-European methodology and the way of thinking cultivate the egocentric paradigm, while other cultural ideology types-for example, some oriental ones-overpass this paradigm by forming the so-called *subjective-objective* self-consciousness. The aim is achieved, as we shall find out below, through *cultivating of irrational consciousness intentions*.

Subject's self-identification as a dually antinomian (i.e. spiritually-created) being fixes his nature, but not his inner substance.

Actually, the fact of a man's life being determined by both biological and spiritual demands tempts the scientists to define a man's *inner substance* as *dualistic*. But the dualistic nature of man doesn't necessary presuppose the dualism of his substance. A man's ontological status merely influences his axiological status, but doesn't define it and doesn't replace it. Hence when defining the substance of a man (i.e. his identity), not only his nature should be taken into consideration, but mostly *his unique congenial* qualities and characteristics. Biological structure can't be considered to be his exclusive feature as it is incident to the whole biologic world. From our point of view, the most exceptional quality of a man is his capability to take part in *spiritual* activity. And a man's *spiritual* basis as *an aggregate of creative potencies* has wider meaning rather than his *sensible basis*.

- *Spirituality as a collection of creative potencies (capacity for creative activity) should be understood broader than capacity for rational activity and should not be reduced solely to the sense.*

If the biological nature of a man doesn't single him out of all variety of the biological world, then his sensible nature only fixes his capacity for rational activity. That is undoubtedly the exclusive property just of the human psyche, but the history of mankind shows that this exclusive property of the human psyche functions as a service of his body-biological nature. The ability to rationalization, the activity of thinking within the deductive linearity distinguishes a human from the biological world, in the end, only in the degree of his adaptation to the external environment. So it appears that the rational activity aims to improve the biological

nature of a human, which, as we have found out, is not essential for him.

Annex. The above doesn't mean that man's sensible activities do not constitute an essential element of his spirituality. But the concept of *spirituality* is broader than the concept of sense and of rationality, because it involves all creative potencies of human including "unreasonable" or irrational ones.

However, in order to identify the creatively constructive functions of irrational manifestations of the human psyche, we must distinguish between *irrational* and *unconscious*, because the latter in philosophical and psychoanalytical literature is more often understood only as *instinctual* components of the psyche.

Irrational manifestations of the human psyche should not be reduced solely to its unconscious-instinctual manifestations.

Unfortunately, the interpretation of the irrational manifestations of the human psyche as unconscious-instinctual is typical for the most of modern scientists of the West. Such interpretation has shown itself most prominently in psychoanalysis, which is inclined to see in the *unconscious* and the *irrational* only complexes arising on the basis of animal instincts. By such an approach to the irrational becomes clear a) the negative attitude of scientists to the category of the irrational, b) the conclusion about the need of the neutralization of irrational ideas through sublimation or rationalization (logization), c) the reduction of the spiritual category to the semantic boundaries of rationality (sense).

Such a bias towards the irrational can be illustrated best of all by the concept of Freud, who has reduced all the diversity of irrational psychic processes to unconscious instincts and put forwards a thesis about the need of *the total rationalization of unconscious ideas*. Indeed, if the proper realization of the energy of animal instincts hasn't been provided in time, an *overabundance* of unconscious ideas may arise and that, sooner or later, will lead to a mental disease, by provoking various psychoses and neuroses, or to deviant behavior. Therefore, *a rationalistic reflection on unconscious ideas is necessary*. The logic is simple: since the unconscious strata of the human psyche are the source of deviant behavior and nervous breakdowns, they need to be moved to the level of the conscious. Hence, the practical actions of a doctor must be reduced to *talking cure*. So, if we project the medical findings of Freud on the common philosophical principles (and that has

happened anyway in the contemporary European culture), we must admit that all in the human psyche, which is found beyond the conscious, has a negative, destructive character and is a pathological symptom. Therefore, according to Freud, irrational manifestations of the psyche are only *a character of the hysterical mind, which is ruled by unconscious ideas* [4].

Irrational manifestations of the human psyche should be interpreted as the basis of subject's spirituality, i.e. his essential basis.

By his rational-logical capacities man builds a world of algorithms: a world, which is subject to mathematical laws and formulas. But the formalized world, being ideally absolutely predictable and rationally organized, loses its ability to enter the level of *other being*. Pure rationality provides only itself, while *the irrational* is open to *the increment* of being, to the arising of something *unprecedented*.

The transcendently ideal, aesthetical, moral-all this doesn't follow from the man's animal nature, as well as shall not be rationally justified, remaining for the rational conscious fully or partly mystified. But exactly this irrational-mystical part of spirit determines *the uniqueness of the human being*, as fundamentally distinguishes it from the world of the biological nature and from the world that is subject to algorithmic rationality.

The capacity for an irrational action, the illogicality of emotions, the heuristic thinking is not only the basic of the uniqueness of a person, but also *the nature of a creative act* and that is more significant. And outside of creation, outside of capacity for creativity there is no *development*. Therefore, if we deny man's irrational capacities, we deny the possibility of creative activity itself and in the end we come to the denying of all-of civilization, culture and the individual.

Elements of the Irrational System:

Reality is an entire being and only entire being is real.

A ban on the hierarchy of the elements of being in many Eastern cultures is achieved by considering the reality as an organic, undifferentiated whole. "The One", as a cosmic entirety cognized by intuitive and mystical means, becomes the theoretical basis for the approval of the principle of samsara, which presupposes the essential unity of all life. Such a model of the world-attitude, unlike rationalistic systems,

excludes the possibility of any anthropocentrism and does ridiculous the statement of the question of the relationship between man and nature, removing in such a way many worldview problems, typical for the modern rationalistic world outlook.

The true reality is life itself and the whole of life, which doesn't have itself any differentiation between matter and spirit, concepts and images, evil and good, the Secular and the Sacral. Through the senses, we can't cognize all of reality, but only that part of it, which is perceived as subject-material. And even in this case we are wrong and protect ourselves from the truth, because we cognize something apart from The One, the entirety, apart from what doesn't have any division into the material and spiritual. With the concepts and logic again we don't cognize all of reality, but that part of it which we call "idea". But again we are wrong, because the idea is a fragment of reality, not reality itself; the idea is a *fragment* of the spirit, not the spirit. The truth is absolute and entire and it is not the truth outside its absoluteness and entirety.

Annex. The ancient Indian sources formulate the main principle of the irrational world-attitude, according to which the complete knowledge can be fully achieved only by overcoming of rational-logical barriers by freeing the mind of categorical limitations. Only in this way the primordial reality, "from whence all speech, with the mind, turns away unable to reach it" [5], can be touched. "The eye does not go thither, nor speech, nor mind. We do not know, we do not understand, how any one can teach it" [6-8]. In other words, only when the subject of knowledge is able to rise above the thought, the word, the logic, "we hear what cannot be heard, by which we perceive what cannot be perceived, by which we know what cannot be known" [9]. It is possible only through mystical intuition, embracing reality in its integrity and indivisibility. This kind of intuition doesn't imply any cognition of the object by the subject of "research" already; it *doesn't imply any of the subject-object relationship*, but means the actual identity of the "I" and "The One". As long as we rotate in conventionally abstract categories, we only skim the surface of reality, but we do not penetrate into it.

Irrational perception of reality is caused by overcoming the boundaries between conception and imaginative thinking and also between the forms of motion and developing of being, on the one hand and the forms of motion and development of thinking, on the other hand.

If you analyze, for example, the Jain concept of cognition, it becomes clear that the idea of creating an *irrational* logic is almost entirely feasible. Jainism does not just offer a new theory of knowledge, which states the need for a comprehensive methodological approach to contemplation and understanding of the world, including logical and conceptual, sensory and sensual, artistic and imaginative and mystical ways of relating to being. It offers exactly *the logic*, in other words, not only *the methodology* of knowledge, but a set of laws, according to which *the very act* of thinking is administered. Jain logic doesn't deny the judgments like "*S is P*" or "*S is non-P*", but, without fail, prefaces them conditional. But most importantly, Jains offer a number of logical judgments that bring together conceptual and logical thinking with artistic and imaginative one. Jains admit judgments built on the principle of contradiction (completely unacceptable approach, in terms of Western logic), that is, judgments such as "*S is P and non-P*" or even "*S is and not-is*". Moreover, they go even further and offer impredicative judgments, in other words, logical judgments like "*S is Indescribable*" or "*S is Ineffable*". Once again, we notice that for Jains all these judgments belong to the *logical* type and impredicative judgments become a means of cultivation of mystery, of unsayable, which is so characteristic of mysticism and art.

Finally, there are three kinds of judgments formed by the combination of the first four that seem at all irrational. They are: impredicative judgments that have a predicate; impredicative judgments that have a negative predicate; as well as impredicative judgments that have a predicate in its contradictions. The last type of judgment seems to be most interesting, as it provides comprehension of the objects of reality *both* in the discursive structures of consciousness (and in the discursive structures of the controversial nature) and in the *non-verbalized* structures of consciousness.

Annex. In order to illustrate the utility of the irrational logic, we give a concrete example, which can be described as an impredicative judgment having predicate in its contradictions. Indeed, what can be said about the image that arose in our minds? Exactly that, *at the same time, it is, is not and is indescribable*.

If we apply the Jain logic to the knowledge of reality, as it is interpreted in the Vedic-Brahmanic concept, many things will fall into place. Recall that the Vedas identify reality with The One and deny the adequacy of fragmentary knowledge. Since everything exists in The One, any fragment of reality, taken by itself, is a non-reality. Therefore, knowledge of the objects of reality

is not the knowledge of reality itself. For this reason, according to Samhita, true knowledge can be the only one that sees in the individual and contradictory the unity of reality, the entirety of the universe. Now try to imagine, how it is possible to produce the universe or an object in its involvement in the universe in logical form? Apparently only with the aid of “*S is P and non-P*”; because the community of an object and all that is not the object is precisely the Universe. This Universe is impredicative in the sense that no approval or denial in relation to it will bring us to its adequate description.

Irrational worldview is the perception of subjectless.

Intellectual cognition can be useful as the lowest, the starting stage of the cognitive process, which is necessary to organize events of the objective, “becoming” being. The most valuable outcome of a purely intellectual knowledge is the inevitable awareness of its failure to ascend to true spirituality, to the truths hidden behind the material particularity of being.

Emotional and psychological perception of the world is rid of selfishness and means *sympathetic fusion of subject and object*. Such sympathetic fusion reaches its peak in love, which is based on pure irrationality. Love means precisely co-feeling and co-participation and co-union and co-experience and co-gnosis of the lover and the object of love. It’s quite natural that such a profound unity, amounting to a full merger, a full identity, means to overcome own sense of “I” as a self-sufficient and self-contained unit of being.

Irrational perception's effectiveness is directly related to the need to overcome the psychological individual Ego.

Impermanence is a property not only of the physical world, but of *the mental one* as well. Individuality is not something substantial. What we call individuality or “I” is *a stream of consciousness*, an endless string of successive mental states. The unity of the person is due to the integrity of this stream of consciousness and at the same time the volatility and fluidity of human subjectivity doesn’t allow us to characterize the “I” as a certain authenticity. So, subjectivity is an unstable range of egocentric experiences and, in this sense, it emotionally bounds man to the ostensibility of the event-reality, just as sensual desires. The overcoming of subjectivity is necessary for man’s liberation from selfishness of the “I”. Here full freedom of man is achieved, not only from

the conditions of the outside world, but also from the boundaries from his own Ego. Taking the path of subjectless, a person moves into a new dimension, where laws of time and space don’t have the power. Thus *the suppression of his Ego is a necessary prerequisite to go beyond the subject-object relations*.

Annex 1. In this respect, the technique of concentration is typical, which can be derived from the common philosophical design of Buddhism. In the first stage of concentration one overcomes the ability to think logically and detachment from the “pure reason”. In this way man gets rid of stereotypes and patterns of rational thinking, which is able to mislead him. The next stage lies in the emotional experience of the four noble truths; it leads to the ceasing of further speculations and boundless joy and peace embrace all the human being. The third stage frees man from the sense of physicality. And finally the fourth stage frees him from feeling his own “I”, leads to the actual subject-object identity, “throws” him beyond subject-empirical world, beyond time and space.

Annex 2. Overcoming of one’s subjectivity is the result of an absolute philosophical irrationalism. And in this sense the absolute irrationalism is a direct axiological contrast to the absolute rationalism that cultivates this subjectivity. In its absolutization irrationalism sacrifices subjectivity for peace; rationalism, however, as we shall see later, sacrifices peace for subjectivity.

Transformation of the Rational-scientific Paradigm:

Anthropocentric worldview in its evolution was the source and at the same time the result of the fundamental orientation of the Western world to a special type of rationality.

This orientation has evolved as the archetypal paradigm of Western consciousness expressed by a boundless faith in the scientific-rational and formal-logical means of knowledge of knowledge and understanding of reality and in an effort to create a universal picture of the world where all the elements could be systematized and brought to a strict logical conformity with the deductive linearity. Such paradigm didn’t in any way include or deny the development of artistic and imaginative world-attitude. However, the aesthetic image of the world in its ideological functions has always given way to the scientific and rationalistic image. From the very beginning art, religion and aesthetics though forming its own model of the world, at the same time were not the unconditional part of practical philosophy in the West.

Since the Renaissance scientific rationalism has been gradually acquiring the status of *a universal outlook*, on the basis of which a new image of the world has been built. Scientific and rationalistic ideals have eventually penetrated to all levels of human being. In political theory the liberal vision has been formed; Christianity has gone through the Reformations; economics has got impregnated with the spirit of capitalism. Philosophy has provided deep reflection over the events of cultural and ideological shifts. The results of this reflection are concepts that reflected both solidarity of philosophy with the progressive scientific and rationalistic movement in Europe and protest against it.

Artistic image of the world as part of the rationalistic worldview functions as intellectual reflection.

In the era of the Early modern period aesthetics acquires the value of an integral part of philosophy and of the overall image of the world. At the same time, the philosophical doctrines of the Early modern period are predominantly built as systems of strictly scientific nature that fundamentally distinguishes them from the field of religious, artistic, mythological and other “non-scientific” activities. And aesthetics is a part of the philosophical and scientific system and therefore is also considered as an area of systematic knowledge. The aesthetic image of the world built Western scientists of the Early modern period becomes in this way an integral part of the scientific worldview. In this context, they often assess artistic creativity and art by the *gnostic* and even *epistemological* positions. That’s why for the Western philosophers of the time there is a crucial question: *what are the aesthetic abilities of man in relation to his intellectual, rational abilities?* Hence-the constant comparison of aesthetic (and religious) sense with the activities of the mind and of aesthetic contemplation with intellectual contemplation.

But no matter how clear is the relationship between scientific, artistic and aesthetic activity, no matter how much we haven’t ascertained the interpenetration and interdependence of the scientific world and its non-rational and aesthetic image, we must recognize that the very *principles* and *ideas* that lie in these two forms of perception of the world are fundamentally opposed to each other. Science is built on the principles of conceptual logic, common sense, consistency and evidence; art operates in the system of illogical and non-discursive images out of practical life, lives according to the principles of inconsistency and doesn’t require any conceptual proof. The ideal of science is knowledge;

art, on the contrary, cultivates mystery. Science appeals to the mind; art-to the heart (emotions).

Annex 1. Philosophical concept of Immanuel Kant can be considered as the first serious warning of the danger that threatens mankind by the unbridled Reason, which in its rational-pragmatic aspirations can discredit the values of the spiritual order. That’s why Kant gives so many efforts the justification of boundaries of “pure reason” and rehabilitation of ethical and aesthetical values. However, in this case, Kant himself is hostage to the scientific-rationalistic tradition: the justification of morality and art becomes a subject of formal science, while ethics, aesthetics get rooted in his system as necessary steps of a strictly scientific concept.

Annex 2. At the same time, the greater flexibility practical laws of the strict science gained and the deeper the scientific-rationalistic spirit rooted in Western European outlook and the general image of the world, the more clearly the reaction of artists and philosophers to this process was traced. In the XVIII and XIX centuries in Europe the rationalistic picture of the world has finally rooted. Now rationalism permeates all levels of human existence: the rational model prevails not only in science, but also in the fields of politics, economics and law. Rationalism breaks into the everyday life of the Western European average man, defining his ideas, his attitude to the world, society and himself.

The aesthetic image of the world has moved to the periphery of worldview. This doesn’t mean that in that period artistic culture of Europe lies in decline. On the contrary, it reaches unprecedented heights, as if trying with its own means to resist the cold rationality of impending civilization. However the outcome of this confrontation of artistic practice and the practice of “common sense”, aestheticism and practicality has already been predetermined. Early modern period’s worldview sacrifices the aesthetic image of the world for the approval of the scientific and rationalistic image. Art, religion, philosophy do not die, but their *ideological* functions are virtually not demanded.

Interpretation of the artistic image as the subject of rationalistic logic deprives it of its axiological sense.

Georg Hegel undertook let a utopian, but for the Western European worldview a very relevant attempt to revise fundamentally the foundations of logical thinking. The aims of Hegelian critics are not so much philosophical systems themselves as formal and logical laws underlying any systematic, conceptual thinking. Arguing his critics,

Hegel rightly appeals to the phenomena of spiritual life and of nature, which actually can't be adequately expressed by categories of *final* thinking on the principle "either-or". Therefore, Hegel introduces *the dialectical* method as an alternative to *the metaphysical* and *formal-logical* method trying to bring the forms of thought with the forms of life itself into full compliance. It is significant that Hegel tries to make dialectic the principle of thought *itself, the very act of thinking*. One would think that such an approach should lead the scientist to the idea of going beyond the exact science to the area of imaginative perception and of emotional and psychological contemplation. In other words, to the area of aesthetic and religious experience, where the limitation of formal and logical laws is really overcome through diverting the discourse and analysis. But it isn't happening: Hegel remains true to the rationalistic tradition setting strict science as a worldview standard. That's why, in contrast to the romantic, Hegel considers that the main goal is not the endowment of art or religion with philosophical functions of science, but on the contrary, *the endowment of scientific methodology with elements of artistic and imaginative contemplation*.

Artistic image of the world as part of the rationalistic worldview can claim the theoretical to actually emerging worldview expressed in the forms of a strictly scientific knowledge.

This programmatic thesis peculiar to the Romantic philosophers couldn't find its practical use. Unfortunately, the call to the fact that *art should be a prototype of science and sciences only rush for what is already achieved by art* [10] couldn't save the Western European value system from rationalistic skews of the scientific image of the world.

German classical philosophy failed to solve the problem of the reunion of artistic-imaginative and scientific-rationalistic images of the world. Its philosophical reflection on the development of Western European culture and ideology remained the ideological reflection and has not acquired the status of the ideology or worldview (in the *practical* sense of the word). The same can be said about art, which while achieving unprecedented heights became part of the spiritual culture of the West only as a kind of *critical reflection* on the scientific and rationalistic nature of this culture. Thus, art and anti-rationalistic philosophy making the pride of the spiritual culture of the West represented not the spirit of this culture, but rather *a spiritual protest* against it.

Post-classical European philosophy and aesthetics have already renounced to any attempts (which are typical for classic philosophy) to "reconcile" science with art, imaginative contemplation with conceptual thinking. And if by the German Romantic the rise of art causes the association of scientific and artistic-imaginative models of the world in *a single system* (even if it is based on the unconditional primacy of art), in the post-classical philosophy building of the imaginative picture of the world is seen as a full-fledged and *versatile alternative* to the whole worldview.

Annex. Comparing the growth of irrational ideas in philosophy with the general development of practical Western European worldview, we can assume that the first act as a reaction to the increasing rationalization of worldview and philosophical and aesthetical concepts are formed as versatile systems that interpret the world in their respective categories. In the proposed image of the world of Western philosophers the emphasizing of the status of irrationality can be felt more and more vividly. And this higher attention to irrationalism appears directly proportional to the practical rationalization of real life and to the penetration of scientific and logical methods in all areas of social being.

Existential model of world-attitude, overcoming the gap between subject and object, closes the world of the individual within the narrow confines of individual existence.

Considering the practical results of existential constructions, we can conclude that the philosophers of this direction, concerned about the socialization and disintegration of spiritual processes, began to design new models of worldview, which ultimately could compensate for the loss of the spiritual unity. Existentialism marks a kind of compromise between the real orientation of the West to the deepening of the differentiation of spirit and the rapprochement with the microcosm of the macrocosm.

Existentialism pushed away from the being of man. At the same time it recognized that man as such has ceased to be whole, crumbled to a certain amount of qualities and properties. But man is more than just a sum, more than a number of qualities, even if the number is infinite. Existentialism, for the first time in the history of Western philosophy, has taken a radical attempt to abandon the subject-object paradigm and reunite human and being, world and I. Human existence was presented by existentialism as the unity of the external world and

the individual being of a person. To be more precise, the unity of the inner and the outer in human existence is a kind of refraction of the external through the internal. The external world becomes accessible to man by including it in the individual being of a person. It would seem, existentialism overcame the impairment of the differential intention of the Western culture: the world appeared to be not only within the human being, but it was experienced as man's own "I"; the external world and human being inextricably merged into the structure of existence and, finally, formed a single unit.

However, having brought together man and the world in a single existential structure, existential philosophy has been forced to admit that such a union is limited by the actual being. The unity of the person and the world has been devalued by human existence itself, which suddenly turned out to be infinite small and tightly closed. Spirit and being divided into a number of individual Dasein, which operate within the boundaries of everyday fact.

Annex. Since, according to existentialists, ontologically in addition to human being there also is existence, which defines the "rules of the game" and is the source of the situational for human, insofar epistemologically the specific content of human existence is not merely an experience of one's finite being-in-itself, but the experience of one's finite being-in-the-world (In-der-Welt-sein). Moreover, since the starting situation is that the existence of the individual and the external world are in an indissoluble unity (as the experience of being-in-the-world), then, from the point of view of existential philosophy, it is even somehow inappropriately to raise the question about the subject or object of cognition. The fusion of subject and object in the fact of the existence of me-in-the-world becomes primary; not the world is originally given as an object, not "I" as a subject, but at once-my presence in the world. However, such an epistemological unity of the "I" with the world doesn't really eliminate the alienation of man from the outside world. *Cognition doesn't create the original connection to the world of the subject; it does not arise from the impact of the world on the subject. Cognition is the mode of existence reasoned by being-in-the-world* [11]. Act of cognition is implicit in the fact of my existence; however, my being-in-the-world always remains the property of my "I".

Scientific and rational image of the world provides a total extrapolation of its principles to the whole sphere of the spiritual practice.

If, before the beginning of the twentieth century, philosophy and art though didn't determine the development of the worldview any longer, but still retained the function of cultural and historical reflection, the modern rationalism has questioned the need, opportunity and the very right to existence of such reflections.

Annex 1. Problem of the crisis of the rationalistic worldview reflected in the searches and debates of the twentieth century, which were attended by scientists from around the world. Michel Foucault proposes the concept of historical change of the mental prerequisites of culture and knowledge. Trying to "save" the modern type of scientific rationality and to justify the possibility of further development of scientific knowledge, Foucault returns to Kant's apriorism striving to find out, if historical increment of the very forms of prior knowledge is possible. In order to justify the development of modern epistemology, Foucault appeals to the existing semiotic relations, relations of "words" and "things", which, in his logic, determine the condition and type of episteme. As a result, the object of his research become speech practices formed on the basis of the semiotic field within the episteme. The scientist presents this field as a kind of three-dimensional space, in which modern sciences are distributed according to their functions, methods and goals. The first dimension is filled with exact (physical and mathematical) sciences, the fundamental method of which is deductive linearity and strict sequence of verified statements. The second dimension belongs to the domain of natural-scientific knowledge as well as of other empirical knowledge that doesn't have such a strict linearity, but seeks to systemize the causal relationships in order to gain structural permanence. At the same time, sciences, which are in the second dimension of the epistemological triangle, use actively the methodology of the exact sciences. But philosophy, understood by the scientist not as humanitarian knowledge, but in the narrow sense of *scientific reflection*, is the third dimension of the prerequisites of modern knowledge and it is in an active contact with the other two dimensions. As we can see from Foucault's diagram, there is no space not only for art, but also for the actual humanities, which are "dispersed" in the three-dimensional space of the epistemological space.

Annex 2. Another revealing symptom of awareness of the crisis of scientific-rationalistic image of the world in the Early modern period was the reflection on scientific knowledge and its prerequisites by the theorists of so-called "Vienna Circle" among the logical positivists.

M. Schlick and his followers advanced verification criterion as justification for a truly scientific knowledge. In their opinion, the scientific image of the world should be based on the principles of empirical verifiability and well developed algorithms of formal logical tools. All that locates beyond the verified statements and necessarily requires a conceptual foundation can't be therefore the subject of any scientific debates. So, not only metaphysics found itself behind the scientific image of the world, but also all the humanities as well as the spiritual culture in general.

Annex 3. Ludwig Wittgenstein, developing the concept of the "perfect language", created a universal logical and epistemological model of knowledge, in which the diversity of scientific and non-scientific semiotic systems effectively reduced to a set of elementary statements. Moreover, according to Wittgenstein, these elementary statements are evaluated on a two-point logical scale. Logical-mathematical statements, according to the Austrian positivist, represent the expression pattern of schemes of the formal transformation of meaningful statements about the world in general.

"Irrational" Consequences of Super-Rationalism: By the twentieth century, the implementation of rationalistic program has reached its peak. It can be concluded from the tendencies towards *self-negation* of rationalism subject to an axiological inversion. Anthropocentric purposes have failed to make man happier; on the contrary, he was lost in the world of the technetronic civilization, in the labyrinth of algorithms and utilitarian expedience. While ordering reality, rationalism has lost it, turning it into a mathematical symbol. In practical worldview rationalism has reborn as monetarism; abstract-numerical interpretation of the world becomes dominant in the public consciousness.

Extrapolation of commodity-money relations in the spiritual life as a whole provides an outlet of rational-economic values into the non-economic sphere of being.

Such extrapolation, in my opinion, is an ugly symptom only because provokes in worldview orientations, filling the spiritual life with out-spiritual intentions.

The worldviews of the end of the second millennium reflected the outcome of the *disintegration* of spiritual processes. The process of common spiritual disintegration affects not only the loss of a holistic

worldview of personality, but also the practical life of man, his mode of life, his way of existence. A social person in his or her practical activity is forced to be included into the process of disintegration, since his or her function in this process became the indispensable condition of the public status. The differentiation of knowledge generated the differentiation of practice: the division of labor has turned the whole man into a *specialist* closed on professional intentions. In its turn, the artificial restriction of the individual spiritual potentialities to narrow professional intentions has affected not only the loss of ideological orientations, but also the forced closure of the individual. The closure of human existence on the professional intentions triggered several negative side effects: the loss of intersubjectivity and communication, the increase of alienation and, with it, the growth of mental illnesses and suicide.

Annex 1. In its turn, the contradiction between the narrow reality of a professional and the infinite diversity of life makes a person to fill the social niches unclaimed by social order. The simplest and most common way to overcome this contradiction is the extrapolation of the professional intentions of man to the worldview as a whole. This subjective identification of professional reality and real life, the transfer of the "craft" settings to the whole diversity of spiritual processes has the *effect of intentional extrapolation*.

Annex 2. It is especially important to pay attention to the extrapolation of economical intentions, which generates a monetarist worldview, because at the end of the twentieth century style of thinking required a distinct economical color and the extrapolation of economical intentions, having reached a mass character, is already at odds with the highly professional orientations.

Economic rationalism is implemented in the orientation of the subject to unproductive forms of life.

At the time when the inner world of a person ceases to be self-sufficient for itself and loses the ability to obtain external intensives for self-development, comes a very natural psychological crisis. Awareness of the boundaries of self, of one's spiritual limit and, at the same time, awareness of the redundancy of the external world, which is not able to transform creatively (and even more-to implement itself) in my self, forces the individuality to seek additional funds in order to justify one's existence. In the end, the *crisis of self-sufficiency* stems from the awareness of the problem of existence itself, that is, at the time when the very fact of his

existence becomes a problem for human. This problem arises from the intuitive and informed opposition of the “Me” and “Not-me”, from the need of unity, of belonging to the external world, from the overcoming one’s own isolation and powerlessness. However, the overcoming of the isolation of one’s existence toward the external world is only possible through the creative implementation of *me-in-the-world* and of *the-world-in-me* that requires significant man’s volitional, mental, emotional and spiritual costs. If there is a lack of the capacity for the creative implementation of *me-in-the-world* and of *the-world-in-me* and the person isn’t in a position to develop it, the deep existential crisis is possible. Unwillingness to put up with his own isolation and powerlessness, on the one hand and the inability to spiritual perfection, on the other hand, forces a human to look for ways out of the negative psychological situation. Ideally, the most appropriate way out of it should be a natural human desire to develop one’s productive orientations, fight for oneself and the world at the level of spirit. Otherwise, the person gets in the way of pseudo-solutions being doomed to inevitable degradation. This degradation can occur in the forms of alcohol and drug abuse, it can end up a suicide, or, which is comparable; it may take the form of the *stimulation of monetary psychology*. The subjective granting of money with spiritual functions and the assignment of mythical attributes to it is a consequence of the disease state of mind, of a deep psychological crisis.

Identification of self-worth with the price of the accumulated capital and of the possibilities of my I with the purchasing power of cash is a consequence of the absolute form of the extrapolation of rational-economic intentions.

It’s easy to see that this identification inevitably leads to the alienation of human qualities. The evaluation of oneself, of one’s capabilities, the evaluation of the “I” according to the cash capital creates psychological dependence of the personality on living standards. Consideration of the person in terms of its ability to pay has led to the fact that the value of a person has been identified as its *purchase price*. Hence, the whole world appears to man as a commodity and is assessed in terms of its *venality*.

Annex 1. The relationship on a “buyer-seller” can only exist within sociality. Out of sociality such relationships aren’t possible. A salesman trying to sell spirit becomes a commodity himself. A buyer who seeks

to realize himself through money is identified with his capital, i. e. he becomes money. Any attempt to transfer the scheme of “buyer-seller” in the region of the spiritual involve alienation of humanity and in real life they always end in tragedy. The one who sells himself, being transformed into a commodity, in the end, always ceases to feel like a man, a spiritual being. The one who evaluates himself in proportion of his capital also has to identify his “I” out of himself. At the same time, the consciousness of both inevitably closes within the perverted understood subject-empirical being.

Annex 2. At a time when efforts to the development of individuality do not bring the desired results and turn out to be subjectively hopeless, there is a need to prove self-worth and self-sufficiency through the recognition of this fact by the external authority. This assumption already contains an insurmountable contradiction: the crisis of my “I” and my self-sufficiency must be overcome through recognizing my usefulness *beyond* my “I”. Obviously, such attempts are nothing more than an illusion as they clearly indicate on the recognition of the opposite thing-the insufficiency and depending of my “I” on external factors.

Economical rationalism like nothing else promotes the “objectification” of the world introducing objectivity in its absolute terms.

The idea of money lies in the fact that the elements of the subject-empirical being are presented in terms of their purchase (exchange) characteristic. The idea of money prefaces being with a number of conventions and assumptions. Money abstracts the world: in the light of money the objects of being are considered as *not having any qualities*. The only characteristic of the world objects recognized by money is defined as the ability of their exchange. In practice, this is possible when there are two assumptions: first, being should be nominal, deprived of its real qualities and secondly, an artificial quality-the quality of exchange-should be attributed to the objects of being. Only when these two conditions are fulfilled the objects of the empirical world can receive a conditional status of *goods*.

In essence, in the idea of money the qualitative characteristics of being are replaced by quantitative. The view of the world as a commodity transforms being into a conventional set of equivalent values. This, in turn, is possible only if all the elements of being are conventionally presented as *a pure (absolute) objectivity*.

Religious and Aesthetical Experience as a Verifiable Form of the Irrational System:

The principal limitation of any theoretical knowledge is that it is always mediated; the deepest tragedy of any mediated knowledge is that it is mediated by human consciousness itself.

No doubt, it would be folly to build epistemology expecting to evade the mechanism of mediation. But irrationalism and organicism don't aspire to such a problem: they only say that purely rational, theorized structures don't exhaust the whole cognitive capacity of the human intellect.

Where the logic, "common sense" is powerless or even harmful in the way of knowing the truth, there illogical, irrational mechanisms of obtaining and processing of information can be useful. And artistic-aesthetical experience understood as *an epistemology of the irrational* can be a very productive basis in the matter of organizing these mechanisms. It is, in this sense, if not a source of direct knowledge, but, in any case, coming very close to it, because a number of mediating links during the creation and perception of a work of art isn't assigned. Art doesn't just break the logic of common sense, but also destroys the mechanisms of self-limitation of consciousness, i.e. it is constructive. After all, logic and conceptual thinking in general are forms of knowledge and development of the world worked out by mankind and at the same time factors limiting this knowledge. Rationalized thinking, being verbal and discursive, is at the same time discrete, it's alien to the true dialectic.

Annex 1. The quest for a universal aesthetic idealization is caused by the overall "image of the world" produced by Russian worldview. With this aesthetic idealization is not only overcome the one-sided rationalistic worldview, but also produced a highly interesting view of man and the world in general, religion, social life and art itself. Art gets a function of the knowledge of life itself. Aesthetical experience is understood in this philosophical tradition as "chaste" knowledge combining a "whole wisdom", moral purity and the actual Truth. It's not only the knowledge in the proper sense of the word; it's also the "epiphany", "grasp" of the essence of being; it includes both understanding as the most valuable result of the cognitive process and empathic compassion with the object of knowledge.

Annex 2. The desire for a combination of the rational and the irrational, of the *mind* and the *heart* has already been observed in Russian literature of the XVIII century and in the materials of an earlier period before the secularization of philosophy. And in these materials it's easy to grasp this specific mystical start serving as a prerequisite of knowledge. As one of the major philosophical sources of Russian irrationalism (and mysticism as one of its forms) we must recognize nothing else than Orthodoxy. Exactly that turned out to be the Byzantine-Russian phenomenon, in which there was an irrational reinterpretation of Christianity. And we find exactly in Orthodoxy the interpretation of the heart as, in particular, the "second mind" both of the *gnostic* and the *super-intellectual* ability of man.

Aesthetic cognition is irrational in terms of its mechanisms, it is not guided by the hypothetical-deductive, but the emotionally-psychological structures of consciousness.

Not only the mechanisms of aesthetic cognition are irrational, but its objects as well. There is no secret that the spiritual life can't be subject to a complete and exhaustive logical analyze precisely because it has largely irrational laws.

Annex. There is, however, the interpretation of the irrational as of "not rationalized yet". Today, they say, something seems to us irrational, but tomorrow we will study this phenomenon and it will cease to seem to us as such. But we are discussing the thing that *fundamentally* can never be studied, brought into full conformity with prudence. When you try to rationalize these spheres of being, thinking inevitably becomes a dead end. And then the man has nothing left but to exclaim: "Madman! I wanted to understand with the cold mind something that you can only understand with the heart and feelings..." [12]. In its most general form the irrational can be defined as a special emotional and psychological state of a subject, by which it gets an access to the meaning of objects that in their nature are fundamentally not subject to rational and logical processing. It's clear that such knowledge is possible not only through the art and it's just a form of irrational knowledge, along with religious faith, intuition etc.

Art reproduces connections and relationships of spiritual being.

As knowledge, art, therefore, must to a large extent depend on some object, which we study through artistic contemplation. Question arises: what is known in the art? The correct answer to it will be the following: in the art life is known in all its diversity and integrity. Art, therefore, isn't only a *reflection*. If knowledge of the material world suggests its idealization, in the case with the knowledge of spiritual reality, the art doesn't idealize it, because their nature is *identical*. In art, the knowledge of the essence of being is administered, for the meaning of the universe is concentrated in the area of ideal relations.

Annex 1. Philosophy is a rational and discursive text and this is, in the opinion of Russian thinkers, its weakness. Art uses words not to make judgments and inferences, i.e. uses them formally and this is its strength. The transformation of philosophy in art, it is, above all, deprivation of the text of its discreteness and verbal. Music, as a form of art, in which the discreteness and the verbal are reduced, almost to zero, can serve as an *ideal model of a holistic expression of ideas*.

Annex 2. Russian philosophers were perfectly aware of the fact that any act of knowledge always has its rational and irrational sides. Science, as art, doesn't exist without intuition, inspiration. Art, too, contains rational moments, even though they are for it forced rather than essential. Any knowledge, action, perception is a synthesis of these two aspects of intelligence. To achieve the "integral knowledge" there is also required a combination of rationalism with irrationalism. Therefore, total rationality, denying the importance of the rational aspects of cognition has always been foreign to Russian philosophy. This is another reason why Russian philosophy didn't accept the system of Schopenhauer or, for example, Jacobi's research. In this sense, Russian irrationalism sought to develop an *organic* view of being.

Religious and aesthetic experience have a common irrational basis with creative productivity.

The fact that "mystique" and art have a common basis (i.e. – the irrational discretion of the irrational) is a very important observation, however, it isn't sufficient for their identification or even for recognition of their essential closeness. And the main difficulty here is the fact that "mystique", by definition, is a way to get *first-hand* knowledge, while art, considered from the gnostic point of view, has always been regarded as an

indirect knowledge. Whatever metaphysical content mystique may be filled with, it is, by definition, albeit conditionally, yet the direct vision of the essence, while art, at first glance, is a knowledge conjugated to a number of mediating links. If in mysticism the truth as such just appears to man, in art the way between the truth and the perceiving subject is far more complicated.

However, the truth in art, being objectively mediated through the author's consciousness and the object of art, subjectively creates a sense of immediate unity of the perceiving subject with the idea embodied in the work of art. The assumption of this relative mediation of artistic and aesthetic contemplation, considered in the gnostic perspective and of the conditional immediacy of mysticism makes possible their comparison and recognition of their apparent relationship.

Organic Model of Sofian Panaesthetism:

If we assume that the basic defect of rationality is the quest for absolutization of the subjective forms of being and the approval of creatively unproductive utilitarian-pragmatic intentions, then, apparently, the real overcoming of rationalistic worldview is possible on the way of a radically new vision, for which a compromise of subjective and spiritual forms of being and most importantly, a creative and productive approach to the man and the world would be typical.

We can build different models of worldview corresponding to these requirements, but we would like to dwell on the *Sophian* image of the world, which, of course, isn't only very beautiful and elegant, but also brilliantly grounded in theory and, in addition, has deep ideological roots in the cultural and philosophical traditions of Russia.

The natural course of history has led humanity to a qualitatively new state: the development of science, art, informational revolution, culture as a whole suggests humanity as an integral and independent organism.

The unity of our planet almost covers all the possible relations between its parts. We are seeing the interdependence of economic processes, which suggests global economy; we can see how environmental change

in one part of the Earth destroy the ecological balance in the other; the sphere is no longer a privilege of individual leaders. Any seemingly private action entails the transformations on a global scale. In short, at this stage of historical development we are witnessing the emergence of global civilization.

The list of processes and relationships, acquiring global status, would be incomplete and, in fact, meaningless, if we had not identified the spiritual aspect of global unity.

The spiritual unity of mankind is to be understood not as a universal solidarity or consent of the people on all issues, not as a process of standardization, erasing individual start. In our case we only need to fix the fact that the spiritual potency of humanity represents a unified and coherent field; it acquires ontological existence. The concepts of “social consciousness”, “public opinion”, “social psychology” is acquiring a more and more concrete form, become a quite tangible force to be reckoned with. Mankind has created the spiritual atmosphere that is beginning to correlate our understanding of the world.

Consciousness has created a world of spiritual values. All is spiritualized for a man. The idea is implemented in the whole structure of the material world. For human the universal permeation of the world with spirituality isn't something subjectively given, some man-made feature. For him it's the unconditional reality, part of being as such, a stable and full-fledged world. Consciousness has created a natural connection between man and nature and as a result of the tireless work of thought mind's joining the network of matter was so deep and organic, that the objective world today appeared before human as an inspired creation.

This connection between man and nature comes out in the form of thought, spiritual life. Moreover, we state that an idea is always full of material content and can't be without it; as well as nature gets inspired by man's thought by facing him.

Because of this interaction of spirit and matter such concepts as truth, beauty, goodness etc. arise, concepts that are meaningless outside the human mind. But, at the same time, these concepts are exactly what mankind

guides its knowledge to, not only knowledge, but also active action. Thus, a person creating a culture creates itself and, at the same time, the object of its knowledge. In this sense, the history of humanity is nothing more than a history of self-creativity and a history of the knowledge of this self-creativity.

It remains to add that the spiritual world, which results from universal creativity, can't be understood merely by rational means, only because such knowledge doesn't exhaust all the meaningfulness of a creative act and doesn't reveal the substance of reality as a pervading spirituality.

Annex. As an artist, whose creative potential isn't limited to, a person must mobilize its full spirit. In a creative act the non-rational ways of the development and understanding of reality come to the fore and their presence alone can guarantee a holistic view of the world. Sophian view of the world is difficult to describe in the subject-object categories-for humanity is represented here both as a subject and as an object of art. Therefore, in sophiology the very possibility of parasitism, selfish interest in one or the other event looks like a theoretically unfounded. At the same time the concepts of Sophia, the God-man, the unity of all have little in common with the pantheistic philosophy, with its inherent leveling of the individual for the common. The integrity of the ideal state of humanity provides complete freedom of its components, just as the unity of a beautiful necklace is caused by the unique brilliance of each of its diamonds.

CONCLUSIONS

Irrational system has no lesser degree of intersubjectivity than a system of rational type.

Like art, all science is aimed at truth. But the means that it chooses are largely opposite to art. It doesn't aspire to the increment of being. Physics, chemistry, mathematics are not interested in good, let alone beauty. The subject of their research is mostly abstract truth. In this case, the method of science is the ultimate objectification of phenomena, exposure of the material structures of an object. It removes layer after layer the spiritual strata from things regarding them as something subjective, artificially introduced, not expressing the real essence of things. In this way science works fine with its primary function: it solves the utilitarian tasks of humanity, helps people meet their practical needs.

However, its claims to the disclosure of the truth of the universe, to reveal the essence of the world are unfounded, because the meaning of all things lies neither in formulas and equations, nor in chemical reactions and biological structures. Science can study a person to its molecular structure, figure out all the processes occurring in it, but it would never answer the question: What is man? Science can easily show you what it the form of a symphony, make harmonic analysis, but it would never say what is music and wouldn't find any beauty in it. Science can analyze your action, make a list of the possible consequences, match it with the criminal code or the official morality, but it is powerless to answer unequivocally, whether it's good or evil, moral or not. In answering these questions science advises to be guided by pragmatic considerations, but this is not an answer, but an escape from the answer.

Science seeks the truth of the phenomenal world in its noumenal roots. It tries to find the sense of being in the out-spiritual field, oblivious to the fact that everything on earth is permeated with the idea. It yearns for objective truth and, on this pretext, brushes away all the human as subjective, all the perfect as irrelevant, ignoring the fact that its truth is a fiction outside man, outside of the human spirit.

Annex. But perhaps the most tragic contradiction of the exact sciences (as well as of consistent materialism and pragmatism) is that their goals are diametrically at odds with the results they receive. In an effort to objectify the world extremely and to unravel its secrets by analyzing the pure objects, science, in fact, like art, only gives a new phenomenological interpretation of things. *Active knowledge is a factor of the development of the world, of the self-discovery and self-formation of cosmic being... The knowledge of the tree is the development, the improvement of the tree, the actual implementation of the value in the plant world. Cognition is the sunlight, without being can't increase* [13]. It should be added that without that sunlight being not only can't increase, but also can't find it's meaning. The periodic table by Mendeleev no less inspires, *subjectifies* matter than "David" by Michelangelo. And Pythagorean theorem out of the phenomenal being has no more meaning than the "Liturgy" by Tchaikovsky. Unlike science, philosophy, religion and art are open about their devotion to spirituality and don't try to get the truth alienated from the spirit and, hence, from the ethical and aesthetic values.

Methods of the verification of a system can be based only on the axiological principles.

So far, the verification of statements, hypotheses and theories was carried out by means of logical verifiability. Logical verification of a system reveals its consistency. However, logical consistency doesn't identify the attitude of the theoretical system to reality itself. The principle of consistency verifies the system not in reality and for it, but only within the boundaries of logic itself. But the logical forms of the motion of thinking aren't the same as the forms of the existence of reality, only because consistency isn't a property of the latter.

Annex. Logical verification doesn't have access to the area of axiology. Scientific truth (derived by rational-logical methods) has no value content, as truthfulness here is understood as the itself-for-itself-value. However, the logical truthfulness of a system can't guarantee the absence of axiologically destructive consequences of its practical implementation.

Practical productivity of a system serves as criterion of axiological verification.

Empirical verification would make more sense, if it weren't just a statement of the efficiency of a theoretical system. The feature of any experiment is to answer the question whether the theoretical positions of the system are confirmed in practice. The question should be worded differently: is the practical implementation of the system constructive or destructive? Does it have constructive or destructive sense? As it can be seen, absolutely any system can be subject to such axiological verification: both of rational and irrational types.

REFERENCES

1. Lukes, S., 2007. The problem of apparently irrational beliefs. *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*.
2. Richardson, A., 2005. Reichenbach's disease and Mirowski's theory of knowledge? Or, will to power as philosophy of science. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science. Part A*, 36: 4.
3. Kassinove, H. and C.I. Eckhardt, 1994. Irrational beliefs and self-reported affect in Russia and America. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16: 1.

4. Sigmund, F., 1994. A Note on the Unconscious in Psychoanalysis / Sigmund Freud, psychoanalysis and Russian philosophy. Moscow, pp: 30.
5. Taittiriya, II, pp: 4.
6. Kena, II, pp: 3.
7. Mundaka, II, pp: 1.
8. Katha, I. 3. 10.
9. Chândogya, VI. 1. 3
10. Schelling, W.F., 1936.. System of transcendental idealism. L., pp: 387.
11. Heidegger, M., 1931. Sein und Zeit. Tübingen, pp: 61.
12. Baratynsky, E.A., 1981. On errors and the truth. Mind's magnificent feast. Moscow, pp: 43.
13. Berdyaev, N., 1989. Philosophy of freedom. Philosophy of freedom. The Meaning of the Creative Act. Moscow, 93: 80.