

On the meaning of human life (neoclassical discourse)

Abstract

This article attempts to analyze the essence of the meaning of human life, its fundamental bases and reasons for its great importance, especially in the post-secular era.

Keywords: life, meaning of human life, neoclassicism, basic question of philosophy, existential determinants

Volume 5 Issue 1 - 2023

Gennadiy P Menchikov
Kazan Federal University, Russia

Correspondence: Gennadiy P Menchikov, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia, Email menchikovg@mail.ru

Received: February 14, 2023 | **Published:** March 07, 2023

Introduction

In the 70-80s of the twentieth century, classical and non-classical philosophy is replaced by modern neoclassical philosophy (or “post-non-classical”, “post-postmodern”), with a changed basic question of philosophy, life, and non-classical, postmodern, finally becomes yesterday’s in the afternoon (A. V. Rubtsov). During the period of awareness of the “Anthropocene” (P. Crutzen),¹ the discovery and influence of synergetics, virtualization, “de-symbolization of the Absolute (G.P. Aksenov), “death of the Legislator” (E. V. Timoshina, V. E. Kondurov), the post-secular era, “when it is no longer the irrational forces of the Absolute that dominate” (P. S. Vavilov), when the world was demonstrably opened as a universe-provided-to-itself, and not to the other world,²⁻⁴ there is a heightened attention to the question of the essence of the meaning of life in general and the meaning of the life of a human being in particular.⁵ In neoclassical philosophy, a person began to be understood not functionally, but ontologically self-existent being, as an end in itself and intrinsic value of being, as co-existence. The cornerstone of the signs of the modern neoclassical understanding of the essence of man and the meaning of his life was laid by the works of N. A. Berdyaev, V. V. Rozanov, K. Jung, E. Fromm, A. Schweitzer, I. Prigogine. The main developers were V. Frankl, K. Rogers, A. Maslow, R. Assagioli, S. Grof, M. Heidegger, I. T. Frolov, M. K. Mamardashvili and others. The main essence of neoclassicism in understanding the essence of man is a turn to the understanding of man as a unique being in being. It turned out that not the only one but the dominant type of determination of life in any human being, penetrating all other influences in it, are the so-called existential determinations. When everything is over for an animal, everything is just beginning for a person. “If people understood that they are people,” Augustine Aurelius sighed. Existential determinations are a circle of determinations associated with the experience of the meaning of life as such, the meaning of the existence of everything in being and other so-called adjacent to it. “eternal” problems, unconsciously and consciously. The main one, one way or another, sooner or later, is the problem of the meaning of human life.

The meaning of life as self-determination

The life of a person and for a person is, of course, not only the exchange of substances between the organism and the environment. This is an important, but only the biological side of life, inherent, by the way, to all living things. In neoclassical philosophy, it became clear that life as a given in general is eternal and is, in fact, the “original cause” of the existence of being, and “non-living” is relatively non-living, the “lowest” level of organic in being, in essence, decay products of the living. In the understanding of “life” there is a) pre-biological

meaning (organic, pre-cellular, unfolded, still folded), b) biological meaning, c) human life - life beyond the biological meaning, d) and life as such. Life is a philosophical category that reflects a special form of the existence of being, a different measure of the inseparable unity of matter and spirit in being, the essence of which is constant self-reproduction, self-preservation and transgressive expansion of its boundaries.⁶ Life in general is spontaneous. self-active, synergistic, capricious, stubborn, expedient, but not purposeful, difficult to predict. This is the “causal work of desire, grief” (A. P. Maltseva, J. Lacan), unceasing growth, expansion of oneself and renewal. And this is a common end-to-end, natural, “causal”, and not an acausal process of being.⁴ Man in being, in his essence, is alive, but not an animal, even with the predicates “reasonable”, etc. It is unlawful to attribute him to the species of animals, as is still done today. Distinguishing between the nature of man and the essence of man, studies show that his essence lies in the fact that he is, in one way or another, supranatural, unique.

But in humans, apparently due to the presence of a whole structure of the spirit, a multi-level spiritual reality (consciousness, the unconscious and the human soul with its sublevels and subelements),⁷ there is a so-called. a lack of. These are questions not only “why and how to live, everything lives” (it is more or less clear with this), but the deterministic work of desire in cognition to understand and answer the most sacramental question “why”, “for what” he lives, exists in this world, (we repeat, not “why”, and even “not for the sake of what”, but “why”). The search for the meaning of life is peculiar, by the way, only to a person, one way or another, any person is consciously or not clearly aware. That is why they accompany the life of man and mankind, as a self-similar fractal system, throughout its existence. Today, however, the existential question is of particular importance. In the context of, for example, mass digitalization and precariat,¹ but “this is the deprivation of the fundamental meaning of existence from the working stratum of mankind, and not just unemployment” (M. Fomin).⁸

Due to various reasons, the very existence of a meaning (direction, intention) of being in general, in being and in human life in particular, becomes problematic. (Like, say, the sun, wind, etc. in being. If we ask them - “why do you shine, sun?”, “why do you blow, wind?” - not for the same reason to warm the earth or winnow grain, inflate the sails - they will answer ... but in order to be first one hundred percent the sun, the wind). The fact is that in the classical and non-classical

¹Precariat (from Latin precarium - unstable, penultimate position before the poor) - these are whole layers of people who do not have permanent employment, in a simplistically - specific mass unemployment; a new social class, rather a stratum, of the era of a digitalized labor market, which is being formed literally before our eyes.

times of the existence of mankind, which were essentially creationist, the meaning of human life was involuntarily set from the outside by some Absolute or who assumed the role, who imagined himself to be the Absolute, that is, in essence - creationist. It was, like, clear why; and “why” more often coincided with “why”. So, the existing However, in neoclassicism, thanks to the synergetic discovery and non-creationist vision of the world, in the most difficult for a person emerging post-secular conditions of “constructive (activity) realism” (V. A. Lektorsky), a person and humanity for the first time were left to produce, acquire the meaning of their own lives independently. It became clear that “Society is a construct”, that is, what and how we do, it will be so, both good and so-so, and bad. There was no one and nothing to rely on, blame and justify (see S. A. Kibalnik).⁹ In essence, for the first time we are seriously entering a non-utopian era (S. Kurginyan), we are getting rid of utopianism and absolutist illusions. For the first time regarding the material well-being of mankind, the so-called. democratic order, unprecedented freedom overthrew or weakened the pressure of the Absolutes and put humanity, each of us, in front of a real opportunity and the need to grow, develop, determine, acquire, choose one’s own meaning of life (not why, but “why live ?; well, then what next? ; to be or to seem; to be or not to be?”). But “finding the meaning of life” is not an easy task. The inability to cope with such a phenomenon leads a person to sad consequences (syndromes “Existential vacuum”, “Boredom”, “Empty nest”; as well as “Emptiness”, “Resentment for life”, “Whining”, “Revenge” ...). Although, as you know, a person who has “something to live for” can endure any “how” (F. Nietzsche, V. Frankl).

Why do we have this problem?

The problem of the meaning of life - a kind of lack: incompleteness-integrity-non-eternity-imperfection - arises only in a person and follows from the fact that, like no other living being, a person knows in advance about his finiteness (biological death) and, in this regard, about some then the incorrigible “imperfection” of the world. Intuition, intuitive knowledge, “great-knowledge”, “proto-knowledge” about this sometimes already in childhood and even in the imprinting of the perinatal period shocks a person so much that he lives in confusion. The “solution” of this question in oneself, in oneself, is the initial basis of the “line of life”, subordinating actions of different levels. Hence the question “why”; “to be or not to be” ... - the essence of the expression of the problem. Accept this world as your home of being, stay in it and build it; or just fight and suffer; or initially not to accept it, to leave it, not native, alien; or vegetate; or whine, do nothing about it and only take offense at it; and even destroy it, take revenge on it, in order to “come true”, “show”, “shout” and “prove” to this world in any way, - to everything, everyone, people - “people, I’m still in it”; and ... at least for some reason carve on a tree: “Vasya was here.”

The fact is that it is not so easy to come true as a person, to be and stay “on the seven winds” (see G.K. Saikin, J. Derrida and others). Therefore, in understanding the meaning of human life, at least two levels are visible. First. The meaning of life is a phenomenon and a concept that concentrates the rootedness of a person in being, the existence of roots, connections with the eternity of being, which ontologically bind a person to this world, and then inspire him to life (or disappoint him), thanks to which it is worth living, it is worth becoming, to be and hold on to a person, it is worth enduring all the joyful and disturbing complexity of a person’s life, if as a person. In a narrower sense, the meaning of life is a value (idea, task, own solution), to which a person voluntarily devotes his life, that which determines and accompanies his whole life, is the main leading motive of life, (not identifying “motive” and “stimulus”) inspires, justifies his life (“life was not in vain”) or upsets up to misfortune

and even suicide. Since the purpose of life and the meaning of life are not the same thing, this does not happen with the purposes of life; they are important but transitory. And one more of its properties: the meaning of life is what a person grows in himself, sets himself in front of himself, motivates even in incredible conditions (V. Frankl), to which a person reaches out himself and voluntarily, no one pushes him in the back, coerces, as an incentive does. And it is expressed in what is called “vocation”, “service to life”, “deon-duty” - the fulfillment of a simple / complex, but human mission, the mission to take place, to be, to remain human. Since the purpose of life and the meaning of life are not the same thing, this does not happen with the purposes of life; they are important but transitory. And one more of its properties: the meaning of life is what a person grows in himself, sets himself in front of himself, motivates even in incredible conditions (V. Frankl), to which a person reaches out himself and voluntarily, no one pushes him in the back, coerces, as an incentive does. And it is expressed in what is called “vocation”, “service to life”, “deon-duty” - the fulfillment of a simple / complex, but human mission, the mission to take place, to be, to remain human. Since the purpose of life and the meaning of life are not the same thing, this does not happen with the purposes of life; they are important but transitory. And one more of its properties: the meaning of life is what a person grows in himself, sets himself in front of himself, motivates even in incredible conditions (V. Frankl), to which a person reaches out himself and voluntarily, no one pushes him in the back, coerces, as an incentive does. And it is expressed in what is called “vocation”, “service to life”, “deon-duty” - the fulfillment of a simple / complex, but human mission, the mission to take place, to be, to remain human. Frankl), to which a person reaches out himself and voluntarily, no one pushes him in the back, does not force him, as a stimulus does. And it is expressed in what is called “vocation”, “service to life”, “deon-duty” - the fulfillment of a simple / complex, but human mission, the mission to take place, to be, to remain human. Frankl), to which a person reaches out himself and voluntarily, no one pushes him in the back, does not force him, as a stimulus does. And it is expressed in what is called “vocation”, “service to life”, “deon-duty” - the fulfillment of a simple / complex, but human mission, the mission to take place, to be, to remain human.

As for the meaning of life of the second level - the question, what exactly is the meaning of a person’s life (mine, me - “the one, inimitable, beloved”), there are different positions here: individual and generic, individually generic. Mankind and man, as self-similar fractal systems of being, have been and are going through variants of the meaning of life: hedonistic, religious, utilitarian-pragmatic, deontological, it seems to be entering a realistic-humanistic one. However, since the meaning of life permeates through intention, there are three main approaches to defining the “meaning of human life”.

The first one is transcendent(as the researcher Z. V. Fomina rightly calls it), which claims that the meaning of a person’s life should lie outside his daily life and can be associated with the existence of a higher reality, with a certain Absolute. A person must live for something / someone outside of his own and everyday vain life. Only by the decision of the Otherworldly can he justify his life. Indeed, people have always looked for a way out of a) a depressing contradiction (the infinity of the universe and the finiteness of human life; “remember, War and Peace” by L. N. Tolstoy - “it can kill me, the only one, my soul”); from b) equalizing with life those who live by doing evil, lies, injustice and immorality; from c) equalizing everyone in non-existence as in other existence). And they “found” him. In some irrational-mystical postulate: to live for “immortality souls”, for “ In addition, there are many questions here. Of course, now it has become clearer, the world and the people in it are not only reasonable, order and chaos are interconnected. Nevertheless, in order

to affirm the otherworldly meaning of life, it is necessary to know (to assume how one can believe in many things and in anything); to know that there is this life - this world and "that" - the other world, there is this world - this world, that is, causal ("causal"), and there is ontologically "that" world - the other world, "acausal". But there is no knowledge about the existence of such an other world, there are no facts (but there will be facts, we will say). Because the boundaries of knowledge are constantly expanding, humanity is faced with the still unknown, "mysterious", but in fact the world is becoming more and more complex; mysterious, but not mystical-mysterious. Secondly, there must be someone/something, the Otherworldly, who would justify this life. But such a desire - to whom, with what it would be possible to "report" outside this worldly life - is also not confirmed by the facts; although it may be subjective. The judicial and legal system of mankind is sometimes very lame. Thirdly, is this worldly life not meaningless if its value is narrowed down to preparation for the "one" about which humanity has no factual information. The question of the meaning of life, therefore, turns into a question not of a realistic, not real, but of some kind of irrational-mystical (finitely primordial, given from the outside) meaning of life; not an ideal, but an idol. And he involuntarily belittles the real meaning of life, for many centuries he does not allow life to be human life, by definition. And it turns out, unfortunately, on the contrary, and bitterly: "if there is a god, then everything is allowed".⁹ To whom? In what? Recall that on the buckles of fascist soldiers during the Great Patriotic War, everyone had "God with us" stamped on them. What?! How is that?! Paradoxically and strangely, even the "monsters" etc. there are state lawyers and official "human rights defenders", but the witnesses, the weeping, suffering parents of their victims, etc. do not have them. How is that?!

It is no coincidence that there is a second approach in philosophy - the immanent one (named by Z. V. Fomina), which claims that the meaning of life lies in life itself and therefore justifies the real, earthly existence of a person. The immanent approach exists in epicureanism, hedonism, eudemonism, and also in rationalism. Epicureanism (Epicurus) considers the meaning of human life to be in the enjoyment of life, by which, by the way, he understands "not the pleasures of debauchery or sensuality", but the achievement of a state of calmness and equanimity of the spirit - ataraxia, "freedom from the suffering of the body and from the turmoil of the soul." Hedonism (Aristippus) adheres to a similar position, since the attempt to live for other, some higher goals happens and passes, leaving a person alone with his earthly needs and suffering, which remain "forever". Eudemonism (Socrates, Epicurus, Spinoza, Feuerbach, Spencer) considers happiness, bliss, the highest goal of human life, happiness, which is the inner freedom of a person, independence from the outside world. Rationalism (Ortega y Gasset) most clearly emphasizes the intrinsic value of life itself. But! But the immanent approach is also possible as given from the outside, otherworldly, transcendental. In contrast to external goals, life for him appears as self-creation, self-realization, hence it is connected with the joy of direct experience of life, similar to the sports and festive feeling of life, where the "smells of life" most of all, where life manifests more in vitality - "in its own game", laid-back, joyful, spontaneous. And yet, the presence of the meaning of life here, according to Gasset, is affirmed, it would seem, in the creative fullness of life itself. However, let us remember in the case of creativity, if in the case of creativity as a passion, as a game of life, the meaning of life becomes in the consumerism of life. An inversion occurs: it turns out that the world, life, people are a means, and a person himself turns into a means for consuming life. Denies the existence of a meaning of life external to a person and existentialism (especially Camus). However, as he believes, there is no external meaning, but they also see the internal human existence

because of the inevitable death as absurd, meaningless. Therefore, a solution is proposed - instead of a person's desire to get rid of the absurdity and meaninglessness of existence, it is better to learn to live with one's illnesses, consciously accepting the challenge, opposing the meaninglessness of absurd reality with one's own rebellion, one's own absurdity, one's even amorphous freedom as completely and as long as possible. These are disappointing conclusions if they limit the meaning of human existence to the limits of immediate life. So, it seems that both approaches make the same methodological mistake they unlawfully break the whole: part and whole, eternal and relatively non-eternal, infinite and relatively finite.

Therefore, there is a third approach - let's call it immanently transcendental. In accordance with it, the meaning of human life in existence can be, first of all, realistic, based on the essence of a person as a person (and not an animal, not a cognitive machine, not a means, not a tool, not an instrument, not a function, not a thing, not a toy). Consequently, the meaning of life lies in the most immediate life, but proceeding from the position of eternity-infinity, in the service of life, human life (not in the consumption of life and not in serving something above life, not in marginality to life). And life from the position of eternity is certainly connected with the real spirituality of human existence. Because "human spirituality" is a special state of human spiritual reality. But it is resolved realistically, to a certain extent, and in a human form: without opposing a person to his immediate life, without ruining life by grounding and serving his greedy flesh and sensuality, but also without stealing the "other world of being" by serving, without destroying the intention to "absolute reality". In this regard, in neoclassicism, we are, indeed, for the first time actually, albeit painfully, beginning to learn how to live in a non-utopian era.¹⁰ It is no coincidence that the confrontation between realism and anti-realism is today the front line of philosophical battles, and anti-realism has so many faces (E. L. Chertkova, V. A. Lektorsky).¹¹ The real spirituality of a person is associated with the performance of special functions in relation to the eternity of being: communicative, existential, hermeneutic, deontological.

In the communicative function of spirituality, a kind of breakthrough occurs, a person rises to the possibility of communicating with the universe as a whole and "alive"; the whole nature of communication with the surrounding reality is changing, the exchange of information with other people is becoming unusual. In the existential function - there is an insight into the unique essence and value of human life as such; highlighting the fact that the eternal and infinite world exists, as it turns out, through you; an event occurs - a rethinking of oneself in the universe. In the hermeneutic function - the assimilation of the meaning of life moves from "knowledge" and "experience" to "understanding", penetration into the context of being, unspoken, unsaid, revealing the dumbness of being, objects, things, processes, especially human dumbness. In the deontological function - the spirit of a person reaches such a level that makes a person able to grasp the proper and normative in this world of order-chaos. Due to the universe, coming from the very essence of the life of the universe, from its logos, conformity to laws. Existence seems to be calling people. And "hearing" it, makes a person an extremely independent and responsible being ("I have to"), and, therefore, as free as possible - sometimes happy. In this respect, a person becomes relatively eternal, relatively immortal. makes a person an extremely independent and responsible being ("I have to"), and, therefore, as free as possible - sometimes happy. In this respect, a person becomes relatively eternal, relatively immortal. makes a person an extremely independent and responsible being ("I have to"), and, therefore, as free as possible - sometimes happy. In this respect, a person becomes relatively eternal, relatively immortal.¹²⁻¹⁶

Neoclassical philosophy evidently proceeds from the fact that a person does not have absolute immortality, but there is a real relative immortality. It is expressed not in far-fetched, but in real forms of otherness. A person continues his life in grown children, descendants (provided that children are not baby animals, children are a “cultural phenomenon”); in the results of human activity, dissolved in the remaining and acting other people, in things, in the active deeds of living people; they prolong the life of a person, continue to have ontological significance; in the memory of a person, which continues to influence, act on the souls of subsequent people (not opposing, but not identifying memory with popularity); in the ashes of a person, in the ritual of human burial, which also has an alien and cultural component. So, an important discovery was made in neoclassicism: the meaning of life is the main determinant of our life as a human being. A person can live normally as a person, without languishing only when his life has meaning, when he has not lost the meaning of life and can at least somehow, unfortunately, in various forms and to some extent realize it.^{17–20}

All this indicates that man is not only a reflex animal, but first of all a reflexive being of being (without identifying “reflex” and “reflexivity”), not only a puppet in the hands of instincts and society, not only a cognitive machine, as he was most often seen classical philosophy and not a mystical-demiurgical being, as seen by all sorts of mystical points of view. Without rejecting not instincts, not innate predisposition, not the influence of the external environment, the neoclassical understanding of the essence of man proves that all these determinants determine human behavior, but are not its causal determination.⁴ Environment and instincts influence, but do not determine human behavior. Even in the most unfavorable or satiated conditions of existence. Conditions, environment only reveal the depths of a person’s essence. By “The modern neoclassical view of the essence of man, his meaning of life is based on the fact that, in principle, a person’s life as a person cannot be approached from a utilitarian point of view, usefulness-unusefulness, it is unacceptable to approach it as a means, thing, functionally. This is inevitably acceptable to things, to a certain extent to animals, but not to man. If we in it, under any circumstances, understand a person as a person. Human life is super-useful, justifies itself by its existence, life is a task, it is a mission of a person to live as a person. Which, of course, is not easy. The modern neoclassical view of the essence of man, his meaning of life is based on the fact that, in principle, a person’s life as a person cannot be approached from a utilitarian point of view, usefulness-unusefulness, it is unacceptable to approach it as a means, thing, functionally. This is inevitably acceptable to things, to a certain extent to animals, but not to man. If we in it, under any circumstances, understand a person as a person. Human life is super-useful, justifies itself by its existence, life is a task, it is a mission of a person to live as a person. Which, of course, is not easy. This is inevitably acceptable to things, to a certain extent to animals, but not to man. If we in it, under any circumstances, understand a person as a person. Human life is super-useful, justifies itself by its existence, life is a task, it is a mission of a person to live as a person. Which, of course, is not easy. This is inevitably acceptable to things, to a certain extent to animals, but not to man. If we in it, under any circumstances, understand a person as a person. Human life is super-useful, justifies itself by its existence, life is a task, it is a mission of a person to live as a person. Which, of course, is not easy.”

From all this in neoclassical philosophy it follows that the essence of man is not that he is a biosocial being, he is not the most intelligent, but an animal, or the most intelligent, but a machine, but is originally a cultural being or a subject-object of culture. Man in his essence does not need any predicates and compliments, neither the best nor

the worst, even the most fallen of us. He is fundamentally different. One of the discoveries of neoclassical philosophy is precisely the understanding that the nature of man (his origin) and the essence of man (his substantiality) are not the same thing. It is important to stop confusing “human nature” and “human essence”, and at all levels: worldview-methodological-pedagogical-psychological-neurophysiological-biological. Modern research proves that a person, unlike higher animals, has, in addition to the neocortex, subcortex, stem brain, spinal cord, even the skin - the “brain”, the peripheral part of the brain (A. Megrabyan, S. N. Raeva, N. P. Dubinin, I. I. Karpets, V. N. Kudryavtsev); that a person has not two, but three signal systems (A. Ya. Zverev, U. Sh. Akhmerov, N. U. Akhmerov, E. A. Tsvetkov, I. P. Shmelev); a human being also has not two forms of comprehension of being, but at least three - the well-known rational-logical, sensual-emotional and unconscious or, according to Yu. A. Urmantsev, meditative. U. Akhmerov, E. A. Tsvetkov, I. P. Shmelev); a human being also has not two forms of comprehension of being, but at least three the well known rational logical, sensual emotional and unconscious or, according to Yu. A. Urmantsev, meditative. U. Akhmerov, E. A. Tsvetkov, I. P. Shmelev); a human being also has not two forms of comprehension of being, but at least three the well known rational-logical, sensual-emotional and unconscious or, according to Yu. A. Urmantsev, meditative.^{21–24}

Conclusion

The conclusion that initially a person is a cultural being or a subject-object of culture seems unrealistic and complimentary. But note that we are not talking about idealization - the “pinkness” of a person, not about the norm of culture and “culture”, the form of its expression, they can be different (from the stages of savagery, barbarism, civilization and to the stage of culture itself), but about the essence of man. We are talking about the fact that each of us is already born with the so-called “innate ideas”, “collective-unconscious”, etc. non-animal drives, and also by the way of satisfying, it would seem, biological drives, from the very beginning we are different - cultural (socio-cultural-genesis) beings (V. A. Vorontsov). We are talking about a constant feature of a human being, about that fundamental anthropic invisible trait, lying in a person and separating the natural and human in him with a Rubicon. proves the existence of their overstepping this anthropic line. Each person is a being not only and not so much reflecting, but in one way or another reflecting and actively constructing the world in his own way; moreover, both creatively and destructively, since the natural world is not suitable for man as a man and man is not ready for him. To come true as a man, a man bears a double burden. No one forces him, but in order to come true (quench his languor, incompleteness and incompleteness), he is forced to self-actualize himself as a person and the world as for a person (G.K. Saikina).

In understanding the essence of a person, in comprehending and growing the meaning of his life, in his self-actualization, it is important to distinguish between the existential and the deficient: B- and D- his approach, B- and D- motivation, B- and D- cognition, B- and D- his values, B- and D- his love in the broadest sense. A. Maslow explains this wonderful idea in the following way. We are talking, for example, about the fact that a hungry person notices first of all food, a beggar - only money, that is, a lack that distorts everything and leads to degradation of perception, and not to self-actualization. Most of the pre-humanistic theories dealt and deal only with scarce motivation. However, a careful look at people’s behavior reveals another kind of motivation, actually human - existential motivation. Deficient motivation is motivation focused on satisfying a frustrated need. It consists in dissatisfaction with the present universe, it is beyond the joy of life. With such motivation, they lose value and additionally frustrate him. Deficient cognition is a cognition where

objects are not considered in themselves, then it channels, narrows and inverts perception and thinking, so that the person is aware mainly of those aspects of reality that have to do with the satisfaction of a vital need. A student who studies only to pass tests, etc., in fact, does not become a cultured person. One, perhaps, of the excusable features of deficient cognition is that a person can be prompted to immediate action and to an attempt to change the situation faster than the existing state or situation has matured (which is objectively necessary in case of fire, in battle, etc. situations). But here, too, the natural development is violated by the intrusion into the objective process, so to speak, “through no fault of ours.” Existential motivation is growth motivation or metamotivation, when a person does not experience (as if stepping over) neither hunger, nor pain, nor fear; new motivations appear, such as responsibility, the desire to help, curiosity or the desire for games, activities, etc., when they can bring satisfaction and joy as such, so to speak, for free. Here we are talking about the desire to seek positive value goals, satisfaction with the present, satisfaction with growth to come true, and not just compensation for a lack. Existential knowledge is more accurate and effective, because here one’s own perception is distorted to a lesser extent in accordance with the needs and desires, one’s “self” (Yu. Razinov). Such knowledge first perceives the essence of things as they are, and not only their utility. It is able to appreciate the essence as such, the perception is richer and more complete. The perceiver remains here independent of the perceived. External objects are valued as such, in and of themselves, and not in their relation to personal concerns, much less small ones. In fact, in the state of B-knowledge, a person tends to remain immersed in depth, in essence, in contemplation or observation; active intervention is no longer appropriate. Existential knowledge can be trusted. That is why, no matter how one criticizes such a point of view, if science does not exist for the sake of science, and art does not exist for the sake of art, then they are neither science nor art; they are doomed to harm man and humanity and, naturally, to self-degradation. Either they and their representatives must self-actualize, that is, enter a new round of self-realization. This does not mean that a self-actualizing person does not have flaws, that they are perfect. They have “everything like people”, but they have a real open-closed system (and not open and not isolated - they do not identify openness with openness, but closeness with isolation), they are not neurotic. It’s just that self-actualization is not given automatically, although through it the meaning of the life of a human being is self-realized. (and not open and not isolated - they do not identify openness with openness, but closeness with isolation), they are not neurotic. It’s just that self-actualization is not given automatically, although through it the meaning of the life of a human being is self-realized. (and not open and not isolated - they do not identify openness with openness, but closeness with isolation), they are not neurotic. It’s just that self-actualization is not given automatically, although through it the meaning of the life of a human being is self-realized.

Thus, a person is a being capable of living as a person without being “nervous”, “not freaking out” only in the culture created by him, culture as the third house of being; self-actualizing and self-actualizing; as service in being and being. Not falling into hardened “traps” that the Absolute sees everything and does everything for us: that life is a struggle, copying the life of the animal world, and not careful, synergistic actions and relationships with each other in it; that only the environment forms a person, and not he himself in the environment, the conditions in which he found his life, if you cannot or are not able to change at least part of this environment, conditions yourself. And satisfaction in comprehending the meaning of life - the main and main “lack” - is sometimes the happiness of a person.

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

None.

References

1. Kriman AI. Post-humanistic turn to the post (in) human. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2020;12:63–64.
2. Menchikov GP. On changing the main question of philosophy. Scientific notes of the Kazan State University. 2010;152:125–134.
3. Menchikov GP. Neoclassical philosophy: essence, content, meaning. Scientific notes of Kazan State University. 2013;155:105–117.
4. Menchikov GP. Determinism XXI: problems and solutions. *Sputnik*. 2015;17–22.
5. Baydachnaya EV. The essence of the existential turn in culture: on the way to development. *Questions of Culturology*. 2013;6:60–64.
6. Menchikov GP. Life as a philosophical category. *Vestnik MGUKI*. 2008;5:13–17.
7. Menchikov GP. Spiritual reality of a person (analysis of philosophical and ontological foundations). Kazan: Grandan; 1999. 408 p.
8. Fomin MV. Transindustrialism the upcoming social reality. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2018;1:48.
9. Kibalnik SA. If there is a God, then everything is allowed (The central meta-theme of Dostoevsky’s work in modern European psychoanalytic philosophy). *Questions of Philosophy*. 2019;9:87–98.
10. Derrida J. Finally learn to live. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2005;4:133–144.
11. Realistic turn in modern epistemology, philosophy of mind and philosophy of science? Materials of the “round table”. *Problems of Philosophy*. 2017;1:5–38.
12. Augustine A. Confession. M: Renaissance. 1991. 448 p.
13. Aksenov GP. Desymbolization of the Absolute. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2015;8:55.
14. Vavilov PS. Representations of the Subject of the Altered State of Consciousness: Philosophical and Cultural Analysis. Abstract diss. cand. Philosophy Sciences. Kazan: KAZGIK. 2019;3.
15. Vorontsov VA. The nature of the first mask and its role in anthroposociocultural genesis. *Philosophical Anthropology*. 2017;3(1):151–167.
16. Lektorsky VA. About the concept of “constructive (activity) realism” / “Time philosophizes”. Conversation T.G. Shchedrina with V.A. Lektorsky. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2022;9:9–10.
17. Lepekhin VA. Anthropological revolution. Turn, turn or all the same coup? *Philosophical sciences*. 2016;4:149–153.
18. Maslow A. Motivation and personality. Theories of personality in Western European and American psychology. Samara: BahraKh. 1996:409–450.
19. Rubtsov AV. Postmodern architectonics. Time. *Questions of Philosophy*. 2011;10:37–47.
20. Saykina GK. It’s hard to be human. (Metaphysical routes of man). Kazan: Kazan University; 2012;428.
21. Urmantsev Yu A. On the forms of comprehension of being. *Questions of Philosophy*. 1993;4:89–105.
22. Fomina ZV. Values of human existence. *Saratov*. 2001;24:26.
23. Frankl V. Doctor and soul. St. Petersburg: *Yuventa*. 1997;235:158–242.
24. Fromm E. Anatomy of human destructiveness. *Respublika*. 1994;316.