FOUNTATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE SCIENCE IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

ABSTRACT
The aim of the study is to develop an idea of alternative science based on ideas in the history of philosophy. The novelty of the work lies in the creation of an idea of an alternative model of science, which allows solving the existing problems of modern science. The main research methods are hermeneutic and axiologic, as well as a systems approach. The conclusion reached by the authors is that alternative science should not describe existing empirical realities but develop a scientific ideal. In turn, this scientific ideal must have a spiritual content, i.e. to be spiritualized. It must be recognized as the highest truth, and all other ideas that have their manifestation in our world, science must consider through comparison with a scientific spiritualized ideal.
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RESUMEN
El objetivo del estudio es desarrollar una idea de ciencia alternativa basada en ideas de la historia de la filosofía. La novedad del trabajo radica en la creación de una idea de modelo alternativo de ciencia, que permita resolver los problemas existentes de la ciencia moderna. Los principales métodos de investigación son hermenéuticos y axiológicos, así como un enfoque sistemático. La conclusión a la que llegan los autores es que la ciencia alternativa no debe describir las realidades empíricas existentes, sino desarrollar un ideal científico. Por su vez, este ideal científico debe tener un contenido espiritual, es decir, ser espiritualizado. Debe ser reconocida como la verdad suprema, y todas las demás ideas que tienen su manifestación en nuestro mundo, la ciencia debe considerarlas mediante la comparación con un ideal científico espiritualizado.

INTRODUCTION

The methodological basis of the research consists of fundamental and applied research on the problems of science, scientific knowledge and the consequences of scientific activity, materials of scientific and practical conferences. To develop an idea of an alternative science, a systematic approach, hermeneutic methodology, the principle of historicism and an axiological method were used.

Science, having a social essence, is at the same time a part of spiritual life. In addition, if as a social phenomenon it fits into the social world and corresponds to it, then as a spiritual phenomenon it does not always correspond to the principles of spiritual being. There are serious problems with its compliance with the norms and ideals of spiritual life (ALLEN, 2020).

The reason for the spiritual problems of science is its social orientation, the fact that it has a practical purpose. Science serves not cognition, not truth, but social benefit (LOWENTHAL, 2018). Benefit, in turn, as usual, is at odds with morality and spirituality. As a rule, benefit is on one side and spirituality on the other. The very concept of benefit arises from ignoring the spiritual and moral being. It is from this that the negative consequences of scientific activity follow. Science performs not just cognitive functions but serves the public good.

Science fully fits into social life and meets its requirements. However, this circumstance gives rise to serious spiritual problems. The point is that sociality is irrelevant to the problems of spirituality. Society is indifferent to matters of spirituality. Spiritual values in society are significant insofar as they are included in social values, but in and of themselves they have no special weight. Those factors that allow science to meet social requirements give rise to rather deep spiritual problems, the consequences of which are realized in social life, giving rise to undesirable phenomena (MELIKOV, 2012).

RESULTS

Based on ideas formed in the history of philosophy, a generalized image of an alternative model of science was created. Moreover, this is not just another model of science, which is at the same level as the existing one, but the model is a must, a model necessary for science to be a phenomenon of a person's spiritual life, or rather, a spiritualized phenomenon, and bring real, and not momentary, illusory benefit. Such science should unambiguously connect the truth and the higher essence of phenomena not with empirical facts, not with theory and logic, but with the sphere of ideas.

Empirical facts and logical theory for such a science are only a means, and not the ultimate goal of knowledge. Accordingly, the method of comprehending higher essences and truths should be not only logical thinking and observation, but above all higher intellectual and intuitive abilities based on the spiritual experience of a scientist. In contrast to the established science, where logical thinking dominates, the indisputable supremacy of spiritual experience should be established in this science. However, the proclamation of ideas as the highest essences of science still does not change anything substantively in the already existing science.

In this case, we only change the emphasis placed on questions about essence and truth, but by no means change the science itself. After all, existing science, whatever it may be, one way or another always contains ideas, although they are often silent about them. By highlighting the sphere of ideas as the sphere of essences and truths in science, we will only switch our center from theory and facts to these ideas, but the established content of science will remain unchanged.

However, in order to change the content of science indeed, which today is not very satisfactory, it is necessary to identify scientific truth not only with an idea, but also with a spiritualized ideal. Science should not describe existing empirical realities but develop a scientific ideal. In turn, this scientific ideal must have a spiritual content, i.e. to be spiritualized. The scientific ideal must be identical with the spiritual ideal. It is he who must be recognized as the truth, and all other ideas that have their manifestation in our world, science must consider through comparison with the scientific spiritualized ideal.

DISCUSSION

All modern science is the embodiment of only one of its models developed in the philosophical culture (SIMPSON, 2017). However, there was and there is another model that remained unrealized. Moreover, it corresponds to the true purpose and the highest essence of science (MILTON, 1996). In European culture, the origins of this model lie in the philosophy of Plato. Although in the ancient East there was not only the idea of this model, but it was also implemented. In particular, the ancient Indian teachings about nature, space, and man are just the implementation of this model of science. Moreover, Plato, who is well aware of ancient Eastern culture directly
from the primary sources themselves, reflected in his teaching ideas that existed without him. However, why exactly Plato? The fact is that Plato's philosophy is opposed to the teachings of Aristotle, whose ideas laid the foundations of subsequent science.

Plato's philosophy is idealism, a philosophy of ideas. Accordingly, Plato connects truth not with empirical reality and not with knowledge, but with ideas, which are the essence of the embodiment of perfection, goodness and beauty. The realm of truth is not the realm of reason, as in Aristotle and in modern science, but a realm that is above reason and governs reason itself. A person enters there with a special gift, which Plato calls intellectual intuition, not with the help of his mind. Truth is the idea. In addition, as an idea, truth is informal, it is higher than form, not logical, but higher than logic, there is not knowledge, but higher than knowledge. Form, logic, knowledge in themselves can be false; therefore, it is wrong to identify the truth with them. Plato's philosophy does not deny the importance of logic and knowledge, but does not absolutize them, but directs the search for truth to the sphere of ideas. Plato is not specifically concerned with developing an appropriate model of science, but his philosophy lays the foundation for a different model.

The very same alternative model is taking shape already in modern times. At this time in philosophy, the most acute issue is the ideology of science, and the whole philosophy of modern times is essentially engaged in the development of this ideology. The ideology of science developed by F. Bacon, R. Descartes, I. Newton, which is being formed and accepted by historical practice, opposes Leibniz's model of science. He develops his own philosophical doctrine, which he calls monadology. Nevertheless, this teaching at the same time represents the ideology of a different model of science. Leibniz develops his philosophy in polemics with the Newtonian model of science, which by that time had already been established. Monadology is the philosophical teaching about monads.

Leibniz is thus concentrated on monads, just as Plato is concentrated on ideas. He defines monads as spiritual units of being. According to Leibniz, monads coincide with plural substances. Monads are forms of existence of substances. The main quality of a monad is integrity. Monads are completely simple, devoid of parts. Monads are in eternity, they are excluded from time, and therefore they are unchanging and constant. Monads are metaphysical nonspatial forms. The entire existing world is nothing more than a manifestation of monads. And just as Plato associated truth with ideas, Leibniz identifies the highest truth with the monad, for it is in the monad that the highest essence of phenomena is contained. Science, according to Leibniz, must be monadology, i.e. the area of knowledge and comprehension of monads. Here the analogies with Plato are not accidental, since in essence the monads are the same as ideas. Plato only connected the truth with the idea, Leibniz is already building a model of science aimed at comprehending ideas - monads.

The main thing in science, according to Leibniz, is not a generalization of facts, but the comprehension of monads. To comprehend the essence of monads, you can use the method of generalizing facts, or you cannot. The whole question is in the quality of fact and the quality of human intellectual ability. In the presence of a qualitative fact or a developed intellect, sometimes even one fact is enough, and with a developed intellect, even a fact of poor quality. So comprehending individual monads relative to various sides of the universe, science thereby realizes its highest destiny.

A little later Leibniz, but in the same epoch of modern times, questions of the philosophical foundations of science are in the center of attention of another German thinker I. Kant. Within the framework of his teaching, Kant explores the phenomenon of human cognition with one goal - to determine the possibility of cognition in science. Kant analyzes the already established science and reveals its limitations. Much in the world remains outside of scientific knowledge due to its rationalism. The true essence of phenomena for science remains unknowable. Therefore, in human culture, along with the established science, considerable attention should be paid to faith [MEHED, 2014]. Kant, according to him, in his teaching limited knowledge in order to give place to faith. Kant does not speak of a science other than that, but the whole course of his reasoning leads to it. This is especially prompted by several provisions of his philosophy, which are fundamentally new in this matter in comparison with his predecessors.

First, Kant does not simply associate truth with ideas, as Plato does, but calls ideas absolute truths. Secondly, he defines all possible scientific knowledge as "synthetic a priori judgments", i.e. first of all, as extra- and super-experienced in nature, and who accordingly increase, rather than repeat and analyze already established knowledge. Scientific knowledge inherently reflects a kind of supra-empirical reality and is characterized by novelty. Third, Kant introduces the term "transcendental", attributing it to scientific knowledge. Science is transcendental in nature, that is, it builds a human idea of the otherworldly, mystical basis of the universe, which he designates with the term "transcendental",
Science, therefore, is not just a sphere of comprehension of absolute truths; it is a priori, synthetic and transcendental. The content of science is the realm of the proper, not the real. At the same time, we can rightfully say that with these ideas Kant outlines the contours of an alternative model of science.

Kant’s contemporary I.G. Fichte directly calls his philosophy science teaching—the doctrine of science. According to Fichte, the subject itself lies at the heart of scientific knowledge, which is distinguished primarily by its systematic nature. Fichte denotes the subject with the term “I.” On the one hand, this is some kind of absolute reality, the Divine, absolute “I” that generates the universe, and is never accessible to our mind. On the other hand, an individual, empirical “I” that coincides with an individual concrete person. Cognition is a pulsation within the “I,” characterized by a change in the state of identity of the individual “I” with the Divine as a result of colliding with obstacles from the “non-I”, i.e. the objective world, to a state of opposition, and then, as a result of overcoming these obstacles, again to identity. The individual and absolute “I” alternately coincide and are identified, then disintegrate and diverge. This is the dialectic of scientific knowledge. According to Fichte, scientific knowledge is not knowledge about the objective world, but knowledge about the subjective foundations of the objective world. And with his teachings Fichte reveals these subjective foundations of scientific knowledge.

Problems of science teaching are in the center of attention of the third German thinker E. Husserl. In his first fundamental work, “Logical Investigations,” he defines the main object of his philosophical research scientific knowledge and knowledge, and his goal—the construction of science about science, science. He starts from the positivist model of science and, dissatisfied with it, builds his own, opposite model.

E. Husserl’s creative life is remarkable. He begins his creative biography as a scientist, defends his thesis in mathematics. The largest mathematician of the late 19th century, Weierstrass, with whom Husserl was an assistant, considered him a capable and promising mathematician. However, dissatisfied with the scientific activity itself, he soon abandoned mathematics, was carried away by the problems of philosophy and became the founder of phenomenology, one of the main philosophical trends of the 20th century.

Any model of science is based on an appropriate interpretation of truth. Husserl proceeds from definitions of truth that are fundamentally at odds with those generally accepted in science: “No truth is a fact, that is, something definite in time. Truth, it is true, can have the meaning that a thing exists, a state is present, a change occurs, etc. Nevertheless, truth itself is higher than the temporal, that is, it makes no sense to ascribe to it temporary existence, emergence and destruction. ... What is true is absolutely, true “in itself”, the truth is identically one, whether people or monsters, angels or gods perceive it in their judgments” (CONTEMPORARY BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY, 1972, p. 472).

Elsewhere Husserl writes: “Each truth in itself remains as it is, retains its ideal being. It is not “somewhere in empty space,” but is the unity of meaning in the overtime kingdom of truth. It belongs to the area of absolute obligatory, where we could include everything and the obligation of which is reliable for us; or at least it represents a reasonable guess, as well as the whole circle of indirect and indefinite guesses about the existence, which is vague for our understanding. Therefore, the circle of all, which is obligatory, although we have not yet known it and, perhaps, will never know” (CONTEMPORARY BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY, 1972, p. 476).

Truth belongs to the sphere of the ideal, it is the world of pure essences, it does not have a human and temporary character and does not have the status of existence at all. At the same time, Husserl focuses on the evidence and self-evidence of truth. He emphasizes the ability of truth to reveal itself outside and in addition to the reflective, discursive activity of thinking. Truth, according to Husserl, is not revealed in the process of logical cognition. A person approaches it and communicates through experience. However, this is not just a subjective experience, but also the experience of truth itself, as a whole, through the corresponding, as Husserl himself says, “flow.” Each flow element also represents integrity. These elements of the flow of experiences are phenomena.

Based on this, Husserl calls his direction phenomenology—the doctrine of the structure of the flow of experiences. Phenomena are the components of the experience of truth. Phenomena are comprehended exclusively through the method of “internal entry”, through an intuitive act. Therefore, the main method of discovering the truth is the method of “direct entry” into the stream of consciousness, intuitive-direct perception of the essence. The phenomenological method is a method of direct fusion with the streams of consciousness, which is fundamentally opposed to the deductive-dismembering method that has become established in science. Accordingly, science, according to Husserl, should be in essence phenomenology, i.e. reveal the essence of ideal phenomena in the area under study.
In addition, V.S. Soloviev with his theory of knowledge and philosophy of knowledge. Having criticized empiricism and rationalism for their one-sidedness, he sees the truth in the area of superstistical and superrational. "If sensations and concepts, the empirical and logical elements of our cognition, are two possible images or ways of being cognizable for us, then the cognized itself, the very object of our cognition is not contained in either one or another image of relative being. There is neither sensation, not a concept, but what is in sensation and concept, what is felt in every real sensation and what is thought of in every rational concept, that is, being". (SOLOVIEV, 1888), - writes Soloviev in his work "Critique of abstract principles." And existence, according to Soloviev, is unconditional and absolute.

Proceeding from this, knowledge, according to him, is carried out in the unity of its three levels: empirical, rational and mystical. The mystical level of knowledge is embodied in the phenomenon of faith. Solovov does not speak specifically about science, but he sets before philosophy the task of realizing a universal synthesis of philosophy, science and religion. And this, of course, presupposes a new model of science. Naturally, the conclusion suggests itself that this new model of science requires recognition along with the empirical and rational side of knowledge and the mystical, expressed in faith. Moreover, knowledge in this science should be based not just on faith, but on faith in God.

Any knowledge, including scientific knowledge, must represent the knowledge of the absolute beginning of the world of God as a total unity. It is achieved in a special knowledge of reality, the quality of which determines the wholeness. Naturally, these conditions radically change the whole existence of science. Science should be an area of integral knowledge, and its result should be the knowledge of total unity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the generalization of historical and philosophical ideas, we can say that science should not be limited to the sphere of being, existing, but first of all, it should develop the sphere of what should be (Stanford, 2006). It is precisely what is due that is the main thing in the alternative model of science. In other words, science must comprehend not only the idea, but also above all the Logos - the Divine idea, in which, as Christian sources assert, the thought of God coincides with the will of God.

Logos is an idea that has become an ideal, and its comprehension is the main meaning of a new type of science. Science can cognize various phenomena, but fundamentally, it cannot do this without the Logos. The Logos is the basis of all true knowledge, and therefore true science must certainly be built on its foundation. Moreover, the Logos is not only the basis, but also the very content of human knowledge (WILSON, 1999). The world is the Logos and its embodiment. Therefore, the Logos and the features of its embodiment exhaust the subject of science (RUPHY, 2017).

It is interesting that the names of many modern sciences very accurately reflect the content of science, which is included in its alternative due model. These are the sciences that contain the word "logos" in their name: biology, physiology, sociology, geology, psychology, philology, etc. Each science should really be an area of comprehension of the Logos in the sphere that it declares as its object. Biology is literally the "Logos of life", and its object, respectively, is life, as the embodiment of the Logos. Geology is the "Logos of the earth", its object is the earth, as the embodiment of the Logos. And this should be the meaning of all sciences, of course, and those in the name of which the word "Logos" is not found.

The widespread interpretation of the Logos as a doctrine is not entirely accurate and can only be accepted as secondary in meaning after the recognition of the meaning implied here. Science should be like philosophy, for which the comprehension of the ideas of the Logos is prerogative (MELEIKOV, SKORODUMOVA, 2020). Science is called upon to reveal the Logos - the idea of a specific area of knowledge. Proper science and proper philosophy are the same in what are the realms of the comprehension of ideas. The widespread interpretation of the Logos as a doctrine is not entirely accurate and can only be accepted as secondary in meaning after the recognition of the meaning implied here. Science should be like philosophy, for which the comprehension of the ideas of the Logos is prerogative. Science is called upon to reveal the Logos - the idea of a specific area of knowledge. Proper science and proper philosophy are one and identical in what are the realms of the comprehension of ideas.

The proper science outlined above, at the very foundation of its existence, eliminates the shortcomings inherent in existing science. This is a spiritualized science, for it proceeds from the highest spiritual foundations of the world, represented in the Divine Logos. The Logos presupposes corresponding morality, love and beauty. Therefore, proper science also presupposes them as its basis.

This science cannot admit immorality into its ranks, for morality, as an essential characteristic of the Logos, lies
at its foundation (ISRAEL, 2014; ROBERT, 2019). Such a science cannot do without the value of beauty for itself, for without it the Logos does not reveal itself. This science will have to be based on love and harmony in relation to people, the world and God, for love is one of the manifestations and at the same time one of the facets of the Logos itself (BATESON, 2002).

Its platform is humanism in the highest sense of the word, spiritual humanism (NICOLESCU, 2008; JEFFREY et al., 2018). It cannot oppose man in principle: since the basis of this science is the Logos, which is the inner essence of the world and man, insofar as it develops not only the external, but also equally the inner world of man. Moreover, it presupposes a harmonious combination and correspondence of the inner and outer world of a person (MELIKOV, 2020).

Since the truth in this science is seen in the Logos, then all scientific truths acquire genuine concreteness (KOEPSELL, 2017). Here the truth cannot be abstract and abstract, because the Logos itself contradicts this. Proper science in its cognition certainly penetrates into the essence of phenomena, informally generalizing facts and phenomena. Science, revealing the Logos, which represents the highest Divine essence of the world, cannot but reveal the essence of individual phenomena.

The Logos is an expression of freedom; it is the ideal, first, of freedom, which is a way of being in the spiritual world. Therefore, a science oriented towards the Logos becomes a way of being and the development of human freedom. It takes a person out of the context of necessity and, thanks to the strength and power of Divine grace, introduces him into the world of freedom, where he can manifest his will, which has become absolute. The creation of the human world in accordance with the principles of freedom, in turn, is a deeply creative process, similar in its essence to divine creativity. Therefore, this science becomes completely the area of genuine creativity (BARRON, 1997).

Finally, this science revives personality in scientific creativity. The comprehension of the Logos and the disclosure of its content is not a general and collective process, but above all an individual and personal one. It is carried out on the basis of personal spiritual experience. Therefore, science becomes personal; authorship is significant in it, as in any genuine creativity. And it is not one averaged, faceless and anonymous theory, but a multitude of theories and doctrines, each of which, like the situation in philosophy, has its own specific author.

In the sphere of officially existing sciences, such a model has not been implemented. Only a few scientists in their activities are trying to go beyond the established principles of science and implement the principles of science due. Today, this is more the exception than the rule. Therefore, the stated model of science is rather a program for the development of modern science. We can say that the future of science is associated with this model, since it indicates a way out of the dead-end situations in which it has fallen.
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