

Manifestations of elitism and mass character in anthropological types of kalokagathic person

Prokop'eva Marina Yuryevna¹

Tishkina Elena Ivanovna²

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 12 (2)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 25 March 2021

Date of revision: 24 June 2021

Date of acceptance: 18 September 2021

Prokop'eva Marina Yuryevna, Tishkina Elena Ivanovna (2021). Manifestations of elitism and mass character in anthropological types of kalokagathic person. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 12(2). 178 – 184.

¹Candidate of Philosophical sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Kurgan State University, 640000, Kurgan, st. Ippodromnaya, 13, apt. 3

²Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Kurgan State University



Manifestations of elitism and mass character in anthropological types of kalokagathic person

Prokop'eva Marina Yuryevna¹, Tishkina Elena Ivanovna²

¹Candidate of Philosophical sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Kurgan State University, 640000, Kurgan, st. Ippodromnaya, 13, apt. 3

²Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Kurgan State University

Email ID : prokopiewa.m@yandex.ru

ABSTRACT

The paper considers culture as a complex formation, including various subsystems that ensure the formation of the axiological core of humanistic principles, the poles of which are elitism and mass character that coordinate this process. The evolution of culture is associated with the historical dynamics of philosophical and anthropological types of man. The analysis of the types of kalokagathia proposed by A. F. Losev is undertaken. The opposition of the elite and the mass character has ancient roots, therefore, the philosophical and anthropological types of the kalokagathic person are identified, which vary between the domain of elitism and mass character in culture. Modern posthumanism provides society with new economic and political principles that are based not so much on ethical as on aesthetic values that do not imply establishing a balance between them, i.e. excluding freedom as a criterion for the stability of the socio-cultural space, forming a unique type of personality — a “mass personality”.

Keywords: culture, elitism, mass character, kalokagathia, philosophical and anthropological type, kalokagathic person, humanism, posthumanism.

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the problem of overcoming the crisis phenomena in culture is urgent. Such crises can be resolved through the awareness of the deep connection and unity of European and Ancient culture, which creates the axiological core of humanistic principles that guide the formation of the socio-cultural space to this day. In our opinion, elitism and mass character that coordinate this process are the poles of the formation of these principles. Elitism and mass character are adaptively evolving subsystems that regulate the plasticity of culture for effective evolution in a changing environment. The evolution of culture forms elitism as an operational subsystem responsible for the prospects for the development of culture, and mass character — as a conservative subsystem that preserves the basic qualities of culture. The ability to change the radii of mass character and elitism is the condition for self-preservation of culture [17, p. 43].

Thus, we can represent the historical dynamics of culture through the activity of binary conjugated differentiations of elitism and mass character. On the other hand, we can talk about the historical dynamics of the philosophical and anthropological types of man, correlating them with the elite and mass culture of a particular period. We will consider a person as “a biocultural system in which the unity of natural and cultural character generates new human qualities that allow us to characterize a person as a special integrity and independence of the borderline form of being along with nature and culture” [9].

The opposition of elite and mass character in Western European culture has ancient roots, when for the first time creative activity in the sphere of culture is considered as the privilege of a narrow layer of the spiritual elite, a person becomes a part of culture. Cosmocentrism becomes a distinctive feature of the Ancient Greeks' worldview. On the one hand, this is harmony and order, on the other, — an absolute deity, in which the laws of nature are accessible only to anthropomorphic gods, therefore they are understandable to man, who is a part of cosmic energy and a microcosm. Thus, the events of the great and eternal, god-chosen and god-protected ancient society and the events of ancient man, who was entrusted with a divine mission, fit into the cosmic harmony and proportionality. In this model of the world, a special type of personality, expressed in ancient kalokagathia is formed. The term “kalokagathia” literally means “beautiful and good”, “nice and kind”, although there are many interpretations of its translation. The Ancient Greeks attributed “beautiful” to the body, and “good” to the soul. However, in ancient kalokagathia, “beautiful” is not separated from “good”. The idea of ancient kalokagathia captures the ancient

Greek ideal of a perfect personality, which contains the antinomy of physical (external) and values-based (internal) existence. An integral part of kalokagathia is freedom, which establishes a wise and healthy balance between soul and body, ethical and aesthetic character.

For the first time in world history, beauty is becoming a principle of the world structure and a self-sufficient value. It was beauty that occupied one of the leading positions in the Good, to which, in the opinion of many Greek thinkers, human life should strive. According to Plato, the love of beauty is one of the first distinguishing features of the Ancient Greek [7]. And there is some truth in this statement. In the 19th century, Eugene Emanuel Viollet-de-Duc, a French architect and researcher, suggested that the Ancient Greeks had “absolute vision”, which brought them such joys that we now do not know [16, p. 17]. Sculptural images (of gods, heroes, winners of various games and competitions) adorned the urban environment everywhere. Poetry took part in various aspects of life, including the political one. Music was understood and used as a means of healing, creating a spiritual mood. Ancient Greek theater was an important part of everyone's life, and the tragedy was supposed to serve to purify the soul — to generate a state of “catharsis”.

The everyday life of the Greek was also aesthetically arranged. This concerned not only architecture and sculpture, but also clothes, things, furnishings, festivals, and the art of words. One of the properties of Hellenic thinking is determined by the concept of “eidos” (view, appearance, beauty, property, idea, contemplation). It reflects the visibility, tactility, physicality of ancient fine art. More flexible canons than the ancient Egyptian or Mesopotamian ones were formed. These new canons were anthropometric, mathematical, and visually adjusted, based on the proportions of a correctly built human body. It was the “canon of nature”, but processed, which became the “canon of culture” [4].

The person, the bearer of kalokagathia, was an ideal citizen of the polis, who strives to achieve the goals of the civilian collective. Ancient kalokagathia enjoyed a reputation as an aristocratic ideal, in which nobility was associated with a noble origin. However, in ancient kalokagathia, it is already possible to distinguish the domain of elitism and the domain of mass character. In accordance with this, we will make an attempt to identify the philosophical and anthropological types characteristic of a particular domain [13].

We will take as a basis the typology of A.F. Losev [8, p. 384-503], who, analyzing the socio-historical significance of kalokagathia, comes to the conclusion that each class group and social class in Ancient Greece had its own kalokagathia, continuously passing from one to another. The philosopher singles out the following meanings of kalokagathia, defining in it some semantic shades of both “beautiful” and “moral”: socio-historical kalokagathia, i.e. belonging to a particular class group; political kalokagathia, belonging to a particular party; in the era of the cultural crisis in Ancient Greece, the intelligent-sophistic kalokagathia appears, the understanding of which is based on the “refined” and “pampered” methods of thinking and life; philosophical kalokagathia, which has the meaning of the unconscious, arising from the use of the term in everyday life.

A.F. Losev distinguishes several subtypes in socio-historical kalokagathia.

The ancient aristocratic kalokagathia contains both elements of the ancient tribal, aristocratic, priestly nobility, and material well-being, Spartan valor. It arises in a mythoepic worldview and a kalokagathic person-aristocrat appears. Thus, the kalokagathic aristocrat is found in Plato's dialogues. In “Theaetetus”, this is the old aristocrat Theaetetus, who fought bravely and died of his wounds. In “Protagoras”, Plato, contrasting the external beauty of the young boy Agathon with kalokagathia “from nature”, that is, the common, naturally formed beauty of the sophists Hippias and Prodicus, shows their well-being as bliss (Greek “eydaimonia”) [11, p. 199-265].

The socially demonstrative type is the most expressive type of classical kalokagathia, since it is represented by Olympic and other competitions, choregies and theatrical celebrations, processions and the entire external, demonstrative side of Greek culture. In socially demonstrative kalokagathia, the ideal of heroic integrity and physical harmony appears. The main feature of the heroic ideal is the aesthetic one.

A.F. Losev also singles out the bourgeois kalokagathia, warning that this term has a purely conventional meaning, since the bourgeois personality type appears in the public consciousness only in the Modern Period. However, the norms of bourgeois morality, focused on thrift, industriousness, self-restraint, prudence, etc., have existed for a long time. Ancient Greece was characterized by a progressive humanization of the divine, an increase in the anthropomorphism of mythology. Any important business began with sacrifices or with an appeal to the gods, due to which religion gradually acquired a formalistic character and, by the Hellenistic period, it was already based on the principle “you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours”, that is, in order to achieve success in business, one must turn to the gods, and the practice of religious worship is a pledge of a god-fulfilled request [12]. The bourgeois consciousness is active, enterprising; it struggles with contemplative aristocratic ideals, which seem to it too dead and empty, constrained and retrograde. We can attribute this type of kalokagathia to the domain of mass character, despite the fact that the anthropological type of tradesman is just emerging in culture.

The political type of kalokagathia is described by Aristotle and concludes that kalokagathia exists among those people who simultaneously have a sufficiently high “morality” and wealth, i.e. the philosopher adds to the noble origin the features of democracy in the form of freedom and the interests of citizens, and the best political form, “polity”, unites virtue, wealth and democratic freedoms in the person of the “best people”. Aristotle singles out the following traits of a person belonging to the political type of kalokagathia: “... people of noble origin, rich,

free-born quite thoroughly claim honor in the state”, since “people of noble origin are more citizens than people without kin” [3, 1283a]; “people with great wealth are often more educated and of a more noble origin” [3, 1293b], since “external benefits are acquired and protected by virtues” [3, 1323a]. Any paid lessons are unacceptable. Craft and art classes “deprive people of the necessary leisure and belittle them” [3, 1337b], someone who does something for a fee, is partly like a slave. Those who have leisure, possess land ownership, and “the farmers must be slaves or Barbarians-Perioeci” [3, 1329a]. To be able to use leisure time, the noble person “needs to learn something, to be educated in something” [3, 1338a]. We see the image of a “political man” who plays the role of a statesman and despises physical labor, thus it contains the domain of elitism.

Both the creation of philosophy and the formation of the ideal of a polis citizen were due to the presence of a special value unknown to the axiological systems of other ancient cultures. Freedom has become such a value. The concept of freedom in Ancient Greek culture was multifaceted. It included not only civil freedom, but also freedom in possession of the body, in clothes, in thoughts and words [15]. Rhetoric, oratory and logic developed extraordinarily. Freedom of spirit manifested itself in the search for the beauty of thought, expressed figuratively, almost unrestrained by anything, and harmoniously, elegantly designed. Freedom also had a political meaning. For the first time it was formulated by Herodotus in his “History”, proceeding from the opposition of the Hellenes to the Barbarians. The Hellenes are free (without having a despotic king over them), while the Barbarians are slaves. Freedom as the absence of external coercion, therefore, is proper to the Ancient Greeks, among the Barbarians only one Persian sovereign possesses it [14, p. 200].

Thus, freedom is associated with the idea of being chosen. The Greeks never set themselves the goal of “exporting freedom” to the lands of the Barbarians. Even during the reign of Alexander the Great, the spread of the Greek “ethos” (including the idea of freedom) took place through the founding of numerous colonies in the conquered territories. Another feature is the elitist principle of self-identification of the Greeks, who called all non-Greeks who spoke a foreign language Barbarians. The idea of the natural domination of the Greeks over the Barbarians was based on the assertion that the latter had a low cultural level. For example, one of the heroines of Euripides delivers a monologue glorifying the Greeks in the face of the Trojan Barbarians: “The Greeks are kings, and the Barbarians, bow down! It is indecent for the Greeks to bow down before the Barbarian on the throne” [6]. Therefore, it was absolutely natural that the Ancient Greek idea itself became the basis of Ancient Greek ethnophilosophy, defining the Ancient Greeks as the only elite ethnos and assigning to all other Barbarian peoples the role of a kind of “ethnic mass”. For example, in Plato's view, Hellas is an island in the middle of the future ocean of barbarism (foreign culture), an island that lives by its own laws, thinks differently, feels differently, breathes differently [7]. Consequently, it can be argued that not only at the level of the cultural elite, but also at the level of the Greek ethnos as a whole, an attitude was formed not only for singularity, but for exclusivity (elitism), which was traced, first of all, at the cultural level.

The intellectual-sophistic kalokagathia is represented by Greek intellectuals (5th–4th centuries), first of all, by the sophists, but not only by them. At that time, an educated, well-mannered, cultured person appears, which means “beautiful and good”, but he cannot become a hero, since for this he needs life training and upbringing, for example, like those of the Stoics. Thus, for example, for Heraclitus “one, if he is the best” is above the ten thousandth crowd. Moreover, the philosopher and aristocrat by origin considered the “best person” not the one who is more noble and wealthy, the criterion for dividing was the mental abilities of a person and his adherence to spiritual values. Heraclitus denounced the ignorance of those people who, in pursuit of material benefits, neglect their spiritual perfection, and at the same time do not tolerate the “best persons” who differ from the majority [5, p. 46]. The philosopher even writes his works in a deliberately complicated language (for which Heraclitus was named “the dark”) to emphasize that he writes not for the majority deprived of wisdom, but for the “chosen ones”. The philosophy of Pythagoras is called the philosophy of being chosen. It was created as an elite knowledge for initiates, available only to members of the secret Pythagorean Order in Croton. Admission to the school of Pythagoras was based on a strict individual selection of the most worthy persons on the basis of their intellectual and volitional qualities; it included several stages or degrees of initiation: the preparatory stage of purification or catharsis, the stage of perfection and, finally, the highest perfection, contemplation of the fullness of truth. The path that the applicant had to go was interpreted as the purification of the personality, giving access to the highest spiritual values (in harmony with physical improvement).

Aristotle in “Nicomachean Ethics” offers an example of “the truly proud man”, which can be attributed to the intellectual-sophistic type of kalokagathia. This sample was intended for Alexander the Great, the pupil of Aristotle. “The truly proud man” is a person who found a golden mean between humiliation and arrogance [2. 1107b]. “The truly proud man” was guided by the norms that were obligatory both in wartime and in peacetime. He does not show his strength on weak people, this is a plebeian trait. He does not ascend above those who are below him, but he behaves majestically with high-ranking people [2. 1124b]. The characteristic of “the truly proud man”, which includes such traits as honor, generosity, justice, courage, etc., opposes the “seigniorial”, aristocratic, elite character to the popular, rude, mass one.

Philosophical kalokagathia is associated with the dismemberment of the wholeness and harmonious completeness by philosophical reflection, which constitutes the core of Greek kalokagathia, internal and general content and

internal form. The ratio of “body” and “soul” is the starting point for understanding ancient kalokagathia, therefore, the harmony of body and soul is the harmony of the body with itself.

Freedom of thought was almost unrestricted. Ancient rationality not only explained the world and life, but maintained the stability of life not on the basis of observance of rituals, traditions, the “natural” order of things and relations, but on the basis of recognition of the rationality and morality of order, harmony, and unreasonableness, immorality of chaos, anarchy, disharmony. The representative of philosophical kalokagathia is Socrates, who distinguishes it from good deeds, from virtue and beauty. Xenophon describes his views on kalokagathia as knowledge of the good, “which became the life of the good, which gave wisdom”. In this wisdom there is the fact of the realization of good and there is a sense, significance, appearance, physiognomy, a picture of its existence, which is kalokagathia. This is knowledge that has become life, or wisdom, which is the unity and indivisibility of kalokagathia [8, p. 419 -421].

The kalokagathic person is a rebellious philosopher-prophet shown by Plato in the “Feast” dialogue under the mythical name Eros [10, p. 430 -491]. He is deprived of a state of peace, beauty for him is not only an object of pleasure, but also a moral duty of active ascent to it. We see that Plato's kalokagathia is antinomical: on the one hand, the aesthetic love of beauty coincides in it, and on the other hand — the moral and practical need for inner improvement, which emerged from aesthetic love. Plato admitted that despite the fact that representatives of various classes and strata of society “for the most part” give birth to their own kind, “it still happens that silver offspring is born from gold, and gold offspring — from silver; the same in other cases”. Therefore, it is necessary to transfer the most capable children of the lower strata to the higher one, and the less capable children, people from the families of the upper strata, — to the lower one.

Thus, we see several anthropological types of the ancient Greek, represented by different forms of kalokagathia, which correspond to one or another domain of culture. The socio-historical kalokagathia, with its representatives, a man-aristocrat and a man-hero, corresponds to the domain of elitism; the political kalokagathia is represented by a political person; the intellectual-sophistic kalokagathia — by “the truly proud man” and the philosophical kalokagathia — by a philosopher-prophet. The anthropological type, corresponding to the domain of elitism, includes elements of the old tribal, aristocratic nobility, but also material well-being, Spartan valor, education and upbringing. This is not only “the truly proud man”, but also physically and spiritually beautiful person.

The bourgeois type of socio-historical kalokagathia, focused on thrift, hard work, self-restraint, prudence, etc. corresponds to the domain of mass character, where all the advantages, qualities, achievements are “earned” by a bourgeois man with his own hands, and not obtained from birth, he is an individualist, therefore he does not appreciate any traditional and generic foundations of life. The bourgeois consciousness is active, enterprising, it fights with contemplative aristocratic ideals, which seem to it too dead and empty, constrained by retrograde principles.

We can find these anthropological types in different historical periods, but their emphasis shifted: from aesthetic to ethical one, or vice versa; sometimes they were combined. Freedom is the criterion that establishes a balance between ethical and aesthetic, good and beautiful, soul and body in a kalokagathic person. Humanistic principles are the axiological core of the formation of the socio-cultural space, which are represented in the domain of the ancient elitism by the values of upbringing, education, material prosperity (wealth), democratic freedoms, beauty, emanating from the idea of the Good (according to Plato), i.e. beauty, proportionality of appearance, true thinking and restrained noble behavior, which are the main humanistic principles of the elite culture of antiquity.

The domain of mass character is characterized by completely different principles based on enterprise, thrift, caution, disregard for ethical and aesthetic ideals, bodily pleasures. Although the bourgeois type of kalokagathic person is just beginning to take shape in ancient kalokagathia, in subsequent historical epochs it will become widespread, like mass culture.

Thus, anthropological types corresponding to elitism and mass character appear already in antiquity. However, in the modern world there is a change in the radii of their activity. Provoked by the coordinate changes that transformed the European society of Modern Period, it itself became a trigger for a change in the socio-cultural space. The humanistic model of the ancient domain of elitism is losing its relevance and the principles of the domain of mass character are brought to the fore. Modern posthumanism provides society with new economic and political principles that are based not so much on ethical as on aesthetic values that do not imply establishing a balance between them, i.e. excluding freedom as a criterion for the stability of the socio-cultural space.

The society itself has undergone even more serious changes. For thousands of years, the history of human development has formed and consolidated the vertical hierarchical principle of social structure, supporting it with the help of mythological, religious, philosophical and other concepts related to the elite and mass subsystems. The traditional division of society into classes, whose representatives were formed in a certain cultural environment, adhered to a conditioned axiological system, norms and principles of life, seemed unshakable. But the 20th century, and then the 21st century, showed that this principle of organizing society is not an axiom.

The social structure of modern society is “more fragmented and complex with a number of sources of differentiation, including not only class, but also gender, ethnicity and age” [1, p. 85]. To describe the structure of a new society, which is called by researchers “postmodern society” (A. Etzioni), “post-industrial society” (D.

Bell), “metamodren” (T. Vermeulen and R. van der Akker), and even “non-society” (A. Touraine), the most appropriate direction will be horizontal, not vertical one. The change in the principles of differentiation of society, the change in the direction of its development inevitably entailed a violation of the ratio of the subsystems of the elite and the mass character, since it entailed a modification of the qualitative characteristics of both the elite and the masses. And the blurring of the previously clear boundaries between mass and elite cultures is one of the manifestations of this process.

The first and main change that society undergoes consists in a kind of “cultivation” of human life. If the industrial society determined the desire to ensure the physical survival of a person (the production of material goods, their local distribution, accumulation and consumption) as the main goal, then the post-industrial society declared the question of the standard of living as an agenda. From now on, new forms of social inequality are based more on intellectual rather than material conditions. The economy is losing its status as the dominant of social development, which sets the conditions and rules for the functioning of all other social structures. Its place of coordinator is taken by the system of mass media, and communication, as well as education system, which has also successfully “entered” itself into the domain of mass character.

The loss of a total structural model by society provokes the strengthening of local, often spontaneous processes. Social polysemy is being formed, which is no longer perceived as a danger, because it is perceived as a guarantor of the stability of society in a multivariate future. Indicators of cultural identity are now defined as criteria for the new status hierarchy: axiological orientations, the level of cultural aspirations and education.

In modern society, a unique type of personality is being formed — a “mass personality” [1, p. 86]. In contrast to the “mass man” approved by J. Ortega y Gasset at the beginning of the 20th century, this new man is no longer an object, but a subject of history, realizing himself as a spiritual being with creative potential and pluralism of being in the cultural space. He received a previously unknown opportunity “to feel free flight in a single fourth dimension of culture, not knowing the time and territorial boundaries”. [18, p. 32].

REFERENCES

1. Anisimova S.G. Personality in Post-Industrial Society: Transit through Anomie. Vestnik Yakutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta – Bulletin of the Yakutsk State University, 2008, vol. 5, no. 4. pp. 84-90.
2. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Translated from the Ancient Greek by I.V. Braginskaya. Aristotle. Essays: in 4 volumes, vol. 4. Moscow, Mysl Publ., 1984, pp. 53-295.
3. Aristotle. Politics, Translated from the Ancient Greek by S. Zhebelev. Aristotle. Essays: in 4 volumes, vol. 4. Moscow, Mysl Publ., 1984, pp. 376-644.
4. Bolshakov V.P., Novitskaya L.F. Features of Culture in Its Historical Development: from Its Inception to the Renaissance. Veliky Novgorod. Available at: http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Bolsh/3_03.php (accessed on 18.06.2021).
5. Heraclitus of Ephesus. Fragments. Anthology of World Political Thought: in 5 volumes, vol. 1. Moscow, Mysl Publ., 1997, pp. 45-47.
6. Euripides. Iphigenia in Aulis, Translated from the Ancient Greek by F.F. Zelensky Available at: <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=60743&p=1> (accessed on 18.06.2021).
7. Karabushchenko P.L. Plato's Elitology: Ancient Aspects of the Philosophy of being chosen. Moscow, Astrakhan: MOSU Publ., 1998. Available at: https://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/karab/index.php (accessed on 18.06.2021).
8. Losev A.F. Terminological Environment. Chapter XI. Losev A.F. The History of Ancient Aesthetics: The Results of the Millennial Development: in 2 books, book 2. Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ., 1994, pp. 384-503.
9. Omelchenko N.V. The First Principles of Philosophical Anthropology. Available at: <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=544029&p=1> (accessed on 18.06.2021).
10. Plato. Feast. Translated from the Ancient Greek by S.K. Apta. Plato. Selected Dialogues. Moscow, Eksmo Publ., 2009, pp. 430-491.
11. Plato. Protagoras, Translated from the Ancient Greek by V. Solovyov. Plato. Selected Dialogues. Moscow, Eksmo Publ., 2009, pp. 199-265.
12. Posternak A.V. A Textbook on the History of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome. Moscow, Publishing House of the Orthodox St. Tikhon Humanitarian University, 2008. Available at: https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/poster/ (accessed on 18.06.2021).
13. Prokop'eva M. Yu. Kalokagathia: The Ratio of Truth, Goodness and Beauty. Vestnik Kurganskogo gosuniversiteta – Bulletin of the Kurgan State University. Ser. Humanities. Vol. Kurgan, 2014, pp. 30-32.

14. Svetlov R. V., Castle L. Political freedom and the hope of an afterlife in ancient philosophy. Materials of the 2nd summer youth scientific school and the historical and political seminar. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University, 2003. pp. 198-211.
15. Stirk P.M., Weigall D. Concepts of Freedom. Available at: http://politology2004.narod.ru/conceptions_of_freedom.htm (accessed on 18.06.2021).
16. Tatarkevich V. Ancient Aesthetics. Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ., 1977.
17. Tishkina E.I. Elitism and Mass Character as Phenomena of the Existence of Culture: Diss. in Support of Cand. of Cultural Studies. Yekaterinburg, 2012.
18. Chuchin-Rusov A.E. The New Cultural Landscape: Postmodernism or Neo-Archaism. Voprosy filosofii – Questions of Philosophy, 1999, no. 4. pp. 25-34.