



ARTICLES AND STATEMENTS

Historical Variability of Anthropological Models and the Categorical Essence of Human Nature

¹Alexander Fedulin

²Vardan Bagdasaryan

¹Russian State University of Tourism and Service, Russia

Dr. (History), Professor

E-mail: rector06@mail.ru

²Russian State University of Tourism and Service, Russia

Dr. (History), Professor

E-mail: vardanb@mail.ru

Abstract. This article studies the various anthropological models in world history. It is shown that the view of humans as individuals is associated with some ideology and is not generally distributed throughout civilization. The difference in the understanding of human nature based on period—traditional society, modern, and postmodern—is traced. Anthropological models are described in correlation with the ideologies of liberalism, socialism, fascism, and conservatism.

Keywords: anthropological model; God-man; individual; traditional society; modernism; post-modernism; liberalism; socialism; fascism; conservatism.

Introduction. In spite of the notion that a person is identical with an individual, taken now as an obvious truism, such an identity has not always been obvious. The term “individual”, in literal translation from Latin, means “indivisible”. Accordingly, an “individual” is a person possessing only his or her own particular characteristics both of external and internal nature. However, the term is inadequate for expressing the innate characteristics of the human essence that define the teleological senses of a person. In view of the individualistic orientation that exists today, it can even have destructive consequences for a person [1]. The goal of this study is to test the hypothesis of change in anthropological models when the paradigm of historical development is changed.

Materials and Methods. The theory of modernization has been taken as the basis of understanding the historical process. In this article, the theory is methodologically connected with the social and cultural methodology. Anthropological models in history are correlated with the division of history into periods—traditional society, modern, and postmodern. The ideological spectrum is considered with regard to classical ideologies—liberalism, socialism, conservatism, and fascism. A key method of the research is comparative historical. The works of major thinkers of various ideological platforms, reflecting a variety of views about the nature of a person, have formed the historical basis of the work.

Discussion. Aristotle argued that a person’s essence changes depending on changes in governmental structure [1]. Thereafter the problem of differences in understanding the person’s essence in various social systems has been studied primarily by philosophers. The historical anthropology, having proclaimed that humanity should be at the focus of the historical studies, has

distanced itself from the ambiguity of the actual understanding of human nature (the "Annals" school, microhistory, the new cultural history) [3, 4, 5, 6]. The task of this paper is to study the problems of determining human nature on the background of the historical process.

Results. Traditional anthropological model: the God-manhood ideal.

It was impossible for archaic societies to imagine that the individual as a subject existed in its modern sense. Identification of the human with a super-being showed the way to attain perfection. Thus identity with that super-being was sanctified as the meaning of life.

In contrast, contemporary anthropology considers self-identification with "We" rather than with "Ego" as a sign of backwardness and primitiveness that is strongly associated with the savage worldview. Meanwhile recent investigations in the field of developmental psychology disprove this point, because "We"-identification can not be acquired before the "I"-identification.

It was archetypal thinking that determined the core ethical values of any traditional society. Almost every single ethnic group had his own forefather who, in fact, represented the personalized tribe or clan (for instance, in Slavic mythology such a forefather was called Dazhdbog). The personal way to salvation lay in attainment of identity with a perfect, unspoiled first man, whose image was inherent in every culture (specifically for the Abrahamic religions, it was Adam) [7]. Offering the God-manhood idea, Christianity has further strengthened the traditional anthropological view on human nature. The main difference between the nature of the modern worldly person, the heavenly perfect person, that is Adam, and God-man, namely, Christ, is concealed in the proportion of biological and spiritual principles. The body dominates the modern human spirit.

The mind, the third principle of the human being, along with body and spirit, operates ambivalently. It may be subject to both spirit and body. The first opportunity follows by "deification," the second one - by "dehumanization." Undoubtedly spirit prevails in the heavenly person. The body of god-man is considered to be absolutely spiritual.

In addition ancient philosophy focused on the issue of relationships between macro- and microcosm. Interpretation of the cosmos as a fundamental order was the main point. According to the pantheistic tradition, humanity as a microcosm was similar to the Universe [8, 9]. As a consequence, the overriding ethical intention of Hinduism and other pantheistical religions rejects self-identification in order to achieve inner peace [10, 11]. The cosmology of Abrahamic religions affirmed that God created humanity "in His image and likeness".

As a result, two different anthropological attitudes to the issue of human evolution emerged. The Eastern and Orthodox traditions link it to deification, while the Western one emphasizes individualization. We adhere to the vital approach that extends the concept of life to include non-biological systems and thus is closer to the tradition of Eastern civilization.

Beginning from Ancient Greece, Western thinking tends to interpret human nature as consistently depleting the spiritual aspect of life. It was Aristotelianism that recognized mind as a primary principle. Quite the contrary, Plato and the Platonists considered spirit to be an immanent quality of human nature. Eventually, the former attitude, that is, Aristotelianism, became the basis of Catholic theology.

Hence, Western Christianity came to portray humanity as a rational egoist. Intellectual development and a rise in the standard of living were chosen as the main criteria of success. Eastern Christianity placed emphasis on human spiritual qualities and measured success of the state or society by progress in moral capacities.

It is worth saying that what we now call the "individual" used to be called a mask in Pre-Modern times. Boethius stated that the Latin term "persona" originated from the word "mask". In this sense a mask is a kind of "temporary rented" guise, which has nothing in common with the profound essence of human existence. A mask can be easily replaced by another one. Hence the tradition of the medieval masquerade appeared as a symbol of instability and simulation [12]. In the Early Modern epoch the carnival personalized this approach transformed into the ontological norm, and during the age of Enlightenment the whole world turned into a global theater with people as actors.

Ancient mythology described the universe as three vertical levels of being: 1. the sphere of Heaven; 2. the sphere of Earth; 3. the sphere of Humanity. The sphere of human existence was located between heaven and earth. Such a kind of interim position reflected the fundamental meaning of sacred anthropology which persisted in showing Humanity as a special continuum comprising both heaven and earth. Woman was perceived as terrestrial essence, whereas man embodied the heavenly element. In fact, the creation of the world consisted in the separation of

heaven and earth, while the creation of humanity resulted in two substances being reconnected and thus the harmony of the universe was restored.

The three spheres of life were consistent with the rational, spiritual and biological principles of human nature, which, according to sacral anthropology, were correlated with three parts of the body, namely brain, heart and the lower abdominal area. It was the heart, not the mind, that guided the "perfect person". The mind came to the fore of anthropological projects from the beginning of Modern history, to be exact since René Descartes stated: "I think, therefore I am." As the development of the consumption-oriented, hedonistic morality progressed, the main symbolic point of humanity shifted to the lower abdominal area. Strengthened by mass culture, the biological principle becomes dominating.

Anthropological model of Modern history: the human as an individual.

According to esoterism, the one-dimensional material being relates to a new type of quasi-human, the so called Golem, who lacks a spiritual substratum. In Jewish folklore, a golem is a clay giant animated by magical means. The secular system is golem-like, because its cultural and anthropological focus refuses the highest spiritual ideals for the sake of individual freedom. The spirit of the modern human as an integral God-given part of human nature is increasingly atrophying. So, as the global project of anthropological inversion is implementing: the human turns into a golem. In fact the split of science as a whole into a number of disciplines as a consequence of the advancement of science has led to a deconstruction of the human microcosm. Humanity as a whole has appeared to be beyond any scientific discourse. Moreover, not one of the modern scientific disciplines studies spirit as a separate subject.

The loss of the soul is the main challenge of modern anthropology, which has narrowed humanity to purely material processes. In that sense the concept of Julien Offray de La Mettrie, the French physician and enlightener, is extremely significant. Proclaiming the human as a machine, he likened the human body to clockwork and thus denied the very existence of the soul. Consistent with materialism in lacking a soul, the ethic should be based on the principles of hedonism aimed at meeting physical needs. In La Mettrie's opinion, humans surpass animals just because of our needs.

The process of materialization of the universe led to the elimination of the spirit from the anthropological discourse. Humans were treated as a special, the most perfect animal. Biological analysis of human nature was important at the appropriate stage of scientific development in order to define human differences from animals, to collect empirical data in the field of anthropogenesis. The most important evolutionarily acquired features of *Homo sapiens* are:

1. augmentation of the cranial cavity and brain;
2. bipedalism;
3. grasping hand, with well-developed thumb;
4. lowering of the larynx and lingual bone
5. decrease of the canines;
6. menstrual cycle;
7. reduction of hair-coat.

According to scientists, the above-mentioned biological characteristics induced the formation of society [13]. Transformation of the brain structure caused abstract thinking, which in turn resulted in the emergence of culture, science, religion, government, production etc. In addition, abstract thinking and changes of the jaws made speech feasible. The menstrual cycle determined the ability for year-round pairing. In this conjunction the family as an institution evolved from a basic social unit to an objective biological phenomenon [14, 15, 16]. So, inherent coexistence of social and biological principles within humanity allows application of the term "biosocial organism" to humanity.

Being seemingly well-composed, the concept raises a number of issues. It is unclear how humans could survive while accumulating evolutionary changes reduced physical capabilities. Proved by paleoanthropological research, hereditary accumulation suggests that evolution was predetermined teleologically, in other words, that the evolutionary process was controlled from heaven. Thus, nowadays the theory of evolution, which used to be positioned as an alternative to religion, advances synthesis of religious and scientific knowledge.

Anthropological models and universal ideologies.

Anthropology of liberalism.

Liberalism considers humans as individuals, a concept that is quite the contrary to traditional religious anthropology [17, 18]. Human development is strongly associated with individualization.

By taking social content out of human nature, the aforementioned ideology reduces the human being to biological survival. Hence there is a direct step towards the dictatorship of consumer ethics. If religion invokes the ideal of deification, then the liberal principle of asociality lessens human nature to the animal. Naturally, the biologically oriented paradigm is not expressed directly in liberalism, but it can be extracted from its declared values. Nowadays it is the liberal view of human nature that has been established as a norm of everyday consciousness.

The widespread stereotype of liberalism being closely connected with progress needs to be revised. It is evident that humanity evolved through socialization, which is opposite to the liberal set of values. Essentially liberalism put forward the concept of human involution. The prominent liberal theorist and severe critic of totalitarianism, Hannah Arendt once admitted that the term "human" per se excluded the idea of progress [19, 20].

Anthropology of fascism.

Despite the fact that there is much divergence between liberalism and fascism, they share their opinion about human nature to the extent that both ideologies deprive humans of a social nature and reduce it to a purely biological content. The difference is a matter of emphasis.

Fascism stressed the instinct of domination, the desire of some individuals to subjugate others. The fascist categorical approach to the person was largely determined by the legacy of Friedrich Nietzsche, whose ideal was a superman overcoming human nature. According to Nietzsche, superman was absolutely asocial, public morality ran counter to the vital idea, and thus the traditional Christian virtues were not acceptable.

It is worth saying that the elaboration of the highly-organized fascist corporate-totalitarian state was not contradictory to the prime idea of asociality. As Arnold Gehlen, a member of the NSDAP and a theorist for Nazi bioanthropology, said, the state just replaced human instincts, which became reduced during evolution, and thus the existence of states is reasonable only to the extent of the implementation of biological and instinctual principles (first of all, duty of struggle) [21, 22, 23]. Race wars and the scramble for life space were regarded as objective inevitabilities, as an interpretation of the law of natural selection.

What liberalism has done is just to replace the term race war by the less odious concept of war of civilizations. Meanwhile, peace between peoples and civilizations requires a certain level of human development, self-restraint of the individual, altruism and tolerance, and thinking through universal human values. It is a socialized person, not a human-beast, who is capable of dialogue among civilizations.

Anthropology of Socialism.

Socialism defines the human being as a social creature, who cannot exist irrespective of other people. "Civil society", which is nothing more than "contemplation of single individuals", was not sufficient for Karl Marx. Therefore he suggested the idea of "human society, or socializing humanity" as a new materialist ideal.

However the thesis "what society is, so is a person" cannot explain what is the driving force of social transformation. To resolve this contradiction Marx worked out the notion of alienation. It is asserted that a human alienates from its own essence while living in an exploitative society, which means that society did not define a genuine human being. Thus, Marxist anthropology came logically to the conclusion that spiritual substance was an integral part of human nature.

The problem of alienation was resolved by Marx's contemporary, German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach, who abolished the dual nature of human existence, which is inherent in religious anthropology. In Feuerbach's opinion, humans express their true essence and best qualities by creating God, who indeed is a human alienated from his own ego and placed in the supernatural realm. Afterwards the issue of overcoming alienation became a cornerstone of the "new left" philosophy, especially Freudo-Marxism and Marxist existentialism [24].

Conservative Anthropology.

Historical and reflective components of human evolution are highly important for conservative thinking. The person does not exist outside tradition and national culture, because such a value as experience can only be transmitted within the paradigm of civilization. There are Russians, Germans, and Chinese, but not a universal person, so the appeal of abstract universal human rights is a fiction.

While essentially correct, this premise could lead to racism if hyper-expressed, since the unity of humanity was leveled by conservative ideas. In fact differences of civilization did not demolish the fundamental value of all historical civilizations. The cause of their specificity was not different

values, but diverse forms of their implementation, as well as the fact that, historically, civilizations may stay at various levels of the highest achievement of the universal values.

Conservative criticism of liberal and socialist doctrines from a spiritual position deserves special attention. They attacked sharply both the asocialized individual created by liberalism and the dictatorship of the collective utility praised by socialism.

Starting with Feodor M. Dostoevsky and Konstantin N. Leontiev, Russian conservatives pounced on the image of the global human anthill, associated with all kinds of socialistic doctrine. They emphasized that “common” as a category is not always and not everywhere equal to “spirit” as a category [25].

The main challenge for conservatism consisted in finding a constant, eternal pillar of human beings. For the fundamentalist school such a pillar was God. For example, Konstantin P. Pobedonostsev, a notorious Russian conservative statesman, said that the human is just “a clay vessel for storing divine grace” [26]. All in all, the spiritual deification of humans by conservatives seems to be more attractive than the liberal individual or the social human of socialism [27].

Postmodernist post-anthropology: destruction of humanity.

Postmodern anthropology followed the path of fragmentation and relativization of human nature. Protagoras’ famous statement, “man is the measure of all things”, which used to be a shocking phrase in ancient times, nowadays is converted into the primary postmodernist intention. Typical for modern anthropology, the individual (self-sufficient, indivisible human) has been displaced by the dividuum (divisible) human as the prime object of postmodern anthropology. Today anyone can play many roles at the same time. The Internet and its virtual worlds reproduce this illusion of multiple identities in a very active way. It may sound ironic, but it is a fact that modern people are losing their ability to think abstractly, because nowadays the existence of phenomena is not accompanied by any meaning.

According to a widespread functionalistic approach, the essence of humanity is uncognizable [28]. The only thing that can be known is humanity’s functions, what human nature consists of. The most common tool in psychoanalysis for functionalistic cognition in fact leads to the deconstruction of human identity since it is based on the concept of the unconscious, which is outside of the psyche’s traditional limits.

In addition, the preoccupation of modern anthropology with the reconstruction of the human genome has caused the destruction of personality. For example, in 1990 the US launched an international project aimed at decoding the human genome, which gathered together genetics from the most powerful states of the modern world such as China, Britain, Germany, France and Japan. The most dangerous effect is that the human genetic code is just a figure, hence the number can become equivalent to the individual in the future.

Once in a while public opinion is disturbed by reports about tiny chips implanted into the human body as sensors and electronic maps. Rumors that they were grafted on the forehead and hands made many people recall Revelations and the seal of the Antichrist. A significant part of the diocesan bishops and monks sharply rejected this coding and thus entered into conflict with the overwhelmingly indifferent Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The question about genome management was revealed as a prime task in 2000 when leaders of the United States and Britain reported in a joint statement the initial decoding of the human genome. Provided that the person is a dividuum consisting of elements of the code, it would be possible to combine his nature by disassembling and assembling this code over and over, so human cloning is just a matter of time now. Genetic mutation would be determined by required functions. Indeed today we have been changing our genetic structure with the help of medicine, while researchers rush to find powerful means of neurochemical modification. How much will it take to embed computers in our brains and to get used to them as to an additional hemisphere? Maybe 10 years, maybe 50 or 60, but this time must come.

Undoubtedly, biotechnology continues to develop. Inevitably, it will be used in order to improve human nature in a biological sense. The problem is that such transformations are not going to be transferred to the social and spiritual level of human life, reflecting the one-dimensional biological-oriented paradigm of postmodern anthropology.

Conclusions. The analysis that has been conducted confirms the correctness of the hypotheses of the variability of understanding the essence of humanity in various historical eras. Human life has several ontological layers. Thus it has been understood in the framework of traditional religions. The narrowing of human nature to some single level of existence has deformed that nature. Just such deformations have claimed a generality of ideology. The lines of

destruction of the human being have been intensified all the more in postmodern discourse. The task of changing those trends is before us. This suggests convening an anthropological assembly. It is important to restore the entire form of human nature in all the existential aspects of its manifestation.

References:

1. Yakunin V.I., Bardasaryan V.E., Kulikov V.I., Sulakshin S. Variability and cyclicity of global social development of humanity. Moscow: Scientific Expert, 2009. p. 464.
2. Aristotle. Aristotle. Works: In Vol. 4, Moscow, Thought, 1983. Vol. 4, Book 3, p. 470.
3. Burke P. Reflection on the Historical Revolution in France: The Annales School and the British Social History // Review. 1978. Vol. 1. № 3/4. P. 147-156.
4. Henretta, J. (1979) Social History as Lived and Written *American Historical Review*. Vol. 84. № 5. P. 1293-1333.
5. Cohn, B.S. (1980) History and Anthropology: The State of Play *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. Vol. 22. № 2. P. 198-221.
6. Koska, J. (1980) Theory and Social History: Recent Developments in West Germany *Social Research*. Vol. 47. № 3. P. 426-457.
7. Yakunin V.I., Bardasaryan, V.E., Kulikov V.I., Sulakshin S. Variability and cyclicity of global social development of humanity. Moscow: Scientific Expert, 2009. p. 464.
8. Dictionary of Mythology. Ye. M. Meletinskiy, ed. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. P. 672.
9. Grigoryan B.G. Philosophy on the essence of humanity. Moscow: Politizdat, 1973. P. 319.
10. Chanyshv, A.N. Course of lectures on ancient philosophy. Moscow: Upper School, 1981. P. 374.
11. Chatterjee S., Datta D.M. An Introduction to Indian Philosophy. University of Calcutta, 1968. 437 p.
12. Radhakrishnan S. Indian Philosophy (Volume 1) 2nd Edition. USA, Oxford University Press, 2008. 650 p.
13. Bakhtin M. Collected works in 7 volumes. Moscow: Russian dictionaries, 2008. Vol. 4, 1120 p.
14. Markov A.V. Human evolution. In two books. Moscow: Astrel, 2011-2012. p. 496, 512.
15. Semyonov Yu.I. The rise of marriage and the family. Moscow: Thought, 1974. p. 307.
16. Faynberg L. A. At the sources of sociogenesis: From the stage of monkeys to ancient human community. Moscow: Science, 1980. 150 p.
17. Butovskaya M.L. Evolution of humanity and its social structure // Nature. 1998. No. 9. P. 87-99.
18. Locke J. Works in 3 volumes. Moscow: Thought, 1985-1988. 621 p., 560 p., 668 p.
19. Hayek F. A. The Road to Serfdom. USA: University of Chicago Press, 2007. 304 p.
20. Hannah A. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Schocken, 2004. 674 p.
21. Hannah A. The Human Condition. University Of Chicago Press, 1999. 366 p.
22. Gehlen A. Studien zur Anthropologie und Soziologie. Neuwied am Rhein u. Berlin: Luchterhand, 1963. 355 p.
23. Grigoryan B.T. Latest currents and problems of philosophy in the FRG. Moscow: Science, 1978. 367 p.
24. Bagdasaryan, V.E. (2003) The image of the enemy in Soviet historical films, 1930s-1940s *Homeland History*. № 6. P. 31-46.
25. Liberalism, conservatism, and Marxism: a problematic-thematic anthology. Pivovarova Yu. S., ed. Moscow: INION, 1998. 167 p.
26. Pobedonostsev K.P. Moscow anthology / Pobedonostsev K. P. Works. Saint Petersburg, 1996. P. 223.
27. Chestneyshin N.V. The problem of humanity in the social philosophy of Russian conservatism: Dis. for Ph.D.: 09.00.11. Archangelsk, 2004. 210 p.
28. Cassirer E. An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture. Yale University press, 1962. 250 p.

Историческая изменчивость антропологических моделей и категориальная сущность природы человека

¹ Александр Федулин

² Вардан Багдасарян

¹ Российский государственный университет туризма и сервиса, Россия

Доктор исторических наук, профессор

E-mail: rector06@mail.ru

² Российский государственный университет туризма и сервиса, Россия

Доктор исторических наук, профессор

E-mail: vardanb@mail.ru

Аннотация. В представленной статье исследуется различие антропологических моделей в мировой истории. Доказывается, что взгляд на человека как индивидуума связывается с определенной идеологией и не имеет всеобщего для цивилизаций распространения. Прослеживается различие понимания природы человека в периодизации - традиционное общество - модерн - постмодерн. Представлено описание антропологических моделей в соотнесение с идеологиями либерализма, социализма, фашизма и консерватизма.

Ключевые слова: антропологические модели; богочеловек; индивидуум; традиционное общество; модерн; постмодерн; либерализм; социализм; фашизм; консерватизм.