

**V. Rubskyi**

*a 4<sup>th</sup> year student, Faculty of Philosophy,  
Department of Philosophy,*

*I.I. Mechnikov Odessa National University  
Tel. +38093–840–17–09; email: pavv@te.net.ua*

*У статті описується пошук нових філософсько-методологічних проблем аналізу свідомості методами нейронауки. Таким чином, методологічно необхідна редукція аналізу людської свідомості представляється як онтологічна. Автор, аналізуючи останні наукові публікації на цю тему, приходиться до висновку, що когнітивний аналіз суб'єкта мислення підміняється молекулярним аналізом мозку, що виключає розгляд мозку як інструменту. Таким чином, спроби розгадати таємницю співвідношення тілесного і духовного, шляхом методом нейробіологічної редукції генерує в області когнітивної науки більше проблем, ніж вирішує.*

*Ключові слова: свідомість, неврологія, методична редукція, когнітивний, фізикалізм, біологічний редукціонізм, свобода волі, детермінізм, мозок.*

*В статье описывается поиск новых философско-методологических проблем анализа сознания методами нейронауки. Таким образом, методологически необходимая редукция анализа человеческого сознания представляется как онтологическая. Автор, анализируя последние научные публикации на эту тему, приходит к выводу, что когнитивный анализ субъекта мышления подменяется молекулярным анализом мозга, что исключает рассмотрение мозга как инструмента. Таким образом, попытки разгадать тайну соотношения телесного и духовного, путём методом нейробиологической редукции генерирует в области когнитивной науки больше проблем, чем решает.*

*Ключевые слова: сознание, неврология, методологическая редукция, когнитивный, физикализм, биологический редукционизм, свобода воли, детерминизм, мозг.*

*The article describes the search for new philosophical and methodological issues of the analysis of consciousness, along with the methods of neuroscience. In this way technically necessary methodological reduction analysis of human consciousness is perceived as ontological. The author, analyzing the latest scientific publications on this topic, concludes that cognitive analysis of the subject of thinking is substituted with the molecular analysis of the brain (that excludes the consideration of the brain as a tool). Thus, the attempt to solve the mystery of the relation of bodily and spiritual by neurobiologically reduction method generates in the field of cognitive science more problems than it solves.*

*Key Words: consciousness, neuroscience, methodological reduction, cognitive, physicalism, biological reductionism, free will, determinism, brain.*

**Topicality of the problem.** The significance of barriers to productive discussions have already been designated in the famous book of Oswald Spengler “The Decline of Europe”, where the author with pessimism talks about the incommensurability of the main cultural areas. Tightness of different world for each other is one of the problems of modern comparative philosophy. Attempts to provide a general basis for a genuine arguing of both sides today can not be called satisfactory. In this regard the possibility of fruitful philosophical discussions now acquires a special urgency. In fact, it’s a matter of the near future of mankind. Ability to find a constructive platform for ideological debate may depend on peace and security in regions where there is a clash of cultures and civilizations which has already begun as a clash of equals. The purpose of the study is to define the philosophical and existential foundation of ideological debate. **Research objectives:** 1) to determine the fundamental differences of ideological discussions and their consequences from other types of discussions; 2) to analyze the specifics of constructing arguments in ideological debate; 3) to select the structure of the ideological debate; 4) to explore the specificity of the provisions of the paradigmatic correlation outlook.

The object of the research is a form of ideological debate as the meeting of different paradigms and axiology. The subject of research is structural and existential aspect of the ideological debate on the example of the collision between theism’s and atheism’s philosophical foundations.

**Key Points:** 1) the structure of the ideological debate does not involve stretching the production of formal evidence of his theses due to the nature of its subject, which is in the field fundamentally inaccessible to the valence argument parameters; 2) in a collision of worldviews occurs transition of the system to an external field of argumentation, thus depriving such constructive discussions; 3) the most productive method of ideological debate is a manifestation of consciousness as a tool of correlating paradigms and finding common grounds controversial theses and theories.

**Worldview discussion as a concept.** Worldview discussion is a discussion, the subject of which is the basic provisions of a particular worldview. For example, inter-religious discussion Christian and Muslim worldviews, atheistic or theistic, in the field of philosophy, and irrational rationalist, etc. The center for a discussion of such discussions is the very foundations of the world view, rather than derivatives investigation of any preceding philosophical premises, although the participants can wrongly present consequences as the basis. For example, issues on such topics as belief in God – from the lack of logic, Judaism – from poorly understood Tanakh, etc. Sometimes these approaches mirror the prejudices of the parties. For example, postulating the existence of God can be perceived as ideological cowardice (Camus, Paul Sartre), the same can be attributed to cowardice and postulate His absence (B.Paskal, S. Kierkegaard). Islam, Judaism and Christianity are equally output opponents’ worldview genesis of errors in reading the Scriptures. This very fact indicates a secondary appeal to Scripture as the basis of speculative appeal to science, logic, etc. Together with the loss of substantive differences, the discussion loses its value. After all, if the grounds of our judgments are hidden from us, we cannot make judgments [3: §29]. Nondeducibility of grounds of axiological differences allows us to raise the question on the grounds of discussions, classified as ideological.

In the domestic, political, legal, scientific and other types of discussions the parties have the possibility to *force* the opponent to an agreement, as the “rules of the game” and their implementation ensured common paradigmatic settings. But when the focus of debate is these settings themselves, then, as experience shows, the subjects of different

worldviews do not find instruments of persuasion, in the absence of evidence of general field. Consensus cases are extremely rare, and particularistic. More importantly, they are not such discussions even compelling to the target audience.

World person cannot be regarded as a scientific theory. There are cases when a person throughout his life didn't fully articulate. Trying to give consistency and coherence outlook partly there is a violence to the nature of worldview as the quintessential fundamentals of thinking, rather than the rules or conclusions. Worldview can be controversial in terms of third-party analysis and harmonious, from the point of view of the subject. Irrational and "doxios" (based on a subjective common sense) judgment, in contrast to the "epistemic" (rational) takes structurally predominant value in any worldview. A significant role of emotional and volitional components, a sense of the sacred, segmentation of world structure on the theoretical and everyday level forces us to refer to the logic of the peripheral circle in architectonic consciousness. "The Illogical is necessary, – Nietzsche wrote. – Among the things which can bring a thinker to distraction is the knowledge that the illogical is necessary to mankind and that from the illogical springs much that is good» [4:§31]. Introducing a category of "Alert" in the evidence analysis system, Husserl draws attention to the important fact: "Where a certain state of affairs is really a sign of another situation, which, if it is considered in itself should be a consequence of the first, the first performs this function in the thinking consciousness not as a logical basis, but due to the connection that is established between both beliefs of mental experiences or dispositions valid evidence previously spent" [2: 38–39].

Value-semantic part of the world is well-founded, and may even bypass rationalistic constructions personal worldview. For the materialist, for example, thesis: "there is no God" is almost never is – "everything is possible". Although from the perspective of understanding of God as the guarantor of the system of spiritual values, his denial, from the point of view of the external listener, must necessarily lead to the vast voluntarism. The same can be said of other systems of evaluation and measurement of the opponent's worldview. The application of terms: morality, rationality, consistency, usability, etc. assume their axiology causing fixing not a particular ideology, but only their own tendentiousness. "We are primordially illogical... this is one of the greatest and most baffling discords of existence" [4: § 32]. This Nietzsche's view in terms of other axiology might be called wrong, as the lack of logic here is disharmony. But in a number of religious systems and philosophies (intuitionism) illogicality is a part harmony.

Introspective, the requirement of human consciousness to its own world outlook, even when it is objectified, is not determined by its logical harmony and coherence, and its ability to provide a satisfactory solution to the internal regulations such as the meaning of life, pain, and his ability to inspire and uplift man. Satisfactory of existential parameters outlook makes it all the structural contradictions and atavisms unnoticed or irrelevant. World "actually absorbs the pure essence of physical, mental and ideal things, no matter how accomplished their awareness and even if there is this awareness in general" [11:71].

**The existential aspect of the ideological debate.** Man's worldview never cuts to rational schemes and constructions, his beliefs and ideals is the fundamental level of his being. From this point of view, the statement of the worldview into question, a real attempt to offer an alternative, always involves a deep spiritual crisis (in any sense of the word "spirituality") panelists. A normal consciousness has resisted this attempt at ideological nucleus as a crossing place of his identity. The participants to feel comfortable with the situation itself forced to partially block the real dimension of what is happening and take it

like be played in an ideological reevaluation of values, hypothesis it. For this reason, reliance on a painless algorithm of discussion, calling into question the identity is in vain.

For many potential subjects of discussion, the call for an ideological revision is unacceptable. After all, it involves the entities entering into philosophical discussion a certain degree of self-criticism to the foundations of his thinking and openness to other axioms, the willingness to listen to the interlocutor whose position is traditionally unacceptable and therefore largely incomprehensible.

For example, for representatives of “Epistemic foundationalism” and dogmatic types of worldview, religion or philosophy discussion as a research question is inconceivable. They admit only a rigid format of controversy, reproof, etc., because the setting of the absolute superiority of their outlook over the other is included in the axiom of this worldview. Therefore, the entry into a constructive discussion for the dogmatic consciousness already would be to agree on the revision of the Central axioms of consciousness that is unthinkable. For example, in some Orthodox circles, a good-natured dialogue between the Orthodox Patriarch with the Pope is condemned as a “heresy of ecumenism”. Associate Professor, Ranepa Dmitry Uzlaner, highlighting the “anti-religious fundamentalists”, argues that “fundamentalism can be understood in a non-religious context” [13]. On the other hand, philosophical subjects (relativistic) approach in the discussion often refuse to understand some of the truth of dogmatists, obviously considering their position a relic of past ages, and their representatives – obscurantiste. “It’s too easy to preach tolerance and to be tolerant, – pointed out this Russian philosopher S.N. Bulgakov, – not having anything going for you, but try to be tolerant, fervently believing in a particular truth” [7: 66]. In this phrase, Bulgakov is important for understanding the philosophical foundations of the debate underline “fervor” as the emotional-volitional component of the worldview. It links into the capital itself personal experience and specific theoretical beliefs. Even the word “certain” here is not accidental, since the existential truth is the result of selection for something in particular, then what becomes the “vehemence” of intellectual life. Thus, the unilateral bashing fundamentalists for dogmatism is the example of the same narrow-mindedness that he himself fundamentalism. It is important to understand that every worldview contains its own system of self-preservation and prejudice is an integral part of it.

**The problem of language in philosophical discussion.** The ideological debate is particularly important, common to all types of discussions – the problem of language. As Leslie Stevenson underlines [6: 26] in his experience of comparative philosophy, if the discussion opponent the answer is in terms of his worldview, it means an indirect recognition of the axioms of his theory. Here we can fix a certain linguistic impasse: on the one hand, it is impossible to refute rely on axioms, which are refuted. On the other hand, if the answer is given in terms of his theory, it will not be convincing, and indirectly to indicate the terminological closeness of its position, its inability to dialogue. Indicative in this vein, (the problem of language in opposing) discussion of Ernst Jünger and Martin Heidegger about nihilism, where Heidegger says that Junger objects nihilism is still the language of nihilism, which leads to its multiplication, whereas, according to Heidegger, “essence of nihilism is not nihilistic” [1], and to overcome it, we need in-depth analysis of notnihilistic core of nihilism. That philosophical language, which is used by Junger, it’s – “the barrier that prohibits the passage of the line, i.e., going beyond nihilism” [1]. This example is not unique. On the contrary, the problem of language as the meeting point of the two worldviews typical of each discussion, involving the axiom of consciousness. For

“a new kind of intimate experience we may expect in philosophy, – I.F. Mikhailov sums up Wittgenstein’s thought, – we have no means to understand it; because to understand the experience means to understand the language in which it is (can be) pronounced, and for such experience does not exist a possible language ... In these circumstances it is difficult even to talk about the experience of “something” because it is “something” there, Wittgenstein says, a grammatical “post” for empirical values” [10].

**Structural analysis of the displacement of discussion.** Every once in a philosophical debate, in the search for evidence of its innocence, opponents have to resort to fundamentally unsuitable argumentation. To be persuasive arguments must be clear, evidence-based, valence, explicitly, verifiable and falsifiable, that is, to be in the field of more obvious things, as a structural proof of any thing relies on using non-obvious explanation is obvious. However, the move to evidence-based level in an ideological debate is the inevitable devaluation of the substance of the discussion, and the substitution of its subject that is not in the field of provability. The two polemic sides look for the key to constructive discussion, not where it is lost (i.e. at the level of axiomatic statements) but at the level where there are clear-formalized arguments. This inevitably entails a classic mistake in the proof “Ignoratio elenchi”, when the argument, in view of this offset has proved another thesis than the one that entitles discussion [12: 315]. For this reason, the multiplication of polemical writings in the field of ideological debate does not lead not only to the Aristotelian truth, but also to the understanding of the parties.

The structural frame of traditional discussions itself contains a wrong assumption of the truth of mutually contradictory positions. In the logical framework they have in contradictie, so that the law of the excluded middle affirmed the truth of falsity of one over the other. However, this design does not correspond to reality. The juxtaposition of opposing theories doesn’t provide verification of their interdependence. All the philosophical theories have a lot of gaps and inconsistencies in relation to the other paradigm, as well as within its own. This is one party may be submitted so that the other may not be able to parry. But “not being able to contradict is proof of incapacity, not of “truth”” [5: § 515]. For clarity, take into consideration the vast experience of a polemical confrontation between materialism and religion. While the merits of the disagreement of these items we are talking about God as a category of consciousness, a discussion question is: do you have this theological category of referent or not, the disputing parties moving to more explicitly level of objectification in order to confirm the thesis lying in a fundamentally different level. Thus, all the developments of arguments in formalized field are false evidence base. For example, the whole direction of works is aimed at the materialist critique of faith and the biblical text (L. Taxil, J. Fraser, Z. Kosidowsky).

This trend, in order to refute the existence of God, aims to prove that the Bible and theology contain errors, confusion and internal contradictions. Their opponents are also involved in the problems of the sacred texts and teachings like, as if it depended on the existence / non-existence of God. As a result, the side “A” for the purpose of rejecting God rejects only theology. A side “B”, in turn, sees its task to defend the coherence of faith and prove the conceptual inconsistency of materialism. While the doctrines of the criticism are not criticism of the personal experience of knowing God, of whom there is a debate. Thus, the initial position of atheism (as a rejection of the existence of God) is replaced by the position of atheology or antitheism (both terms refer to the rejection of theology). In this modified model discussion claims theism is not the existence of God, and his own philosophical usefulness. Atheology is a part of theology rather than atheism. This is true

not least because they themselves theists regularly and harshly criticize the theistic constructions of each other that does not overcome, and only strengthens theism as an intellectual construct. Muslim theologians, for example, radically reject the construction of Christian theology, but because of this denial should not be output on the absence of God. "Antitheism as criticism and denial of certain forms of theism is not a sufficient basis for construction of holistic worldview. In other words, antitheism tends to be limited to "destructive work", it shows the contradictions of some form of theism" [14].

Prof. B. Finogentov considers an illustration of these words to be the recent best-selling book by the famous French philosopher Michel Onfray "Treatise of atheology" (2005), absorbed amount of atheological arguments against the world's religions. But on the positive program the author spoke of as "the future of atheism", which has not yet come. "We can say that in itself rationalist critique of theism - a simple matter, but ineffective to overcome theism" [14]. The following sample bias in quasiprobativ area there is a discussion relationship between *faith and science* as an argument for or against the existence of God. As an argument against the religious worldview are examples of conflict of church and science (Copernicus, J. Bruno, Galileo, M. Servetus). Contrary to the other side, allowing this same offset discussion lists facts of confrontation between science and atheism (Lavoisier, N. Vavilov, genetics of 50-s, repression of members of the USSR Academy of Sciences, etc.). The attraction of this kind of argument is unhelpful because the circumstances of repression or encouragement of science can not give answer about the ontology of the phenomena of religion and atheism. And, thus, cannot be a justification for not/being of God. The same can be applied to the attraction of the theory of evolution and the moral and historical arguments: the immorality of believers doesn't deny God more than their Holiness proves It. The contradiction of the idea of evolution as evidence of its compliance with the belief (theistic evolutionism) characterizes the theology, not the existence of God. As another example of the general tendency to shift from the essence of the debate in a different field, a discussion of historical events.

Side "A" provides an argument such religious precedents as the Inquisition, the Crusades, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, etc. The answer is in the same field side "B" represented by odious historical figures materialists such as Mao, Stalin, Mussolini, Pinochet, Lenin's red terror, etc. Here, artificial polemical construct is applied. Historical facts are attracted by both parties as illustrations only as already occupied positions. This kind of argument is built on the logical anachronism, does not reveal the existing differences and, especially, can not determine the presence or absence of God that is the declared object of discussion. For the opportunity to make a compelling case discussion of axiomatic beliefs, usually goes into a quasiprobativ area. Increasing the mass and complexity of the arguments only prevents its consideration of the central issue of discussion. The arguments constructed with the assumption «Ignoratio elenchi», there are quasiarguments. Thus, we come to the fact that the specificity of the ideological debate does not allow the parties to go on quite explicable evidence based argumentation of language, since the essence of ideological differences is the difference between paradigms.

**The manifestation of consciousness as a type of comparison.** Correlation of paradigmatic axioms can be thought of only as a manifestation of self-consciousness with the aim conciliate the interlocutor, not in order to force an agreement. The manifestation of consciousness is by nature the experience rather than a theoretical statement about what Wilhelm Dilthey wrote as "the objectification of life" [9: 219] – its verbal expression, recognizable in the experience. Trust to the testimony is a necessary condition for

ideological debate. Here is the border of argumentation as a discussion tool and starts self-certification of consciousness. For example, the brief formulation of the content of theistic consciousness: is possible and actually there is communion with God. [8]. We can discuss the accuracy of the verbal expressions of the opponent, but not the contents of the testimony. Since the most important methodological circumstance here is that if the parties will not have confidence in the contents of a manifestation of consciousness, they will not go out of the circle of its own axioms. Testimony of opponent you must trust to the extent that the reliability of what he says because with the tools of the different paradigm it is fundamentally impossible to check. Here we see the need to overcome the arbitration field search for ideological debate as possible to overcome the comparative gap.

How is it possible to relate the proposed paradigms? Some epistemological model, for example, Kuhn suggests that impossible. However, based on other models (for example, A. Poincare) it is quite possible, given that the structure of the human mind never fully corresponds to its ideological interpretive theory. In the experience of consciousness, the believer often thinks according to the structure of the unbeliever, and often the unbeliever thinks (about duty, love, honor, etc.) as if God exists. The same can be said about the practical community of other worldviews. This gives the correlation of the paradigms of constructive value. Partly the believer recognizes in himself the unbeliever, and the unbeliever recognizes the important predicates of the believer, a Christian – Muslim, Baptist – Orthodox, etc. Thus, this structure is ideological debate again becomes a participant in the choice of self-identification. It is fruitful, even when after the articulation of self-consciousness and understanding of others, both again choose its former ideological identification. Only in this case there is enrichment and convergence of different types of consciousness, not polemical, theological and philosophical schools only.

**Conclusions.** In the study to determine the philosophical and existential foundations of the ideological debate, we have analyzed the specific structure of its argument. That has allowed to allocate the structure of the ideological debate and to highlight the specific parameters correlate paradigmatic positions, chief among them: a trust to the testimony an opponent and insecurity of explicable axioms. This led to the conclusion that the ideological structure of the debate does not involve the valence of production of formal evidence, as the subject is not in the field of traditional types of argument.

As the most productive method of ideological discussion presented correlation of paradigms, which reveal common ground of disputed theses and philosophical theories.

## REFERENCES

1. Alain de Benoist. Jünger, Heidegger, and Nihilism / Alain de Benoist / transl. by Greg Johnson. –<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/junger-heidegger-nihilism>
2. Husserl E. Logical Investigations / E.Husserl. – London, 2001. – Vol 2. – 384 p.
3. Kant Immanuel. The Critique of Judgment / Immanuel Kant. – [http://www2.SunySuffolk.edu/fellenm/Classes/PHL293\\_files/Kant.pdf](http://www2.SunySuffolk.edu/fellenm/Classes/PHL293_files/Kant.pdf)
4. Nietzsche Friedrich. Human, All Too Human / Friedrich Nietzsche. – <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/38145/38145-h/38145-h.htm>.
5. Nietzsche Friedrich. The will to power / Friedrich Nietzsche. – [https://archive.org/stream/TheWillToPower-Nietzsche/will\\_to\\_power-nietzsche\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/TheWillToPower-Nietzsche/will_to_power-nietzsche_djvu.txt)
6. Stevenson L., Haberman D. Ten Theories of Human Nature / L.Stevenson, D.Haberman. – 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. – New York, Oxford University Press. – 264 p.

7. Булгаков С.Н. Свет невечерний / С.Н. Булгаков. – М.: Республика, 1994. – 415 с.
8. Вестель Ю. Тезисы в защиту паламизма / Ю. Вестель. – Режим доступа: <http://theology.in.ua/ua/bp/discussions/critic/40335>
9. Дильтей В. Типы мировоззрений и обнаружение их в метафизических системах / В.Дильтей // Культурология. XX век. Антология. – М., 1995. – С. 216-229.
10. Михайлов И.Ф. Витгенштейн и проблема мистического опыта / И.Ф.Михайлов. – Режим доступа: [http://philosophy2.ru/iphras/library/kozl2\\_1.html#\\_ftnref5](http://philosophy2.ru/iphras/library/kozl2_1.html#_ftnref5)
11. Проблема человека в западной философии. – М.: Прогресс, 1988. – 552 с.
12. Уёмов А. Основы практической логики / А.Уёмов. – Одесса, 1997. – 388 с.
13. Узланер Д.А. Новые атеисты – это фундаменталисты / Д.А.Узланер. – Метрополь. – 13 апреля 2015. – Режим доступа: <http://mtrpl.ru/uzlaner>
14. Финогентов В.Н. Атеизм: антиизм и внетеизм / В.Н.Финогентов // Здравый смысл. – 2005. – № 4 (37). – С. 15–21.

*Рекомендовано до друку науковими керівниками  
к.філос.н., доц. О.С. Петриківською, к.філол.н., доц. Л.М. Філюк  
Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.06.2016*

**UDC 94(477)"1986"**

## **10 UNKNOWN FACTS ABOUT CHERNOBYL**

**V. Yakovenko**

*a 1<sup>st</sup> year student, Faculty of Philosophy,  
Cultural Studies Department,*

*I.I. Mechnikov Odessa National University*

*Tel. +38097–327–24–09; email: nikusya.yakovenko98@mail.ru*

*В данной статье рассказывается о Чернобыльской трагедии, которую назвали самой большой техногенной катастрофой в истории. В этом году исполнилось 30 лет, как произошла авария на Чернобыльской атомной электростанции и 15 лет как ЧАЭС была полностью остановлена, но интерес к Чернобылю не падает. В статье автор рассматривает не только все подробности этого фатального дня, но и описывает несколько правил поведения в зоне отчуждения, а также цитирует мнения журналистов из других стран об этом печально памятном бедствии. Кажется, мир еще не осознал, что могло бы случиться в тот день, если бы не нашлись мужественные и отважные герои Чернобыля! К 2016 году в окрестностях ЧАЭС установлено много памятников и мемориалов, каждый год 26 апреля люди по всему миру чтут память об этом дне.*

*Ключевые слова: бедствие, радиоактивный, реактор, эвакуация, ядерный.*

*У даній статті розповідається про Чорнобильську трагедію, яку назвали найбільшою техногенною катастрофою в історії. В цьому році виповнилось 30 років, як сталася аварія на Чорнобильській атомній електростанції та 15 років як ЧАЕС була повністю зупинена, але зацікавленість Чорнобилем менше не стає. У статті автор розглядає не тільки усі подробиці цього фатального дня, але також описує декілька правил поведінки у зоні відчуження; крім того, авторка цитує*