



Cross-Cultural Communication
Vol. 10, No. 6, 2014, pp. 21-24
DOI: 10.3968/5616

ISSN 1712-8358[Print]
ISSN 1923-6700[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

What Is *Anthropology* ?

V. S. Olkhovsky^{[a],*}

^[a]Institute for Nuclear Research of NASU, Kiev-028, Ukraine.
*Corresponding author.

Received 20 August 2014; accepted 10 November 2014
Published online 26 December 2014

Abstract

There is a variety approaches to the definition of *anthropology* described and it is shown that the contents of the term *anthropology* are distinguished by the unique multi-valence. It is analyzed how the development of mathematics, physics, astronomy, cosmology and other natural sciences raised the questions and problems of pure anthropologic contents even before the natural scientists and mathematicians. Then the conclusion is made that the cultural history, and particularly in a peaked form in the philosophic anthropology, already long ago place every man to the necessity of a serious choice between such two diametrically opposed opinions:

(a) Man is a measure of all things and also a top of evolution. But if the personality of man vanishes after the death, then the role of man is in its sense similar to the role of a soap bubble; moreover, if the Universe is dying (it follows from the second law of thermodynamics), then the role of all mankind is similar to the role of the short-lived soap foam. And it is possible to show that this opinion is internally contradictory.

(b) Man is a top of the God Creation, to which after the penitence before God and acceptance of the Christ expiating sacrifice by God it is given the eternal life and the government of the Creation under the leadership of God – and then his existence has the sense in the eternity! And also the modern science does not contradict to this.

In conclusion it is established that namely the biblical theology solved the question how man can obtain the Truth in the sense of adequate reflection of the reality.

Olkhovsky, V. S. (2014). *What Is Anthropology? Cross-Cultural Communication*, 10(6), 21-24. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ccc/article/view/5616>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/5616>

INTRODUCTION

The term *anthropology* (*άνθρωπος* is man in a Greek, *λόγος* is learning) does rather often meet in scientific, popular scientific, philosophical and theological editions, but practically equally often the various approaches to the anthropology contents. It is natural to pose such questions:

- Is anthropology the humanity science?
- Or it in the region of the natural sciences?
- Or in the junction of natural and humanitarian sciences?
- Or a many-disciplined science?
- Or it is partly the philosophical region?
- How does anthropology enter in the Christian theology?
- How anthropology and especially anthropogenesis (the human origin) is connected with the researcher view-world?
- Are connected the questions of human essence and human origin with the question on the *Truth as an adequate human reflection of the Reality?*

1. WHAT IS ANTHROPOLOGY?

It is known a huge multitude of sciences, enveloped by the unique term *scientific anthropology* (Korneyev, 1967; Philosophicencyclope - dia, v.5, 1970; Rutkevich, 2006; Hrisanfova & Perevozchikov, 1999; Deryagina, 2003; Haritonov, Ozhigova, & Godina, 2004). In the West Europe and United States anthropology is usually

considered by the humanity science on man in all his measurements – social, cultured and physical (anatomy, physiology, anthropogenesis), including also ethnology. In soviet and post-soviet science there was considered and continues to be considered that anthropology was formed in the junction of nature and humanity sciences. In this connection the particular accent is done in the complex many-planned approach to the main problems of human biology, and the main regions of anthropology are considered evolutionary anthropogenesis, age and constitutional anthropology, population and ethnology anthropology, and there were developed many anthropological applications in the system of natural sciences, in the pedagogical and medicine practice (Korneyev, 1967; Philosophic encyclopedia, v.5, 1970; Руткевич, 2006). In the foundation of modern evolutionary anthropology there are as before lied the Darwin hypothesis on the human origin from as if extinct primate-like creatures, published by him in 1871 in book “The human origin and the sexual selection”, and the Engels hypothesis on the leading role of labor and social relations during the final human formation (see also Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.1, 1960). Last time in Internet there has been appeared other naturalistic hypotheses which are competing with each other and are not confirmed by any scientific data.

Contents of the term *anthropology* are by itself distinguished by unique multi-valence and the collection of the anthropological disciplines continues in time to expand steadily. Moreover, the development of the natural sciences and mathematics already from the very beginning of the 20-th century directly posed the questions and problems of the anthropologic contents even before the researchers of the natural sciences and mathematicians:

(a) What is the role of the *observer and researcher* (i.e. namely of a man) in the *measurements* of micro-events and micro-processes? [particularly there are kept in mind the *problems of the quantum-measurement theory* (see, for instance Olkhovsky, 2000; Olkhovsky, 2005)].

(b) *Why* the nature laws and also physical and cosmologic constants are tuned with the exact accuracy for the support of the human existence, i.e. the *anthropic principle* holds (see, for instance, Barrow & Tipler, 1986; Olkhovsky, 2001) ?

(c) *What does the human mind make to be able to comprehend the Universe and its laws?* That, that the human mind can comprehend something in the nature, is evident for everybody, first of all for scientists. But in that, *why* our mind is able to comprehend the Universe, there is no evidence and unity. There are known the Einstein words: “It is mostly unconceivable in the Universe that, that is conceivable by us” (see, for instance, Olkhovsky, 2002).

(d) Let us recall also the known words of the evolutionist J. Haldane (see, for instance, Стробел, 2006):

If my (human) thinking is totally determined by the motion of the brain atoms, I have no foundation to assume that my (human) convictions are true.

(e) *Why* all mathematical disciplines (from arithmetic and geometry till group theory, functional analysis, theory of multitudes and many others), being originated by abstract human mind, are always applicable in physics, cosmology and other natural and even humanity sciences (for example, in linguistics) and are used for the concrete formulations of the nature laws, which reflect the *objective reality* ?

And from all this it is natural such setting of the research problem: *How anthropology enters in the natural-sciences method and generally in the cognition of the truth on the reality* (both relative truth and moreover absolute truth)?!

Furthermore, there is a long time existing *philosophic and theological anthropology*.

2. PHILOSOPHIC ANTHROPOLOGY

The main task of the philosophic anthropology is the study of the essence, assignment and origin of man (humanity). The term *philosophic anthropology* can be used in three senses, Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.5., 1970; Rutkevich, 2006):

(a) in the first sense - for defining any philosophic studies on a man, unlike the multitude existing nature and humanity disciplines and any disciplines named by words with the term anthropology (anthropologic biology, cultural anthropology etc.). The human nature is always interesting for philosophers, therefore the term *philosophic anthropology* can be factually used for any elaborated philosophic doctrine.

(b) in the second sense - in a more narrow sense the term *philosophic anthropology* can be used for those studies when the human problem becomes the central or the unique problem. Particularly typical it is for many studies in 19-20 centuries, for which man became the unique philosophic topic which deserves attention (Feuerbach, Stirner, Kjerkegor etc.).

(c) in the third sense - in a more exact sense the term *philosophic anthropology* is applicable to one direction of the German philosophy 1920-1960-th years. The studies of Scheler, Plessner, Geler, Rothacker, Sombart and some other German thinkers of the first half of 20-th) arose practically simultaneously with the existentialism and under the influence the precedent studies, such as the life philosophy Nietzsche, Bergson and Dilthey, phenomenology of Husserl, and partly American pragmatism) but, unlike to the existentialism for philosophic anthropology the data of natural and medicine sciences, sociology and psychology, ethnography and history, they are used as the base for studies of the integral conception on the human being.

There is also the complex interaction of the *anthropologic approach* with the *existentialism*, *pragmatism*, *the depth psychology*, *structuralism* and even with the revision of the Marxism (Sartre etc.) [Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.5., 1970; Rutkevich, 2006; Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.1, 1960).

Sometimes to the philosophic anthropology one relates theologic anthropology, referring to the works of the secular philosophers and some theologians (Bart, Gogarten, Niebuhr, Pannenberg, Hengstenberg etc and even the philosophical works of papa John-Pole II (see, in particular, Rutkevich, 2006).

3. THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Anthropology relates also in Christian systematic theology. The biblical theological anthropology deals with the man in his relation to God. The object of theological anthropology is studies on the human origin (its creation by God), on the unity of the human kind, on the human duality (the human material nature and human spiritual non-material nature), on the human sin-fall and the consequences of the human sin-fall, studies of the human salvation with the human union to the eternal life together with God, elaborated on the base of the analysis of the Bible as a Divine revelation (see, for instance, Strong, 1979; Тиссен, 1994; Райри, 2000).

4. THE DEFINITION OF THE HUMAN LIFE

The problems of anthropology are essentially connected with the definition of the human life. There is not yet the clear scientific definition of the life (both biologic and spiritual). But there are continuous steady attempts to establish finally that, in which there is the difference between alive and not alive objects. And a long time ago it is established that alive biologic objects are distinguished from the not alive ones by the *cell structure*, *exchange of matters*, *the ability of reproduction*, growth, motion, development, active regulation of its composition and functions and finally by the *adaptation to the medium*.

The radical method of the definition the difference between the alive object and not alive object appeared only with the realization or comprehension of the role of *information* in the Universe. *The base of the biologic life is the genetic information, obtaining by the descendants from the ancestors, and included in the hereditary structures of the organisms. The carrier of this information is the totality of genes. And at all, the life of any individual is impossible without constant information flows inside its organism.*

And moreover, only the alive organisms and also constructed by a man technical devices are able to *consume, analyze and transform information*, and a

man himself can consciously create new information. Here we touch upon already not only biologic, but also spiritual life (abstract thinking, creation etc). A human being is a dual biologic and spiritual being. The spiritual life consists of the *abstract thinking, self-conscience, the language with its grammatical structure, and also conscience, will freedom, creation and spiritual feelings*, which no animal has. And in reality the human being has pure biologic genes but has *no spiritual genes*. Besides that, unlike to animals, any man is born in fact twice or in two stages (biologically – approximately 9 months after the conception and spiritually approximately 1, 5 - 2 years after the biologic birth, when a child, with the help of his parents and others, can begin to talk and separate himself from other men and women). Till now there is no scientific theory of the *origin of neither biologic, nor spiritual human life*.

CONCLUSION

As to the unresolved problem of anthropogenesis, the view-world choice is inevitable and rather sharply posed:

Or (a) super-natural Intelligent Design (in creation of the world and a man and in the salvation of a man), or (b) blind irrational case, or (c) as if legislative self-origin of the highest level of matter and spirit from the lowest level (postulated on the base of the extrapolation of synergetic processes, of self-origin of the genetic information from chaos or the blind dogma of the self-origin of the spiritual superstructure in the matter basis). And the history of philosophic anthropology added in 20-th c. one more alternative:

(d) Teilhard de Chardin had attempted to reconcile theology and the evolutionary doctrine and founded one of the directions in the *theistic evolution* – “*evolution under the leadership of God*” and had considered biologic and thereafter human spiritual evolution as the process of the non “resulted” but “emergent” character (Шарден, 1987). Such evolution has *a certain direction* – from the less organized for the more organized forms of life and conscience. But if the evolution was directed only by the blind case, then life could not be developed only in one direction of the growth of the high organization: There must be something more than the blind case. The conscience could not appear in a human being, if it were present in the precedent alive and not alive forms of the reality. And then, according to the Teilhard de Chardin hypothesis, it is reasonable to assume that it directs all the evolution process from the very beginning. Further Teilhard de Chardin extrapolated the evolutionary process also for the future. He thought that all the evolution process converges to the omega-point – in the super-personal unity of all the things in God. This makes God the *final* (first and last) reason of the evolution, but not simply the actual reason or alpha-point. So, according to Teilhard de Chardin, Homo Sapiens is similar to the

caterpillar before the transformation it in the butterfly – the being of quite another nature or “conscience” (*cosmic conscience*).

The history of the culture (science, philosophy and theology) already a long time brings in the mostly cardinal form every man to the serious choice between such two diametrically opposite opinions about himself:

(a) *A man is a measure of all things* (as antic philosopher Protagoras claimed, then often it was repeated in the soviet time and it is repeated by someone even now) and evens *an evolution top* (as the evolutionary doctrines assume). But if the personality of man vanishes after the death, then the role of man is in its sense very similar to the role of a soap bubble. Moreover, if the Universe is dying (it follows from the second law of thermodynamics (Adams & Laughlin, (1997), then the role of all mankind is very similar to the role of the short-lived soap foam. One can see that in this opinion it is impossible to find the satisfactory sense of the human beings.

(b) *A man is a top of the God Creation*, to which after the penitence before God and acceptance of the Christ expiating sacrifice it is given the eternal life and the government of the Creation under the leadership of God – and then his existence has the sense in the eternity! And also the modern science does not contradict to this. And to this also science does not contradict, because with this not only conclusions from the historical proofs of the sacrifice and resurrection of Christ are agreed (see, for instance, Стробел, 2006), but also conclusions from the *Goedel theorem* (see, for instance, Olkhovsky, 2004), namely: *a finite system of postulates brings only to the incomplete or contradictory totality of logic consequences in the framework of any human theory*). Really, only infinite omnipotent, saint and all-knowing God, *giving the life sense to a man as His collaborator* (1 Cor., 3:9) and younger brother of Jesus Christ (Matt, 28:11; John, 20:11; Ebbrei, 2:11), can contain in Himself all the Reality without contradictions.

And namely the biblical theology mostly consequently decides the *question how the human being* (notwithstanding of his finiteness and limitedness) *can obtain the Truth in the sense of adequate reflection of the Reality!*

REFERENCES

Adams, F. C., & Laughlin, G. (1997). A dying universe: The long-term fate and evolution of astrophysical. *Objects, Reviews of Modern Physics*, 69(2), 337-372.

- Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford: London Press.
- Стробел, Л. (Trans.). (2006). *Создатель под следствием, Симф.* [Li Strobel, Creator under Trial]
- Deryagina, M. A. (2003). *Evolutionary anthropology: Biological and cultural aspects*. Moscow. [in Russian:...]
- Haritonov, V. M., Ozhigova, A. P., & Godina, E. Z. (2004). *Anthropology*. Moscow. [in Russian:...]
- Hrisanfova, E. N., & Perevozchikov, И.В. (1999). *Anthropology*. Moscow. Retrieved from <http://www.bio.msu.ru/>. [in Russian:...]
- Korneyev, P. V. (1967). *Modern philosophical anthropology*. Moscow. [in Russian:...]
- Olkhovsky, V. S. (2000). On deterministic and casual (statistical) descriptions in science and in consistency of the both with the biblical world-view). *In the Collection “A man and the Christian Worldview”*, (5), 362-370. Simpheropol, Ukraine. [in Russian:.....]
- Olkhovsky, V. S. (2005). On the role of paradoxes and antinomies in the human thinking. *In the Collection “A man and the Christian Worldview”*, (10), 107-110. Simpheropol, Ukraine. [in Russian:...]
- Olkhovsky, V. S. (2001). Comparison of evoluzionizm and creation doctrines in the light of the modern physics. *In the Collection “A Man and the Christian World-View”*, (6), 266-272. Sim-pheropol, Ukraine. [in Russian:...]
- Olkhovsky, V. S. (2002). Science and World-View (how science relates with the Christianity, “scientific”[rational] atheism and cosmic humanism of “New Age” Simpheropol. Retrieved from <http://www.scienceandapologetics.org>
- Olkhovsky, V. S. (2004). On knowledge, truth and faith. *In the collection “A man and the Christian Worldview”* 9, 31-38. Simpheropol. [in Russian:...]
- Райри, Ч. (Trans.). (2000). *Основы богословия*. Санкт-Петербург. [Rairy, Ch., The foundations of the theology]
- Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.1. (1960). *Anthropogenesis* (pp.75-77). Moscow. [in Russian:...]
- Philosophic Encyclopedia, v.5. (1970). *Philosophical anthropology* (pp.354-359). Moscow. [in Russian:....]
- Rutkevich, A. (2006). Philosophic anthro-pology. “Krugosvet”, Encyclipeady. Retrieved from <http://www.krugosvet.ru/articles/108/101>
- Strong, A. H. (1979). *Systematic theology*. F.H.Revell Company.
- Тиссен, Г. К. (Trans.). (1994). *Лекции по систематическому богословию*, «Логос», СПб. [Tissen, G. K., Lectures on systematic theology]
- Шарден, Т. Д. (1987). *Феномен человека*. Москва. [De Sharden Teyar, Phenomenon of a man]