

УДК: 165.742

OUR HUMAN TRUTHS AS F.C.S SCHILLER UNDERSTOOD THEM

Volodymyr Zharkykh

The article deals with human truths as they are understood in F.C.S. Schiller's humanistic pragmatism.

Key words: human truths, creativity, reflective equilibrium, culture, communication, language, traditions, innovations.

Among the founders of the pragmatic way of thinking along with C. Pierce, W. James and J. Dewey a very important place is to be assigned to F.C.S. Schiller. Schiller's scientific interests covered a wide range of problems. One of the main philosophical issues for him was the concept of "our human truths" which he treated in the light of humanistic pragmatism.

For Schiller truth is human truth incapable of coming into being without human effort and agency [3.182] Human truths do not force their way on man. He must look for them. Man's ideas of human truths are always related to a purpose [2.232]. They must work and answer to a need because the question of truth is always practical [2.95]. In the changing reality their influence on human life experience is considered in terms of "reflective equilibrium" [7.34]. A truth remains true or becomes untrue depending on whether it stimulates or prevents maintaining constructive human relations.

Looking over the history of Europe Schiller analyzed possible ways to organize people's life in co-operative activity. He tried to visualize such a form of social structure that could encourage and support prosperity and peace in the atmosphere of multitude of languages and cultures [4.249]. He came to the conclusion that his supposition was not impossible or utopian. In the reality of Europe, contemporary to him, he saw, as he called it, an "anomalous" state, whose national feeling was based neither on language, nor religion, nor geography, nor force. Nevertheless, it was as genuine, fine and patriotic as any in the world, for it was based on justice and mutual forbearance. In his view the brightest example of such a society was presented by Switzerland. This country condemned inner disagreements and outside wars. Schiller wrote that it was the only country in Europe, which discovered the secret of living in peace and prosperity thanks to the natural wisdom of reasoning and common sense. Divided by mountains, religion, language and history and surrounded by strong and wealthy neighbors, this state was able to hold out and unite. Schiller was sure that it was possible to achieve such stability solely through just and tolerant culture of communication. German, Italian and French Swiss live in concord because none of them tries to dominate and oppress the other by imposing opinions or languages. They respect individuality in their country. The rights of the people are observed and adhered to according to the federal constitution. Moreover every Swiss considers it his honorable duty to master all national languages of his country. As a result he becomes a more educated person, he has a better understanding of the opinions and judgments both of his countrymen and the French, Italians and Germans living abroad.

Schiller put special emphasis on the influence of a multitude of national

languages on preservation of peace and preventing conflicts. He insisted that language is not the only and even not the necessary element, identifying nationality or consolidating a state. There are different countries speaking the same language or a slightly different variety of the same language. This does not endanger their unity and their national or cultural identity. In history, European history in particular, there were, and there still are, quite a lot of examples of countries, which use not one but several state languages as a means of dealing with state affairs. He reckoned that such a decision reflected the humanistic understanding of the human truths and needs. Every and each person has the right to speak the language, which in his understanding facilitates a better and easier expression of his thought. A common language is convenient for conveying ideas and other kinds of communication. But it cannot be used as the foundation for political unification because modern states are, as a rule, not uni-national but multinational. Language is an element of culture, it is not a civil characteristic. Using legal means to introduce one state language will humiliate and oppress other members of society especially if they represent a sizable group. When people realize the necessity and practical usefulness of mastering not one but several languages, language no longer constitutes the main indicator of nationality. Instead of creating tensions it turns into an instrument of internationalism and cooperation [4.249]. As such, it does not divide, but on the contrary, it draws people closer because it takes off the obstacle in discourse and other types of communication.

Learning languages, as Schiller suggested, could encourage and boost international trade and intercultural understanding. Another advantage of the influence of a multitude of languages in a state, as he saw it, is in the resulting rise of the level of individual development, which in its turn could facilitate the search for constructive political decisions. It was Schiller's firm belief that a bilingual or trilingual Europe would not only be a more intelligent and better-educated Europe, but multilingual awareness will speed it on the way to a federated Europe [4.249]. Though, it must be remembered, he warned, that though knowing two or more languages makes communication easier and more accessible it is not in itself a guarantee of the appearance and development of intercultural attitude.

In present-day reality there appears a new sense in communication, the logic, purpose and dynamics of which are directed to the support and promotion of mutual understanding and consolidation. Its new quality and human truth are clearly seen in the formation of a worldwide informational openness. In accordance with this quality its appearance and spread modifies a large number of judgments by which people identify the languages and the culture they or others belong to [7.94]. This type of culture is defined as a culture of communication on a par. It promotes effective co-operation and greater tolerance. Its pragmatic characteristics are set by the purpose and expectations of finding common human truths for the sake of which people get into contact and start talking to each other. Communication, passing among people, includes a lot of personal issues, such as intentions, interests, motives and direct communicative assignments. To be productive, useful and true, communication is to be based on positive constructive motivation in all its spheres and forms. Its underlying principle must stress the humanistic ideas of co-operation and call for unity. The essence of this culture is intercultural exchange and cross-cultural influence, which can

be applied in many different directions. Its purpose may be summed up as an appeal to people to start working together devising their new future without strife and terrorism and building it on humane and humanistic background.

With this idea in view a great emphasis is laid on the methods and vehicles with and through which people can begin getting friendly and understanding [1.29] on the way to their common human truth. The most important and universally recognized, effective and known means is human language. Its role in providing understanding or, on the contrary, breeding antipathy and animosity, as was noted long ago by Schiller, is obvious and does not call for corroboration. At present, when distances are not so long any more, natural human language gains even greater significance. Productive flow of communication requires tact and consideration. It depends among other factors on what language is used and how it is offered. The impact of the language, especially if it is imposed forcibly, may be a severe shock for a person who gets into or is made to face an unfamiliar culture. Adaptation to the new cultural ways, language and concepts may lead to the loss of cultural identity and altogether break the sense of reality. In such a case a person finds himself at once in several cultures and on different levels of his own identity [1.79]. Cultural identification is a many-leveled structure. The correlation in them is continually changing; its development goes on in a conflicting and uneven stream of ups and downs. It depends on the personal nervous and intellectual constitution which is the reason whether or not this process will proceed as desired. Each person has his own special features of actualization and adaptation on different levels of his identity and in various forms of communication. The consciousness of every person makes him build his own reality in which he composes a specific, original "picture of the world" [1.53]. In his mind it is represented as a hierarchy of social and cultural systems of values, which were formed and crystallized in language through the course of his experience and activity. Contrary to a widespread notion cultural identity is not static. It is not a quality formed once and forever, constantly distinguishing a person, a group or a society. Migration inside the country, emigration to other countries often affect people so that they lose all ties with their former cultural identity or their feeling of it is crucially modified. Contacts and communication stimulate personal development, ability and language skills for intercultural exchange [1.76]. At worst through them a person is warned against possible undesirable turns in his experience, at best they present valuable human truths and prepare him for them so that he can become a globetrotter fearing no cultural pitfalls.

Taken in this context the general understanding of the human truth in culture and its role in a man's life is changing. Habitually culture was analyzed in the aspect of what a person could contribute to its continuation and development. Now there has been added a new angle from which the problem can be viewed. It has become universally recognized that culture is a mighty vehicle of providing means for finding common human truths, developing communication and finding ways of bringing people closer. Priorities are changing places [6.4]. Emphasis is laid on what culture can give a person and how it can promote establishing common human truths and spreading communicative processes in the world. The European Union, pursuant to this concept, is now starting to implement a project "Soul for Europe" [6.8], which has been devised with the aim of attaching a more humanistic dimension to European

integration process. The project envisages a freer exchange of ideas through different types of communication.

In looking for common human truths culture and communication have mutual influence on each other. Their interaction creates new modes of human relations by smoothing differences and creating new symbolic meanings. Because communication itself becomes a culture, it does not only penetrate all the notions and perception of reality but through it and thanks to it new forms of social behavior are established. What, where and how to speak, what to wear, what new eating habits to acquire, these and many more other innovations are regulated by the standards and culture of communication. All these rules are dictated by the practical necessity to minimize visible incongruities, distinctions and misunderstanding that could hinder effective communication.

Hardly anyone would deny the fact that man's nature is deeply social, that his spontaneous tendencies of feeling and acting are dictated by and directed to his environment. Man has created a specific form of social co-existence, having made laws, institutes and rules, which organize his life and relations. The problem of the relations of man and his social environment can be decided in a great variety of ways. All through his evolution man aspired to find the best solution and make the best choice for the sake of saving and developing his life and social environment. Schiller tried to find an answer to the question if it was possible to discover a law, by following and observing which society could always be on the way of progress. He had to admit that he could not formulate or even detect such a law. But true to his principles of humanistic pragmatism he insisted that it was man who was responsible for establishing his human truths and directing the development of his reality. So he suggested a compromise. He offered to single out and examine conditions, under which the most vivid manifestations of progress had been recognized in history. He further proposed to analyze them and consider if there was any possibility to imitate or create similar conditions and thus provide a way for an indefinitely long-lasting progressive change. His suggestion was that the human truth and the main condition of progress were to be found in the proper balance between innovation and tradition, in his wording between "forces of conservation and change" [4.254]. Violation of the balance in one way or another is equally harmful. This conclusion led to another. The other, no less important condition is based on the widening of knowledge. Keeping up with both conditions is based on human interrelations, intercourse and communication in looking for human truths in the widest possible sense. A society, able to observe both these conditions, not only generates strength and prosperity, but it is a live source of constantly growing and improving culture, cooperation and prosperity [4.248]. In such a society motivation and need for communication and activity will be directed not to digging out, considering, detailing or promoting differences but to overcoming every obstacle on the way to consensus and communication.

Schiller advised that the most important human truth is hidden in the fact that motives and grounds that could serve as a foundation for such a society, must be sought not in the political but in the economic sphere. Economically well-off and independent people will be more inclined to find a positive decision. He did not hope that his aspirations would find realization soon. Progress in human relations has never

been easy or quick. It is usually slow and very often imperceptible. But the universal human truth is that to reach a goal one must actively start on the way to it. Schiller finishes his article [4.250] by an ancient quotation – destiny takes the willing by the hand, but drags the unwilling by the hair.

Literature:

1. Agner M. Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation. N-Y., 1994. – 189 p
2. F.C.S. Schiller, Logic for Use. N-Y, 1930. – 469 p.
3. F.C.S. Schiller, Studies in Humanism, N-Y, 1907. -462p.
4. F.C.S.Schiller. Our Human Truths, N-Y, 1939.- 371p...
5. F.C.S. Schiller. Riddles of the Sphinx, N-Y, 1910. -478 p.
6. UNESCO: Manual of General Conference. Paris: UNESCO, 2002. -31 p.
7. White Morton, A Philosophy of Culture, The Scope of Humanistic Pragmatism, Princeton, 1998, - 137p.

Жарких В.Ю.

О ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКИХ ИСТИНАХ КАК ИХ ПОНИМАЛ Ф.К.С.ШИЛЛЕР.

В статье рассматривается понятие человеческих истин в русле концепций гуманистического прагматизма Ф.К.С.Шиллера.

Ключевые слова: человеческие истины, креативность, разумное равновесие, культура, коммуникация, естественный язык, традиции, новации.

Жарких В. Ю.

О ЛЮДСЬКИХ ІСТИНАХ ЯК ЇХ РОЗУМІВ Ф.К.С.ШИЛЛЕР.

В статті розглядається поняття людської істини в руслі гуманістичного прагматизму Ф.К.С.Шиллера.

Ключові слова: людські істини, креативність, розумна рівновага, культура, комунікація, мова, традиції, новації.