

**FEATURES OF EXPLICATION "PRACTICE": BETWEEN
UKRAINIAN SOVIET AND CHINESE MARXISM
CARACTERÍSTICAS DA EXPLICAÇÃO "PRÁTICA": ENTRE O MARXISMO
SOVIÉTICO UCRANIANO E O MARXISMO CHINÊS**

Sergii RUDENKO

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine.
E-mail: rudenkosrg@gmail.com

VITALII TURENKO

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: vitali_turenko@ukr.net

Dmytro NELIPA

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: nelipa_dv@ukr.net

Olena ZARUTSKA

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: o.a.zarutska@ukr.net

Victoria OMELCHENKO

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: victoria.007.omelchenko@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The article carries out a comprehensive comparative analysis of the understanding of "practice" in the context of thinkers of two directions of Marxism – Ukrainian-Soviet and Chinese philosophers. When examining the concept of "practice" in Ukrainian Soviet Marxism, the work of the following domestic thinkers is studied: P. Kopnin, V. Shynkaruk, V. Tabachkovskiy, V. Ivanov, O. Yatsenko. It is substantiated that domestic thinkers in the 60s and 80s of the XX century. focused their attention on practice not so much in the epistemological or socio-philosophical content, but in the anthropological and existential one. According to most of them, practice is not so much the opposite of theory, but a fundamental principle of consideration of all scientific and theoretical problems through the prism of their humanistic content, which allows us to realize the connection of theoretical knowledge with all the variety of ways of mastering a person. being, reveals the essence of knowledge as a cultural phenomenon. The work "On Practice" by Mao Zedong is analyzed, which reveals the prospect of further understanding of the researched concept within the framework of Chinese Marxism. In particular, he singles out two key aspects of the explanation of "practice": epistemological and political-philosophical. Therefore, Marxism in China is used to solve its problems and transform the rich practical experience of the state into theory, as well as in combination with Chinese history and unique Chinese traditional culture.

KEYWORDS: Chinese Marxism, Soviet philosophy in Ukraine, practice, modern Chinese philosophy, epistemology, Kyiv philosophical school.

RESUMO:

O artigo realiza uma análise comparativa abrangente do entendimento de "prática" no contexto de pensadores de duas direções do marxismo – os filósofos ucraniano-soviético e chinês. Ao examinar o conceito de "prática" no marxismo soviético ucraniano, o trabalho dos seguintes pensadores domésticos é estudado: P. Kopnin, V. Shynkaruk, V. Tabachkovskyi, V. Ivanov, O. Yatsenko. Constata-se que pensadores domésticos nas décadas de 60 e 80 do século XX. concentraram sua atenção na prática não tanto no conteúdo epistemológico ou sociofilosófico, mas no antropológico e existencial. Segundo a maioria deles, a prática não é tanto o oposto da teoria, mas um princípio fundamental de consideração de todos os problemas científicos e teóricos pelo prisma de seu conteúdo humanístico, o que nos permite perceber a conexão do conhecimento teórico com toda a variedade de maneiras de dominar uma pessoa. ser, revela a essência do conhecimento como fenômeno cultural. Analisa-se a obra "Sobre a prática" de Mao Zedong, que revela a perspectiva de aprofundamento do conceito pesquisado no âmbito do marxismo chinês. Em particular, ele destaca dois aspectos-chave da explicação da "prática": epistemológico e político-filosófico. Portanto, o marxismo na China é usado para resolver seus problemas e transformar a rica experiência prática do estado em teoria, bem como em combinação com a história chinesa e a cultura tradicional chinesa única.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Marxismo chinês, filosofia soviética na Ucrânia, prática, filosofia chinesa moderna, epistemologia, escola filosófica de Kiev.

1. Introduction

The relevance of the research topic is due to the fact that Marxism is most often associated with socio-philosophical or political-philosophical issues. Therefore, certain problems and concepts, in particular epistemology, seem to remain in the shadow of both the followers of Marxism and the researchers of this direction of philosophy. In our opinion, one such concept is certainly "practice".

The scientific achievements of Ukrainian, Western, and Far Eastern scientists became the basis of our research. However, it can be noted that they lack a comparative analysis of the explanation of "practice" in Ukrainian-Soviet and Chinese Marxism. Accordingly, the purpose of our article is to reveal the peculiarities and characteristic features of the understanding of the concept of "practice" in the above-mentioned directions of the development of Marxism.

*The concept of "practice" in Ukrainian soviet thinkers
in the second half of XX century.*

If we talk about Ukrainian Soviet Marxism, the greatest attention was paid to the concept of "practice" with the emergence of the Kyiv School of Worldview and Anthropology (the early 1960s) in its wake. It was the founder of this school, P. Kopnin, who clearly outlined the significance of the studied concept, emphasizing the humanistically oriented philosophy. Its subject is not only the "objective laws of nature and society", but also the reality dependent on man, which is mastered in the process of his activity. The scientist called for studying epistemological problems in a wide range of meaningful ones, in the context of the collective experience of mankind, and at the same time applying scientific criteria to the analysis of worldview problems. As a result of "the limitation of philosophy to its own subject, which is understood, in the end, as the attitude of a person to the world of a person, the Ukrainian Soviet thinker built a general scheme of Marxist philosophy, which, in his opinion, "corresponds to the modern level of the development of philosophy". This scheme looks like this:

- 1) the concept of worldview;
- 2) the main question of philosophy;
- 3) the subject and object of cognition and practice;
- 4) cognition and display, information, sign and sign system;
- 5) truth and its criterion;
- 6) feelings and reason, empirical and theoretical knowledge;
- 7) reason and mind, birth and development of theory;
- 8) truth, beauty and freedom" (Popovych, 2009, p. 14).

His successor as Director of the Institute of Philosophy, and academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR Volodymyr Shynkaruk continues Kopnin's line, which is revealed in the output of the fundamental collective monograph "Man and the World of Man: (The Category "Man" and "World" in the System of Scientific Worldview" It is in this work that a number of problems that vividly reveal the social-historical and active-practical essence of man and his attitude to the world. The worldview meaning of philosophical research is seen in the disclosure of the active basis and "practical-spiritual" form of the unity of man and the world (Chelovek, 1977, p. 4).

Therefore, according to the scientist, the interaction of realities is represented in the human being through our experiences of an event (real, imagined) as actually existing. "From the position of present

existence, we review the past, and only from these positions do we see opportunities, realized and lost", we project existence into the future as a dream, hope, etc. Explaining what real life should be like so that we are able to change real existence (social and cultural environment, etc.) in accordance with our understanding of it as appropriate, was a primary task, taking into account the Soviet practice of "building a new world" according to the communist ideal (Rozvytok, 2014, p.314).

A particularly important figure in Kyiv's worldview and anthropological philosophy in general, and in the context of the explication of practice, is the personality of V. Tabachkovskiy. Accordingly, first of all, his work "The Crisis of Bourgeois Rationalism and the Problem of the Human Personality" (1974) should be noted. The book analyzes the interpretation of the specifics of social regulators of human activity in European philosophy. The author examines how French personalism and existentialism attempt to overcome the limitations of classical rationalism through an idealistic "essentialization" of reason, which seemed to be the main such regulator. The book shows that the interpretation of history as a depersonalization of the process leads to a religious interpretation of human life. The social conditioning and methodological defects of European philosophical concepts are revealed and the significance of the Marxist principle of socio-historical practice for solving the problem of social regulators of human activity is shown (Kryza, 1974, p. 2). At the same time, his active study of the phenomenon of practice begins.

Of course, this is not a coincidence. Yu. Melkov writes the following about this: "The theme of practice as the basis on which both ontology and epistemology are based is another important distinguishing feature of the Kyivan philosophy of the Marxist tradition - as well as consideration of the human world in its development, dialectical contradictions and unity. and the opinion of O. Yatsenko, "Marx found in practice a cell where the material and ideal, objective and subjective exist in inseparable unity", and therefore this "cell" turns out to be the most important subject of research in human life, thinking and being, spiritual and material The principle of a person's practical creative activity is to be not only central but also a unifying center of research in the most diverse fields of philosophical thought. This explains the flourishing of Soviet philosophy in the 1960s in general and in the Kyiv school in particular, along with worldview topics and the field of philosophical anthropology, researching the problems of philosophy and the methodology of science" (Melkov, 2008, p. 45).

Therefore, V. Tabachkovskiy published a separate monograph "Critique of idealistic interpretations of practice" (Tabachkovskiy, 1976), chapters in the monographs "Bourgeois concepts of culture: crisis of methodology" (Tabachkovskiy, 1980), "Actual methodological issues of modern science" (Tabachkovskiy, 1983).

S. Grabovskyi emphasizes that V. Tabachkovsky's research on the phenomenon of practice proved its extremely difficult nature, which fundamentally did not lend itself to reduction in the direction of material production or revolutionary activity. In his opinion, practice appeared as a human creation with the whole range of its internal and external contradictions. In the 1980s, it was V. Tabachkovskyi who was engaged in the further transformation of worldview issues - in the direction of post-Marxist philosophical anthropology, in its classical and post-classical forms (Grabovskyi, 2014, p. 328). As we can see, practice in his studies is not a purely materialistic phenomenon, in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, but in an existential context (Turenko & Semykras, 2021, p.52).

At the same time, if we talk about another representative of the Kyiv anthropological school, namely V. Ivanov, he thinks in the tradition of the so-called active approach. Sensory-object activity is a crucible in which the human universal is transformed into the object world created by man, and vice versa. That is, the specificity of human nature – universality – is transformative activity as such, "the universal force of creation", "the subjective basis of practical creativity" (Ivanov, 1977, p. 58). It exists only in the subject-practical transformation of the surrounding world, in acts of practice. So, now we can talk about such a clear practical activity as "the universal essential definition of a person, the substance of his social existence" (Ivanov, 1977, p. 59).

In this context, it would be appropriate to note the opinion of M. Kiselyov: "the expediency of human activity is formed in practice. It objectively reflects the history of human labor, which has become a peculiar logic of the activity of a social person. In the subjective aspect, the goal characterizes the way a person develops natural and social -historical reality in the forms of human practice; the entire objective structure of activity is presented and mediated in it. That is why expediency acts as a structural and functional component of activity and, at the same time, is a general spiritual and practical way of human existence. In this special capacity, it is necessary an element of culture"" (Kyselyov, 2012, p. 107).

The credit of M. Tarasenko was that in his monograph, he proposed and implemented an original approach to the analysis of socio-cultural foundations of the technology. Unlike the dominant formational, substrate and structural-functional approaches, M. Tarasenko's approach consisted in identifying the inter-subjective meaning of industrial technology, the power of specificity of social forms of practice and object-subject relations (Rudenko & Turenko, 2019, p.150). Therefore, M. Tarasenko views harmonization of relations between man and nature as socially created relations in replacing technologies that are based on the forms of matter motion with technologies built on the dialectics of human collective work (Tarasenko, 1975, p. 3).

2. Features of the understanding of practice in Chineseized Marxism

First of all, it should be noted that before K. Marx, materialism considered the problem of knowledge separately from the social nature of man and its historical development, and therefore could not understand the dependence of knowledge on social practice, that is, the dependence of knowledge on production and class struggle. Marxists consider man's production activity as the most fundamental practical activity, determining all his other activities. A person's knowledge depends mainly on his activity in material production, thanks to which he gradually comes to understand the phenomena, properties, and laws of nature, the relationship between himself and nature; and through his activity in production he also gradually comes to understand, to one degree or another, certain relations that exist between man. None of this knowledge can be obtained without industrial activity. In a classless society, each person, as a member of society, joins forces with other members, enters into certain production relations with them, and participates in production to satisfy the material needs of a person. In all class societies, members of different social classes also enter into certain production relations in different ways and engage in production to satisfy their material needs. This is the primary source from which human knowledge develops.

Understanding this, the prominent Chinese statesman and thinker Mao Zedong devoted special attention to the researched concept in his study "On Practice" (1937). At the same time, it should be noted that "in recent years it has become clear that many of the concepts used by Mao in writing his famous essays *On Contradiction* and *On Practice* (1937) derive from a detailed study of Soviet Marxist philosophy, and that many aspects of his own Mao's philosophy and that of Chinese Marxism are exceptionally orthodox by the standards of the international communist movement of that time" (Knight, 1993, c.57).

It should be also noted that Mao in "On Practice" argues that knowledge comes from practice and that true knowledge is tested by practice, while other approaches fail to grasp the importance of dialectical materialism. According to Mao, the truth of ideas can only be evaluated in practice. In "On Contradiction", he breaks with Marx, following Engels' view that contradiction is present both in matter itself and in ideas in the brain. According to Mao, there is always a struggle between various conflicting aspects, as well as what he called a fundamental contradiction. The class struggle, which is the main contradiction, can only be resolved by a revolution that overcomes the antagonism between labor and capital.

However, Marxism in China is to use the former to solve China's problems and transform China's rich practical experience into a theory, and in combination with Chinese history and uniquely. Chinese traditional culture, Chinese Marxism is constantly endowed with distinctive practical characteristics, national characteristics, and characteristics: therefore, within its framework, it is important to: "first, adhere to the practice of the first point of view, be good at turning theory into the life experience, good at using theory to guide the new the practice of innovation, and, secondly, it is the inheritance and development of new ideas of Marxism, in-depth study to solve important practical problems in reform and development, and the constant provision of Marxism to modern China" (Chen, 2016, p.1135)

Because of this, it should be noted the opinion of Mao Zedong, who emphasized: "This dialectical-materialist theory of the process of knowledge development, which is based on practice and goes from the smallest to the deepest, was not developed by anyone before the emergence of Marxism. Marxism-Leninism holds that each of the two stages of the process of cognition has its own characteristics, with knowledge manifesting as perceptual at the lower stage and logical at the higher, but that both are stages of an integrated process of cognition. Perceptual and rational are qualitatively different, but not separated from each other; they are unified on the basis of practice. Our practice proves that what is perceived cannot be grasped immediately and that only what is grasped can be grasped more deeply. Perception only solves the problem of phenomena; only theory can solve the problem of substance. Solving both of these problems is in no way separated from practice. Whoever wants to know something cannot do so except by encountering it, that is, by living (practicing) in its environment" (Mao Zedong, 1960, p.20).

As we can see, Mao was sufficiently critical of both the reasoning of Marx himself and the reflections of the Soviet ideologues of Marxism - V. Lenin and Y. Stalin. Therefore, it is not surprising that even in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China we see the following two positions that are directly related to the studied concept:

"Trying to free the mind, seek truth in facts, keep up with the times, be realistic and pragmatic. The Party's line of thinking is to start from reality in everything it does, integrate theory with practice, seek truth in facts, and verify and develop truths through practice. All Party members must uphold this line of thinking, actively explore and boldly experiment, open the way and innovate, and work creatively; never stop learning new situations, reflecting on experiences, and solving new problems; and enrich and develop Marxism through practice and facilitate the adaptation of Marxism to the Chinese context.

Promote new socialist customs and practices; pave the way in the application of basic socialist values and the socialist concept of honor and shame; fight for communist ethics; uphold the traditional

virtues of the Chinese nation; and, when any difficulty or danger arises, come forward and fight bravely without fear of sacrifice to protect the interests of the country and the people” (Constitution of China, 2017).

Such tasks are due to the fact that "in order to clarify the dialectical-materialistic movement of knowledge that arises on the basis of practice, which changes reality - to clarify the movement of knowledge that gradually deepens - below we will give a few additional specific examples.

In its knowledge of capitalist society, the proletariat was only at the perceptive stage of knowledge in the first period of its practice, in the period of the destruction of machines and spontaneous struggle; she knew only some aspects and external relations of the phenomena of capitalism. The proletariat was then still a "class in itself." But having reached the second period of its practice, the period of conscious and organized economic and political struggle, the proletariat was able to understand the essence of capitalist society, the relations of exploitation between social classes and its own historical task; and it was able to do this through its own practice and through its experience of the long struggle, which Marx and Engels scientifically summarized in all its diversity in order to create a theory of Marxism for the education of the proletariat. It was then that the proletariat became a "class unto itself."

Summing up, a comparative analysis of the understanding of practice in two such directions of Marxism as in Ukrainian Soviet and Chineseized Marxism, we can note that:

1) In the Ukrainian Soviet thinkers practice appears as a fundamental principle of consideration of all scientific and theoretical problems through the prism of their humanistic content, which allows us to realize the connection of theoretical knowledge with all the variety of ways of mastering human existence

2) In Chinese Marxism we can see two key aspects of the explication of practice: epistemological and political-philosophical, which makes it possible to use it to solve problems in China and transform the rich practical experience of the state into theory.

References

CHELOVEK Y MYR CHELOVEKA (1977). (*Kateboryy "chelovek" y "myr" v systeme nauchnobo myrovozzrenyia*), pod red. V.Y. Shynkaruk. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

- CHEN, Lixin (2016). *Relationship of Marxism in China and Chinese Traditional Culture*, 3rd International Conference on Education, Management, Arts, Economics and Social Science (ICEMAESS 2015), pp.1133-1149.
- CHINA, Constitution Of The Communist Party Of China. Revised and adopted at the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China on October 24, 2017, URL: http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/download/Constitution_of_the_Communist_Party_of_China.pdf
- HRABOVSKYI, S.m(2014). Vidrozhennia ukrainskoi filosofii v URSR (1960-1980 rr.), Tertium non datur: problema kulturnoi identychnosti v literaturno-filosofskomu dyskursi XIX-XXI st. : *kolektyvna monohrafiia*. Kyiv: NAUKMA, pp.326-365.
- KNIGHT, N. (1993) Review essay: Mao Zedong's thought and chinese marxism—Recent documents and interpretations, *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, №25:2, pp.54-63.
- KYSELOV, M. M. (2012). *Problema tsinnosti v suchasni ukrainskii mentalnosti, Filosofski dialohy'2012. Filosofskoantropolohichni chytannia: Yevropeiski tsinnosti ta ukrainski realii (do 80- littia vid dnia narodzhennia O. I. Yatsenka)*: zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv: IF NAS, pp. 106–118.
- MAO ZEDONG. (1960). *ON PRACTICE*. On the Relation Between Knowledge and Practice, Between Knowing and Doing, 3d ed. Imprint Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
- MELKOV, Yu. (2008). Kyivska filosofska shkola: osnovni idei ta kharakterni osoblyvosti, *Visn. nats. aviats. un-tu. Serii: Filosofiia, Kulturolohiia*, № 2(8), pp.43–47.
- POPOVYCH, M. (2009). Pro filosofsku kulturu krainy na imia «SRSR», *Filosofska dumka*, № 3, pp. 5–15.
- ROZVYTOK FILOSOFSKOI DUMKY V UKRAINI (2014). *Navch. Posibnyk*, za red. prof. Yu. M. Vilchynskoho]. 3-tie vyd., pererob. i dop. Kyiv: KNEU.
- RUDENKO, S. & TURENKO V. (2019). Formation and development of the philosophical anthropology studies in soviet Ukraine. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, №16, pp. 143-156.
- TABACHKOVSKYI, V. (1974). Kryza burzhuzaznogo ratsionalizmu i problema liudskoi osobystosti, Kyiv, Naukova dumka.
- TABACHKOVSKYI, V. (1976). *Krytyka idealistychnykh traktuvan praktyky*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka.
- TABACHKOVSKYI, V. (1980). *Problema «praktyky-kultury» v klasychnii burzhuzaznii filosofii, Burzhuzazni kontseptsii kultury: kryza metodolohii*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, pp. 15-78.
- TABACHKOVSKYI, V. (1983). *Pryntyp yednosti teorii i praktyky v rozvytku naukovoho znannia, Aktualni metodolohichni pytannia suchasnoi nauky*, Kyiv, Vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury, pp.48-71.
- TARASENKO, M. (1975). *Philosophical Aspects of the Attitude of Man-Nature*. Kyiv: Naukovadumka.
- TURENKO, V., & Semykras, V. (2021). *Philosophical legacy of V. G. Tabachkovskyi: historical and philosophical reconstruction*. SOPHIA. Human and Religious Studies Bulletin, №17(1), pp. 50-54.
- YVANOV, V.Y. (1977). *Chelovecheskaia deiatel'nost – poznanye – yskusstvo*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.



RUDENKO, Sergii, TURENKO, Vitalii; NELIPA, Dmytro; PETRENKO, Ihor; ZARUTSKA, Olena; OMELCHENKO, Victoria. FEATURES OF EXPLICATION "PRACTICE": BETWEEN UKRAINIAN SOVIET AND CHINESE MARXISM. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol.20, n.2, 2023, eK23033, p. 01-10.

Recebido: 06/2023

Aprovado: 06/2023