

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

UDC 101.1:167.7

D. Y. SNITKO^{1*}, O. P. VARSHAVSKYI^{2*}

^{1*}Dnipro National University of Railway Transport named after Academician V. Lazaryan (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail dimanche82@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7417-7958

^{2*}Dnipro National University of Railway Transport named after Academician V. Lazaryan (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail wasistist@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3601-0131

WILL TO TRUTH AND GENDER STUDIES

Purpose of the paper is to establish the emergence and evolution of a gender problematics from the foundations of classical philosophy, namely, from the phenomenon of will-to-truth as the spontaneous desire of man to understand the life. To achieve this purpose, the following tasks are solved: 1) to investigate the way in which philosophy constitutes itself; 2) to establish how the category of "sex" manifests, both in the natural and in the social contexts; 3) to determine the correlation of gender studies and philosophy. **Theoretical basis.** If for the methodology of gender studies it is inherent to proceed from the contextuality and value foundations of knowledge, then in this paper gender is considered directly from the being-in-world, human presence. **Originality.** The distinction between will-to-truth and will-to-knowledge, conducted for the first time by Michel Foucault, is used as a method by which the ontological demand of sex (gender) is revealed. **Conclusions.** As a result of the study, it was found that scientific developments in the field of gender issues in their subject matter are not mainly descended from subject sphere of classical philosophy. Sex (gender) is not substantiated metaphysically, and it is ontical, not ontological attribute of the human kind; its presentation as the determining factor of the cultural history in context of femininity/masculinity dichotomy is biased. This quality is similar to Nietzsche's will to power, i.e., determination of definite knowledge that is later used in legal, socio-political discourse, corrects language practice, determines scientific researches making them dependant on axiological component of culture. As the social justice problem is solved, gender as the subject of social study loses its actuality.

Keywords: philosophy; feminism; gender studies; genderology; bias; will-to-truth; will-to-knowledge; being; sex; gender

Introduction

Mistrust of speculative knowledge, desire to "bring it down to land" has befallen philosophy from the times of sophistry. Since the subject of philosophy cannot be tasted, then expressing and proving anything is a very popular decision in history. At its every stage, whatever the truth illuminates thinking, the reaction to it will naturally be scepticism and relativism. Therefore, philosophy will again and again have to be substantiated by the fact that it is a strict science, that its problems are not spontaneous, and the conclusions are relevant.

And in our very pragmatic age, the philosophy has been enriched by such a number of unexpected topics and interdisciplinary ties that there is an impression it has no, or maybe, had no conceptual shores. Post-Soviet postulate that any knowledge of the accomplished truth (and not only philosophy or religion, but even the scientific idea of a fact) is pre-theoretically and socially-psychologically "loaded", calls into question the fact that the essential thinking has no bias in relation to its subject. That, as they say, provides the rationale for the method of anarchist epistemology by Paul Feyerabend – do whatever you want (mach was Du willst) and anything

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

goes. The bias of a researcher becomes common in the scientific environment so that it can claim to be its new norm.

Thus, in 2018, there was a widely-publicized case of the mathematician Theodore Hill's (2018) article, in which the author relied on objective biological and experimental data, using certain mathematical models, and draws the conclusion with regard to gender differences in adaptation to environmental conditions. This article, however, was rejected by the well-known scientific periodical, and then completely removed from publication in another one, because, in the editorial board's opinion, it violated gender tolerance, humiliating the feelings of girls.

This case is no exception. Its reasons are cynically Diogenes-style revealed by the most resonant mystification of recent years, known as "The "Grievance Studies" affair". We will not dwell in detail on its plot, it is widely discussed in scientific journalism (Melchior, 2018), we just briefly introduce its storyline. Three scientists, the mathematician James Lindsay, associate professor at the University of Portland Peter Boghossian and editor of the *Areo* journal Helen Pluckrose, have, over the past few years, published several dozens of fake articles in well-known humanities journals for, how they explain it, a social experiment. Their "articles" met all the formal requirements, but they contained false or even absurd information and unscientific conclusions. (For example, a special award winning "research" under the pseudonym Helen Wilson (2018), relating to the reaction of urban residents to the scenes of dog sexual contacts in urban parks, referred to uncertain impressions of people who became the basis for culturological and legal conclusions.) Despite to the apparent fictitiousness of the submitted "articles", they were accepted, reviewed and published.

The object of this provocation was the work that the authors themselves called "grievance studies" devoted to various forms of discrimination and humiliation: gender, sexual, racial, age, etc. It is unlikely that the institution of preliminary review has failed here. Rather, there was a research trend, the relevance of the topic to the actual demand of public opinion. The main emphasis is on the fact that this trend precedes, defines and even ignores the content part of the research. Actually, this is what is called *bias*.

It is important to keep in mind that the revealing of bias does not in any way detract from the social value of gender studies or genderology. This term, in our opinion, can be used not only for gender linguistics, but also for gender studies in general. We stand on the enlightenment philosophy principles, striving for the emancipation of mankind in all spheres of life. The presence of the oppressed and disgraced is a shameful fact that must be completely extinct.

If discrimination is discussed by the discriminated people, it is unlikely that they remain outside observers of the studied object. "Grievance Studies" are aimed not only at comprehension of the subject, but also at its display. This is why they look like a militant manifestation. To catch a trend here to further falsify it is quite easy. Involvement in the situation, direct immersiveness in the subject is open to representation and swordplay in comparison with, say, declarative remoteness.

However, one should not forget that biased is not only feminism, but also those sciences that until recently were considered "pure". This is naive following the positivism of the early XX century to believe in the existence of a single scientific method, extracted from the natural sciences and adaptable to the humanities, which allegedly operates eternal undeniable "facts". An observer of all realities is at the crossroads of the current forces of history and of his soul, and therefore is affected by the political and mass of other interests.

Therefore, we must avoid the hidden challenge in the speculation of three modern "cynics" aimed at deliberate discrediting of gender studies. We are interested in another phenomenon in this issue. Bias of feminism and, more broadly, genderology correlates with the fundamental per-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

sonality of philosophy, as if identifying them. The fact that philosophy always has its own name, is expressed from a certain Dasein, being-in-the-world, human presence here and now, as if indicating the inevitable subjectivity and even the arbitrariness of a philosophical inquiry. As a result, it allows for any generalization.

We will not agree with this, because it is a true path to eclecticism. Despite absolute freedom, philosophical thinking is a discipline. Its strictness is provided by the build-up of questioning not from occasional (albeit perhaps actual) reasons, but – from being (Bulanenko, 2011). All aspects of philosophy are the branches of this query. And if genderology is one of these aspects of philosophy, even if it is newly discovered, it will definitely show itself in the projection of the question of being. It is this *precedent* that we would like to find out in this paper. It has to loom somewhere outside of political bias.

Purpose

The purpose of the paper is to establish the emergence and evolution of a gender problematics from the foundations of classical philosophy, namely, from the phenomenon of will-to-truth as the spontaneous desire of man to understand the life. To achieve this purpose, it is necessary to solve the following *tasks*: 1) to investigate the way in which philosophy constitutes itself; 2) to establish how the category of "sex" manifests, both in the natural and in the social contexts; 3) to determine the correlation of gender studies and philosophy.

Literature review

The theme of the current state of philosophy, dissolution of its subject, its place in culture as a whole, and in socio-humanitarian knowledge, in particular, has been raised quite often by thinkers in the West and in the post-Soviet countries. And of course, there can be no single point of view on this: for example, Y. Habermas tried to rehabilitate the classical foundations of philosophy (Vetyugova, 2013), while R. Rorty actually announced the end and substitution of philosophy through various discourses (Tselishcheva, 2016). However, the crisis of philosophy and its difficult relationship with other sciences is not an accident, but rather its significant and indispensable characteristic (Kemerov, 2018).

Among the contemporary discourses that take over and actively transform the philosophical heritage, gender studies (genderology) are the most influential ones. They constitute an impressive stock of texts. Among them, for our task there are important works by L. Fisher (1997), who actualized the question of how gender discourse is rational and how it can be correlated with the philosophical one. In particular, she distinguished the arguments of philosophical classics and gender discourse. A. Pechenkin (2011) notes that gender studies use the ideas of the relativistic flow in the philosophy of science, which contributes to the deepening of the crisis of philosophical and scientific knowledge. Not rarely, gender studies now appear as a certain avant-garde of philosophical rather than sociological thought (Slezkina, 2012).

In the vast majority of gender studies, it goes without saying that the philosophy (like culture as a whole) is not neutral in relation to women, remains patriarchal, and enshrines the dominant position of a man in stereotypes. In connection with this, they put the task of deconstructing logocentrism as a "male image" of philosophy in order to eventually obtain an alternative to "masculine thinking". For example, the known researchers T. Vlasova and I. Hrabovska argue that the formation of a binary categorization of sex hides the strategic goals of the socio-political apparatus of production of a certain sexuality mode (Vlasova, Hrabovska, & Halytska, 2018).

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Hence, for our study, methodologically significant are the works of M. Foucault in relation to such concepts as "will-to-truth" and "will-to-knowledge". For it is not accidental that the conclusions of gender studies, enclosing in the context of government practices, have mostly political consequences. M. Foucault (1996) actualized the questions on social determination of the discourse about sex and gender – these topics, the list of practices and the use of terms in their field, are formed by the expediency seen by the political power (in the broadest sense). In this case, the issues of gender equality, sexual emancipation and political rights are fully consistent with the more global goals of social life (demographic policy, material production, functioning of power institutions). So, Foucault outlined the idea that gender and sexuality issues are raised not so much because of their ontological weight, but to achieve certain practical goals.

It is likely that this approach may be useful in interpreting the ideas of feminist theorists, which are the foundation of modern gender studies. Thus, S. de Beauvoir (2017) was the first one who liberated "male" and "female" from an objectivizing (biological) point of view, considering them in the cultural context in relation to the social hierarchy. And thus, these categories became an integral part of political discourse, where the determination of women as "Other" displaces the substance approach to the reciprocity of men and women.

Instead, philosophy requires the movement of thought from *being* to the *public sphere*, and not vice versa (Foucault, 2011). If we really stand on the fact that we are capable of bringing our being and relationship to conformity with reasonable existential principles, then bias is an enemy of gender studies as well. Political expediency also undermines the understanding of gender.

Statement of basic materials

Looking at the origins of philosophical thinking, we will have to agree with the fact, which is usually stated by representatives of feminism, namely: neither gender nor sexual difference was a trigger for it. It turned out that the gender category was ignored (or forgotten?) by classical philosophy.

Is it reasonable to assume that there was a "collusion" of philosophers of the "stronger" sex against the "weaker" sex? How does philosophy pose its problems in general?

Of course, we do not know this better than those through whom we are generally familiar with the phenomenon of philosophy. In this regard, Aristotle as the first systematiser of knowledge appears to us as the most important witness. In *Metaphysics* he says:

But everywhere science deals chiefly with that which is primary, and on

which the other things depend, and in virtue of which they get their names.

If, then, this is *substance*, it will be *of substances* that the philosopher must

grasp *the principles and the causes*. (Aristotle, 1976, p. 120)

Today, such a statement seems to be something abstract and boring. But this Aristotle's "must grasp" has no hidden intention. Both for him and for his ancestors, and for our contemporaries, the being specified by him to the notion of "substance" and "principles and causes", remains magically unknown, that is, it is an *aporia* in which thinking unexpectedly finds itself.

We find ourselves in such a way that the question of the substance of being has engaged us in advance. In our surprise there is no gap in it for a certain plan. Michel Foucault calls this state of

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

a subject – "will to truth", opposing it to "will to knowledge". He convincingly showed that knowledge differs from the truth in the fact that it relates precisely to the desire for supremacy, domination and pragmatic formation of social discourse in a certain direction (Foucault, 1996). That is, being is not a certain representation of things existent, but, above all, a question. Its orientation is not separate, precedes one or another specific intentionality.

Moreover, interestingly, in the thinking of being, the object itself is not important. That is, philosophy does not think with ideal substances, but with all sorts of things. And, say, dual gender or pack multiple gender, if they exist, are also in being, inseparable, eternal and inevitable.

Being is not things in existence. The internal form of the term sex/gender is "posture, form, figure, method, property". That is, this category is relative to the being, and is not actualized anterior to the being for thinking. Thus, at the works of Aristotle, its characteristics begin to show themselves for the first time when he speaks of the movement, the ground for which he saw in the transition between the different states of being: from actual to potential, and back – to the actual one. This dialectic of reality and opportunity has distinct gender characteristics. The defined form marks the frontier of amorphous matter.

This idea became a paradigm for the Hellenistic philosophy (Neoplatonism, Stoicism, early Christian heresies), which identified actual life with the "fiery" omnipresent vigorous Logos-God, provoked by the "dark" impure passive matter, in the direction of disintegration into a plurality of distorted phenomena downward their degradation. (It is noteworthy that such dialectic is reproduced in Western thought in other epochs as well, for example, in the psychoanalysis of S. Freud, in the misogyny of O. Weininger).

But this ontological paradigm does not think in terms of masculinity, as it may seem. On the contrary, in this aspect, it thinks of its own being, which it understands (perhaps naive) in the context of the general notion of "physos", thus spreading the logic of the living to inanimate and even artificially produced things. Moreover, this peculiar biologizing inherent in early thought and in the case when its subject is a human society.

The question of the substance of being, solving what is, immediately faces the problem of how it should be. Ethics naturally follows from ontology. The proper as its subject relates to the social (political). Being proper means being together. And Aristotle, the author of ethics and politics, is looking for these samples in the natural society, receiving a verdict of "masculinity" through the millennium. He, they say, not only justified the institution of slavery, but also for centuries determined the secondary and humiliating role of women in society. The Feminists believe that Aristotle was guilty of the fact that he likened the man to an active form, and the woman – to the passive matter, identifying the notion of "woman" with reproduction, and the notion of "man" with citizenship.

However, the transfer of motivation and meanings from one epoch to another is deliberately artificial. Aristotle, like the representatives of his school, was thinking in the conceptual horizons inflicted by the Hellenistic culture. It is in its antiquity, "wife" means "fertile", and "husband" – "man, human being".

The "guilt" of ancient thought in general is not that it supposedly exalted a man over a woman, but that in it a man was understood as "political animal" (Aristotle). In the natural order a person, having differentiated features, has not an exceptional nature. Accordingly, the gender roles are defined in advance. Inequality and superiority of power are self-evident and indisputable.

However, "physos" does not cover all spheres of being. Physical does not mean political. The liberation of mankind required a qualitatively different prejudice about man. And the Christian Book of Genesis in the first chapter reveals it, giving a person a separate stage of creation in the

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

identity of the Absolute: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them". However, the insight into the gender equality is immediately sharply halted by the second chapter with the teaching and didactic "rib theory", where the female got the sin provocation brand.

It took ages of thought wandering for mankind to acquire such sovereignty that the entire field of philosophy would be reduced to the question "What is a man?". However, Kant's "man" does not have any organs that could be used to determine a gender. And in this case, the philosophical thought is directed at the being of the substance, and not the substance: a person is a substance that "exists as end-in-itself" (Kant, 1994). The thing here is the one corresponding to absolute. Self-determination of a person surpasses all that is included in the causative relationships, including sex. This self-absorption also exists in the later Heidegger's (2003) concept of Dasein, a human presence that "is distinguished by the fact that, in its very Being, that Being is an issue for it" (p. 27).

The conclusions that follow from the subject absolutism are not related to one gender at the expense of another. And from here, too, there is no specific "masculine" ethics, full of individualism and arbitrariness in opposition to the so-called "women's ethics of care" – sympathy for others, responsibility for others, dedication and altruism (Artemeva, 2000). On the contrary, the imperatives of Kant literally speak of humanity, placing the boundary of the will of an individual with the category of "other". The existence of some sexually determined ethics is, of course, a myth.

Probably for the first time the gender is actualized as a historical factor by F. Engels (1986) when it comes to the structure of a society that develops as a certain dialectic of patriarchy, which is associated with the hierarchy, private property, class order, and state. Perhaps this resulted in the context in which Simone de Beauvoir (2017) presented and substantiated women as "oppressed sexual class" in her classic feminist work "The Second Sex" 1949. Contrary to the classical "masculine" philosophy, which always perceived itself as humanity, Simone de Beauvoir understood the gender as a self-sufficient identity, or even the substance of mankind. Socrates is probably a human being, but first of all he is a man.

In accordance with the representations of phenomenological and existential thought about the *orientation* of consciousness, Simone de Beauvoir makes an unexpected conclusion: gender is not a generic attribute, but an attitude. All biological (ontic) in man is just a proposal with which we then deal. Men, women and not only are made. The essence of the human sex is the so-called "Gender". It follows from this: maternity is not an instinct and not an organism's function, but a choice; a woman is not a commodity but a target; the body is the property of the subject, and not of public institutions; love is the attitude of the strong, not the submissiveness of the weak; marriage is not a rule of society, but a project; family is a union of peers, not subordination. These revolutionary ideas will be debatable for a long time, but they have already changed the content of the social institutions of the Western world, even corrected their language.

The fate of a woman in the light of her special reproductive and social roles; sexual difference from the point of view of material production and labour market; differentiation of socio-gender roles, private and public in the family, domestic labour in the labour market, the influence of the prevailing stereotypes of sexual behaviour and language on sexual self-identity, the solution of double standards of behaviour – there are without a doubt the actual problems of the present. However, our task was not to plunge into the theory and practice of feminism.

We only seek to comprehend the leading intentions of gender studies. And first of all it draws attention to the fact that it comes to the meaning of sex/gender, if any, rather reluctantly. The fact that the culture is based on prejudices that impede human freedom, first of all, results in the demand for their overcoming.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

This idea is not new; it follows directly from the Kantian apriorism. Understanding is always biased, culturally conditioned. Culture is a certain game, in which among the various roles there is a sex, or as recommended in this context, gender. The subject in this game is an actor. Since even to himself he has an attitude, that is, he wants to act in front of himself. All roles are predetermined by a certain "scenario", drawn from the institutions, are in subordination. They are stereotypical, but not eternal and not objective. On the contrary, the culture is historically flowing.

And if culture is really paradigmatic, what should follow from this? The demand of equality is already a given. But if it is possible to rebuild its interior according to rational considerations, then till what extent? Is it possible to completely turn the historical scene? Marxist attempts have clearly shown that this is a utopia. Culture is not refutable; the change of social roles does not change the fundamental mediation of human existence. The historical plot cannot be cancelled, neither turned back in the direction of "naturalness", nor reset. On the contrary, the further, the more dramatic for philosophy, as well as religion, art, and, in general, human existence, the question is – according to which plan, for what and how the historical flow develops.

But to see in the history a goal, a deep intrinsic sense, for the postmodernist view is unacceptable "onto-theo-teleo-phallo-logos-centricism" (Derrida). This kind of thinking seems "masculine", built on binary asymmetric oppositions. As a result, the relativistic position is postulated, entirely in the spirit of Protagoras, for which there is no essence of the existence of phenomena outside the very phenomena.

What, in fact, is fully consistent with feminist and gender studies, which, explicitly or declaratively, refuse the assumption of the "logic of being", from the classical categories of causal and teleological nature, from the sexual opposition "male-female" in favour of the mosaic structure of gender. The bias thus gets an intellectual justification. If there is no being, but there is only its fiction, then the intentionality about reality acquires a certain activism, in terms of M. Foucault, "*will to knowledge*", in contrast to "*will to truth*", which operates primarily in the context of the practices of political struggle and social consensus. This will, therefore, is a derivative of Nietzsche's "*will to power*". Even in the context of scientific discourse, it looks like a desire to dominate; hence alternative perspectives are qualified according to the trend and sometimes persecution.

Family, public institutions, culture as a whole, being subjects of research, find themselves in a situation of cognizance. In the fact they are, they have a presumption of guilt. The researcher in relation to the subject appears as the injured party and the avenger. As if subject had to confess guilt and to repent. Thus, in "Grievance Studies" the necessity was proved to train men like dogs, to force white students to listen to lectures on the floor as punishment for slavery. This intention is the basis for formulating the activist tasks of genderology: *evaluation and revaluation* of the nature of knowledge depending on the gender identity of the knowledge creators, that is, the roles defined by the culture; *demystification* of ideas about the nature of sex; *revision* of the humanities and, as practice shows, natural sciences; *re-reading* of the history of philosophy and science according to how they put and solve a gender perspective; *liberation* of philosophy from the "tyranny" of masculine ontology in favour of ethical, legal and political themes; *correcting* of the natural language depending on the woman's experience or at least gender neutral definitions.

The volitional attribution of the phenomenon to the prejudice (bias) uses, of course, already clear meanings, and gender studies are based on the philosophical and cultural heritage. Their relativity is also constituted by the fact that they are conditioned by the objective transformations of the human existence conditions, which we now see in the western world. They ar-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

gue that masculinity is "... derived from the gender ideology of society and is shaped by the influence of traditional views on the role of man, modern economic realities and social situation", and therefore, "considering masculinity, it is necessary to take into account its plurality, historicity, situationality" (Kuptsova, 2015). Even for everyday experience, it is clear that the social roles of man and woman have essentially evolved over the past three generations, and not necessarily because of feminism, but rather because of the objective process of secularization and urbanization. This without a doubt is of interest to sociological surveys, in which genderology only applied already known philosophical problems of freedom, identity, physical-spiritual dualism.

Consequently, it should be emphasized that studies in the field of gender focus on the temporal and changing phenomena of contemporary culture, thus avoiding the perception of more general laws of history. For example, the matriarchy or patriarchy, as a certain social process, has been objectively extinct. It makes no sense to project them into the future. Similarly, the overwhelming majority of problems fairly roused once by feminism, turned out to be resolved in the XXI century (Vlasova, Hrabovska, & Halytska, 2018). Moreover, the gender problem itself is temporary. The modern gender discourse is actively promoting the thesis that already in the XXI century the category of "gender" ceases to be relevant at all – and also not due to the work of genderologists, but because of scientific and technological progress. As the industrial revolution generated an issue of gender equality, so the next, cybernetic (technical) revolution will lead this issue to oblivion. The post-gender world, according to the topic experts themselves, will not know gender differences. One of the most important reasons for this is the rapid advancement of biotechnology and genetic engineering, which can really free a woman from the reproductive function of her body (Ferrando, 2014).

Bias that may be expedient in achieving a result in good deeds, in the scientific field is fraught with, if not false, then controversial conclusions, for example: men have always exploited women; a woman and a man have the same abilities and are practically equally successful in all kinds of activities; sexual intercourse without consent is identical to violence; political correctness is not the same as censorship. In order to overcome the nature of the reaction to certain social transformations, the historical changes in culture caused by scientific and technological progress, in order not to escape from the historical scene together with solving the present-day political problems, the gender studies should follow the philosophy of courage in criticizing their own principles based on analysis of the fundamental features of human existence, gender must have sense.

Originality

In this paper, the distinction between will-to-truth and will-to-knowledge (M. Foucault) is used as a method by which we made an attempt to identify the demand of sex (gender) from being as a subject of philosophy.

Conclusions

As a result of the study, it was found that scientific developments in the field of gender issues (genderology) do not originate from the principles of classical philosophy. Sex (gender) is not substantiated metaphysically, and it is ontical, not ontological attribute of the human kind. Its presentation as the determining factor of the cultural history in context of femininity/masculinity dichotomy is biased. Thus, in its essence, genderology is similar to Nietzsche's

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

will to power, i.e., determination of definite knowledge used in legal discourse. Its subject matter is rather a political problem than the substantial aporia. Consequently, it constitutes a component of sociological or cultural research, which historically is transient as the problem of social justice is resolved.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (1976). *Sochineniya v chetyrekh tomakh* (Vol. 1). Moscow: Mysl. (in Russian)
- Artemeva, O. V. (2000). Etika zaboty: Feministskaya alternativa klassicheskoy filosofii. In A. A. Guseynov (Ed.), *Eticheskaya mysl: Yezhegodnik* (pp. 195-215). Moscow: RAN, Institut filosofii. (in Russian)
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2017). *Le deuxième sexe*. A. A. Sabashnikova, I. Malakhova, Y. Orlova, Trans. Moscow: Azbuka-Attikus. (in Russian)
- Bulanenko, M. (2011). *Ponyatie istiny i problema samoobosnovaniya filosofii v grecheskoy i khristianskoy antichnosti*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing. (in Russian)
- Engels, F. (1986). Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats. In K. Marx, & F. Engels, *Izbrannye proizvedeniya in 3 vol.* (Vol. 3). Moscow: Politizdat. (in Russian)
- Ferrando, F. (2014). Is the post-human a post-woman? Cyborgs, robots, artificial intelligence and the futures of gender: A case study. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 1-17. doi: 10.1007/s40309-014-0043-8 (in English)
- Fisher, L. (1997). Is Reasoning gendered? *OSSA Conference Archive*. Retrieved from <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA2/papersandcommentaries/32> (in English)
- Foucault, P.-M. (1996). *Volya k istine: po tu storonu znaniya, vlasti i seksualnosti. Raboty raznykh let*. S. Tabachnikova, Trans. from French. Moscow: Kastal. (in Russian)
- Foucault, P.-M. (2011). *Le gouvernement de soi et des autres. Kurs lektciy, pročitannykh v Kollezhe de Frans v 1982–1983 uchebnom godu*. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
- Heidegger, M. (2003). *Sein und Zeit*. V. V. Bibikhin, Trans. from German. Kharkov: Folio. (in Russian)
- Hill, T. P. (2018). An Evolutionary Theory for the Variability Hypothesis. *Arxiv.org*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1703.04184.pdf> (in English)
- Kant, I. (1994). Antropologie in pragmatischer Hirsicht. M. I. Levina, Transl. In *Sobranie sochineniy in 8 Vol.* (Vol. 7). Moscow: Choro. (in Russian)
- Kemerov, V. E. (2018). Crisis, which is always with you. *Voprosy filosofii*, 6, 37-46. Retrieved from http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1985 (in Russian)
- Kuptsova, T. (2015). Critical Understanding of Masculinity in the Age of Gender Transformation. *Almanac of Ukrainian Studies*, 18, 80-82. (in Ukrainian)
- Melchior, J. K. (2018). Fake news comes to academia. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from https://www.wsj.com/articles/fake-news-comes-to-academia-1538520950?fbclid=IwAR1fINdeXJuZK8Z7LfSM8IEqKEt7Z2z_mTqgjMEIYmZVI2C12R-8hMempQ (in English)
- Pechenkin, A. A. (2011). Ot Kuayna k feministskomu empirizmu: Krizis epistemologii v sovremennoy filosofii nauki. *Filosofskie iskaniya. Moskovsko-Peterburgskiy sbornik*, 2, 193-214. (in Russian)
- Slezkina, Y. M. (2012). Kharakteristiki dominantnykh modeley maskulinnosti i femininnosti (na primere oprosa studentov, obuchayushchikhsya po spetsialnosti "sotsialnaya rabota" v TGU). *Tomsk State University Journal of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science*, 1(17), 85-91. (in Russian)
- Tselishcheva, O. I. (2016). Richard Rorty and the crisis of modern western philosophy. *Tomsk State University Journal of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science*, 2(34), 333-338. doi: 10.17223/1998863x/34/38 (in Russian)
- Vetyugova, Y. S. (2013). J. Habermas about crisis of philosophy in modern culture. *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i yuridicheskie nauki, kulturologiya i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 6(32), 39-41. (in Russian)
- Vlasova, T., Hrabovska, I., & Halytska, Y. (2018). *Aktualnyi gender: Mizhnarodnyi ta ukrainskyi kontekst: Monohrafiia*. Kyiv: Milenium. (in Ukrainian)
- Wilson, H. (2018). Human reactions to rape culture and queer performativity at urban dog parks in Portland, Oregon. *Gender, Place & Culture. A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 1-20. doi: 10.1080/0966369X.2018.1475346 (in English)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Аристотель. Сочинения в четырех томах / Аристотель ; ред. В. Ф. Асмус. — Москва : Мысль, 1976. — Т. 1. — 550 с. — Серия: Философское наследие.
- Артемьева, О. В. Этика заботы: феминистская альтернатива классической философии / О. В. Артемьева // Этическая мысль: Ежегодник / отв. ред. А. А. Гусейнов. — Москва : РАН, Институт философии, 2000. — С. 195–215.
- Бовуар, С. де. Второй пол / С. де Бовуар ; пер. А. А. Сабашникова, И. Малахова, Е. Орлова. — Москва : Азбука-Аттикус, 2017. — 928 с.
- Буланенко, М. Е. Понятие истины и проблема самообоснования философии в греческой и христианской античности / М. Е. Буланенко. — Saarbrücken : Lambert Academic Publishing, 2011. — 273 p.
- Энгельс, Ф. Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства / Ф. Энгельс // Маркс К. Избранные произведения в 3-х т. / К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс. — Москва : Политиздат, 1986. — Т. 3. — 639 с.
- Ferrando, F. Is the Post-Human a Post-Woman? Cyborgs, Robots, Artificial Intelligence and the Futures of Gender: A Case Study / F. Ferrando // European Journal of Futures Research. — 2014. — P. 1–17. doi: 10.1007/s40309-014-0043-8
- Fisher, L. Is Reasoning Gendered? / L. Fisher // OSSA Conference Archive. — 1997. — 15-17 May. — 12 p. — Access Mode: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA2/papersandcommentaries/32> (Date of Access: 07.05.2019). — Title from Screen.
- Фуко, П.-М. Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет / М. Фуко ; пер. с фр. С. Табачниковой. — Москва : Касталь, 1996. — 448 с.
- Фуко, П.-М. Управление собой и другими. Курс лекций, прочитанных в Коллеж де Франс в 1982–1983 учебном году / М. Фуко ; пер. с фр. А. В. Дьякова. — Санкт-Петербург : Наука, 2011. — 432 с.
- Хайдеггер, М. Бытие и время / М. Хайдеггер ; пер. с нем. В. В. Бибихина. — Харьков : Фолио, 2003. — 503 с.
- Hill, T. P. An Evolutionary Theory for the Variability Hypothesis [Virtual Resource] / T. P. Hill // Arxiv.org. — 2018. — 28 March. — 26 p. — Access Mode: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1703.04184.pdf> — Title from Screen. — Date of Access: 07.05.2019.
- Кант, И. Антропология с прагматической точки зрения (1798) / И. Кант ; пер. М. И. Левиной // Собрание сочинений в 8-ми томах. — Москва : Чоро, 1994. — Т. 7. — С. 137–376.
- Кемеров, В. Е. Кризис, который всегда с тобой / В. Е. Кемеров // Вопросы философии. — 2018. — № 6. — С. 37–46. — Access Mode: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1985 (Date of Access: 07.05.2019). — Title from Screen.
- Купцова, Т. Критичне осмислення маскулінності в епоху гендерних трансформацій / Т. Купцова // Українознавчий альманах. — 2015. — Вип. 18. — С. 80–82.
- Melchior, J. K. Fake News Comes to Academia [Virtual Resource] / J. K. Melchior // The Wall Street Journal. — 2018. — 5 Oct. — Access Mode: https://www.wsj.com/articles/fake-news-comes-to-academia-1538520950?fbclid=IwAR1fINdeXJuZK8Z7LfSM8xIEqKEt7Z2z_mTqgjMEIYmZVI2C12R-8hMempQ — Title from Screen. — Date of Access: 07.05.2019.
- Печенкин, А. А. От Куайна к феминистскому эмпиризму: кризис эпистемологии в современной философии науки / А. А. Печенкин // Философские искания. Московско-Петербургский сборник. — Москва, 2011. — Т. 2 — С. 193–214.
- Слезкина, Ю. М. Характеристики доминантных моделей маскулинности и фемининности (на примере опроса студентов, обучающихся по специальности "социальная работа" в ТГУ) / Ю. М. Слезкина // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Философия. Социология. Политология. — 2012. — № 1 (17). — С. 85–91.
- Целищева, О. И. Ричард Рорти и кризис современной западной философии / О. И. Целищева // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Философия. Социология. Политология. — 2016. — № 2 (34). — С. 333–338. doi: 10.17223/1998863x/34/38
- Ветюгова, Ю. С. Ю. Хабермас о кризисе философии в современной культуре / Ю. С. Ветюгова // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. — 2013. — № 6 (32), Ч. I. — С. 39–41.
- Власова, Т. Актуальний гендер: міжнародний та український контекст : монографія / Т. Власова, І. Грабовська, Ю. Галицька. — Київ : Міленіум, 2018. — 132 с.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Wilson, H. Human Reactions to Rape Culture and Queer Performativity at Urban Dog Parks in Portland, Oregon / H. Wilson // Gender, Place & Culture. A Journal of Feminist Geography. – 2018. – P. 1–20. doi: 10.1080/0966369X.2018.1475346

Д. Ю. СНИТЬКО^{1*}, О. П. ВАРШАВСЬКИЙ^{2*}

^{1*} Дніпровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені академіка В. Лазаряна (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта dimanche82@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7417-7958

^{2*} Дніпровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені академіка В. Лазаряна (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта wasistist@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3601-0131

ВОЛЯ ДО ІСТИНИ І ГЕНДЕРНІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Мета статті полягає в тому, щоб установити виникнення та еволюцію гендерної проблематики із засновків класичної філософії, а саме, із феномена волі-до-істини як спонтанного прагнення людини до пізнання буття. Для досягнення зазначеної мети вирішуються наступні завдання: 1) дослідити те, яким чином конститує себе філософія; 2) встановити, як виявляється категорія "статі", як у природному, так і в соціальному контексті; 3) визначити кореляцію гендерних досліджень (або гендерології) та філософії. **Теоретичний базис.** Якщо для методології гендерних досліджень властиво виходити з контекстуальності, ціннісних засновків знання, культурних і соціальних передсудів та стереотипів, то в даній роботі стат (гендер) розглядається безпосередньо із буття-у-світі, тобто із людської присутності і в її пізнавальній здібності. **Наукова новизна.** Розрізнення волі-до-істини та волі-до-знання, проведене вперше Мішелем Фуко, застосовується як прийом, завдяки якому виявляється онтологічна затребуваність статі. **Висновки.** В результаті дослідження було встановлено, що наукові розробки у галузі гендерної проблематики безпосередньо не впливають із предметної області класичної філософії; стат (гендер) метафізично не обґрунтовується, являє собою онтичну, а не онтологічну характеристику людського виду; її презентація як визначального чинника історії культури в контексті дихотомії фемінності/маскулінності є ангажованою; ця властивість аналогічна ніцшеанському волінню до влади, тобто встановленню певного знання, що тоді використовується в правовому, соціально-політичному дискурсі, корегує мовну практику, визначає наукові пошуки, узалежнюючи їх від аксіологічної компоненти культури; по мірі вирішення проблеми соціальної справедливості стат як предмет соціологічного дослідження втрачає актуальність.

Ключові слова: філософія; фемінізм; гендерні дослідження; гендерологія; ангажованість; воля-до-істини; воля-до-знання; буття; стат; гендер

Д. Ю. СНИТЬКО^{1*}, А. П. ВАРШАВСЬКИЙ^{2*}

^{1*} Дніпровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені академіка В. Лазаряна (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта dimanche82@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7417-7958

^{2*} Дніпровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені академіка В. Лазаряна (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта wasistist@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3601-0131

ВОЛЯ К ИСТИНЕ И ГЕНДЕРНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

Цель статьи заключается в том, чтобы установить возникновение и эволюцию гендерной проблематики из оснований классической философии, а именно, из феномена воли-к-истине как спонтанного стремления человека к познанию бытия. Для достижения этой цели решаются следующие задачи: 1) исследовать, каким образом конституирует себя философия; 2) установить, как проявляется категория "пола", как в природном, так и в социальном контексте; 3) определить корреляцию гендерных исследований (или гендерологии) и философии. **Теоретический базис.** Если для методологии гендерных исследований свойственно исходить из контекстуальности, ценностных оснований знания, культурных и социальных предрассудков и стереотипов, то в данной работе пол (гендер) рассматривается непосредственно из бытия-в-мире, то есть из человеческого присутствия и в его познавательной способности. **Научная новизна.** Различение воли-к-истине и воли-к-знанию, проведенное впервые Мишелем Фуко, применяется как прием, благодаря которому выявляется онтологическая востребованность пола. **Выводы.** В результате исследования было установлено,

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

что научные разработки в области гендерной проблематики непосредственно не происходят из предметной области классической философии; пол (гендер) метафизически не обосновывается, представляет собой онтическую, а не онтологическую характеристику человеческого вида; его презентация как определяющего фактора истории культуры в контексте дихотомии феминности/маскулинности является ангажированной; это свойство аналогично ницшеанской воле к власти, то есть установлению определенного знания, что потом используется в правовом, социально-политическом дискурсе, корректирует языковую практику, определяет научные поиски в зависимости от аксиологической компоненты культуры; по мере решения проблемы социальной справедливости пол как предмет социологического исследования теряет актуальность.

Ключевые слова: философия; феминизм; гендерные исследования; гендерология; ангажированность; воля-к-истине; воля-к-знанию; бытие; пол; гендер

Received: 02.12.2018

Accepted: 21.03.2019