

N. Medzhidova<sup>1</sup>, P.P. Soloshchenko<sup>2\*</sup>, S.M. Zhakin<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>*Baku State University, Baku, Azerbaijan*<sup>2</sup>*Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan  
(E-mail: nargiz516@hotmail.com; p\_soloschenk@mail.ru; samatsky7@gmail.com)*

## Problems and prospects of modern civilizational development

The article discusses the problems and prospects of modern civilizational development in the context of theoretical and practical attitudes of philosophical anthropology. Using the methodology of the activity approach, the authors reflect on the possibility of realizing the potential of philosophical research on the human problem in the processes of humanization of social activity. The authors, paying attention to the contradictory nature of the development of philosophical anthropology as a universal knowledge of the essence of man, bring to the fore the problem of understanding man as a unique biosociocultural system in its integral being. The modern organization of the social existence of mankind, as well as the modern type of culture, requires a scientific awareness of the place of man in the world and opens up new prospects for the development of philosophical anthropology. The current appeal to the theoretical and practical principles of philosophical anthropology is meant to address, first and foremost, those facets of human nature and life that distinguish a person as a significant and creative beginning of civilizational development, creating social and cultural forms of his or her being.

*Keywords:* man, philosophical anthropology, activity approach, humanism, symbiosis of sciences, civilizational development, philosophical thinking.

### Introduction

The growing uncertainty in understanding the future prospects of civilizational development and the role of an individual in these difficult processes requires the modern scientific community to make constant efforts to find and substantiate such methods of social activity and personal creativity in which the ideal of a holistic person and humanistic criteria of social practice would be affirmed. At the same time, determining the conditions, means and methods of successful self-development and self-improvement of a person, his social and cultural self-activity, his free and creative activity become of paramount importance. Therefore, the request for the implementation in science and social practice of the transition “from considering a person as a derivative of social phenomena to his understanding as a subject, a person capable of solving personal and socially significant problems” remains relevant [1]. This, in turn, should be based on the variety of ideas about the value of a person and his spiritual world, the ability to create, the qualities of a person associated with his ability to go “upward”, value attitude towards another person [2].

The leading level of intellectual and spiritual development of the population, which takes the form of human capital and ensures the innovation process in every sphere of human activity, becomes the main form of the country's wealth. There is a change in thinking in solving social problems, its focus on harmonizing personal interests with the interests of the country becomes more and more necessary. Gradually, paternalistic moods, a pragmatic selfish attitude, and the technocracy of economic and social development programs remain in the past.

To ensure the effective inclusion of a person in the process of civilizational development, it is necessary to reorient the public consciousness towards the acquisition of qualitatively new knowledge and skills. Each person must see his place in society, be aware of the responsibility for the consequences of his actions. Under these conditions, the education system, precisely as a sphere of formation of an integral person, is increasingly turning into the largest branch of society, which, on the one hand, forms and develops the main productive force — the person himself, and on the other hand, is an indicator of the degree of culture and civilization of society.

In choosing a strategy for modern civilizational development, from our point of view, the emphasis should be on the achievement by each person of a universal level of personal self-development, which should be postulated as the end result of the economic functioning of social production and at the same time as the

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [p\\_soloschenk@mail.ru](mailto:p_soloschenk@mail.ru)

most important resource and means of the progressive development of society. To create conditions that help to develop this skill at all levels of social practice, we think it is necessary to implement the principle that recognizes for each member of society the ability to independently master a universal, active way of interconnection with the outside world, which will allow each person to become an active participant in modern social transformations. It is necessary to search for ways and means of forming a “qualitatively different reflexive culture of thinking”, instilling “a different, new culture of organizing all types of communication”, developing strategies for mastering “a different culture of organizing any type of activity in general” [3].

The solution to this problem is impossible without using all the spiritual wealth of philosophy. One cannot but agree with V.S. Solovyov that philosophy makes a person completely human [4]. This happens because the bearer of a philosophical worldview can only be a specific person, a living person who has his own judgment on each issue, not learned from books, not afraid to express this judgment aloud, to argue and defend it. There is no place in philosophy for a dry, lifeless, official presentation of ready-made knowledge, but there is always an open space of conversation, dialogue, discussion, during which the “eternal” questions of existence echo the burning issues of modernity. Philosophizing is the constant pushing the boundaries of world perception, finding an unusual focus of vision, discovering for and in oneself the whole depth, complexity, and polyphony of existence. Therefore, while studying philosophy, we are engaged in freeing ourselves from the violent power of external forms and assessments, we do not agree with any arrangement of our life in which the possibility of a person being completely human, free in his views on the world and responsible for his being in the world is suppressed.

The entire history of philosophy convincingly shows that the formulation and solution of a particular problem are inseparable from the specific historical, social, cultural conditions of a philosopher’s life. Moreover, philosophy itself, which develops as a real-life process, is filled with burning questions that give rise to living philosophical creativity. It is in philosophy as a theoretically fundamental worldview that the fullness of the human relationship to the world is achieved. In philosophy, the researcher is no longer interested in the subject “in itself”, but in the subject for a person and in relation to a person, in connection with him, with his spiritual quest and practical intentions. Here, any result of the movement of thought acquires philosophical meaning only when it is associated with vital questioning and direct experience of life, the general context of human existence, and the interests of a particular person. Philosophical attitude is a special form of human attitude to the world. When philosophy connects a person with his needs and interests, on the one hand, and the world, understood not “in itself”, but as the world of human existence, on the other, only then philosophy retains its meaning and its right to exist. Thus, philosophical research, like human thinking itself, is not something independent of the world and independent in relation to the broader and more general process of human life activity, but is a critically creative comprehension of life in concepts.

#### *Experimental*

The proposed research is based on the methodological basis for effectively solving issues of social practice in an activity-based approach that recognizes a person as a full-fledged subject of activity, participating in the creative process of transforming the world, being an active participant in modern social transformations, revealing all new own possibilities in this process.

In the words of K.H. Momjian, “there will not be a single phenomenon in the entire “space” of the society that does not represent a certain “hypostasis” of activity. In the social world, it is like carbon, which “hides” behind the outwardly opposite diamond and graphite, forming in reality their “secret essence” or substance itself...” [5].

It is in this understanding that the essence of the activity approach to social reality that consists acts as an explanatory philosophical principle, which we accept as a methodological basis for the study of various social processes and social structures.

Activity is a specifically human form of an active relationship to the world, a certain type of being in the world. This is the essence of the activity. In terms of content, it represents a purposeful change and transformation of the world, purposeful activity of a person, acting as “self-regulating behavior in the environment of existence, aimed at self-preservation in it by expedient adaptation to its conditions” [5; 173].

The activity approach makes it possible to study social processes not only by describing them, but also by explaining, analyzing, revealing their essence. This is the main advantage of the activity approach as an explanatory principle, as a result of which the research base of social philosophy is not only expanded but it also becomes possible to implement such functions of scientific theory that studies society as recommendato-

ry and predictive, which in itself is important, especially in modern conditions of progressive globalization and the formation of a single information space.

Various variants of the activity approach were developed by such prominent philosophers as E.V. Ilyenkov, G.S. Batishchev, M.K. Mamardashvili, G.P. Shchedrovitsky, E.G. Yudin. The idea of activity was also successfully used in the psychological theories represented by the works of A.N. Leontiev, P.Ya. Galperin, V.V. Davydov, who, in turn, developed the principles of the activity approach of L.S. Vygotsky and S.L. Rubinshtein.

### *Results and Discussion*

Philosophy as a universal science reveals the fundamental grounds for the existence of any object, including the objects of all private sciences. Questions about the essence of the objects of private sciences are beyond the competence of these sciences. Within the scope of their competence, private sciences cannot solve issues of a fundamental nature. If a specialist comes close to the essential issues, he has no other way but to think philosophically, because he finds himself in the sphere of philosophical issues of his science. All sciences, one might say, are connected by their philosophical questions around the main question of philosophy — the question of the world, man and man's place in the world.

By deepening knowledge to the foundations of a particular sphere of reality, a variety of sciences concluded that they somehow raise the question of a person. The above applies not only to the sciences that directly have a person as an object but also to the “natural sciences”. Progress along the path of knowledge accelerates to the extent that a person begins to interfere with the object of knowledge, transforming it. As a result, natural objects involved in the sphere of transformation acquire a human dimension. The specificity of cognition of such an object as a person is that it, as a whole, cannot be comprehended by any one or even several dimensions. The most important methodological difficulty is that one has to deal not just with a changing object, but with an object that, by transforming the environment, also changes itself, developing its own essence in the process of transformation. It is no coincidence that numerous attempts to define “human nature” in various teachings of philosophical anthropology failed to produce universally recognized results and aroused legitimate doubts about the viability of philosophical anthropology as a discipline capable of integrating the growing multidimensional knowledge about man.

If philosophical anthropology is traditionally understood as a philosophical discipline, the subject of which is “human nature”, then philosophical anthropology will be unable to act as an integrator of knowledge about a person, that is, as knowledge about an integral person, and in general will be forced to permanently prove the validity of its existence as a special discipline.

The question of what a person is is not identical to the question of human nature, and therefore it cannot be answered in a formal and logical way — by listing signs. Speaking of a person, we are dealing with a universal object. Doubling the world in the course of transformative activity, a person creates a “second nature” — an artificial environment and a social world, acquires the ability to scientific, objective thinking, to see the essence of any object, and discovers an inner ideal doubling-consciousness.

Despite the huge accumulated material in the field of anthropological knowledge, the problem of comprehending the essence of man still remains open. The impossibility of comprehending the essence of man in a traditional scientific way and through philosophical analysis has been noted by many, both in the past and in the present. A person, being a mystery to himself, without stopping at what has been achieved, continues his way of comprehending his own essence, his nature.

As a result of significant differentiation of the process of cognition and deepening of specialization in the field of philosophy and science, there is a need to develop the problem of understanding a person as a unique biosociocultural system in its integral being. The modern organization of the social existence of mankind, as well as the modern type of culture, requires a scientific awareness of man's place in the world. Today, humanity is still far from completing the construction of a unified system of knowledge about man. However, the creation of a unified science remains the limit of the aspirations of many specialists in the field of human studies.

Anthropology, in particular philosophical anthropology, fails to create a full-fledged image of a person, due to the diversity of manifestations of its essence and existence. The reason for this state of affairs lies in the very nature of the subject under study, namely, in man. Since the emergence of philosophical anthropology as an independent direction, an attempt has been made to present in some integrity the numerous ideas accumulated by philosophy about man. As it turned out, the essence of a person is not amenable to analytical dissection, the construction of a system of essential characteristics of a person through the

identification of his individual attributes leads to the fact that the very essence of a person eludes the researcher.

It has always been inherent in a person to think about such questions: Who is he? What is the meaning of its existence? What is its difference from other living beings, what is its origin? Philosophers of the past, as soon as they did not call a person: both the “crown of nature” and the “social animal”, some philosophers compared a person with God, others with an animal. Therefore, a person throughout his existence is trying to find an answer to the question, what distinguishes him from other living beings? Flesh or soul, mind or creative spirit? However, the thesis of its exclusivity and originality is not questioned.

Throughout the history of mankind, the proportion of human problems in one or another philosophical concept has changed depending on the degree of understanding of the problem of man as the initial principle of philosophizing, as well as the philosophical understanding of man himself, his being and the meaning of existence. We can say that the first ideas about man arose long before philosophy appeared. This is evidenced by the myths and primitive religious ideas that have come down to us. About any field of philosophical knowledge, except for philosophical anthropology, one can say when it arose and what its subject matter is. The answer to the question of the origin and subject of philosophical anthropology remains open to this day.

The outstanding significance of L. Feuerbach's work in the history of philosophical thought is connected with his understanding of man as a purely natural, biological being, as “the only, universal and supreme subject of the new philosophy”. The German thinker believed that not the “thinking Self”, not the “Absolute idea”, about which his predecessors in German classical philosophy spoke a lot, but nature is the objectively justified genuine beginning of philosophy. Defining man as the most perfect part of eternal nature (and not the creation of God, not self-consciousness) and “the highest subject of philosophy”, Feuerbach sees the task of the latter (if it is true) not in “creating books, but in creating people”.

According to Feuerbach, the spiritual principle in a person cannot be separated from the corporeal, the spirit and the body are two sides of the reality that is called the human organism. However, in the unity of these two sides, it is the body in its entirety (and not thinking) that constitutes the essence of the human “I”. In addition, the German philosopher noted that a separate, isolated person does not contain a human essence; the latter is present only in communication, in the unity of man with man. The philosopher called this unity “the greatest and last principle of philosophy”, and all essential relations, principles of various sciences are only different types and forms of this unity. Feuerbach considered all questions of being and cognition proceeding from the human essence as natural because he does not oppose man to nature, but considers man to be a part of nature [6; 182–184].

Today, when we set our task to study man, and in practice we would like to humanize social relations, L. Feuerbach's teaching about man acquires a new sound. After all, for Feuerbach, a person is a world of feelings, emotions, moods, desires, reflections. Feuerbach believes that love, friendship, and devotion are the main things in a person's life. Feuerbach's penetration into the so-called “subjective man”, into his inner world, makes Feuerbach's philosophy more interesting than ever. He notes that a “subjective person” makes his feelings a measure of what should be. Today we also clearly understand that many phenomena in society should be judged by the “human”, “personal dimension”. Turning to this dimension is a manifestation of humanism.

Seeing in Hegel's statement of the identity of being and thinking only the identity of thinking with oneself, Feuerbach declared that the unity of being and thinking is true and makes sense only when the basis, the subject of this unity is taken by man. Offering a materialistic interpretation of thinking, Feuerbach emphasized that man thinks, and not the superhuman “I”. Feuerbach insisted that only this unity of being and thinking embodied in people as material beings really exists, and the Hegelian identity of being and thinking is an idealistic fiction.

In contrast to Hegel's identity of being and thinking, Feuerbach asserted a kind of identity of being and sensuality, insisting that the real in its reality is sensuous and that only a sensuous being is a true, real being. If for the former philosophy, Feuerbach pointed out, I am an abstract, only thinking being and the body has nothing to do with my essence, then as for the new philosophy, it proceeds from the position: I am a genuine sensual being; the body enters into my essence; the body in its entirety is my Self, makes up my essence. Believing that the essence of being as being is the essence of nature, Feuerbach called nature as a whole an entity indistinguishable from being, and man — an entity that distinguishes itself from being; moreover, it was emphasized that nature is the foundation of man [6; 186].

Reproaching Hegel that he “did not ripen to being as such, to free, independent, self-sufficient being”, which is the being of nature, Feuerbach declared that it is “given in and through itself” and its basis is “in

itself “. All this taken together formed the basis of the materialistic conclusion that in reality “thinking comes from being, and not being from thinking”

Thus, if at the very beginning of Feuerbach’s transition to materialistic positions, he saw the “source of healing” of philosophy — “only in returning to nature”, the highest product of which is the human being, then soon, when considering the unity of nature and man, the main attention is transferred to man as being of interest to the “new philosophy”, which nature is interested in only in connection with a person. “The new philosophy”, Feuerbach wrote, “transforms man, including nature as the basis of man, into the only, universal and supreme subject of philosophy” and thereby transforms anthropology into a universal science”[6; 95].

If in theoretical terms Feuerbach considered the highest goal of his philosophy an adequate understanding of the essence of man, then in practical terms such a goal was to determine what the relations between people corresponding to this essence should be and how to establish these relations in people’s lives. Feuerbach emphasized that his philosophy has essentially a practical tendency. Feuerbach’s “new philosophy” acted in a practical aspect as the ethics of love, in which the main moral value would be the statement “man is God to man”, and love for man should be the highest and first law of man. It was taking into account this kind of “deification” of man that Feuerbach declared that the love-permeated attitude of a child to parents, husband to wife, brother to brother, friend to friend, in general, man to man, moral relations in themselves are truly religious relations, and the life of people corresponding to such relations has all the characteristics of the divine nature [7; 444, 445].

The XXI century characterizes itself as the entry of humanity into the post-anthropological era, which is characterized by the rejection of a single universal science of man. Many authors trying to resolve particular issues of anthropological research are faced with the uncertainty of the very subject of philosophical anthropology. The definition given by M. Scheler is most often accepted as the subject of philosophical anthropology. M. Scheler considered the ancestral man with his attributive essential properties to be the subject of philosophical anthropology [8]. In some teachings, the subject of philosophical anthropology was the individual man in his existence, both in the form of his subjectivity and in the form of his objectification. There is another point of view, which can be considered a starting point, that the subject of philosophical anthropology is a person whose essence is manifested in his relationship with nature, society, culture, God, Others, and with himself.

Philosophical anthropology, despite the continued growth of its followers, has not come to the development of such a methodical approach to the problem of man, which would realize its claims. Many researchers state the crisis of anthropological knowledge, which requires a change in the anthropological paradigm. Despite the rapid development of anthropological research, many aspects remain open, and, moreover, due to the rapid growth in the number of studies, there is a growing need for a deeper study of the methodological problems of anthropology for a deeper understanding of its discourse.

Another problem of modern philosophical anthropology is the problem of classification of anthropological disciplines, the number of which is increasing day by day (structural, religious, natural science, social, legal, historical, psychological, pedagogical, etc.). There is no integration, but differentiation of anthropological knowledge. Natural science anthropology studies man as a natural being, which has its own biological structure, properties and characteristics, and which has its own biological history. Psychological anthropology considers the problems of mental status in the integral structure of a person. Historical anthropology explores the process of transforming the essential characteristics of a person depending on the cultural and historical changes that take place in society. Structural anthropology studies an interconnected system of sociocultural phenomena. Religious anthropology includes both reflections on a person in standing before God, and religious practice, which is a way of life for a believer.

Regarding the fact of the increase in the number and symbiotic unification of sciences, it is worth noting here, first of all, the following five characteristic features: the growth in the number of metadisciplines involved in description, reconstruction and modeling, the growing need for symbiotic sciences, the transition from discreteness to a continuum, overcoming the fragmentation of sciences, the growth of scientific knowledge about that a person cannot know in principle, the creation of new scientific disciplines based on information and cognitive technologies.

The symbiotic union of sciences changes the image of man. Three modern examples of such a combination can help to gradually determine its significance for the image of a person: first, the slow but obvious interpenetration of neuroscience and psychology. Secondly, this changes the understanding of the external and internal, that is, matter and spirit. Thirdly, this association allows us to reasonably expect that,

for example, the disciplines that are in the process of development in this direction — neuropsychotherapy, and, in particular, neuropsychanalysis — will significantly advance in terms of both diagnostic and therapeutic potential [9].

The increase in the number of sciences based on information and cognitive technologies establishes new relationships between a theoretical person and a practical person. This leads to the formation of such an image of a person, within which a person is presented as a dynamic unity of a temporary, conceptual, and active being. Interaction at the interface level between human and computer is key, as here we can see how this relationship between computer and human leads to an incredible increase in creative possibilities, less and less limited by social diversification.

### *Conclusions*

It can be said that a person is multi-valued and multidimensional to be the subject of one science. However, genuine science is possible, which reduces knowledge about a person into a certain system of a higher level of generalization and abstraction. Such a science, considering the laws of logic and the information of other types of anthropology, will go further than them. The aim of this science will be the intellectual penetration into the last structures and conditions by which the facts collected by physical, cultural and any other anthropology can exist. Different types of anthropology study the partial and empirical aspects of man. However, none of these anthropology considers a person as a whole, as a person. Therefore, the existence of science seems justified and necessary, the purpose of which would be the knowledge and interpretation of personality as a real, independently existing entity, in its last foundations or structures.

Observing the socio-cultural realities of today's life, it becomes obvious that modern man is almost completely at the mercy of forces seeking to take away his confidence in his own thinking. Spiritual lack of independence reigns literally in everything: in the books that he reads; in the people who surround him; in the political parties to which he belongs. The matter is aggravated by the many-sided material dependence that affects his mentality in such a way that, in the end, he loses faith in the possibility of independent thought, and does not see any sense in it. Modern man can be characterized as an over-busy, unassembled, fragmented being. The main problem is that we do not know what to do. Humanitarian thought more and more reveals a tendency towards alarmism, but stating the situation does not change the essence of the situation.

In conditions when there is a total emasculation of the concept of "man" and the reduction of its content to an economic category (human capital) or social function (executive employee; valuable personnel), philosophy can become the resource that can restore a person to his spiritual dignity. This is the first point of practical applicability of philosophy to form a new (regumanized) world order. Indeed, from the very beginning of its appearance, the distinctive feature of philosophy was the emphasis on independent thinking. The figure of the philosopher is also remarkable in this respect. A philosopher, unlike a priest, is not a unique person chosen by the supreme power, but simply one of us, ordinary people, who simply understands the lessons of everyday life more deeply and formulates them in memorable sayings. At the same time, it is important that everyone can learn this with desire. That is, there is not necessarily a superhuman component, God's choice or destiny. In gaining wisdom, everything depends only on the person himself: his desire, diligence, and determination.

The problem of modernity is the problem of non-understanding. There is a paradoxical situation: on the one hand, the growth of human knowledge has reached unprecedented heights, on the other hand, we do not know what to do with all this, how to use it for everyone's benefit. The content cannot exist in isolation from the form. However, the vast content of various sciences today functions outside of an axiological form capable of combining them into one whole. That is why there is a destructurization of scientific, cultural and social processes. The second point of practical applicability of philosophy can be its integrative potential. Philosophy in its transcendental dimension can constitute the general value framework of socio-cultural activity, thus creating a vector of social development, fundamentally different from the political one.

A problem is always a contradiction between two sides. One of the most pressing problems of our time is the problem of the collision of mass and high (classical) culture. It should be noted with regret that the aggressive expansion of mass culture (anti-culture) devalues classical culture. In the public mind, this situation gives rise to two radical positions. Representatives of the first can be defined as snobbish conservatives who deny modern culture the right to exist (misunderstanding should be considered the reason for such unacceptable hostility). Representatives of the second position are the younger generations who are in a position of excommunication with tradition and therefore are forced to reproduce some kind of surrogates of cultural models (their irreverent sharpness with regard to the past is also due to misunderstanding). The third point of

the practical applicability of philosophy can be the establishment of a dialogue between “not understanding”. Since philosophy, among other things, is the ultimate reflection on cultural values, it is able to see at the level of causes (and not only at the level of consequences, as culture bearers themselves do). Seeing the cause frees a person from the position of condemnation or rejection. In other words, philosophy is culturally meta-contextual. In this sense, it is able to create a “third” space for the communication of cultures, in which their differences do not seem so incompatible. Ultimately, each culture is a collective way of creating answers to life's meaningful questions that concern everyone. The content of the answers may vary. This difference becomes the main cause of the conflict. However, this difference still grows out of one questioning, out of one existential need. That is, the cause is one, but the effects are many. It is enough to shift the focus to the cause (essence) and see its common nature for all, so that the level of conflictogenicity of the diversity of consequences will noticeably decrease.

Finally, the very last and main point of the urgent need for the use of philosophy in the creation of a new world order is that only philosophy is able to reach the level of ontology, considering not only certain types of beings, but all things in their being. This ability gives the integrity of vision, which protects from false paths, enabling a more accurate forecast for the future and a more sober attitude to the present.

Recently, one can observe how thought rushes from one extreme to another: scientific slogans overlap with antiscientist ones; someone proposes to conquer space, since the Earth is already used up material, someone proposes to save nature from the harmful effects of man. In the era of total antagonisms, it would be useful to recall that the ideal of philosophy has always been harmony. The contradiction is removed only in the synthesis of a higher order. Perhaps the time has come to stop elevating “society” over “nature” or “nature” over “society”, and the time comes when it is necessary to balance them in a harmonious unity under the guidance of sensitive non-dogmatic philosophical thinking [10].

Appeal to the theoretical and practical principles of philosophical anthropology today is intended to address, first of all, to those aspects of human nature and life that characterize a person as a key and creative principle of civilizational development, creating social and cultural forms of his being. It involves the disclosure and display of the correlative connection of these forms with the subjective human factor, their interpretation as realities accessible to the transforming influence of man, as concrete historical products of human creativity, as such results of human activity that owe their appearance to the specific needs and interests of a person, his creative abilities and opportunities.

## References

- 1 Деркач А.А. Современные задачи акмеологии как метанауки и метапрактики [Электронный ресурс] / А.А. Деркач. — Мемориал [сайт]. Режим доступа [http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article\\_id=21&pid=19](http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article_id=21&pid=19) [http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article\\_id=21&pid=19](http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article_id=21&pid=19).
- 2 Рубинштейн С.Л. Человек и мир / С.Л. Рубинштейн // Проблемы общей психологии. — М.: Педагогика, 1973. — 424 с.
- 3 Батурин В.С. Состояние и проблемы постсоветского образования в контексте теории деятельности / В.С. Батурин // Вестн. Оренбург. гос. ун-та. — 2012. — № 7. — С. 114–120.
- 4 Соловьев В.С. Исторические дела философии / В.С. Соловьев // Вопросы философии. — 1988. — № 8. — С. 118–125.
- 5 Момджян К.Х. Социум. Общество. История. / К.Х. Момджян. — М.: Наука, 1994. — 239 с.
- 6 Избранные философские произведения: [В 2 т.]. — Т.1. / Л. Фейербах. — М.: Госполитиздат, 1955. — 676 с.
- 7 Избранные философские произведения: [В 2 т.]. — Т.2. / Л. Фейербах. — М.: Госполитиздат, 1955. — 942 с.
- 8 Шелер М. Избранные произведения / М. Шелер; пер. с нем. А.В. Денежкина, А.Н. Малинкина, А.Ф. Филиппова. — М.: Гнозис, 1994. — 413 с.
- 9 Меджидова Н. Телесно-ориентированный подход в философской антропологии / Н. Меджидова // Журн. «Metafizika». — 2021. — № 3 (15). — С. 7–17.
- 10 Аббасова К.Я. Философская культура как способ формирования культурной идентичности / К.Я. Аббасова, П.П. Солощенко, С.Г. Караконисова // Вестн. Караганд. ун-та. Сер. История. Философия. — 2017. — № 4. — С. 75–81.

Н. Меджидова, П.П. Солощенко, С.М. Жакин

**Қазіргі өркениеттік дамудың мәселелері мен перспективалары**

Мақалада философиялық антропологияның теориялық және практикалық көзқарастары контекстіндегі қазіргі өркениеттік дамудың мәселелері мен перспективалары қарастырылған. Белсенділік тәсілінің әдіснамасын пайдалана отырып, авторлар әлеуметтік белсенділікті ізгілендіру процестерінде адам мәселесін философиялық зерттеулердің әлеуетін жүзеге асыру мүмкіндігі туралы ойлайды. Авторлар философиялық антропологияның адамның мәні туралы әмбебап білім ретінде дамуының қарама-қайшы сипатына назар аудара отырып, адамның біртұтас болмысындағы бірегей биосоциомәдени жүйе ретінде түсіну мәселесін бірінші орынға қояды. Адамзаттың әлеуметтік болмысының заманауи ұйымы, сондай-ақ мәдениеттің қазіргі түрі адамның әлемдегі орны туралы ғылыми хабардарлықты талап етеді және философиялық антропологияның дамуына жаңа перспективалар ашады. Философиялық антропологияның теориялық және практикалық принциптеріне қазіргі үндеу, ең алдымен, адамның болмысының әлеуметтік және мәдени формаларын құратын өркениеттік дамудың маңызды және шығармашылық бастамасы ретінде ерекшеленетін адам табиғаты мен өмірінің қырларына жүгінуге арналған.

*Кілт сөздер:* адам, философиялық антропология, белсенділік тәсілі, гуманизм, ғылым симбиозы, өркениеттік даму, философиялық ойлау.

Н. Меджидова, П.П. Солощенко, С.М. Жакин

**Проблемы и перспективы современного цивилизационного развития**

В статье рассмотрены проблемы и перспективы современного цивилизационного развития в контексте теоретических и практических установок философской антропологии. Используя методологию деятельностного подхода, авторы размышляют о возможности реализовать потенциал философских исследований проблемы человека в процессах гуманизации социальной деятельности. Авторы, обращая внимание на противоречивый характер развития философской антропологии как универсального знания о сущности человека, выдвигают на первый план проблему понимания человека, как уникальной биосоциокультурной системы в ее целостном бытии. Современная организация социального бытия человечества, а также современный тип культуры требуют научного осознания места человека в мире и открывают новые перспективы для развития философской антропологии. Нынешнее обращение к теоретическим и практическим принципам философской антропологии призвано обратиться, прежде всего, к тем граням человеческой природы и жизни, которые отличают человека как значимое и творческое начало цивилизационного развития, создающее социальные и культурные формы его бытия.

*Ключевые слова:* человек, философская антропология, деятельностный подход, гуманизм, симбиоз наук, цивилизационное развитие, философское мышление.

**References**

- 1 Derkach, A.A. *Sovremennye zadachi akmeologii kak metanauki i metapraktiki* [Modern tasks of acmeology as a metascience and metapractice]. *Memorial*. Retrieved from [http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article\\_id=21&pid=19](http://www.goskadri.ru/index.php?article_id=21&pid=19) [in Russian].
- 2 Rubinshtein, S.L. (1973). *Chelovek i mir* [Man and the world]. *Problemy obshchei psikhologii — Problems of General Psychology*. Moscow: Pedagogika [in Russian].
- 3 Baturin, V.S. (2012). *Sostojanie i problemy postsovetskogo obrazovaniia v kontekste teorii deiatelnosti* [State and problems of post-Soviet education in the context of activity theory]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Bulletin of the Orenburg State University*, 7, 114–120 [in Russian].
- 4 Solovev, V.S. (1988). *Istoricheskie dela filosofii* [Historical Affairs of Philosophy]. *Voprosy filosofii — Questions of Philosophy*, 8, 118–125 [in Russian].
- 5 Momdzhian, K.Kh. (1994). *Sotsium. Obshchestvo. Istoriia* [Society. Society. Story]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 6 Feuerbach, L. (1955). *Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedeniia* [Selected philosophical works]. (Vols.1, 2; Vol. 1). Moscow: Gospolitizdat [in Russian].
- 7 Feuerbach, L. (1955). *Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedeniia* [Selected philosophical works]. (Vols.1, 2; Vol. 2). Moscow: Gospolitizdat [in Russian].
- 8 Sheler, M. (1994). *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* [Selected works]. (A.V. Denezhkina, A.N. Malinkina, A.F. Phillipova, Transl.). Moscow: Gnozis [in Russian].
- 9 Medzhidova, N. (2021). *Telesno-orientirovannyi podkhod v filosofskoi antropologii* [Body-Oriented Approach in Philosophical Anthropology]. *Zhurnal «Metafizika» — Journal “Metafizika”*, 3 (15), 7–17 [in Russian].
- 10 Abbasova, K.Ya., Soloshchenko, P.P., & Karakonisova, S.G. (2017). *Filosofskaia kultura kak sposob formirovaniia kulturnoi identichnosti* [Philosophical culture as a way of forming cultural identity]. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriia. Filosofiiia — Bulletin of Karaganda University. History. Philosophy series*, 4, 75–81 [in Russian].