ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2023, Вип. 24
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2023, NO. 24

UDC 141.319.8:167

O. N. KUBALSKYI[1*]

[1*]Dobrov Institute for Scientific and Technological Potential and Science History Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail kubalsky@nas.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-7956-3150

The Significance of Philosophical Anthropology in Determining the Methodology of Modern Scientific Research

Purpose. This research involves revealing the methodological significance of the anthropological understanding of values for conducting modern scientific research. **Theoretical basis.** Philosophical anthropology acts as an epistemological basis for answers to ontological questions that are part of the structure of such problems in modern science as the construction of a scientific picture of the world, the ordering of data of natural attitude, and anthropocosmism. The ontological basis for the formation of the anthropological theory of values is the teaching of Wilhelm Leibniz, Immanuel Kant, Rudolf Lotze, and Martin Heidegger. **Originality.** The creation of a scientific picture of the world, the research of natural attitude, and an anthropological approach to cosmology carried out from the viewing angle of the philosophy of values show the close mutual conditioning of these scientific issues. A successful determination of one's value positions by a scientist-researcher is impossible without his/her agreeing with his/her picture of the world with the prevailing ideas about the world in their society. Such ideas are studied by anthropocosmism, which researches not so much the world in itself, but a view of this world from the standpoint of the existing state of society and the main intentions of its development. **Conclusions.** The value attitude of scientists at a certain stage of the development of scientific knowledge forms their picture of the world, which has the form of self-explanatory scientific provisions. The facts of modern physics must always, one way or another, receive their legitimation through the world of the human natural attitude. Even the unobservable characteristics of the microcosm are explained by appealing to knowledge about the observable characteristics of the world. The anthropocentric nature of cosmology is determined by the fact that in modern philosophy, the values of a person explain not only the way of one's cognition but also the way of one's inclusion in the world.

Keywords: philosophical anthropology; methodology of modern scientific research; scientific picture of the world; natural attitude; anthropocosmism; values

Introduction

Carrying out scientific research is always a meeting of two realities – the material world external to a person and the ideal world of knowledge. Man appears as a communicator between these two worlds.

Even Immanuel Kant (1781) not only established but also systematically justified the fact that the world of knowledge about the material world accessible to men is largely determined by men themselves: our sensibility, reason, and intuition in their joint action determine the main characteristics of what natural science calls the phenomenon of nature. On the other hand, the founder of philosophical phenomenology, Edmund Husserl (1960), showed how pure phenomena become specific in human consciousness, intertwining into the meanings of a person's empirical consciousness: the world of everyday consciousness of specific people turns out to be the carrier of the ideal world of knowledge. However, some researchers still offer alternative versions of what the principles of scientific research are, which should provide strictly evidentiary and empirically confirmed knowledge and at the same time perceive the world in the current mode of naive consciousness. For such naive everyday consciousness, the world remains geocentric and self-sufficient, not heliocentric and constructed by human cognition). Phenomenology calls such a world of everyday consciousness the world of natural

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

attitude. Such an attitude is not so much devoid of any rationality, but is the embodiment of a specific practical rationality of common sense (Reid, 1997).

Is such a dual position of combining common sense with theoretical thinking a manifestation of a kind of scientific "doublethink" by analogy with George Orwell's (1949) novel "1984"? That is, is it not a manifestation of a peculiar ability to hold directly opposite beliefs at the same time? Or does a person, as a scientist, not engage in self-deception, but rather have special means to harmonize the material and ideal worlds? Classics of philosophical anthropology considered values to be such means. Encyclopedia "Britannica" also considers philosophical anthropology to be a science of values, defining it as "discipline within philosophy that seeks to unify the several empirical investigations of human nature in an effort to understand individuals as both creatures of their environment and creators of their own values" (Olafson, 2019).

However, modern science still has poorly developed axiological tools for cognition, and such a deficit is especially acute in the field of scientific research methodology.

Purpose

Perhaps the insufficient axiological certainty in the appeal to philosophical anthropology is explained by the insufficient methodological elaboration of the three mentioned approaches: construction of a scientific picture of the world, arrangement of the data of natural attitude, and anthropocosmism. Such processing should be done from the standpoint of the philosophy of values. *The purpose* of this research is to reveal the methodological significance of the anthropological understanding of values for conducting modern scientific research.

Statement of basic materials

Anthropological foundations of constructing a scientific picture of the world

The outstanding German philosopher Martin Heidegger (2002) provided the classic definition of the scientific world picture in his special work "The Age of the World Picture", in which he shows the anthropological basis of the scientific view of the world.

For Heidegger, the scientific picture of the world is a product of the culture of its time, it is literally a person's vision of the world through the eyes of one's epoch: as long as this epoch exists, the picture of time is true in its time. The scientific picture of the world does not exist by itself but is constantly produced by a person as a scientist-researcher who creates in line with the clearly defined method according to the procedures defined and accepted in the scientific culture of his time.

> Science becomes research through the projected plan and through the securing of the plan in the rigor of procedure. Projection and rigor, however, first develop into what they are in method… If the projected region is to become objectified, then it must be brought to encounter us in the full multiplicity of its levels and interweavings. (Heidegger, 2002, p. 60)

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

Therefore scientific procedures must be free from prejudices to operate with the changeableness in its subject. Only from within this perspective, the science could deal with facts of nature as if they reveal themselves.

Ukrainian researcher Valeria Honcharenko (2019) stressed that for Heidegger "the acts of becoming of the world as a picture with the transformation of the man into a subiectum" (p. 38).

"Following the Kant's idea of a man as an active subject that constructs the world, Heidegger considers that the human being as a carrier of action and rationality meditates on its own existence that articulates itself in hermeneutic self-interpretation within Being-in-the-world" (Honcharenko, 2019, p. 38).

Therefore for Heidegger (2002) "understood in an essential tray, "world picture" does not mean "picture of the world" but, rather the world grasped as a picture" (p. 67).

The modern age is no exception: what appears to our contemporaries to be absolute truth is actually to a large extent that part of the truth that has received sufficient empirical justification in our time. Decades will pass, and perhaps even centuries – and the scientific picture of the world will inevitably change again, and then other facts about the world will appear as final and basic. They will look like that, but they will never be like that in reality, because the world is changeable, and even more changeable are people's ideas about it. Only human nature is unchanging, which connects our cognition with the nature of the world, of which man is an integral part.

The anthropological character of the natural attitude

Every person and a scientist are no exception, they see the world as it appears in his/her everyday perception. The scientist accustoms him/herself to see behind this everyday perception the signs of the hidden essential characteristics of the world, which are not observable. All modern physics of matter, for example, uses terms that denote probabilistic objects – bosons, quarks, etc. This creates a certain dilemma: on the one hand, from the standpoint of quantum mechanics, the influence of the observer should always be included in the description of reality, and on the other hand, there are physical phenomena that cannot be observed in principle.

Considering the effect of observability as part of the researched phenomenon has become a requirement in almost all-natural sciences. Even in bio-psychology, the principles of quantum mechanics are involved. Thus, the French physician, biologist and physicist Franz Klaus Jansen (2018), who has been dealing with issues of the philosophy of science for the past decades, notes: "Quantum mechanics requires a context, yet the context of an observer is rarely considered. On the other hand, in bio-psychology, the observer context is examined to explain superposition and collapse by different mental functions used in everyday life" (p. 1).

Thus, observability is no less explained by the characteristics of the external world than by a person's ability to perceive it in a certain way. Actually, this is one of the natural confirmations of the philosophical thesis developed by Kant, Heidegger, and their followers.

However, physicists also confirm the observability of the world as its own fundamental characteristic – even in terms of the so-called "unobservable phenomena". If at first physicists prove that such phenomena are not just a fantasy of theorists, but real physical phenomena, then there is detailed proof of a special way of their indirect observation. Thus, the Swiss philosophers Dustin Lazarovici, Andrea Oldofredi, and Michael Esfeld (2018) first claim that despite their unobservability, "the microscopic objects *tout court* have a position independently of them being observed". But, this rule should also apply to the observer him/herself, which

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

leads to an unexpected conclusion about the dependence, or rather the interdependence of the world and the person who explores it.

> However, as it is trivial that physical objects have positions, so it is trivial that in order to access these positions, we have to interact with these objects and thereby change their positions. Generally speaking, for one particle configuration, say a macroscopic object, to contain information about the positions of other particles, there must be a correlation between them, which is, furthermore, reliable in the sense of being reproducible. This applies in particular to correlations between particle configurations in human brains and particles outside the brains, assuming that all the perceptual knowledge that persons acquire passes through their brains. (Lazarovici, Oldofredi, & Esfeld, 2018)

This means that modern physicists do not exclude the physical reality of the world of natural attitude. But they perceive it as a certain inertial system in the world of total relativity. In this inertial system, certain physical characteristics – corpuscularity, positioning in space, other physical characteristics familiar to the inhabitants of the planet Earth – do not just seem real, but are real, albeit within a rather limited time-space framework.

Indeed, if we evaluate two possible alternatives to this position from the viewpoint of philosophical anthropology, then both of them will turn out to be questionable. Thus, Lazarovici and his colleagues claim that two options are most often proposed to be chosen to explain the observability of the physical properties of the microcosm: the first – these properties cannot be observed at all, and the second – they can somehow still be observed, but partially. However, according to these authors, both options are unsatisfactory: according to the first, the physical ontology turns out to be devoid of empirical proof, and according to the second, it turns out that without sufficient explanations, for some reason, some physical properties can be proven, and others cannot (Lazarovici, Oldofredi, & Esfeld, 2018).

Thus, the unobservability of the facts of the physical microcosm is conditional and looks like this only in comparison with the direct observability of the facts of the physical macrocosm.

Philosophy of values from the standpoint of anthropocosmism

At the end of the 19th century, the German philosopher Rudolf Hermann Lotze (2017) wrote a three-volume fundamental work "Microcosmos", in which he substantiated the existence, next to the world of things and the world of ideas, of a world of values, which acts as an intermediary between these two worlds, while remaining self-sufficient.

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

Actually, it is Lotze who should be considered the founder of philosophical anthropology, and not only because he wrote a corresponding extensive special research back in the middle of the 19th century, but primarily because it was his idea to focus attention on values that influenced the strategic development of philosophical anthropology. Thus, almost a century later, Martin Heidegger (1961) in his work "Nietzsche" returns to the defining role of values in ontology and epistemology.

Anthropocentrism in modern Ukrainian philosophy has both its supporters, such as Vasyl Kremen and Volodymyr Ilin (2022), who develop the ideas of anthropocentrism in education, and its critics, who, in particular, criticize technocentrism as one of the key manifestations of anthropocentrism – these are researchers such as Mykhailo Boichenko (2021), Volodymyr Melnyk and Ulyana Lushch-Purii (2022).

In general, philosophical anthropology in each case – whether from the standpoint of anthropocentrism or the standpoint of its criticism – advocates the defense of some values while criticizing others. But in each case, these are values that are created by the people themselves, or rather the human way of life: criticism of anthropocentrism is also in a certain sense a manifestation of anthropocentrism, but in a different version of it. Thus, the philosophy of values is the epistemological resource that philosophical anthropology uses for its own methodological goals, creating alternative versions of the human explanation of the world and the role of man in it (Kubalskyi, 2022; Kubalskyi, 2023).

If the first versions of anthropocosmism still included a significant share of theocentrism (even in the monadology of Gottfried Wilhelm Liabnitz (Strickland, 2014)), then modern cosmology increasingly turns to the principle of anthropology – and not only in defining the foundations of cognition of the world, not only in recognizing the way of human inclusion into the world but also in determining the characteristics of the world as it is in itself. But at the same time, the world appears human-dimensional. This approach is embodied largely in the concept of the Anthropocene as a defining characteristic of evolution on planet Earth for tens of thousands of years. In this way, the main direction of the methodological direction of philosophical anthropology is the arrangement of the world as the ecumene of humanity. Thus, a research team consisting of management theorists from France and Sweden, led by Emmanuel Bonnet, claims that "the Anthropocene challenges any hegemonic attempt to conceive and manage the world as a project" in such a way that "the common ground for design and management can be found in the organized world, that is, a world made up of organizations, management and design processes, whose main actors are humans" (Bonnet, Landivar, Monnin, & Navarro Aguiar, 2022, p. 10). The whole world is seen as a kind of organization that needs proper "management". And such an approach is common among some management theorists and some philosophers. In management theory, the value approach leads to anthropological pragmatics, namely, to the application of axiology to the improvement of a person’s social environment. Hence, a researcher of management philosophy from Indonesia Harry Yulianto (2021) notes: "the value in management science was not only intrinsic as an art, but also extrinsic value as a science to examine the basics of possible action in practice through controlling for negative influences and increasing positive influences in organizational management" (p. 161).

Of course, such interpretations of philosophical anthropology already go beyond the scope of empirical verification applied by special sciences but are also conceptually unjustified. At the very least, taking into account environmental issues, we must be very cautious about such theoretical claims for the practical "reshaping" of the world by men at their own discretion and

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

according to their own values. Thus, American philosopher Seth Sivinski and New Zealand philosopher Joseph Ulatowski (2019) rightly note in their joint article: "Since the world is complex and diverse, we cannot increase the scale without also seriously considering what would happen if we decreased the size of the scale too" (p. 15). However, one cannot completely exclude the need to take into consideration one's own experience in cognition – both social-humanitarian and natural. Thus, the Canadian specialist in Adult Learning Benedict Kojo Otoo (2020) nonetheless truly states: "A researcher may construct knowledge socially as a result of his or her personal experiences in life within their natural settings" (p. 67). In this way, there must be a certain balance in how deeply to involve one's values in the subject of research or to refrain from it.

After all, human values do not always express the interests of all that breathes, and some of them contradict the interests of humanity itself. The values of nihilism, for example, cannot direct practical sciences to anything good. At the same time, if a person, with the help of philosophical anthropology, more clearly methodologically outlines the boundaries of his/her practical influence, this can have better consequences both for the person him/herself and for his/her environment. Anthropocosmism expresses to a greater extent the values of the society in which the research scientist lives, and not just his/her own preferences. The scientist's task is to give these values a clearer functional application.

Originality

Consideration from the angle of the philosophy of values for constructing a scientific picture of the world, ordering the data of natural attitude and anthropocosmism revealed their close mutual conditioning. A scientist's reflexive approach to determining one's own value positions requires their correlation not only with a possible scientific picture of the world but also with a certain version of anthropocosmism, which expresses both the current state of society and the direction of its development.

Conclusions

The scientific picture of the world is an expression of the value attitude of scientists at a certain stage of the development of scientific knowledge, but it is usually perceived as a set of self-explanatory scientific propositions generally accepted at that time. The unobservability of the characteristics of the microcosm does not deny that the facts of modern physics belong to the world of man's natural attitude since these characteristics receive their explanation based on the observable characteristics of the world or do not receive it at all. Modern cosmology increasingly acquires an anthropocentric character from the viewpoint of epistemology and ontology, because the person's values explain not only the way of his/her cognition but also the way of his/her inclusion in the world.

REFERENCES

Boichenko, M. I. (2021). Human Evolution: the Limits of Technocentrism. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (19), 15-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235956 (in English)

Bonnet, E., Landivar, D., Monnin, A., & Navarro Aguiar, U. (2022, June-July). Design beyond the human world of management and organizations: Towards a cosmology for the anthropocene. In *DRS2022: Bilbao.* Bilbao, Spain. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2022.654 (in English)

Heidegger, M. (1961). *Nietzsche* (Vol. 2). Pfullingen: Günther Neske. (in German)

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

Heidegger, M. (2002). The Age of the World Picture (1938). In *Off the Beaten Track* (J. Young & K. Haynes, Trans., pp. 57-85). Cambridge University Press. (in English)

Honcharenko, V. A. (2019). The Concept of the World Picture in Late Writings of Ludwig Wittgenstein and Martin Heidegger. *Bulletin of the Cherkasy Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University. Series Philosophy*, (1), 35-40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31651/2076-5894-2019-1-35-40 (in English)

Husserl, E. (1960). *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology* (D. Cairns, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. (in English)

Jansen, F. K. (2018). *Quantum Mechanics Requires an Observer Context Distinguishing between Reality and its Mental Representation*. Preprints. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201802.0068.v1 (in English)

Kant, I. (1781). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Riga: J. F. Hartknoch. (in German)

Kremen, V. H., & Ilin, V. V. (2022). Philosophy of Human-Centrism in the System of Anthropological Studies. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (21), 5-14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260429 (in English)

Kubalskyi, O. N. (2022). Communicative Approach to Determining the Role of Personality in Science. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (22), 36-48. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271325 (in English)

Kubalskyi, O. (2023). Academic values as a basis for international scientific communication. *Synesis, 15*(1), 490-500. Retrieved from https://seer.ucp.br/seer/index.php/synesis/article/view/2693 (in English)

Lazarovici, D., Oldofredi, A., & Esfeld, M. (2018). Observables and Unobservables in Quantum Mechanics: How the No-Hidden-Variables Theorems Support the Bohmian Particle Ontology. *Entropy, 20*(5). DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/e20050381 (in English)

Lotze, R. H. (2017). *Mikrokosmos: Ideen zur Naturgeschichte und Geschichte der Menschheit. Versuch einer Anthropologie*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner. (in German)

Melnyk, V. P., & Lushch-Purii, U. I. (2022). Revising Anthropocentrism of Technics in the Light of the 21st Century New Anthropological Models. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (21), 72-83. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260334 (in English)

Olafson, F. A. (2019). Philosophical anthropology. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophical-anthropology (in English)

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Novel*. London: Secker & Warburg. (in English)

Otoo, B. K. (2020). Declaring My Ontological and Epistemological Stance: A Reflective Paper. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 53*(1), 67-88. (in English)

Reid, T. (1997). *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense: A Critical Edition* (D. R. Brookes, Ed.). Edinburgh University Press. (in English)

Sivinski, S., & Ulatowski, J. (2019). The Anthropocentrism of the Cosmic Perspective Argument. *Ethics and the Environment, 24*(1), 1-18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2979/ethicsenviro.24.1.01 (in English)

Strickland, L. (2014). *Leibniz's Monadology: A New Translation and Guide*. Edinburgh University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748693238 (in English)

Yulianto, H. (2021). Philosophy of management science: Ontology, epistemology, and axiology perspectives. *Cross-Border Journal of Business Management, 1*(1), 152-162. (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Boichenko M. I. Human Evolution: the Limits of Technocentrism. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2021. No. 19. P. 15–22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235956

Bonnet E., Landivar D., Monnin A., Navarro Aguiar U. Design beyond the human world of management and organizations: Towards a cosmology for the anthropocene. *DRS2022: Bilbao* (Bilbao, 25 June – 3 July 2022). Bilbao, Spain, 2022. 13 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2022.654

Heidegger M. *Nietzsche*. Pfullingen : Günther Neske, 1961. Bd. 2. 493 s.

Heidegger M. The Age of the World Picture (1938). *Off the Beaten Track* / trans. by J. Young, K. Haynes. Cambridge University Press, 2002. P. 57–85.

Honcharenko V. A. The Concept of the World Picture in Late Writings of Ludwig Wittgenstein and Martin Heidegger. *Bulletin of the Cherkasy Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University. Series Philosophy*. 2019. No. 1. P. 35–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31651/2076-5894-2019-1-35-40

Husserl E. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology* / trans. by D. Cairns. The Hague : Martinus Nijhoff, 1960. 158 p.

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

Jansen F. K. Quantum Mechanics Requires an Observer Context Distinguishing between Reality and its Mental Representation. *Preprints*. 2018. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201802.0068.v1

Kant I. *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Riga : J. F. Hartknoch, 1781. 856 s.

Kremen V. H., Ilin V. V. Philosophy of Human-Centrism in the System of Anthropological Studies. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 21. P. 5–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260429

Kubalskyi O. N. Communicative Approach to Determining the Role of Personality in Science. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 22. P. 36–48. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271325

Kubalskyi O. Academic values as a basis for international scientific communication. *Synesis*. 2023. Vol. 15, No. 1. P. 490–500. URL: https://seer.ucp.br/seer/index.php/synesis/article/view/2693

Lazarovici D., Oldofredi A., Esfeld M. Observables and Unobservables in Quantum Mechanics: How the No-Hidden-Variables Theorems Support the Bohmian Particle Ontology. *Entropy*. 2018. Vol. 20, Iss. 5. 17 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/e20050381

Lotze R. H. *Mikrokosmos: Ideen zur Naturgeschichte und Geschichte der Menschheit. Versuch einer Anthropologie*. Hamburg : Felix Meiner, 2017. 1594 s.

Melnyk V. P., Lushch-Purii U. I. Revising Anthropocentrism of Technics in the Light of the 21st Century New Anthropological Models. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research.* 2022. No. 21. P. 72–83. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260334

Olafson F. A. Philosophical anthropology. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 2019. URL: https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophical-anthropology

Orwell G. *Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Novel*. London : Secker & Warburg, 1949. 314 p.

Otoo B. K. Declaring My Ontological and Epistemological Stance: A Reflective Paper. *The Journal of Educational Thought*. 2020. Vol. 53, No. 1. P. 67–88.

Reid T. *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense: A Critical Edition* / ed. by D. R. Brookes. Edinburgh University Press, 1997. 376 p.

Sivinski S., Ulatowski J. The Anthropocentrism of the Cosmic Perspective Argument. *Ethics and the Environment*. 2019. Vol. 24, No. 1. P. 1–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2979/ethicsenviro.24.1.01

Strickland L. *Leibniz's Monadology: A New Translation and Guide*. Edinburgh University Press, 2014. 304 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748693238

Yulianto H. Philosophy of management science: Ontology, epistemology, and axiology perspectives. *Cross-Border Journal of Business Management*. 2021. Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 152–162.

О. Н. КУБАЛЬСЬКИЙ[1*]

[1*]ДУ "Інститут досліджень науково-технічного потенціалу та історії науки імені Г. М. Доброва НАН України" (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта kubalsky@nas.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-7956-3150

Значущість філософської антропології у визначенні методології сучасних наукових досліджень

Мета. У цьому дослідженні передбачено виявити методологічну значущість антропологічного розуміння цінностей для проведення сучасних наукових досліджень. **Теоретичний базис.** Філософська антропологія виступає епістемологічним підґрунтям для відповідей на онтологічні питання, які входять у структуру таких проблем сучасної науки, як конструювання наукової картини світу, упорядкування даних природної настанови та антропокосмізм. Онтологічним підґрунтям для формування антропологічної теорії цінностей виступають вчення Вільгельма Ляйбніца, Іммануїла Канта, Рудольфа Лотце, Мартіна Гайдеґґера. **Наукова новизна.** Створення наукової картини світу, дослідження природної настанови й антропологічний підхід до космології, здійснені під кутом зору філософії цінностей, показують тісну взаємну обумовленість цієї наукової проблематики. Успішне визначення науковцем-дослідником власних ціннісних позицій неможливе без погодження ним своєї картини світу з панівними в його суспільстві уявленнями про світ. Такі уявлення вивчає антропокосмізм, який досліджує не стільки світ сам по собі, скільки погляд на цей світ із позицій наявного стану суспільства та основних інтенцій його розвитку. **Висновки.** Ціннісна настанова науковців на

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023

певному етапі розвитку наукових знань формує їхню картину світу, яка має вигляд самозрозумілих наукових положень. Факти сучасної фізики завжди так чи інакше мають отримати свою легітимацію через світ природної настанови людини. Навіть неспостережувані характеристики мікросвіту отримують пояснення завдяки зверненню до знань про спостережувані характеристики світу. Антропоцентричний характер космології зумовлений тим, що в сучасній філософії цінності людини пояснюють не лише спосіб її пізнання, але й спосіб її включення у світ.

Ключові слова: філософська антропологія; методологія сучасних наукових досліджень; наукова картина світу; природна настанова; антропокосмізм; цінності

Received: 18.08.2023
Accepted: 20.12.2023

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295311
© O. N. Kubalskyi, 2023