

The Essence of the Person as a Universal Determinant of the Social Future

Irina A. Dedova, Valery B. Golubev, Roman V. Moroz,
Pavel A. Romanov and Larisa G. Smirnova
Mari State University, Yoshkar-Ola, Russia

Abstract: In the study the models of the social future determined by the ideas of the essence of human nature are considered. As the subject material and the field for discussions philosophical ideas and works of the Russian literature of the 19th century are taken. This choice is caused by the features of the critical stage in the history of Russia which raised a question about the choice of a civilization way of development and consequently, about the best social system. In research the hypothesis of the driving force of the historical process characterized as a fundamental need of the person for recognition is made. What society is capable to combine in itself such mutually exclusive ideals as individual freedom and social justice? The historical experience in this sense is indicative, after all, the ideas of Russian thinkers are actual right now when not only Russia but also the world community in general try to find the solution of one of the most important problems of mankind: whether such a form of social life which will resolve a contradiction between the aspiration of the person to superiority and the need for equality is possible?.

Key words: Future, vechevoy ideal, thirst of recognition, individualism, irrationalism, inequality, equality, social justice, timos, human nature

INTRODUCTION

The philosophical concepts offering the models of the future represent not so much the prediction of empirical events but the understanding of history as a uniform, logically consecutive process which is considered with the help of the experience of all times and peoples. These are ideal constructions which basis is the view to the person and society from the point of view of the purpose and sense of their development. Many philosophical theories proceed from the statement that the evolution of the society isn't infinite, it will stop at the achievement of such a form which will satisfy the deepest and the most fundamental expectations of mankind, be it liberal democracy or communism.

However, many thinkers of the 20th century began to treat critically the thought that the history is the process logically consecutive and cognizable. The experience of the last century called into question the statements about the efficiency of the society's development on the basis of science and technology and forced to rethink the criteria of social progress. Pessimism is connected with the disappointment in the possibility of universal history to justify all sacrifice brought to the altar of the idea of universal happiness. Does it mean that it is necessary to refuse the concept of progress in general? In our opinion, the historical reality subjects to reconsideration not so

much the idea of progress but the criteria and factors of progress. The progress is expressed first of all in the accumulation and processing of information, in historical memory thanks to which the society does not simply repeat the past, but carries out the transition to qualitatively new forms of life.

To speak about historical progress and regress in general is possible if it is known where mankind goes or where it has to go. Such forms of social being as the purpose of history as "a civil society" and a constitutional state" (T. Hobbes, D. Locke), "liberal democracy" (I. Kant, G. Hegel, F. Fukuyama), "a classless society" (K. Marx), "an information society" (E. Toffler, U. Rostou), "an open society" (K. Popper), "a radio civilization" (A. Toynbee), "bogochelechestvo" (V. Solovyov), "superman kind" (Nietzsche), "a noosphere civilization" (V. Vernadsky), "an idealistic cultural super system" (P.A. Sorokin) can act.

Allegedly, there is so-called "human nature" that is more or less constant set of properties passions, desires, requirements, abilities, characterizing the person as an invariable being. At the same time, the nature of human wants changes from one historical period to another (that which is the object of desire of the modern European, wasn't known to the person of the era of the middle ages). These requirements are created by the person's contemporary environment and it in its turn is a product of the historical past.

One of the main tasks of social philosophical thought is the working out of the concept of the person allowing to define the main motives of human behavior as driving forces of history and thus to reveal the tendencies of further development of the society. This difference is in the fact that the person can define himself as a free and moral being and owing to this fact is capable "to project himself" to the future that is to create new, earlier not existing conditions of his own life.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the research, the materials of Russian fiction which contains philosophical ideas about the essence of the person in general and a Russian person in particular are used. Literature is a peculiar result of self-knowledge and historical self-determination of the people and gives an idea about the ways of development of a national ideal. The philosophical reflection over artistic images allows to define universal intrinsic qualities and needs of a person determining social future.

For the purpose of creation and confirmation of a hypothesis about the existence of a fundamental human need for recognition the comparative analysis of various philosophical concepts defining the purpose and sense of history is carried out. Also such methods as modeling, design and extrapolation allowing to calculate these or those forms of social life from anthropological characteristics are applied. To allocate the images of the best social future and to predict possible tendencies of social development, the methods of idealization and mental experiment are used. To compare and combine the opposite ideas connected with the aspiration of a person to superiority and to equality the dialectic approach allows.

RESULTS

To find out what can satisfy people in the most essential relations, the link to a certain constant, extra historical part of the human nature itself according to which it will be possible to judge about the fact how good or bad this or that political regime or social-economic system is. The concepts of "a natural person" or "pervochelovek" as the prototype being, possessing certain fundamental properties contain the answer to this question. Platon created the ideal scheme of a three part structure of the human soul according to which the desire (the longing soul), pride (a passionate or *timoticheskaya*, soul) and mind (a reasonable soul) direct man's actions. As the main incentive reason forcing people to unite in a society and to create a hierarchical system of social communications, some philosophers call the sensual

desire mediated by the reasonable activity in joint cooperation (Locke, Marx, Toffler), others "timos" (Hobbes, Hegel, Fukuyama). According to "the initial point" of the human nature one can allocate two rows of driving forces of history the fight for material benefits and the fight for prestige.

If only material needs in the form of a constantly extending horizon of desires were the main driving force of history, it would be impossible to explain "the ruptures" of history, war and sudden explosions of irrationality instead of quiet economic development. Only the economic motivation doesn't promote the understanding and prediction of political and social changes. So, the opinion that poverty and deprivations are the reason of revolution is standard. However, just before the French revolution of 1848 and in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century the period of economic recovery was observed. On the contrary, the economic growth generates new expectations and requirements. People compare their situation not to what it was earlier but to what it can be, orienting to more developed and fair forms of life. The person is a public being as his self-assessment depends on that assessment which is given to him by others.

T. Fukuyama, after Hegel, calls a basic need of the person the thirst of recognition. Only it can explain the fact that the person can wish the subjects completely useless from the biological point of view (for example, a medal or an enemy banner) and he wishes them not for the sake of them themselves but because they are desired by other people. But the *sotsiabelnost* of the person leads not to a peace civil society but plunges into a mortal fight for the sake of prestige. "Timos" what we call pride, self-esteem, vanity is the act itself of the estimation of the person, giving the price to himself and the requirement of its recognition. From here there is a special way of understanding history not as a product of science or logic of economic development but as emergence, growth and decline of *megalotimiya* the desire of the person to be recognized as the highest among other people (N. Machiavelli and F. Nietzsche mentioned about it).

The initial interactions between "the first people" generate unequal relations of a mister and a slave as a result of "the first bloody fight" (Fukuyama, 2004). Except the thirst of recognition there is one more important motive of human activity an instinct of self-preservation. Obeying this feeling, one of the fighters decides to accept the slave's life not to risk a violent death. After that the mister is satisfied as he risked his life and received the recognition from the other person for this. Thus, "the first society" was divided into "misters" ready to risk the life and "slaves" who don't want it. Many traditional

aristocratic societies initially arose from the aggressive nomadic tribes which won more peaceful peoples due to their ruthlessness, cruelty and bravery. After winning the Lord in the subsequent societies owned manors and played an economic role of the land-owners operating slaves-peasants. But the feeling of congenital superiority based on the readiness for a deadly risk remained a kernel of the culture of the aristocratic society for a long time. The duels and blood feud are the echoes of "the first bloody fight".

Timos can neglect the benefit for the sake of the achievement of the ephemeral purposes. Timos itself is irrational though during the stable historical periods it is under the control of the reason and "hides" in everyday life under different masks, for example in a competitive fight of politicians and businessmen or in sports competitions. However, during the periods of social crises a *timoticheskaya* part of a human soul promotes the growth of disorganization and pushes people to a basic change of a way of life. So, Dostoyevsky in the works showed the irrationalism of human nature. It is the requirement "to go too far" which is caused by the desire "by all means to declare himself in good or nasty" (Dostoyevsky, 1990). Vysheslavtsev wrote: "Now, when the Russian element has raged and threatens to flood the whole world, we have to tell about him (Dostoyevsky) that he was really the clairvoyant who showed something the most real and the deepest in the Russian reality, its hidden underground forces which had to break outside, amazing all the peoples and first of all Russians themselves" (Vysheslavtsev B.P., Dostoyevsky's Russian element (Cantor, 2000).

The recognition of irrationality of human nature in a new way allows to consider one of the main subjects of Russian literature of the 19th century the subject of "a little person" as a sociocultural factor of the development of the post-reform Russia. Pushkin and Gogol called this phenomenon "a small rank", Dostoyevsky "poor people", Dobrolubov "the exhausted people", Pomyalovsky "small people". "A little person" is a person from the bottoms who received the release from the state serfdom and came in the middle of the 19th century to a proscenium of public life but continuing to bear the spirit of the closed, local communal serf relations in himself. The requirement of recognition of the absolute value of everyone, even "the smallest" the person was shown in this social type. The future social harmony is necessary first of all for the sake of the personality: it means that the social system has to satisfy the main human wants including the requirement of recognition.

But further there is a question: Are the "benefits" of the democratic society really capable to satisfy "the

person as he is"? The analysis of numerous images of "little people" allow to assume that the source of sufferings of "a little person" is not only the autocracy, but his own archaism, isolation, unwillingness to be integrated into a big society. He constantly feels a complex of inferiority, offense, hatred and revenge to the highest layer. He strives for justice but he is morally powerless therefore he brings the threat of disorganization, split, destruction to a big society. Dostoyevsky's "underground" person as a modification of the type of "a little person" appears as a doubled, pathological basis of the development of the Russian society. The hero of "The Besy" Stavrogin in the suicide note made a sentence to himself: "only denial, without any generosity and without any force has poured out from me. Even the denial hasn't poured out. Everything is always small and inert ..." (Dostoyevsky, 1990). In the course of distribution of values of "a little person" to the whole society there is revolutionization of mass consciousness, archaization of culture, destruction of the sprouts of liberalism. Not the material culture but first of all the moral, ideas of social justice and the values of the personality which further led to communal values and to the absolutized "national truth" was a field of dispute on which the subculture of "a little person" was growing. The nihilist Bazarov declares to Kirsanov: "You blame my direction and who has told you that it is casual in me, that it isn't caused by that national spirit which you so much stand up for?" (Turgenev, 1986).

So, the condition of an inequality can't be completely satisfactory for "a slave". And this dissatisfaction forces him to wish changes. The slave starts finding the person in himself that person who he has lost for fear of violent death and finds as a result of work (Fukuyama, 2004). In the beginning, he works for the sake of satisfaction of his master but then the motivation of work changes: instead of fear there appears a feeling of duty and self-discipline and as a result the slave learns to inhibit the animal desires for the sake of work. The work teaches the person to the fact that he as a person is able to transform nature that is to create his own world.

Unlike megalotimiya the requirement of the recognition himself to be the highest in relation to others "the slave" proceeds from the principle of izotimiya the requirement of the recognition of himself to be equal to others. Already in ancient Indian and Greek doctrines the idea of internal freedom arises. But the idea of universal equality of all people before God on the basis of the ability to a moral choice in Christian religion appears to be the most effective. The Kingdom of Heaven gives a picture of such a world in which the izotimiya of everyone is satisfied. The Christianity cleared the fact that all

people potentially possess the equal advantage and equal value. Having carried out the transfer of a valuable aspect from external to internal, the Christian doctrine showed the conditional character of social inequality. The aged man Zosima in "Karamazov Brothers" says: "I dream to see and as if I already see our future clearly: it will be really so that even the most corrupted rich man in the long run will be ashamed of the wealth before the poor and the poor, seeing this humility will understand and will concede to it with pleasure and will answers his magnificent shame with caress. Believe that it will come to an end in such a way: it goes to that equality is only in human spiritual dignity and this will be understood only here. If there were brothers there will be brotherhood" (Dostoyevsky, 1990).

Then, the idea of the equality of the spiritual is transformed into the principle of universal equality of all before the Law and then it becomes revolutionary, having prepared events of 1776, 1789 and 1917. Many thinkers note a direct link between the Christian doctrine and the appearance of liberal democratic societies in Western Europe (Hegel, Nietzsche, Weber, etc.). The idea of socialism was a break into a new quality of a public system where the social status of the person out of property will become a basis of general justice.

That form of a social system which was considered fair in the West wasn't appropriate for the Russian radicals considering that the liberal state doesn't give simultaneous satisfaction of desire and timos but on the contrary reveals deep contradiction between them. The promise of universal mutual recognition in such a society remains unfulfilled as the economic inequality generated by capitalism brings to life the inequality of recognition.

Herzen tried to develop consistently the European ideas of progress, republic and democracy and came to a conclusion that if to build a new order on their basis, it is possible to come to despotism, even more terrible, than Russian. Progress subordinates the personality to the general movement of mankind, does it the means for the sake of the ephemeral purposes. The Republic showed the incompatibility of the brotherhood and equality with the civil society protecting the interests of property. Besides, many Russian thinkers saw the danger of the destruction of spiritual unity of the personality in the movement of the society on the way of economic progress. So, N.K. Mikhaylovsky sang of "a layman" that is a person who couldn't lose the integrity in himself. He let in the expression "a repenting nobleman" which meant the need of "the payment of a debt" to the people, the payment of the highest noble layer for all the centuries of their material welfare. "Populism" as the means promoting the

restoration of historical justice in its essence assumes the destruction of social hierarchy, the washing out of the borders between the layers.

The vechevoy ideal has ambivalent, dual character that can lead it to disintegration into two various ideals cathedral and authoritative. The rejection of the Western liberal model from the part of radical intellectuals in Russia was caused first of all by the aspiration to be exempted from the power of faceless establishments. The state which nullifies everything personal loses moral support from the society. So, the longing for the real master, the charismatic leader whose emergence was predicted by Dostoyevsky arises. It had to replace the callous state machinery by the dictatorship of the personified will. Thus, in the Russian consciousness two, at first sight, mutually exclusive models of the future connected: the promotion of "people", "weight" to be a decisive subject of history and the statement of the advantage and absolute value of the personality.

The absolutization of the personality is the other extreme in which timoticheskaya thirst of recognition can pour out. The realism carried out an attempt to develop logically a sverkhpersonalisticheskaya idea and to show its consequences. The literature of the 19th century recorded individualism growth the tendencies of individualism growth in the images of Raskolnikov and Bazarov a peculiar type of "the super person" who proclaimed "God died". One of such consequences is the motive of a crime for idea. The literature raised a question of a violence justification and then the historical reality of the beginning of the 20th century put the same question before the society. The acts of terrorism of 1905-1907 provoked the explosion of popularity of "Crime and punishment". The main subject of the novel "the murder for the idea" appeared to be in the centre of public's attention. Commenting on such a reading of Dostoyevsky's novel the prince E.N. Trubetskoy connected it with the maximalism of the endured era when the person realized himself as "the owner of that uniform rescuing formula which has to do much good for mankind" (Mogilner, 1999).

The person of a maximal type trying to resolve at once universal problems can't accept the life as it is therefore the victim appears to be the simplest and the most natural exit. Heroic self-renunciation can be based on egoism if it is connected with the desire to die owing to impracticality to it.

DISCUSSION

If the criticism of a liberal society "from the left" indicates the insufficiency of universal recognition, the

criticism “from the right” speaks about its redundancy. The people are initially unequal, and to treat them as equal means not to claim but to deny their human essence. In the human nature itself the denial of equal recognition as an ultimate goal is put. There is a question: does the recognition which can be universalized cost the fact to receive it? Will the universalization of recognition lead to its depreciation?

The bolshevist revolution which sought to create an equal society in the result built the society similar to a pyramid, with the “egocentric” system of the power (which first layers only fulfill orders) and “the cult of personality”. To make a revolutionary turnover and to create an absolutely new society, remarkable persons, leaders with strong will and intellect who “the masses” will follow are required. Therefore in the basis of the revolutionary movement the contradiction between the izotimicheskiye ideals of an egalitarian society and megalotimicheskiye types of persons necessary for its creation is put. And the emergence of such types is possible in the societies committed to the opinion that people aren’t created to be equal.

What will “the last person” become? Will he be able to sacrifice himself for the sake of the benefit of mankind? Or will he prefer comfort and personal wellbeing?

The people living in the 21st century start realizing that their “horizon” as the system of values and ideas is only one of the historical “horizons” which isn’t better and isn’t worse than others. The modern person possesses the historical experience of the past and therefore it is deprived of many “illusions” which pushed the former person to irrational acts. So, the present of Ivan Karamazov’s revolt is in the fact that neither the proof, nor the denial of God’s life worries him: “As for me, long ago I stopped thinking of the fact whether the person created God or God created the person?” (Dostoyevsky, 1990). Such thinkers as E. Toffler, not incidentally speak about the modern world of cultural relativity as “post-historical”: if there is no great purpose, there is also no history which moves to this purpose.

However, the irrational human nature acts against the fact that the person can be satisfied with the condition of “the eternal childhood” that is a happy full state, capable to turn back new slavery. If everywhere there is peace and prosperity, there will be people who will fight against peace, prosperity and equality. The person will intentionally look for discomfort and opportunity to sacrifice himself because pain and suffering will be the only way to show that he is a person.

The field for discussion is a question of possible options of a future social structure: what quality of a person will mostly define the course of history rationalism

or irrationalism? The first will lead to the creation of the economic community with the settled hierarchy. The second will provoke social shocks such as: war and sense of danger will become the only factor forcing people to unite to find national identity and the feeling of civic consciousness.

CONCLUSION

Contradictions are a driving force of social development. We considered the contradiction between the aspiration of the person to personal superiority and a social order as the universal factor defining the course of history. To understand the essence and to define the tendencies of social processes it is important to find out the ultimate goal assumed by the person, the people and the mankind in general as a moral and political ideal. This purpose is caused by the fundamental need of the person which remains in a rather invariable look throughout all the history. Such a need is “the thirst of recognition”: it does the person a social being that is anxious not only for self-preservation but also for continuous comparison of his own status with the status of others. The fight for recognition leads to the initial division of society into unequal in legal relations groups.

Socio-political processes at the turn of the 19th-20th centuries in Russia awakened to life that, that Platon called “timosy” a strong-willed, proud part of a human soul forcing the person to look for such a way of social life which is capable to satisfy the need for recognition of his personal dignity, in the absolute value of his own I. However, the Russian national consciousness embodied in the works of fiction showed the ambivalence of the timoticheskaya thirst of recognition. On the one hand, it was expressed in the requirement of the general legal and property equality. On the other hand, it was embodied in the revolt of the personality against the existing social order. The literature raised an important question before the society: can the person in principle be satisfied with any social structure?

The Russian culture “tried on” on its national soil some models of social future created by the European civilization from liberal capitalist to socialist. But none of them finally resolved a contradiction between the personal liberty and social harmony. It is supposed that exactly this contradiction led to the creation of a social structure, specific to the Russian civilization, seeking for the destruction of hierarchical communications with the support of a cathedral, vechevoy ideal and at the same time creating rigid hierarchy with absolute personified power.

REFERENCES

- Cantor, V.K., 2000. Judge God's Creature: The Prophetic Pathos Dostoevsky. Rosspen Publishing House, Moscow, Pages: 422.
- Dostoyevsky, F.M., 1990. Complete Works. Vol. 30, Nauka Publishing House, Saint Petersburg.
- Fukuyama, F., 2004. End of History and the Last Person. Moscow Publishing House, Moscow, Pages: 588.
- Mogilner, M., 1999. Mythology of the Underground Person: A Radical Microcosm in Russia of the Beginning of the 20th Century as a Subject of the Semiotic Analysis. Moscow Publishing House, Moscow, Pages: 208.
- Turgenev, I.S., 1986. Complete Works and Letters. Vol. 12, Nauka Publishing House, Moscow.