

ANTHROPOIC PRINCIPLE AND "OBSERVER OF NEOCLASSICAL TYPE" IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL THEORY

Gennadij P. Menchikov, Kazan Federal University
Anton S. Krasnov, Kazan Federal University

ABSTRACT

In situation of formation of contemporary neoclassical philosophy the problem of anthropic principle and observer of modern type becomes actual. The world philosophy made three major attempts to "turn to a man". In classical period of world view it was made in form of such position as "anthropocentrism"; in neoclassical period - in form of "anthropological approach"; today, in forming neoclassical world view - in form of "anthropic principle". Differently from previous turns to a man, the "anthropical principle" detects a principally new "reasons" and new proportion between the universe and a man. First, between the universe as open system (synergetics). Second, between the universe and presence in it of such eternally existing phenomenon as life and not of epiphenomenon of a man-anthropos, therefore, other observer - observer of neoclassical type too. In the article is explicated other determinacy, nature of neoclassical situation and such neoclassical "world-man" proportion and not object-subject proportion, as previously. The situation of non-uniformity, but inevitable co-evolutionary co-equality between man and nature, between existence of observer of other neoclassical type and observed properties of the universe, neoclassic specifics of which is still should be researched, is grounded.

Key words: neoclassic philosophy; open and closed system; co-evolution; anthropic principle; fractal determinism; observer of neoclassical type

INTRODUCTION

At the turn of XX-XXI centuries, via synergetics and situational approach, the situation of re-discovery of the universe, place and role of human-anthropos in it, becomes unprecedented. Today the world had already evidently came across as not just globally evolving, but co-evolving, universal, branch-like self-organizing and self-developing system. Distinguishing "absolute" and "ideal", it can be said that for the first time the world came across as *the world without Absolute*, as *the left-alone-universe*. Arrival of neoclassic philosophy, including such main novelty, shows (see works of late J. Derrida (Derrida, 1997), E.N. Knyazeva (Knyazeva, 2015), V.A. Lektorskii (Lektorskii, 2015), V.S. Stepin (Stepin, 2012) and many others), that co-evolution is a stage of a *new, qualitatively different type of thinking and behavior of mankind in the universe*, not of any kind, but only of allowable attitude of a man to himself, this is a new stage of ecological imperative and a man, new mechanisms and ways of integration process of a man and nature, new quality of their convergent interactions. Under such quality are understood new interactions: not only with its nearest part – "geographical environment", "cosmos", but already with eternal-endless Existence. In which is actively present an eternal form of existence as *a life that happened* in form of *anthropos* – "observer" on level of a man.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Until last third of twentieth century the idea of anthropic principle was one of the major, but in cosmology. The largest "turns to man" had happened several times. Detection of properties of "anthropic principle" and "observer of neoclassical type" will be more fruitful is to compare them with previous ones: "anthropocentrism". Their comparativistics shows that the first one, "*anthropocentrism*" proceeded from classical world understanding, eventually from the closed ultimate secluded picture of the world, from linearly established Order, Correctness, created and sanctioned by some *External Absolute*. Assuming this, a man is explained in brought from outside, supernatural manner that is a support of not itself but some Absolute or man assimilating himself to absolute. Unwillingly a man started to be envisioned as the "center" on the universe, and as an observer, positioned seemingly *over* the world, *absolute transcendental and outside external observer*. As observer, he strives to absolute truth, not blurred by subjectiveness and subjectness, in his opinion. This particularly happens in "prosperity periods" of classical type of the world view, when a man was outshines by reducibly understood mind, "absolute mind of the Universe", turned into "absolutely reasonable Order". Such "pandeterminism, similar to infective disease" (Frankl, 2006) had infected a significant part of mankind.

"*Anthropological approach*" is determined by seemingly diverse, neoclassical picture of the world. But the picture of the world itself stays the same, relativist-absolutist, relativism became the Absolute, the form of Absolute had changed: now as absolute happened to be accepted not Order, but Chaos; and "rational fascism" and "madness in classic era" were replaced, we can say, by irrational fascism (Deleuze et al., 1972). It seemed that a man came to envision himself being "*already in the world*", in quality of seemingly *internal observer, but immanent*, i.e. thrown in bu Absolute from without, but now by irrational, schizoid Absolute. As observer a man turned into confused observer - "narrativist", "nomadologist" living in ontological instability (Saykina and Krasnov, 2015). The life started to be thought as unity of fluxes of becoming with biased basis. The world appeared as plan on which heterogenetic multiplicities, "multiplicities-without-unity" are roaming, homeless in existence, with involvement "into Universal game" (Badiou, 2004). Views of anthropos as observer on his "emergence", status, place and role in life of the universe, in cognition of the universe had changed a little.

In *anthropic principle* (AP) the view of a human in the universe had significantly deepened and also received another name – "anthropic principle". Attempt to answer fundamental questions of being, human-anthropos' being are based here on principally other basics already: on qualitatively other non-absolutist picture of the world; on view of the world as opened synergetic system; on absence of closure and surrounding by extramundane, on absence of creative ability of the world and existence of some Demiurge over the universe, rational and irrational by his nature; on removal of problems of the universe's origin in general; on a-dykhotomy of matter and spirit in being; on eternally-endlessness, fractality, self-organization and self-development of the universe which is proved by synergetics. The AP was formulated for the first time by B. Carter in 1973, but then received a development mostly in cosmology. Previous classic science was interested in quantitative correlations. The non-classic science was already in target too – "life provision", but not the life itself as phenomenon of being, but non-epiphenomenon. In neoclassical philosophy the principal criterion of reality and all science became wider and more essential, it's "the life", "the life itself" and the life of a human in the universe. Thus occurred synergetic extension and deepening of anthropic issue, the development of "anthropic principle" itself too.

RESULTS AND THEIR DISCUSSION

In philosophy of XXI century the anthropic principle started to include a certain *structure* of neoclassic problems too, already: - problem of explanation of human "genesis" and "essence": a-genesis and non-epiphenomenality of human-anthropos existence in the universe; - problem of inevitability of co-evolution thinking and behavior of a human in the world - problem of overpopulation and adequate population growth, ways of its solution; -problem of inevitability of optimization of social management and manageability on a newly opened world; - problem of peculiarities of observer of a new neoclassic type in the universe.

Differently from previous turns to a human, in AP the problem of so-called "genesis" of a human and his "essence" and "phenomenality" is solved in a different manner. And namely: on basis of the fact that the world is the open system; relaying on versions of anthropic principle - weak, strong and over-strong; here is distinguished the universe in general and the worlds as our Universe that are not opposed, but also not identified. Finally, if to take a world as integrity, then in AP the human-anthropos (observer) is viewed in *a-genesis* way, not happened but *eternal* and not supernatural (over the world and/or thrown in the world) element of the universe and inherent to essence of eternity, *naturally-existing* in the world; eternal. It became clear that the universe had one "almost improbable peculiarity": the universe is such as it is, and a human "constitutes a necessary natural element" in it. On a certain stage of nature's evolution, a human-anthropos is seemingly envisaged by nature as *observer*, and at this an act-**I**-ve observer of the universe: neither human, nor nature can exist without each other. Fundamental world constants (electro-magnetic, gravitational, strong and weak interactions) here are such from which follows that a man, human, social-cultural existence.

Regarding "our" Universe, here the problem is in the fact that fundamental physical constants are providing the existence not only of human, but also of animals. Even amoeba is observing the world in its manner, in order to receive the information about food, danger. A rightful question appears: how the nature received "such senseless sense of purpose?". How and where did a human-anthropos emerged from? Or is it an incorrectly put question?

In order to ground such extremely complicated fact as emerging and / or did the living creature of *Homo sapiens* type emerged on our planet, in neoclassic philosophy are used the contemporary world-viewing methodological approaches. Such as: understanding of differences of open and closed systems; grounding of existence of eternity of living; life in the universe and eternity of human in it, in open endless-eternal world, in "the world of the worlds"; neoclassical type of determinism (recursive or fractal determinism); clinamen situation - spontaneous deviation of atoms from vertical straight line, fragment of the Universe from the line of global evolution; inverse analysis of phase passages logistic; trans-disciplinarity, hybridity of fundamental researches; insights and empiric researches conducted by Darwin that were left unnoticed are taken into account more thoroughly.

On basis of all this AP postulates the formation and existence if a human in the universe. The fact of "emerging" and existence of *Homo sapiens* type is seen the fact that as in each of "world of the worlds", in bifurcation point a certain vector accidentally and spontaneously *deviates* from the line of *branch-like* global evolution, in which at combination of conditions the formation of new, human reality is continued. So complicatedly forming bifurcation-co-evolution phenomenon of being as a human on our planes had emerged and formed not in rectilinear-regular and not in supernatural manner, but *each time emerges naturally* and in probable-regulated manner and, seemingly, not on the Earth only. Besides, universal evolutionism confirms that a human mind and its cognitive abilities and also a human culture

were developed in course of natural selection, but not by simplistically understood evolution, but synergetically acting co-evolution. And the natural selection is not simple itself, without mentioning the participation of mutations. This evolution nuance, sometimes forgotten, is brought in by Darwin himself: "when is told that one or another part of body is adapted for performance of a certain task, one should not suggest that at first it was formed for performance of this task only too. It seems that usually everything happens in another manner, and the part of body that initially performed one task is adapted via slow changes to performance of completely other tasks". So, in AP it turns that *human emergence cannot be a result of rectilinear evolution in general, and anthropogenesis is incorrectly considered as once occurred genesis and unified linear natural process*. In result of branch-like, evolutionary-co-evolutionary processes, *each time* (see speculations-theories of anthropic-social-cultural genesis: panspermia; paleo-visit; saltation, mutation, neocatastrophis; evolution-labor theory that now are not taken trust today, and neither are disposed of, but continue to be studied) in point of bifurcation *the branching into human type Homo sapiens* was not and never is an immediate and some noisy fact; it's a lengthy and, seemingly, repeated event, and not only for us, earthmen, *event of the universe* that is bringing on us, earthmen, a particular responsibility only.

AP also impacted the change of *major question of philosophy*. In neoclassical philosophy such question became *the proportion of being and non-being*.

"Non-classic human started to notice the complicity and dynamism of the world, but as observer. After straining himself by "over-strong" AP (transformed creationism) he started to sink either into fatality of "being only powerless of logical-absurd course of events", or into radical relativism and social-cultural hysterics: using sophisticated constructing of replacement of theses, representations.

And now the "neoclassical human", in connection of complicity of the world, exploits of people and advanced *real* problem *to be or not to be* ("global problems of modernity") is *forced* to remember this most extreme philosophic question – of being and non-being. That's why such new neoclassical human is forcedly looking at the worlds and everything in it from the most first-fundamental position – to be and/or not to be a life, humankind on our planet, transposed in global evolutionism and co-evolution, and only them goes further in solution of other major philosophic questions. Therefore, due to principally different funding basics, in AP are distinguished different types of observer too: "observer of classical type", "observer of non-classical type" and "observer of neoclassical type".

Differently from observers of classical and non-classical type, the observer of neoclassical type (ONT) is organized in more complicated manner. What are his peculiarities?

1) ONT is, first of all, a *real* observer already. First of all, he has completely different, impartial, initial basics, as it was previously. In synergy picture of the world, ONT is for the first time really overcoming *absolutist* (classical and non-classical) *understanding of the world*; "desymbolization of Absolute" happens. The observer of such type, same as the humankind, enters into post-utopian era for the first time. ONT is forming the adequate understanding of what the real is, for the first time.

ONT understands the agenesity and non-epiphenomenality of such form of being as *life*, for the first time. For the first time the ONT has, in fact, other goals, ideals – the life, and not something outside and over the life. Previously there was always something more important than life. He forms other type of understanding of determinacy of both the whole universe and relatively terminal phenomena in it: this is the fractal type of determinism instead of linear and non-linear. Now "the observer-participant can acquire the "meta-objective position", acquire the

freedom from force of happening", living in this world of complicity, feeling himself non-accidental and non-thrown in it. And in ontology of a human he expresses himself realistically. Differently from previous types of observers, he "tries to overcome extremities and dead-ends, on one side, of abstract ontology in general, deprived of a human, and on the other side, of so-called practical anthropology, deprived of being."

2) ONT is already the *holistic* observer. Striving finally to think in realistic manner, the ONT becomes capable to base on really *integral* and at the same time mundane world. And not only on its part, on our Universe or on presence of extramundane world, or on their eclectic combination. ONT is able to see the world in general and at any point of the universe as unclosed open self-organizing self-developing non-creationist system on the basis of quantum properties of the world and psi-function of each of its objects. Linguistic turn. a new era of information technologies allow to discover and construct the information ("constructive realism in epistemology") and bring in to all those who wish. Conscience of ONT as a perceiving creature is a kind of ecosystem housing of system studied, it is already possible "with taking account of the thought about thought", with shifting of knowledge of such observer into the vivid world.

3) ONT is the *included* observer. Inclusion of observer is expressed in inherence of the observer from the observed. As human is a creation and belonging of the same mundane being, then the being is in fact observing itself via human. The real observer is the researcher, the scientist, usual people – we, the human-anthropos. Our subjective characteristics of observations (of researcher, scientist, usual people - human-anthropos) are translated to the real system. The gravity center of observation is therefore transferred both on conditions as the participant of knowledge production and co-author of this same production. The surrounding world, it's things-processes are endowed by properties of consciousness too. Via researcher, scientist, via psi-functions of things-processes, surrounding world itself, the system itself is the observer. Observation instruments become the observer too. They are organized in a certain manner by us ourselves and "are already laid" in the picture of the world, becoming the co-observer.

CONCLUSIONS

Preconditions of establishing of new philosophizing subject, the observer of neoclassical type are conceptualized in this article. There are established major ontological, gnoseological and aksiological determinants of his existence. The principal difference of ONT from previous subjects of philosophizing is shown: reality of observation, holisticity, involvement.

SUMMARY

So, ONT is the observer grown to a "new knowledge" - transdisciplinary knowledge. It's difference in only in the fact that it is directed at the "truth of life" already. Not only separately on truth of perception, truth-use, truth-convention, truth-verity, truth of obviousness, truth of non-contradiction etc., but at the same time on integrated integrity and integral universe and something, somebody in it. Knowledge of such observer strives to simultaneously include information and knowledge, and understanding, and interpretation, and innovation, and adequate action and humanistic expertise. Eventually he has the integrated knowledge with reliability, effectiveness, safety inherent to it, but already of all anthropogeneous (to be and/or not to be) and not human-sized only. In understanding of united (unus mundus) the observer of neoclassical type started to act as interface, realizing himself via concept – ability to "collect (concipere) senses and ideas as universal, representing by itself the connection of things and discourses"

creatively and adequately, dialog communication of speaker and listener, of writer and reader, of text and context of being.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

Derrida (1997). Interview Les Intellectuels: tentative de définition par eux-mêmes. Enquête, *Journal Lignes*, 32, 57–68

Knyazeva E.N., (2015). Universal evolutionism or the Big History. Philosiphic sciences. 3, 94-95.

Lektorskiy V.A., (2015). Relativism as the disease of contemporary philosophy. M.: Kanon + RSDP Rehabilitation. Pp: 392

Stepin V.S., (2012). Scientific rationality in social-cultural context. Human and his future: New technologies and abilities of a human. Resp. In: G.L. Belkina et al. M. Lenand, Pp: 273-283.

Frankl, V., (2006). Man's Search for Meaning, Beacon Press, Pp: 77.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. (1972). Anti-Oedipus. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem.

Helen R. Lane. (2004). London and New York: Continuum, Vol. 1 of Capitalism and Schizophrenia. 2 vols. 1972-1980. Trans. of L'Anti-Oedipe. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.

Guzel K. Saykina and Anton S. Krasnov, (2015). "Anthropological Turn" in Social Theory. The Social Sciences, 10, 1923-1927.

Badiou, Alain. (2004). The Flux and the Party: In the Margins of Anti-Oedipus. Trans Laura Balladur and Simon Krysl Polygraph, 15/16, 75-92.