



DE LA FILOSOFIA POLITICĂ LA FILOSOFIA LIMBAJULUI. (INSPIRAȚIA DISCURSULUI FILOSOFIC ÎN STRATEGIILE CONTEMPORANE ALE SUPRAVIEȚUIRII UMANITĂȚII)

Alexandru KYRYCHOK, *doctor în filosofie, Academia de Științe,
Ucraina*

Rezumat

În acest articol autorul supune analizei potențialul cognitiv al filosofiei politice, care poate deservi comunicarea politică, mai ales în domeniul supraviețuirii lumii contemporane. Autorul promovează ideea comunicării și înțelegerii, pe care o poate valorifica doar filosofia politică. Actualizând tezele lui Aristotel despre importanța politicii, autorul conchide că politica integrează toate domeniile activității umane, orientându-le către realizarea intereselor statale.

Cuvinte-cheie: *filosofia politică, problemele globale ale omenirii, strategia supraviețuirii omenirii, filosofia limbajului, filosofia practică.*

FROM POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY TO PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE (INSPIRATION OF PHYLOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE IN MANKIND'S SURVIVAL STRATEGY)

Abstract

The article analyzes the possibilities of active involvement of political philosophy in the discussing and solving of global problems of the world and making up of mankind's survival strategy. It is suggested that political philosophy can take its rightful place in these processes, if it draws closer together with philosophy of language and practical philosophy.

Keywords: *political philosophy, global problems of humanity, mankind's survival strategy, philosophy of language, practical philosophy.*

Introduction. The role of political philosophy in addressing global challenges of our time is sometimes compared with the role of a clown (Kierkegaard's well-known parable), sent to announce the fire in the theatre [6, c. 55]. Indeed, in the world of big politics and big money, appeals or philosophers' warnings often cause some rather special kind of sympathetic irony, but not the willing to listen and act. In this regard, they often talk about "crisis" of political philosophy [See., Eg: 7] or even that it "died" [12, p. 9] and "in general no longer exists, except as a matter of burial ..." [15, p. 23]. However, the fact of its final institutionalization in the twentieth century, theorists' activity as Leo Strauss, Isaiah Berlin, Hannah Arendt, John Rawls, the presence of periodicals, known all over the world, show that in fact there was not crisis but repression of political philosophy at the coast of public discourse and practical political life associated with its appeal to the supreme and external to the policy ideas, primarily moral, which are not very much liked by modern politics. "Thus, - writes J. Rancière, - at the same time with the restoration of political philosophy, plenipotentiaries are increasingly excluded from it" [8, c. 12-13].

Meanwhile, as pointed out by John Dunn, in his interview to "Russian Journal" for May 7, 2009: "The history of mankind - is not just cause and due process, it is part of the causal process of the universe development ... or today, people will be able to provide themselves with safe existence, or they will simply cease to exist. I mean the environment and many other



global problems. ... If people do not get their act together, they are doomed to extinction ... So ... political philosophy not only can, but must have the future, as its future is the future of all mankind “[3].

In this article we will try to briefly outline some of the features of the active inclusion of political philosophy in the discourse around global issues of our time.

The results of the study. The main theses of this study are as follows:

1. Political philosophy can take its rightful place in the discussion and solving global problems, if it appeals to the rich heritage of the philosophy of language and writing. Returning to the following quote by John Dunn, you can see that the authoritative British philosopher actually defines the task of political philosophy as the provision of joint actions in the context of the survival of humanity on the basis of mutual understanding. Political philosophy, in essence, is understood as the philosophy of language, focused on political practices. Such an approach, as the experience of the study of Western philosophical thought of the postwar period shows, is not the only one. Namely language, lately, more and more becomes the leading theme of political philosophy, which developed after the “linguistic turn” [See .: 16], as can indicate, for example, English-language historical and political tradition, and namely the works of philosophers who have united around Peter Laslett’s project «Philosophy, Politics and Society» [12], an appeal to the language policy by Thomas Weldon in his «The Vocabulary of Politics» [17], the activity of the “Cambridge school”, primarily Quentin Skinner [14], John Pocock [13] and already mentioned, John Dunn [9], the French tradition of studying politics in terms of language that appeared in the works of F. Lyotard [11], J. Ranci re [8], V. Descombes [4, 5], and others.

2. In this context, the political philosophy must turn to its own traditional philosophy of language, the problem of understanding and mutual understanding. In a situation when political philosophy, together with other intellectual and public discourses is designed to form a verbal basis for concrete and practical action on human self-preservation and continuation of its sound development, namely the international and intercultural understanding becomes the main task. But namely this (understanding), as one of the central problems of the philosophy of language becomes, in particular, the problem of political philosophy, considered as a philosophy of language, and the search for the boundaries of understanding refers to the issue of correlation of political action by the international community. Now Vladimir Vernadsky’s last lifetime publication is often quoted - the article “A few

words about the noosphere” (it was published in 1944 in the journal “Advances in modern biology”), in which the famous scientist provides the requirements for humanity entry into the phase of “human civilization”, where intelligent, modest and thoughtful attitude to the world in which we live, as well as the unity of all people in the world and mutual consent will dominate. Vernadsky not only emphasizes the decisive role of rationality in man (“His (human) power is not associated with his matter, but with his brain, his mind and his mind being directed by his work” [1]), and also stresses that this new civilization will only appear “if he (the man. - A.K.) understands this and will not use his mind and work on self-destruction” [1]. According to V. Vernadsky, a man, who emerged as a subsystem within the biosphere as a whole organism, enters into a phase of noosphere, which is accompanied by increased power of man, active human encroachment into the biosphere and, as a result, opportunities arise to destroy biosphere, hence, to destroy itself. According to this, the emergence of noosphere should be thoughtful and rational and implemented by unification of humanity that respects democracy and freedom of thought. “The historical process we are witnessing is fundamentally changing, - says Vladimir Vernadsky. - For the first time in human history, the interests of the masses - one and everybody - and free thinking of the individual determine the life of mankind, and they are a measure of people’s notions of justice. Mankind, taken as a whole, becomes a powerful geological force. And in front of him, in front of his thought and work, there is the question of biosphere restructuring in the interests of freely thinking humanity as a whole. This new state of biosphere, which we are approaching, without noticing, is “noosphere” [1].

If even one accepts without objection scientist’s rationalist pathos, some points in his reflections are still problematic. First of all, humanity as a “whole” clearly provides for joint action, without which it is impossible to preserve and develop it. But “free-thinking humanity”, if Vernadsky meant the real freedom of thought in the modern sense, and not, for example, freedom from prejudice, in any case, within certain limits, will be “freely acting mankind,” and discussion about the limits or the rules of this action are inevitable. From this point of view, the question of discourses incompatibility in contemporary, for example, French philosophy is not just a problem, but in some way manifestation, such as in the concept of F. Lyotard’s incompatible phrasal modes, where discourses conflict, the discourse violence over another is inevitable. Philosopher sees in this, in fact, a mix of fields of language philosophy and political philosophy: “... linking



one phrase with another is problematic and this problem is a policy problem” [11, p. 13].

However, such a demonstration, if the language is regarded as a condition of general action, in fact, means the impossibility of heterogeneous discourses rooted in different cultures, to come to a common denominator, including in the settlement of global problems. The world's problems, of course, are integral and interrelated, but have two sides: the social and natural one. And if for some solutions of global problems that are identified as “social” (problems of cultural anomie, ethnic conflicts, etc.) the recognition of diversity and cultural identity, of course, is necessary, to deal with, for example, environmental problems that belong to the group “natural” problems, require joint decisions and actions of all mankind, and, decisions should be uniform. In F. Lyotard's language, the program of solving environmental problems - there is another main narrative, legitimizing whole series, including political practices. Jacques Rancière, who, like F. Lyotard, approaches to politics through the philosophy of language, considers somewhat different kind of understanding of the situation, which he refers to the term “disagreement» («*mésentente*»), unlike Lyotard's “divisive» («*différend*»). “Under disagreement we will understand a certain type of speech situation: when one of the interlocutors at once understands and does not understand what the other says. Disagreement is not a conflict between those who say “white”, and those who say “black.” It is a conflict between those who say “white”, but understand this is not the same, or do not understand what the other means by the same whiteness” [8, c. 15] - wrote the philosopher. Thus, the emphasis is not on the conflict rules of discourse and action, but on the difference in understanding the basic tokens and their method of communication with things. “Disagreement does not affect the question of phrases diversity modes and presence or absence of rules for assessing diverse types of discourse - says Jacques Rancière, arguing with F. Lyotard. - It affects not only the argument but the argued, the presence or absence of a common object between X and Y” [8, c. 17]. Adhering to this position in the field of global problems and strategies of survival of humanity, one could word the question of cultural and individual differences in understanding and defining the basic concepts that describe a person's life and his main existentialities (freedom, equality, justice, natural law). Let us note that the named representatives of the French philosophy enter in polemic conversations with modern German researchers of policy and language, in particular K.-O. Apel and U. Habermas, although the first and second repelled in their reflections the concept of “language games” of late L. Wittgenstein; try to address the issues of

mutual understanding in the context of Anglo-American “linguistic turn”, and sometimes their positions are similar. For example, J. Ranci re’s emphasis of attention on the political articulation, ensuring the existence of policy on the whole, is linked to U. Habermas’s concept of “publicity” (  ffentlichkeit) [See .: 10] and refers to the statement of the need for continued support of the discourse of contemporary global problems that arose after the first reports of Rome Club.

3. From the foregoing considerations it is clear that one of the conditions for the incorporation of political philosophy in the process of discussion, negotiation and implementation of strategies for the survival of humanity in the modern world is to focus political philosophy on political practice. In other words, political philosophy will only be able to take its rightful place in the public discourse around global issues of our time, when it becomes not only the philosophy of language, but also practical philosophy. French philosopher V. Descombes, successfully combines philosophy of language with political philosophy and philosophy of action, understands “political judgment, as such, that” leads practical implications for the subject of formulating this judgment “[5]. Despite the complexity to make judgments in clear distinctions, in relation to our subject matter, it can be argued that the wording of philosophical statements indirectly dependent on the successful promotion of humanity to address global challenges of our time, which can, on the one hand, be ascertained, analyzed and described, and on the other - be considered in terms of practical steps to address them. Although descriptive statements already contain, in a latent form, course of action, the second type of statements impels more to action. But we must not forget that the relationship between statements and actions is not causal but modal. Man as a free being, even with instructions for action, always stops in front of a choice - either to carry out the proposed program in practice or not. However, is political philosophy able to be qualified for the solution of practical problems, for example, in the field of environmental protection, combating international conflicts, nuclear disarmament and the like, which in their aspects as if extend beyond practices and are the prerogative of environmentalists or globalists. V. Descombes believes that political statements are architectonic art [5], similar to that which Aristotle describes in the first book “Nicomachean Ethics” (1094a 25). Recognizing each occupational autonomy and their own purposes, policy binds them together. Without seeking, for example, to establish rules for the doctor, pointing to him how to treat the patient, policy establishes how many doctors should be in the state and how much they need to be paid. Similarly,



with respect to the global issues of our time, the development of specific environmental technologies, solutions of demographic and other problem are the prerogative of specialists in these areas, in relation to which policy performs “architectonic” (communication and distribution) functions. Each activity in this direction establishes its own system of rules, and only politics is a somewhat general disposition. The role of political philosophy in this process, in our view, is to define the goals of political activity and the semantics of general concepts and ideas that define these rules. For example, political philosophy can define self-preservation or tearing, as one of the goals of the state and humanity, to develop this concept and the idea of survival, policy can build architectonics and distribution of functions in this area, and specific human activities are practical recipes for their implementation. Partially Edmund Burke was right when he said that theorist and philosopher’s goal is to indicate the true purpose of the state, and the case-practice policy’s goal is to find appropriate means to achieve these goals [Op. for 2, p. 54].

Conclusion. Theses expressed above do not settle the issue of political philosophy representation in the discourse strategies of survival of mankind, but rather push on further reflection. However, we think that proposed approach here will be of interest both from a theoretical and a practical side for political philosophers to find their place in the solution of global problems of our time.

Bibliography

1. Вернадський В.И. Несколько слов о ноосфере // [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://vernadsky.lib.ru/e-texts/archive/noos.html>
2. Гаджиев К.С. Введение в политическую философию: Учебное пособие. – М.: Логос, 2004. – 336 с.
3. Данн Дж. Политическая философия – будущее человечества [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://www.russ.ru/pole/Politicheskaya-filosofiya-budushee-chelovechestva>
4. Декомб В. Інституції сенсу / Пер. з фр., післямова та примітки О. Йосипенко. – К.: Український Центр духовної культури, 2007. – 368 с.
5. Декомб В. Філософія політичного судження [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://rethinkingdemocracy.org.ua/themes/Descombes2.html>
6. Кьеркегор С. Или-или. – СПб.: Издательство РХГА: Амфора, 2011. – 823 с.
7. Политическая философия в России: Настоящее и будущее: материалы круглого стола, проведенного журналом «Вопросы философии» совместно

с факультетом политологии МГИМО и журналом «Полис» // Вопросы философии. – 2002. – № 4. – С. 3–30.

8. Рансьер Ж. Несогласие: Политика и философия/ Пер. с франц. и прим. В.Е. Ланицкого. – СПб.: Machina, 2013. – 192 с.

9. Dunn J. The Cunning of Unreason Making Sense of Politics Basic Books, 2000. – 401 p.

10. Habermas J. Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Suhrkamp. – B.: Neuwied am Rhein, 1962. – 310 s.

11. Lyotard J. F. The Differend: Phrases in Dispute / Translation by G. Van Den Abbeele. – Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988. – 208 p.

12. Philosophy Politics and Society / Ed. P. Laslett. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. – 184 p.

13. Pocock J.G.A. Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History / J.G.A. Pocock. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. – 299 p.

14. Skinner Q. Visions of politics: V. 1: Regarding Method / Q. Skinner. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 209 p.

15. Strauss L. What Is Political Philosophy and other studies / L. Strauss. - Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988. – 320 p.

16. Towes J.E. Intellectual Theory after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience / J.E. Towes // American Historical Review. – 1987. – Vol. 92. – Nr. 4. – P. 879–907.

17. Weldon T. The Vocabulary of Politics / T. Weldon. – Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1953. – 199 p.

der_schura@hotmail.com

Data prezentării: 20 decembrie 2014