

N. Mazeikiene¹, P. Starovik^{2*}

¹*Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania;*

²*Karagandy University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: n.mazeikine@adm.vdu, starpav@mail.ru)*

Socio-philosophical foundations of the mythology of transhumanism

The article identifies the challenges that humanity poses to the current situation of global cultural disorientation, shifting emphasis from universal values to the standards of mass culture. An attempt was made to systematically expound the reasons and key points in the transition of thinking and subsequent actions that made it possible to create conditions for abandoning historically established worldviews for the sake of ideological clichés and creating a new practice — deifying the technical justification of the surrounding subject of space and creating their own ontology from ready-made blocks of destroyed structures. The main problem has been posed that the new ontology makes the subject as autonomous from the burden of traditional «conventions» as possible and ultimately causes extreme distrust of the constructions of the «other», «others».

Keywords: man, subject, individual, transhumanism, metaphysics, reason, reason, tradition.

Introduction

The general purpose of the article and the goal are determined by those tasks that the modern situation of global cultural disorientation poses to mankind, shifting emphasis from universal values cultivated by millennia, to subjective standards dictated for the sake of today.

We do not set ourselves the task of direct polemic and denial of points of view, which are pure declarations or established practical techniques. Our task is to identify, purified from ideology, the roots of the desire to radically abandon the previous history of human cultivation.

We will make an attempt to systematically expound the reasons and key points in the turn of thinking and subsequent actions that made it possible to create conditions for abandoning historical worldviews for the sake of momentary ideological clichés and creating a new practice — deifying the technical deconstruction of the surrounding subject of space and creating destroyed structures from finished blocks own ontology. The reception is not new, but the main problem is that such an ontology makes the subject as autonomous from the burden of traditional «conventions» as possible and ultimately causes extreme distrust of the designs of the other and others.

The concept of «transhumanism» appeared in the philosophy of humanism in the first half fourteenth century and was associated with the ideas of a person's independent value, his rights to freedom of development of his abilities, and also the possibility of improving human nature.

The nineteenth century proclaims new values and contrasts science and religion, science and the «obsolete» culture of man. Therefore, a new person should «come».

At the beginning of the twentieth century, in connection with the development of genetics and biology in general, D. Huxley proposed to understand transhumanism as a «new philosophy» of religious prejudice for all of humanity, who wants to join in scientific and technological progress, which will save the world from most of the problems generated nature and man himself.

Today's transhumanism is a concept that postulates a value system based on pantheistic ideas and global thinking, supporting the use of methods of synthesis of digital, nanotechnology and biotechnologies to improve human nature.

The main content of this concept is the recognition of the imperfection of the mental and physical capabilities of a person as an integral individual, and in this regard, the systematic and full-scale destruction of traditional views on ethics and morality, by denying the absolute truths developed, first of all, by the Christian worldview.

Trans — 1) through, for, after; — 2) a state beyond consciousness and understanding. Transhumanism is a relatively new theoretical movement (originated in the USA in the last decade of the 20th century, took

* *Corresponding author. E-mail: starpav@mail.ru (P. Starovik)*

shape in Russia and Kazakhstan in the first years of the 21st century), justifying the need for «improvement» of a traditional person, up to replacing him with another form of being and turning into a «posthuman». It is based on the achievements of the modern scientific and technological revolution, especially in the field of Hi-Tech, especially nano-bio-info-cognitive (NBIC) technologies and artificial intelligence (AI), which opened up during its course, unprecedented, previously not even expected possibilities of influencing people and their life world. Accordingly, it is implied that as an ideology, transhumanism should replace anthropology and humanism — the theories and worldviews of the «old», «traditional», «natural» people.

It is believed that the very concept of «transhumanism» appeared in J. Huxley in the book «New Bottles for New Wine» (1957), and the word «transhuman» was first used in D. Broderick's science fiction story «Cultivation» (1976). But usually, randomly mixing, one speaks of the super, the trance, the post-man. In any case, this is a person modified with the latest technology to the extent that, from the traditional generally accepted point of view, is no longer a person.

Genetic engineering and working with the human body have fundamentally changed our world. Our views on things like youth, career, and retirement have changed. The very concept of what we can achieve in the time allotted to us has changed.

The transhuman is the first step on the path of evolution into the posthuman. A postman is a future person whose capabilities are so changed and superior to the capabilities of a modern person that we cannot attribute him to that. The first approach is for «natural» interference in genes. Genetic engineering, cloning, eugenics, life extension. The second approach is the artificial improvement of man. Cybernetics — the fusion of man and the technical mechanism — artificial intelligence, robotics.

The tools they are going to use to turn into posthumans include «molecular nanotechnology, genetic engineering, artificial intelligence, drugs to change moods and improve memory, anti-aging therapy, the neuro-interface, information management programs, wearable and implantable computers, cognitive technologies etc». Thanks to them, the exciting perspectives of change, the transformation of everything and everything, in and around itself, open up before a person. The main result, the pinnacle of transhumanism as a new state of man, or already (fasting, trans) non-human, will be his achievement of immortality. Transhumanism is almost another name for immortalism, or immortalism is transhumanism in the state of its full realization.

«Transhumanism cannot be understood narrowly as topics that are discussed on the sites of the transhumanist movement in connection with the possibilities of manipulating human corporeality and consciousness, disputes about the best models of biomonsters and cyborgs. This is the main organizationally formed, but still only one branch of the anti-anthropological and anti-humanistic worldview generated by the state of various spheres of modern life. In fact, the struggle with man has deeper roots, it originated in the course of his knowledge, gradually acquiring later in philosophy and anthropology an articulated theoretical expression» [1, p. 9].

The fundamental, deep philosophical foundation for the emergence of transhumanism is the transformation of the substantialist paradigm into a functional one, and then into a constructivist one.

The rejection of metaphysics with its indispensable ontologism, which began with Kant, is an epistemological philosophy. The general position for the substantialist is the idea of the universally objective character of the ideal, which exists before the individual consciousness and fully determines its experience (consciousness is considered as an intangible substance).

The modern concept of transhumanism: a person has practically exhausted all the possibilities of the body physiologically, the evolution of the body moves too slowly. However, in the social and civilizational senses, human potencies are not finished, development is ongoing and it can be supplemented, whipped up with the help of technical achievements, nano-bio-info-cognotechnology.

The creation of artificial intelligence on the basis of, first of all, neuronet is not the «creation» of a smart machine, but the fusion of the human brain with a machine. This kind of symbiosis will allow you to get rid of a huge number of physiological problems of the individual himself, many social «sores» and will directly affect the change in the social institutions of any state.

The machine will monitor the state of the human body and respond in time to danger: through the modern mounted in the brain, the flow of corrective information will begin, similar to how we «cure» the computer of viruses. This leads to the conclusion that traditional medicine is unnecessary in the future, as well as the traditional education system with teachers, classes, and schools: all information, knowledge and skills will be «uploaded» to the hard drive — the brain, with a small volitional effort.

How much human will remain in this kind of «superhuman»? Here it is important not so much the new state of the body, but the attitude to the culture and history of mankind as a whole. The desire for an irre-

pressible change, «perfecting» the body and mind, can discard culture, morality, morality, humanism itself as unnecessary and backward for the «post-man».

«I was not satisfied neither with myself, nor with the state of society, nor with the fiction of public opinion. The main feeling was this: something was amiss in the world of people, and in myself» [2, p. 220].

Reading texts and reasoning about them makes sense only when you do not fill yourself with dogmatism, but «restore» the living side of the thought, because of which they were created. Penetrating into the text, we revive the mental states that are behind this text and which arose in people reading this text. We are interested in ancient thought, as something that encourages us to think and think the same things.

There are always two sides to thought: the content of thought, i.e. a certain formalized statement about a thing, and a thought about this content, which was born in the conditions of being of a thinker. As if the objective and subjective sides of the same thought.

A person, by default, endowed with consciousness, tends to philosophize. As a consequence of this act, being unfolds in consciousness as a volitional rational and conscious effort. This is a fact of the realization of man, but also a prerequisite for his existence.

Existence unfolds even when a person asks about the meaning of his existence, when he experiences a vaguely defined insufficiency, incompleteness of essence. And, if he lives in a village, a small village, a deeply provincial town, he works honestly all his life, understanding his narrow task, not particularly thinking about the «transcendental foundations of being», universality, does he have an element of existence even when he doesn't in principle ask, but at the same time he feels his destiny, therefore peace and happiness?

Discussion

Existentialism affirms logic... History is a fixation of the acts of being of a person, his self-consciousness. Nature gives only biomaterial, being does not unfold in the effort of man to be in the world to the extent that he wants to be. The text — understanding (stories) does not unfold as a system of representations, but as the work of «self-creation». The effort to understand the text (historical context) creates us, i.e. our being. The text here, in itself, is less important than the effort.

According to Mamardashvili, myth is not a system of representations, but a human-forming machine. The myth always has a constructive, i.e. the human-forming side. Philosophy and science will be an activity, an experiment on the «possible» person (the possible is the one who is created, unlike the real one).

Art is the intensification of the «ordinary» for a person short-term state of vivid emotion, intellectual concentration, amorous, friendly tension. Through art, a person is transferred from a normal state of being to a different mode of life, i.e. being not subject to decay, touched by eternity. The mechanisms creating saturation with harmony of our soul are fundamentally not utilitarian, useless in nature, «nature».

Cinema, painting, music, even the contemplation of football, not to mention a book or religious contemplation, transfer a person to a different rhythm of life, redundant, more intense.

A man is empty when he does not reflect — he is immersed in nothingness. The basis of metaphysics: is being, through form (feeling of emptiness) involving us in itself, i.e. a smarter reality addressed to us. Clever, because it intensifies our creation. The advent of philosophy and science brought to the world «incomprehensible». The world of myth is understandable and meaningful, therefore philosophy and science are opposed to myth.

Memory arises in the consciousness, which is formed through the «blows of the whip of ritual and mystery» [3, p. 30], through society, society. The idea of the law arises from the desire to streamline the willfulness and self-will of people, which, in turn, are the causes of perpetrated evil. Where the destruction of order (the best human qualities) begins under the influence of chaos (elements, absurdity) of natural instincts, there, by virtue of the impact, interrogation can begin, i.e. philosophy.

Self-fundamental phenomena — conscience is the cause of itself, the foundation is not natural. Conscience is based on morality and the phenomena of a moral order, which for its existence has no reason outside itself.

Psychology develops where there is a self-existent existential phenomenon about which one can think.

To clarify the conditions in which, and only in which we can think and express something. To talk about something, we must exist in the sphere in which it exists — intellectually penetrated. The area of our being, our reflection and the area of the object reasoned becomes one and indivisible. Awareness of this fact at the first moment affects the subject and therefore, usually, the opposite reaction begins of an attempt to join another, transforming one's being into the unknown.

«Transformations are understood in this case as a certain addition to the technological side of the phenomenon of life, expressing more creative and organic images of the vitomeric transformation of a living creature» [4, p. 8].

In our opinion, it would be a mistake to consider the phenomenon of transhumanism in a historical retrospective, chronologically sequentially from the beginning of the formulation in philosophy of the problem of changing a person, overcoming the natural and social — thus, we will lose the logic of relations between modern categories of the entire systematics of «posthumanity». It is more correct to start with how the concepts of this philosophy are being developed now, to clarify its actualization in modern society, thereby isolating key events and ideas in time that created the possibility of such a vision of human evolution.

The spatial mode of historical consciousness in the modern world does not matter. «In the world where we live, distances do not seem to matter much. Sometimes there is a feeling that they exist only so that they can be undone; as if space only does, which every minute invites us to neglect it or refute it. Space is no longer an obstacle: to subdue it, a split second is enough» [5, p. 113].

The history of human civilization is the history of the struggle of the subject and the system. By system we mean culture in the general sense.

From the point of view of the philosophy of transhumanism, man is imperfect, therefore, in the framework of today's evolution, *Homo sapiens* — everything that he does in terms of organizing public life, his being, economy, law, politics, are doomed to permanent crisis and destruction.

The culture of modern man creates a system, a rigid framework of determinations, which, due to the limitations of the creators, cannot be adapted either to the revolution of the mind or to the evolutionary development of spiritual life, and therefore to the development of self-consciousness. To exclude «slipping» — a kind of substitution of concepts, we explain that spirituality is understood here not in a vulgar, limited religious plane, but in the sense of the intention (appeal) of consciousness to the fundamentally natural emotional sphere of human being. In the future, definitions will be offered for the generalization reflex.

The system exists only because it copes with the tasks in a short space-time period. The relevance of tasks is lost and the person himself begins to destroy the system, his creation, his roots.

The system collapses and the individual, as part of the system, destroys the life-meaning, mental, legal, moral principles. After the necessary transformations, a new system is created that is designed to solve urgent immediate tasks, again starting the process of confronting the subject with himself.

This is a fundamental historical process of the entire human civilization, a picture of the life of *Homo sapiens*. Now human evolution is over. The results are pessimistic. The end of the story!

The question posed by us for discussion has long been removed, but with enviable regularity, contrary to the generally accepted opinion that this problem has been overcome, it is updated strategically and in nuances.

The removal here must be understood in the framework of the philosophy of the spirit of Georg Hegel, through which we come to the conclusion that the historical consciousness in its embodiment is unclaimed, lost, slurred at certain periods of history. Historical being is directly, indefinitely, indistinguishable until now, since there is no removal of the difference in the thinking of the subject with himself, with his history of being, being of culture, being of the country.

A broad discussion on the transhumanistic perspectives of humanity has been going on for the past few years. Looking at the problem in retrospect, we find that the very problem of changing a person, his consciousness, his habitus and being as a whole can be discovered from the moment of the emergence of classical ancient Greek philosophy.

Before Hegel, who proclaimed the end of history with the victory of the French Revolution, man developed progressively and purposefully, evolved. The French Revolution turned out to be the watershed that defined new values, later called liberal democratic and obsolete values, without a future, i.e. other. All that are different from liberal democracy, ideology, culture, political systems are still alive, but by their example of endless stagnation and subsequent inevitable collapse, they will prove the winner is right.

This happens due to conventions affecting the adequate, truthful reproduction of retrospectives. Conventions, subjective representations of sociopolitical time periods, once taken with a bang, understood as mainstream interpretations, are subsequently eliminated as unnecessary or even dangerous mythologemes, at best transferred to the periphery of the events described.

Such an increasing centrifugal process cannot fail to cause any sane person to reject the entire tradition of historical reflection.

Reflection is a state of mind in which we try to find the subjective conditions under which we can form concepts. Reflection is an awareness of the relationship of these representations to our sources of knowledge. What historical consciousness is fundamentally called upon to explain future changes in the world is turning into a historical hoax, a veil of foggy mind.

One can object to the previous points by the statement that the interpretation is not given to be practically realized. Yes, that's true, but there's a calculation for that — because of the many interpretations, the true state of affairs is lost.

Historical consciousness is largely irrational, its «rationality» is subjective due to direct, internal comprehension of the imagined experienced.

Otherwise, we objectify the phenomenon itself, but do not capture its sacred essence. «Irreality begins with integrity. The imaginary is not some exotic area on the other side of our world, it is our world itself, only taken as a whole as a whole. Therefore, he has no place in the world — it is the world perceived and embodied in its totality with a comprehensive denial of the private realities contained in it, with their elimination, putting out of brackets, with the embodiment of their elimination...» [6, p. 113].

Historical science, like any science, and philosophy in the first place, seeking clarity, the most true vision of the subject, postulates a calm, calm, objective examination of the subject. But, a subject for a scientist, should scream, be uncomfortable, cause «to fight». Otherwise, why consider it, if it is convenient and understandable. Science, therefore, having internal contradictions, is forced to develop. Scientists love contradictions, this is a kind of challenge, sensation and movement of life forward. Another thing is the story, which is «directed back» into new interpretations of *fait accompli*. The problem of domestic history is that it is subversive, but not against, but for. There remains, basically, a passive search of interpretations of the fact. Based on this, the discussion has recently been updated: is science a history at all, since it lacks the prognostic function that is most important for science as such.

But, the problem is not in science, but in the loss of continuity of history by the subject and the quasi-systemic continuity of the object of interpretation. Continuity, which is a fundamental criterion for the veracity of history.

The problem of mythologizing surrounding reality in the colossal informational content of space, in the sense of the final product, is now actualized to a painful state of consciousness, making it infinitely miserable. Then, when the myth is called to the exact opposite.

These features of myth and mythological consciousness were revealed by Aleksei Losev in his *Dialectic of Myth*.

The highest synthesis (the principle of the unity of philosophy, science, religion, art and morality, leading to the highest manifestation of a person's spiritual life) consists of happiness and knowledge (according to V. Solovyov). Mythological science — a science immersed in its own mythology or the science of myths, has not even become simply descriptive and phenomenological. The myth claims to speak of mystical reality.

He believes that the myth claims to reveal mystical reality. Our attitude to myth only as a fairy tale, baseless fiction, a certain «mythical detachment» does not allow us to see the whole depth of mythology penetration into the spiritual reality of society. A new «mythological apperception» arises, totally subjugating the individual perception of reality in accordance with the most widespread ones, due to its simplicity, averaging, and appeal to basic biosocial needs. And, here «... the myth (for mythical consciousness, that is, immersed in this nature, this myth) is the highest in its specificity, the most intense and extremely intense reality» [7, p. 37]. We must perceive myth as a logically necessary phenomenon in a particular historical period. A myth becomes a category of consciousness, acquiring first concrete features, later acquiring the properties of a worldview. Here lies the problem of the «cognitive dissonance» of society, where the ideal is reduced to an animal state and this state is presented as the ultimate ideal goal. «The myth is based on an affective root, because he is always an expression of those or other vital and urgent needs and aspirations» [7, p. 39].

«Myth is vitally felt and created, material reality and bodily, bodily reality to the brim» [6, p. 42].

Gumbolt W. — «each nation has its own laws of the spirit» — a mythological apperception, meaning an individual perception of reality, transformed in accordance with mass ideas. Apperception should be understood here as perception, i.e. a process linking the content of new sensations with previous experience and knowledge.

National memory facing the threat of turning reality into animal reality where the substance becomes identical with essence at the level of double accidents — liberal dualism, a mythological picture of the world

that has been offered to us for the last decades: reality in itself, the concept of reality in itself. To know a myth, to understand its essence, only in this case can we reveal it in an «alien» environment.

Mythological consciousness is naive and direct. Scientific consciousness necessarily has an advantageous, logical character, it is difficult to assimilate, it requires long-term study, abstraction skills and abstract skills. The myth is always synthetically vital and consists of «living» personalities whose fate is emotionally illuminated, i.e. spiritualized and understood even in narrative semitones. It must be remembered that myth is not a prerequisite, it does not precede science, they are not even parallel, but closely intertwined. «... Science is decisively always not only accompanied by mythology, but also really feeds on it, drawing from it its original intuitions» [7, p. 46]. «... Mythology only then is mythology, if it is not proved, if it cannot and should not be proved» [7, p. 47].

The myth has no boundaries, i.e. has no form, because form is always limited (not Aristotle!!!). According to Aristotle, things are objects, things and phenomena that surround us, perceived by feelings. The essence is intelligible. It is the essence of existing, existing things. The essence is eternal, it is the basis of order, peace, universal cosmos. The essence is thought, revealed in the concept, it is embodied in the existing, as a separate object, thing. Matter in itself does not exist, it arises only in form, in existence. Essence precedes existence according to Aristotle.

The irreality of what is happening fits very well in the logic of explaining the reactions of modern society, inert and passive in its integrity.

Conclusion

First of all, two reactions of the internal state — insolvency and suppression — shift attention from an object unattainable to compensate for internal stress, to an object more realistic, concrete in its abstractness. This «ersatz object» must be rooted, traditional in the history, culture of the subject, in the historical consciousness of the subject. It should be well understood and not cause other interpretations, even in a subject prone to prejudice. However, according to Adorno, not only individual, but also group (essentially subconscious and superconscious) structures influence the creation of the final image of what we understand as the universal of historical consciousness [8].

The object remains understandable, not requiring additional efforts in determining the phenomenon, stereotypic. The subject can only be aware that this stereotype does not fit into the relayed official cultural values. With the effort to rise above stereotypes, the standard reason of the subject comes into conflict with the pre-mind of the individual, and how this conflict will be resolved now largely depends on inspiring differences in the social identification of the object.

Prejudice serves as the «trigger» for prejudices, which are largely functional in nature. Therefore, prejudices easily «slide off» from one object to another, «mark» them with one paint, the color of «mental needs and drives of the subject» [8, p. 107] random by time factor.

Reason tries to bring clarity — an excuse for its original distortions, because the «freshest» paint is always on the newest-last (in time) object. Reason attracts a new object, thereby weakening, justifying its prejudices and prejudices in relation to the original object — a historical fact.

Aggression is functionally incorporated by the last object, but this does not affect the fundamental determinants of the historical consciousness of the subject. Adorno explains this extrapolation from the relatively «social weakness» of the object to its «gloomy omnipotence» by the projective mechanism [8, p. 112]. Thus, through anticatexis of adequate, real factual data, historical pseudo-reality is formed.

In the argumentation regarding the subject's aggression, the criterion of cohesion is given: the more cohesive this or that social group is, the stronger is its prejudice (prejudice) in relation to the object. Initially, the difference is determined by external signs. Very soon, the concepts of external designations take on the meaning of the internal qualities of life practice. Here, in both directions, the substitution mechanism is triggered, i.e. conditionally positive connotations are given to the concept of a degrading character (in their view). And vice versa: the excellent qualities of the opposite group are belittled in every way. Verbal definitions, claiming the role of historical patterns, affect subconscious attitudes that relieve tension about the subject's belonging to a culturally belittled group.

Such an appeal to the subject, as part of the aforementioned group, can also be characterized by an ambivalent «negative love», i.e. accented attention is caused by the ability to uniquely personify your negative idea.

Recommendations

How is this problem solved? There are two main ways: one purely techno-political, which puts the individual before a choice, or to keep up with progress, or to «conserve» and wait. The second way is a decision in the spirit of «cosmism» and «reverence for life» going back to Fedor Dostoevsky, Nikolai Fedorov and Albert Schweitzer.

Dostoevsky defines the meaning and life of man as the «duty resurrection of the ancestors». The duty and duty of generations is to revive what our ancestors passed on to us from the depths of centuries, and what was subsequently lost. The main task of human activity is to betray this revived knowledge and skill further to its descendants.

However, according to Dostoevsky, following this obligation, free and conscious, will challenge people to give birth to children as responsibly as possible, which will ultimately reduce childbearing.

Such thoughts, from Fedorov's point of view, are very relevant and can help solve the problem of overpopulation of the Earth from the perspective of a Christian worldview: by «resurrecting» the work of our ancestors, we will also reproduce them from the dust of the earth, which will give us the ability to gain the ability to live outside the earth, in space, in the universe.

To realize this opportunity and duty, it is necessary to unite «rational beings» in the work of studying blind natural forces, in order to subordinate them to creative processes.

It is possible to start such processes under the condition of organizing a «universal» education, which is understood by Fedorov, as the knowledge of natural forces and their submission to the Divine will, the conductor of which is humanity organized and educated, primarily in the Christian spirit. These ideas correlate with Schweitzer's eschatological concept and his understanding of the harmonious development of the subject, where the most advanced technical innovations are superimposed on the basis of universal, humanistic ethics, allowing to overcome the permanent crisis of human existence.

References

- 1 Кутырев В.А. Философия трансгуманизма: учеб.-метод. пос. / В.А. Кутырев. — М.; Берлин: Директ-Медиа, 2015. — 85 с.
- 2 Ясперс К. Философская автобиография / К. Ясперс // Западная философия: итоги тысячелетия. — Екатеринбург: Деловая книга, 1997. — 656 с.
- 3 Мамардашвили М.К. Лекции по античной философии / М.К. Мамардашвили. — СПб.: Азбука-Аттикус, 2018. — 304 с.
- 4 Моисеев В.И. Философские проблемы биологии и медицины: технологии и трансформации / В.И. Моисеев // Вестн. Рос. филос. общ-ва. — 2015. — № 1. — С. 23, 24.
- 5 Бауман З. Глобализация. Последствия для человека и общества / З. Бауман. — М.: Весь Мир, 2004. — 188 с.
- 6 Бланшо М. Литература и право на смерть / М. Бланшо // Новое литературное обозрение. — 1994. — № 7. — С. 84–107.
- 7 Лосев А.Ф. Диалектика мифа / А.Ф. Лосев. — СПб.: Азбука-Аттикус, 2018. — 320 с.
- 8 Адорно Т. Исследование авторитарной личности / Т. Адорно. — М.: Серебряные нити, 2001. — 416 с.

Н. Майжекене, П. Старовик

Трансгуманизм мифологиясының элеуметтік-философиялық негіздері

Мақалада басымдықтардың жалпыадамзаттық құндылықтардан бұқаралық мәдениет стандарттарына ауысуы, жаһандық мәдени бағдарлаудың қазіргі жағдайы, адамзат алдына қойған міндеттері анықталған. Ойлау мен іс әрекетке көшудің негізгі сәттері мен себептерін жүйелі түрде баяндауға ұмтылыс жасалған, идеологиялық үлгілердің пайдасына тарихи қалыптасқан дүниетанымдық ұстанымдардан бас тартуға жағдай жасауға және жаңа тәжірибе қалыптастыруға мүмкіндік берген — қоршаған кеңістік субъектісінің техникалық сипаттамасын танып білу мен дайын бүлінген құрылымдық бөліктерден өзінің жеке онтологиясын құру. Бұл жаңа онтология субъектіні дәстүрлі «шарттар» жүгінен барынша автономды етеді және соңында «басқаның», «басқалардың» конструкцияларына аса сенімсіздік тудырудан тұратын негізгі мәселе қойылған.

Кілт сөздер: адам, субъект, индивид, трансгуманизм, метафизика, ойлау, ақыл-ой, дәстүр.

Н. Майжекене, П. Старовик

Социально-философские основания мифологии трансгуманизма

В статье определены задачи, которые ставит перед человечеством современная ситуация глобальной культурной дезориентации, смещения акцентов с общечеловеческих ценностей на стандарты массовой культуры. Сделана попытка систематически изложить причины и ключевые моменты в переходе мышления и последующих действий, позволивших создать условия для отказа от исторически сложившихся мировоззренческих установок в угоду идеологических клише и создания новой практики — обожествления технического обоснования окружающего субъекта пространства и создания из готовых блоков разрушенных конструкций своей собственной онтологии. Поставлена основная проблема, заключающаяся в том, что новая онтология делает субъекта максимально автономным от груза традиционных «условностей» и, в конечном итоге, вызывает крайнее недоверие к конструкциям «другого», «других».

Ключевые слова: человек, субъект, индивид, трансгуманизм, метафизика, рассудок, разум, традиция.

References

- 1 Kutyrev, V.A. (2015). *Filosofia transhumanisma* [Philosophy of Transhumanism]. Moscow; Berlin: Direct Media [in Russian].
- 2 Jaspers, K. (1997). *Filosofskaia autobiografii* [Philosophical autobiography]. *Zapadnaia filosofia: itohi tysiacheletia — Western Philosophy: Results of the Millennium*. Ekaterinburh: Delovaia kniha [in Russian].
- 3 Mamardashvili, M.K. (2018). *Leksii po antichnoi filosofii* [Lectures on Ancient Philosophy]. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka-Atticus [in Russian].
- 4 Moiseev, V.I. (2015). *Filosofskie problemy biologii i meditsiny: tekhnologii i transformatsii* [Philosophical problems of biology and medicine: technologies and transformations]. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo filosofskogo obshchestva — Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society*, 1, 23–24.
- 5 Bauman, Z. (2004). *Hlobalizatsiia. Posledstviia dliia cheloveka i obshchestva* [Globalization. Consequences for individuals and society]. Moscow: Ves Mir [in Russian].
- 6 Blanchot, M. (1994). *Literatura i pravo na smert* [Literature and the right to die]. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie — New literary review*, 7, 84–107 [in Russian].
- 7 Losev, A.F. (2018). *Dialektika mifa* [Dialectic of myth]. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka-Atticus [in Russian].
- 8 Adorno, T. (2001). *Issledovanie avtoritarnoi lichnosti* [Research on the authoritarian personality]. Moscow: Serebrianye niti [in Russian].