

FROM THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

We launch a new journal “Philosophical Anthropology”. Already in the first issue we try to unite the efforts of specialists in this philosophical movement despite the differences particular to this field of knowledge. Perhaps, in no other modern philosophical problem the question of the status is as pressing as in philosophical anthropology. The very existence of the discipline is in question. What are philosophical anthropologists to investigate, if “man is dead”?

Why is it so? The thing is, philosophical anthropology has lost its canonical form. Whereas no other field of philosophical knowledge has lost its subject. Natural philosophy still studies nature. The artificial environment substitutes the natural environment. Man as a project of nature loses his form. But the return to nature still remains, as Berdyaev wrote, a recurring motif in the history of culture.

Logics, as it should, remains a doctrine of a liturgically congruous thought. Social philosophers still study the characteristics and dynamics of the social organization. Ethics, in spite of the growing interest in practical situations, continues to interpret moral consciousness. Esthetics analyzes art experience using the categories of beauty, perfection, sublime and ugliness.

In the meantime philosophical anthropology actually finds itself in a subjectless space. After ten thousand years, man as an object of study begins to lose his naturalness, sociality, and transcendentality. People do not know what they are, but they are aware of this ignorance. Today man is totally problematic, and transhumanism insists on excluding him entirely as a distinct kind of entity.

Under these circumstances, philosophical anthropology has experienced many sudden transformations. First of all, it survived a galactic explosion when it broke apart in a vast number of anthropologies, such as political, cultural, social, pedagogical and religious. This process has not stopped yet. Philosophical anthropology continues to split in different “approaches” and “experiences” [6]. Differentiation of methods and tendencies in philosophical-anthropological knowledge has announced itself clearly. Today the study continues within the framework of “psychoanalytical anthropology” (S. Freud, J. Lacan), “existential anthropology” (L. Binswanger, M. Boss, K. Jaspers), “Jungian anthropology” (L. Cowan), “structural anthropology” (C. Levi-Strauss), “phenomenological anthropology” (M. Scheler, M. Merleau-Ponty), “transpersonal anthropology” (S. Grof, K. Wilber).

V.A. Podoroga notices that “it is hard to speak neither of some unified systematics of philosophical (anthropological) knowledge as of a “school” nor of a shared view on the development of philosophy as a discipline. Therefore the term “anthropology” loses its nonexchangeable distinct disciplinary qualities and areas of study, predicating different aspects of modern knowledge (politics, philosophy, art, language)” [4, p. 11]. At the same time, there appear certain complexes of reflection that philosophers themselves determine as special blocks of philosophic-anthropological knowledge. Thus, F.I. Girenok uses the term “Archaeavanguardist” [1; 2; 3], while V.A. Podoroga discerns his professional interests from those of his colleagues introducing the term “analytic anthropology” [5].

Today many researchers agree that successive critical consideration within the Cartesian subject concept and the subject-object cognitive paradigm lead to a crucial question of the philosophical anthropology's status. The new "hermeneutics of subject" reveals, it would seem, unexpected possibilities of the philosophical study of man. However, eventually the community is left with no subject at all. It is covered with a net of singularities. Thus, step by step, the status of philosophical anthropology has been radically reconsidered. As a result of a thorough cleanup the usual concepts of personality, its construction, and its identity were eliminated. Deconstruction of the "whoeness" has unsettled the sovereign element of philosophical anthropology – man.

Philosophical anthropology has thus transformed into antianthropology that gradually undermines all its principles. Paradoxically along with the decline of philosophical anthropology its subject becomes a central theme of the entire philosophical and even humanitarian knowledge. Specialists gradually realize that no social or technological project can be carried out without a philosophical reflection on man. Understanding man often comes within the frame of the so-called negative anthropology.

However, philosophy shows not only a crash of classical notions. Philosophical anthropology adopts new meanings, new constellations, and new dramaturgic patterns. Today we can witness that the newest philosophical-anthropological constructs correspond with the classical philosophical approaches in a novel productive way.

For the present this is all we have to say in this introduction.

The journal editor-in-chief
Professor *Pavel Gurevich*

References

1. Girenok, F. *Autografiya yazyka i soznaniya* [Autography of Language and Consciousness]. Moscow, Moscow St. Industrial Univ. Publ., 2010. 247 pp. (In Russian)
2. Girenok, F. *Udovol'stvie myslit' inache* [The Pleasure of Thinking Differently]. Moscow, Fond «Mir» Publ.: Akademicheskii Proekt Publ., 2010. 235 pp. (In Russian).
3. Girenok F. *Figury i skladki* [Figures and Folds]. Moscow, Akademicheskii Proekt Publ., 2014. 244 pp. (In Russian).
4. Podoroga, V. *Antropogrammy: Opyt samokritiki* [Anthropogramma. An attempt of self-criticism]. Moscow, Logos Publ., 2014. 106 pp. (In Russian).
5. Podoroga, V. *Mimezis. Materialy po analiticheskoi antropologii literatury*, 2 t. [Mimesis. Materials in analytic anthropology of literature, 2 vols], vol. I. Moscow, Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya Publ., 2006. 379 pp. (In Russian)
6. Chesnov, Ya. *Narodnaya kul'tura. Filosofsko-antropologicheskii podkhod* [Folk Culture. Philosophico-anthropological Approach]. Moscow, Kanon+ Publ., 2014. 496 pp. (In Russian)