

Sergey Borisov

South Ural State Humanitarian and Pedagogical University, 69 Lenin Ave, RU–454080 Chelyabinsk
borisovsv69@mail.ru

**The Birth of Deep Philosophy
from the Spirit of Onto-Designing**

Abstract

The paper outlines the basic principles of Deep Philosophy – one of the areas of modern philosophical practice. The author considers these principles in the context of onto-designing, a phenomenological model developed by Yuri Mikhailovich Reznik. The author gives a detailed explanation of the main concepts of Deep Philosophy, such as deep dimension, contemplation, personality, resonance, etc. from the position of correlation of the ontic and ontological, the world in-itself and the world for-itself. In addition, the author shares the experience of the philosophical retreat of Deep Philosophy, which took place in September 2019.

Keywords

ontology, Deep Philosophy, philosophical practice, philosophising, philosophical contemplation, dialogue, philosophical retreat, onto-designing, Yuri Mikhailovich Reznik

Introduction¹

It seems that in the field of philosophy, it is difficult to come up with something fundamentally new and offer it to the general public for the practice of self-knowledge. However, the new is often the “good” (undeservedly) forgotten old. Philosophy is a projective activity, creating a project of oneself. A self-conscious person is always in a borderline state between two realities – the reality of the actual and the reality of the possible. The “bridge” between these realities is philosophising, you can walk over a deep and wide gap between these realities. Through self-awareness in the existing (ontic aspect), a person is allowed to create (or complete) their project in being (ontological aspect). Thus, the being of possible, or, using the terminology of the Russian philosopher Y. M. Reznik “the spirit of onto-designing” is opening before us.

“From the point of view of ontological design goals the being of a person should not be considered as a fait accompli, but as a formation, i.e. the opportunity to become a Man, to find unity with the world and himself (possibly one).”²

1

The paper was prepared as part of assignment No. 35.5758.2017/BS “Philosophical practice as a new paradigm of modern socio-humanitarian research” of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation to carry out government work in the field of scientific activity and the RFBR project No. 17-33-00021-OGN “Theory and the practice of philosophical counseling: a comparative approach”.

2

Юрий Михайлович Резник, *Феноменология человека: бытие возможного*, Канон+РООИ «Реабилитация» [Yuri Mikhailovich Reznik, *Human Phenomenology: The Being of the Possible*, Canon + ROOI “Rehabilitation”], Moscow 2017, p. 207.

Not only the emergence of something new is possible, but this is what must necessarily happen, according to the “spirit of onto-designing”. Philosophy is not fixed, given once and for all, with developed cogitable schemes. After all, these schemes are not an end in themselves. They are means for something *to happen, take place, and be accomplished* as a new state of human consciousness. Thus, philosophical theory serves the practice of philosophical lifestyle. This practice is always performed “here and now” in the situation of the realisation of human being.

Philosophical Contemplation as a Practice of “Deep Philosophy”

In 2017, in Italy, a group of philosophers-practitioners issued the *Manifesto of Deep Philosophy*, in which proclaimed were the main principles of the implementation of philosophy as onto-designing.³ Philosophy, according to this manifesto, is a contemplative, personal process leading to self-transformation. Philosophical contemplation appeals to the deep structures of human existence, to the fundamental problems of human life. Joint contemplative communication of group members enhances this effect. At first glance, the phrase “deep structures of human existence” seems somewhat vague and even frightening. Why go deeper, if the usual functions of the mind and language (explanation, clarification, speaking) are just the opposite – the removal of thought from the depths to the surface? Moreover, the psychological connotation of the “deep structures of human existence”, rooted in the modern concept, takes us into the field of research and interpretation of the unconscious, which is the lot of a psychologist, not a philosopher. Contrary, the project of “Deep Philosophy” is precisely aimed at removing these familiar connotations. The concept of the unconscious does not play any role here and has no use. Contemplative philosophising does not task itself with describing certain psychological structures and explaining the mechanism of their work; contemplative philosophising aims to penetrate *beyond* these structures, moving *through* these structures, not allowing the intention to guide the mind to direct contact with being. The purpose of philosophising is to understand, but I do not suggest *understanding* in the sense of the givenness of “in-itself” (the hard patterns of the human psyche) but *understanding* in the sense of the “enlightenment” of being “for-itself”.

The elementary truth of philosophy is that a person cannot completely consider themselves as given of the material world. Therefore, a person is not wholly and completely given of the psychic world, rigidly conditioned by any neuro-biological structures or behavioural mechanisms. The intention of consciousness is directed into the future *through* and carried out *besides* these structures and mechanisms – it is a potentially incomplete project of being “for-itself”. I am breaking with the world “in-itself” by the very fact of my consciousness (intention, reflection, transcendence) and the possibility of different being opens up for me, i.e. the opportunity to be different for the world “in-itself” by gaining being “for-itself”. It is precisely this possibility that the metaphorical phrase “the deep structures of human existence” conveys, which I understand as of being “for-itself”, where a new vision of the fundamental problems of human life in “true communication” is revealed to me through a joint contemplative process about what is essential, most valued, most important for me.

Philosophical contemplation is a special kind of intellectual work. It involves intelligence in all its diversity and is not limited only by the logical and analytical capabilities of the so-called “critical thinking”, in fact, the logical-mathematical form of intelligence. Analytics is a reduction going deep into the object, thinking, experience. Philosophical contemplation is the practice of synthesis, coming from the depths. To go from the depths, we must first be there. But penetration into the “depths of human existence” is not performed by the method of analytical, in fact, “surgical” intervention (which, incidentally, is strongly emphasised by analysts through the concepts of *objectivity*, *disinterest*, *independent judgment*, *detachment*, *neutralisation of emotional relations*, etc.),⁴ but by the method of organic, non-violent penetration. As a rule, various forms of meditation are used for this – exercises focusing attention on this “depth”.

The Meditative Practice of *Deep Philosophy*

Meditative practice is an important component of philosophising. Of course, the whole diversity of this practice is not limited only to practices borrowed from the eastern philosophical, religious and everyday traditions, which have become popular in modern culture and actively promoted by the New Age movement. These practices view meditation too narrowly – as exercises to achieve certain mental states that serve the purposes of religious ritual or psychological and medical prescriptions. It is the question of the purpose of using meditation exercises that is the watershed between New Age practitioners and philosophy.⁵ In principle, any deep immersion in thought, experience, text, a cultural or natural object is meditation, and the exercise of achieving full focus on this is a meditative practice. In this sense, all Western philosophy, starting from antiquity, also practised and practices various forms of meditation.

For example, the French philosopher Pierre Hadot, in an interview with A. Davidson, while speaking about the inherent discrepancy between “philosophical speech” and “philosophical life” inherent in Western philosophy, finds their initial unity in the practice of “spiritual exercises”, essentially a meditative practice. An example is Marcus Aurelius, who was writing down his meditations to relive the philosophical speech in himself. However, because of habits, entertainment, and everyday worries, philosophical speech becomes a pure theory for many and ceases to help a person to lead a phil-

3

You can learn more about the concept of “Deep Philosophy” at: “Deep Philosophy: Contemplating in togetherness from our inner depth.” Available at: <https://dphilo.org> (accessed on 9 March 2020). Also, in the dedicated Loyev Books series: Ran Lahav (ed.), *The Deep Philosophy Group: History, Theory, Techniques*, Loyev Books, Hardwick (VT) 2019; Ran Lahav (ed.), *The Deep Philosophy Group: Origin, Testimonies, Practices*, Loyev Books, Hardwick (VT) 2018; Ran Lahav, *Guide to Philosophical Partnership: Principles, Procedures, Exercises*, Loyev Books, Hardwick (VT) 2017; Ran Lahav, *Handbook of Philosophical Companionships*,

Loyev Books, Hardwick (VT) 2016; Ran Lahav, *Philosophical Contemplation: Theory and Techniques for the Contemplator*, Loyev Books, Hardwick (VT) 2016.

4

Оскар Бренифье, “Искусство философской практики: философские установки”, [Oscar Brenifier, “The Art of Philosophical Practice: Philosophical Attitudes”], *Социум и власть* (2018) 1, no. 69, pp. 80–87, doi: <https://doi.org/10.22394/1996-0522-2018-1-80-87>.

osophical lifestyle. Then, says P. Hadot, the need arises to “bring back the effectiveness of speech”.⁶ In an interview with J. Carlier he said:

“I would say that the topic that struck me the most, from my very youth, due to my readings and subsequently due to my various surgical operations (I have been anaesthetised dozens of times), this is a topic meditations about death. Not because I am obsessed with the thought of death; but I was always surprised by the fact that the thought of death helps to live better, as if we lived our last day, our last hour. Such an attitude requires a complete conversion of attention; it has both an existential value and an ethical value. First of all, it helps to realise the infinite value of the present moment, the infinite value of today’s moments, but also the infinite value of tomorrow’s moments, which we will gratefully acknowledge as unexpected luck. But it also helps to realise the seriousness of every moment of life. (...) What is important here is not what we do, but how we do it. The thought of death, respectively, led me to this exercise of focusing on the present, which is recommended by both the Epicureans and the Stoics.”⁷

Philosophical contemplation is a practice in which our thinking comes into direct contact with being. This is what distinguishes it from our usual thinking and understanding. The content of this thinking is not in itself a thought or the forms and procedures of its expression, the content of this thinking is the thinker themselves in direct relation with being, describing this experience of presence. Philosophical contemplation works in the field of the unique, unknown. This thought is “for the first time ever” since these depths have not yet been illuminated by thinking. Therefore, to characterise this experience, we cannot use the usual forms and procedures of our everyday thinking, we need to overcome its narrow framework, due to its formal laws. If you imagine this on some everyday example, then all our tanks for storing water will seem insignificant if we set ourselves the goal of scooping up the sea with them. Ordinary thinking is objective: to have the concept of a thing means to distinguish it and contrast it with other things, only in this way we are able to determine its signs and properties, give it a characteristic. This form of thinking is very useful for practical purposes when we are dealing with specific objects in our familiar world, but it is not enough when wider horizons of reality open before us. The objectification matrix is not able to accommodate the whole diversity of the subject’s experience when they go beyond this matrix structure. The problem is, for many people this matrix structure seems to be the only possible reality, and therefore, they believe that it is impossible to think, being beyond the limits of objectification, beyond those forms that are caused by our mental structures and rational mechanisms.

It is impossible to engage in Deep Philosophy using only our usual discursive thinking and its objectifying structures. Deep Philosophy seeks to penetrate the source of being’s reality as deep as possible. To do this, we need a different type of thinking that can realise itself not in a closed system of everyday experience, but an open system of onto-designing. Philosophical contemplation serves this purpose. Contemplative practice neutralises the habitual rational and psychological mechanisms; it goes beyond the boundaries of the usual forms of thinking and reasoning. If in ordinary forms these mechanisms determine the order of thinking (i.e. the regulatory form is primary), then in contemplative thinking the experience of presence in being, the experience of contact with it, which does not correspond to any of the usual forms of regulation, is primary. The psychological mechanisms of objectification with fixed patterns of thinking are useless here. At the same time, the philosopher find themselves in a strange situation, when thought can arise “by itself”, getting out of the control of these structures. Intuition cannot be started “at-will”, since insight signals a fundamentally new experience of perception or thinking.

Philosophical contemplation is carried out in a completely different space than the one in which my usual psychological “I” is located; therefore, it can no longer carry out its controlling and regulating functions. I am present in an empty, structureless inner space of silent concentration, which cannot be described from the standpoint of my usual psychological activity. Thus, I get the opportunity to describe this space from the position of its presence in it, as if it testifies to itself within me. This is a completely different form of thinking and understanding. The usual psychological thinking deals only with a limited part of my world, which is strictly regulated by the mechanisms of thinking. Contemplative thinking gives rise to thought before its objectification; therefore, it is much brighter and richer. This feeling is familiar to all of us when we do not have the right words to describe the reality that is opening up to us, although we distinctly feel the fullness of reality and all the preciousness and originality of the moment of presence experienced outside our usual mental framework. As a rule, our usual thinking models working in the autopilot mode interfere with the contemplative mood. To prevent these models, used meditative practices create the necessary contemplative attitude for philosophising. Meditation exercises are nothing more than a working tool – they are not sacred rituals serving religious or medical purposes.

The Personality of Philosophical Experience

Another principle of Deep Philosophy is its personality. This principle also needs to be clarified, since it is not about trying to figure out your psychological problems with the help of philosophy, but about achieving deep and inspiring self-knowledge, the discovery of that which is true in me, which corresponds not only to my personal freedom but also, speaking in Hegel’s words, “the freedom of the spirit that was originally inherent in me”,⁸ to understand one’s purpose. “A man is what he does from what they do to him” (K. Jaspers).⁹ In the wording of Y. M. Reznik, this thesis reads:

“A man is what he makes of himself contrary to what they do (and did) with him.”¹⁰

The personality of philosophising is manifested in its unique temporal dimension. Time acquires an ontological qualitative characteristic. It begins to expand deeper, ceases to be perceived as a surface alternation of moments. Expanding deeper, personal time becomes a series of altered states, transformations of consciousness, which are opening up more and more new structures of being. I suggest we compare this with intuition, which usually acts

5

Lydia Amir, *Rethinking Philosophers’ Responsibility*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2018.

6

Пьер Адо, *Философия как способ жить: Беседы с Жанны Карлие и Арнольдом Дэвидсоном*, перевод с франц. В. А. Воробьева, Издательство «Степной Ветер» – «Коло» [Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way to Live: Conversations with Jeanne Carlier and Arnold Davidson*, Publishing house “Steppe Wind” – “Kolo”], Moscow – St. Petersburg 2005, p. 173.

7

Ibid., pp. 246–247.

8

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie des Geistes: Berlin 1827-1828*, Verlag von Felix Meiner, Hamburg 1994, p. 14.

9

Karl Jaspers, *Einführung in die Philosophie*, R. Piper & Co. Verlag, München 1983, p. 19.

10

Ю. М. Резник, *Феноменология человека* [Y. M. Reznik, *Human Phenomenology*], p. 208.

instantly, but here the whole process of the birth of thought appears in slow motion. Layer after layer, the being's formations open, formed like a crust on the surface made of frozen ideas, impressions, and habits that prevented consciousness from penetrating deeper. It is on this "crust" that the "vain" moments of life, measured by quantitative time, glide. Quality time is expanding in-depth, consciousness penetrates through these layers to the sources where these frozen ideas came from when they were still alive. Thus, in the process of contemplative philosophising, a person faces their future, i.e. all its potentialities are revealed. I suppose that in this deep dimension, it is the future, not the past, that becomes the source of life, energy, the desire to change something. The past remains on the surface on which fragments of everyday routine life float, the surface of that quantitative time, which has already lost its former power and does not impose its deadly monotonous rhythm.

Deep Philosophy pays close attention to the intention of consciousness aimed at finding contact with being, with reality. This is a kind of compass of a person who stubbornly and persistently indicates the direction, orient. This compass is taken out at critical moments when a person gets lost, gets confused in their wanderings and throwings in the world of everyday life. The methods of orientation in the world of "in-itself" and in the world of "for-itself" are fundamentally different. In the "in-itself" world, I am guided by external factors, circumstances that put me in a situation of choice. However, this choice does not concern me personally, but only my presence or non-presence under certain circumstances. This is a choice without a choice because I can (or should) be in certain circumstances, but not be present in them. That is, if I choose "non-presence", then I am in the position of "victim" of circumstances, I choose the world "in-itself" as the only one, and I am guided by the system of signs that are created to orient me in it.

In the "for-itself" world, I focus solely on "presence" regardless of the circumstances in which I am. I choose not something or someone, I choose myself. I listen to my intention, and it directs me to the "deep structures" of my being. Unlike the "in-itself" world, which inspires me with the idea of hopelessness, the "for-itself" world opens up new opportunities for me, satisfying my desire to become different.

"Have a presence this means, firstly, to be autonomous (in the sense of distance from the world), and secondly, to be free, in terms of its existence."¹¹

When I follow the "call" of being, I am not looking for any pleasant experience or happiness for myself, and I am not trying to satisfy my curiosity or particular interest. The "call" of being has nothing to do with satisfying needs. I am attracted by something else; I want to perceive and think of myself not from the position of my incompleteness, insufficiency, but from the position of my fullness, redundancy, i.e. not from the standpoint of their givenness, but from the standpoint of their project. It is like love. You can love from the lack of some personal qualities and feel the desire to make up for these qualities in yourself due to the redundancy of the other. Then love turns into a form of dependence and enslavement. But you can, on the contrary, love from the abundance of those qualities and properties that you discover in yourself, scooping them from that source, which will never dry up and will not become scarce, from being itself. Then love will become a form of liberation from all the conventions and circumstances of the "in-itself" world.

“To start designing for man, only one existential determination for being is not enough. It is still necessary to overcome the inertia of human existence and gain freedom of a creative spirit, as well as to form the ability to create (transcend) another future from the material of the world.”¹²

A person can respond to the “call” of being not only with feelings or experiences. Philosophical contemplation expands the possibilities of thinking, understanding. We can be deeply touched by music or a work of art, perceiving which we will feel the intention of being, the “call” of being. However, philosophical contemplation does not deal with a symphony as such, but with a symphony of ideas. If a musical symphony can be perceived directly, aesthetically, then a philosophical symphony is given to us indirectly through a text, and it can only be perceived eidetically. This requires an understanding of the philosophical text.

Work with Philosophical Text in Dialogue

I suppose that understanding can be viewed from an ontic or ontological position. Ontic understanding works in a system of rigid structures of interpretation defined by one or another philosophical paradigm. The criterion for understanding from the ontic point of view is the establishment of the correspondence of the philosophical text to a certain theoretical model that has received cultural and historical recognition in academic philosophy, the possibility of analysing the text, identifying its basic concepts that confirm or deny the text belongs to a particular theoretical model. Controversial issues (regarding compliance or non-compliance) are subject to discussion, and the text itself may be subject to scientific criticism. There is a rule for ontic understanding that the interpreter must understand the text better and deeper than the author of this text; this expresses my fundamental distrust of the author and the text. This is possible if, by virtue of established cultural-historical or academic rights, I imagine myself as a kind of “mirror of objectification”, capable of perceiving a philosophical text and ideas embedded in it from the perspective of an external observer. For me, a text becomes an object of the “in-itself” world, and therefore, as an expert in this world, I determine its position among other objects. The discovery of my personal involvement with the text is considered as a significant drawback of my interpretation, my “weakness”, which ideally needs to be overcome. This cannot open my contact with reality through this text; on the contrary, it isolates me both from reality itself and the reality of a text.

However, in addition to the existence of “in-itself” in its factuality, the text can be realised “for-itself” (from me) in its capacity. Understanding from an ontological position involves an interpretation coming *from* a philosophical text, which can be realised by resonating with thoughts and ideas generated by this text and coming *from* our inner depths. The philosophical text becomes for me a tool for interpreting my thoughts, ideas that are consonant with what I read. Neither I nor the text is subject to objectification, on the contrary, the philosophical text expands the space of my subjectivity, serves me as a “lantern” for orientation in the “deep structures” of my being. I interpret what I managed to catch, “hear”, coming into resonance with the text. For an ontological interpretation, my agreement or disagreement with the author of

11
Ibid., p. 214.

12
Ibid., p. 220.

the text from the position of some imaginary external criterion (consistency of ideas or theories, their conformity with the paradigm) or external observer (cultural or scholarly “censor”) does not matter. Resonance with the text is possible if there is no divide between me and the text, if I find my presence in the text. This is the essence of understanding in an ontological sense – I understand myself as a text, and I understand the text in my interpretation of this unique experience of understanding. I think and interpret from my reality, endow it with a voice (sound) and thereby voice my project of being. For ontological understanding, the rule is that the interpreter must understand the text based on full confidence in the author, without taking a detached position; the depth of understanding is directly proportional to the depth of the internal contemplative attitude towards being. I cannot share the thoughts and ideas of the author, but for my contemplative work, this does not matter. For me, the philosophical text serves as a launching pad, a door that opens before me new “places” of presence (*Dasein*) in being and new opportunities for self-knowledge.

Because it is dialogical, it is challenging to practice Deep Philosophy individually. Dialogue is necessary to build a relationship with being. A conscious, present “I” is necessary and a conscious, present “You” is necessary. It is thanks to these poles that the ontological tension is created, the space “between” in which being manifests itself. For the “in-itself” world, where everything is totally interdependent and rigidly determined, the “I-You” relationship is impossible, only the “I-It” relationship is possible. “It” dominates the “in-itself” world. “It” is manifested in materiality, objectification, causation. “It” is firmly established in man as the whole world of the unconscious. “It” is embedded in various forms of social relations, simulating the basic forms of the generic (social) essence of man. Consciousness saves us from the world of conditioning, giving us the opportunity of freedom in the world of “for-itself”. Relations in this world are built differently. In this world, our familiar modes and signs of relationships lose their meaning. For example, to communicate in the form of “I-You” one cannot use either oral or written speech at all. A silent conversation reveals much more meanings than the usual speech forms of communication. The “I-You” attitude frees me from the constraint and boundness of the conditions of the everyday world and opens up the possibility for me to perceive the depth of being in a joint presence. As long as I stay inside myself, inside my world, I feel safe in the world of “in-itself”. But in the “for-itself” world, I have no one to fear. I cannot limit myself to my ideas, I can freely overcome my limits to take part in the dialogical “I-You” relationship, which opens up to me wider horizons of understanding reality.

In Deep Philosophy the unity of thinking is achieved. However, this unity is not in conformism, not in formalism, not in regulation and not in joint exaltation, which does not affect the existential structures of a person at all and is, rather, a form of enslavement, not liberation. Unity is achieved through a general orientation to the I-You attitude, when I do not strive *to separate* my thoughts from the thoughts of another and *contrast* myself with another – no, I want to share my thoughts with another, I want *to accept* another, I get growth meaning from the realisation that I am no longer the only creator and owner of my thinking. And this I do not carry out because of external coercion, necessity, hopelessness or fear; it is an act of freedom for me. The basic “I-You” attitude allows me to realise that all participants in the dialogue have

a single mindset because for all of us a single being is revealed; it becomes irrelevant through which individual “doors” you enter this single “room”. My ideas are filled with new meanings due to resonance with the ideas of interlocutors and the ideas of the author of a philosophical text, and broader horizons open up for thinking. My hearing is sharpened; the sound of reality is filled with a rich, saturated polyphony of the “voices” of being.

Work with Philosophical Ideas

Contact with the ontological depth is so shocking that it can become a reserve for the desire for self-transformation. The so-called “normal” mental life cannot satisfy a person because of its superficiality and fragmentation, opening up a very limited set of possibilities for them. The “normal” mental life absorbs and seems very active, although the deeper dimensions of the human being are inactive. A person glides on the surface and does not feel in themselves the ability to be present in what is real and true for them. As a rule, the reality is hidden from direct sight; it must be distinguished. For this, it is necessary to achieve a certain state of thinking which will make it possible to “see”. Gradually, step by step, a person discovers in themselves abilities long inactive.

My “depth” can “talk” with me, express itself, pointing me to new ways of being present. It is worth listening, and its voice will begin to grow stronger, gaining the distinctness and clarity of the word of things. I become a gardener cultivating my soul.

“The gardener cannot tell the plant how to grow or how to bloom. The gardener creates favorable conditions in which the vitality of the plant will show all its potential capabilities. In the same way, the ‘philosophical gardener’ creates internal conditions, cultivating the ‘depth’, freeing it from the ‘litter’ of psychological automatisms.”¹³

I discover a new form of presence and create the necessary conditions to become different. However, one must be aware that self-transformation is an organic, gradual process. It does not happen overnight, and I become different “in a certain sense”, i.e. I cannot become a completely different person, it is beyond my strength. I cannot overcome my “human, too human”. Many of my deep-rooted habits of life will remain the same, but now I will no longer perceive them as independent blind forces from me; my usual way of life will gradually unite around a new inner centre which, one way or another, will change the trajectory of my life route. I will not become another person, but I will become more whole, balanced, attentive and penetrating; I will feel connected with the source with which I am connected with deeper roots than the superficial and chaotic rhizome that connects me with the world of everyday life.

Deep Philosophy, working with philosophical ideas, exposes the widespread myth that philosophy is abstract and far from life. First of all, one should distinguish between philosophical ideas and philosophical theories. Theories have never had a direct connection with reality because they give a systematically and structurally captured model of reality, its idealisation. To a large extent, theories do not describe reality, but the conditions and relationships

13

Ran Lahav, “The Philosophical Gardener: A New Paradigm for Philosophical Practice”, in: Lydia Amir (ed.), *New Frontiers in Philosophical Practice*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2017, pp. 34–55, p. 46.

for which this reality is either necessary or possible. Unlike philosophical theories, philosophical ideas are distinct and clear “voices” of reality that can be perceived, thought, understood. A theory can communicate something, but it cannot call for something; cries and encourages the idea. A theory can explain, justify, prove something, but it cannot transform, inspire, induce someone to act; it makes an idea. The theory is dead because it gives a complete and detached description of the world “in-itself”, the idea is alive because it serves the subject to realise the world of the possible, the world “for-itself”.

Deep Philosophy, working with philosophical ideas, directs the forces of the mind to study the foundations of life and reality. This work has a rich tradition, but Deep Philosophy can be assigned a special place in it: while most philosophers tried to explore reality by creating theories about it, “Deep Philosophy” cannot be satisfied with theorising. The intention to reality moves us through abstract theories so that there is a meeting with reality, a direct contact with it. Therefore, when working with philosophical texts, Deep Philosophy is not interested in the theories that are frozen in them, even if the authors of these texts considered themselves theorists.

Ideas can live their own lives, independent of theory. Of course, interconnected ideas can be a theory, but their function is to serve me as a map of reality so that I can develop my route for moving along it. My presence, in reality, indicates that I am part of it, like a wave in the ocean. Thus, ideas find harmony in what I already have an understanding of, just as the breath of the ocean is present in every wave. Ideas “voice” the reality in which I am already present. Therefore, I do not speak with the “voice” of ideas, I am not voicing them, on the contrary, the *ideas themselves* speak in my voice. Their voice is quite concrete, it is not a theoretical abstraction, which, having fulfilled its function of a “guide”, is no longer needed.

Deep Philosophy uses two metaphors that convey possible contact with reality: the “inner depth” and the “voice” of reality. These metaphors are one as two sides of the same coin. “Depth” is a visual-spatial metaphor, “voice” is an auditory metaphor. Thus, the “inner depth” is an imaginary “place” where we can “hear” the voice of reality. Contemplating in the “inner depths” is about the same as hearing the “voice” of reality. The medium for transmitting this “voice” is the special atmosphere of the philosophical group, which provides resonance. Resonance is possible only in the joint contemplation of ideas. This is not only a procedure of contemplative philosophising; it is also a special psychological state. As a procedure, resonance means a special reaction to the ideas of the interlocutor or the ideas of a philosophical text, which allows us to speak *from* them, and not *about* them. Instead of analysing these ideas, instead of evaluating or criticising them, agreeing or disagreeing, the philosophical group models a dialogue that resembles a rehearsal of a choir or orchestra. Improvisation with resonance serves the general development of a musical theme, filling it with new deep meanings. As a psychological state, resonance opens up special sensitivity and susceptibility to intentions aimed at reality for group members, exacerbates intellectual abilities and capabilities. This resonant interaction opens up opportunities for a deeper understanding of reality by discovering the “consonance” of ideas.

In the objectified world of “in-itself” resonant interaction is impossible – only dissonance is possible. For example, formal-logical constructions cannot allow violation of the law of contradiction. Violation of this law will deprive the argument of the most important support. Only in the discord of a contra-

dictory pair can we endow one of the statements with the status of truth. In resonant interaction in the world “for-itself”, both judgments are possible. This is not about the randomness of choice, but about finding that whole, that relationship where these contradictions are removed. Although different people can react differently to the same “voice” of reality, this does not always lead to a dispute or to the position of “boring” relativism (they are both right in their own way). What resonates in me with reality depends on the voice of my personal experience, which may differ from the experience of another. However, being in a single communicative space, we do not just express different opinions about reality, we contemplate reality from different angles, share the experience of its perception, thereby enriching the overall picture of reality. Only by learning to “listen” to the music of reality, I can understand it and respond to it with my voice. This is achieved through the resonant interaction of a contemplative, philosophical group.

“It is here favorable conditions arise for meta-designing, which is performed by philosophers in the hope of fulfilling their spiritual mission. In their presence one can find meaningful attempts to overcome the finiteness of one’s existence and gain the strength of spirit necessary for the transcendence of being. Only in this way can they realise their life credo and professional vocation.”¹⁴

Philosophical Project in the Educational Process

Personal Interest and Self-Realisation

Selfless service to the truth, personal interest in finding oneself, and the practice of philosophical self-care – they are a solid foundation for an educational process. Practising Deep Philosophy can serve as a methodological guide for building such an educational process. Is it possible to implement a philosophical project through the educational process? This is possible if personal interest is considered the most important in this process, because without it, the person involved in this process, firstly, does not understand what to do, and secondly, it is not clear for what purpose. Personal interest is not a superficial interest from idleness to have fun and spend time thoughtlessly. Personal interest is the full inclusion of feelings, thoughts, memory, preoccupation, interest. In fact, the personal interest of a person is not difficult to determine. It is enough, with the help of leading questions, to give them the opportunity to speak freely about themselves. It will be interesting to any person. This helps a person to self-determine, to feel in themselves a certain emptiness that they want to fill with something to realise themselves fully.

Another important point, in addition to personal interest – a person engaged in educational practice should feel successful in it. Everything that I think about, how I act, that I create, all this must completely coincide with my desires. Education should strengthen awareness of the integrity of the individual, and not lead to imbalance. I, in my authenticity, should not play any roles due to a false and objective assessment system. Personal interest and successful self-realisation are the main factors in a genuine educational process.¹⁵

14

Ю. М. Резник, *Феноменология человека* [Y. M. Reznik, *Human Phenomenology*], p. 223.

15

Sergey Borisov, “Philosophical Practice in Life of University”, *SGEM International*



Mentor and Friendly Environment

The main role in ensuring that processes work is played by the mentor, teacher (in a broad sense of the word). They demonstrate their personal interest and successful self-realisation in what is important to them. That is all because, as a rule, a person does not study according to the principle of “do as you are prescribed”, but according to the principle of “do as I do”. Educational relations are human relations built on the principle of “I-You”. They cannot be detached and faceless. The teacher is guided by their own interest; they completely realise themselves in the subject. It is this “personal component” that launches the genuine educational process, awakens reciprocal interest, the resonance of interests. Learning takes place through the fact that the neophyte finds their personality in the subject under study.¹⁶

Another condition for a successful educational process is a special friendly atmosphere. As an example, I would like to say a few words about the international retreat of “Deep Philosophy” held in Orvieto (Italy) on 26 – 29 September 2019. Conducting philosophical retreats in Italy has become a good tradition. They are held twice a year – in March and September, starting in 2017. In this format, philosophy returns to its true essence. It ceases to be a simple informing about philosophy and the next retelling of various philosophical theories and concepts. Philosophy here acquires the status of research activity, a laboratory of thought. As part of a retreat, it is not customary to simply state the position of a philosopher whose work is put up for collective discussion. Why for the hundredth time repeat what philosophers are already well aware of? The focus is different. What new and unique is born here and now as a result of this intellectual practice? What new turn opens in thought or text well known to any philosopher? A retreat creates unique conditions that are largely reminiscent of the practices of ancient classical universities: work in small research groups, where an intensive discussion of a topic (using special techniques) is replaced by a time of solitude, silence for a clear vision and a clear formulation of that unique thought, an idea that will be the result of participation in session and which is announced by each participant at the end of the working day. The retreat began at 9 a.m. and ended at 9 p.m., repeating for several days. Full immersion in texts, research issues and communication – all this created a special unique creative atmosphere, which is so necessary for any scientist – if they really are a scientist – and not just a functionary in bureaucratic university system.

Philosophers-practitioners from the United States of America, Spain, Austria, Germany, Denmark, Italy, Russia and Israel participated in the retreat. It is gratifying to note that this form of practice has attracted the attention of representatives of neighbouring (relative to Russia) countries, in particular Kazakhstan. All participants in the retreat practice a practice-oriented philosophy opposed to academic tutelage. Someone is the head of a philosophical cafe, someone else is engaged in philosophical counselling, someone runs a master’s program in training specialists in the field of philosophical practice, someone uses philosophical forms and methods in social work. All this creates a fertile field for cooperation and exchange of experience. Here, Russian specialists have a lot to learn: how to make philosophical practice a work of life aimed at real help to people in formats convenient for them.

Process Steps and Methods Used

We begin with an attempt to determine that for everyone there is their basic state of existence so that everyone understands how their authenticity manifests itself, their living “sensory”, when they most clearly felt themselves. This is best understood against the background of such facts, which are death, freedom, loneliness, meaninglessness. Existential psychology works with exactly such a circle of existential problems, given facts. For me, as a teacher of philosophy, it is important for everyone to turn their attention to themselves, but not so that we begin to discuss some private life problems, but so that we discover the origins of philosophy. Here, feedback is necessary for me, the personal reflection of my listeners. I, as they say, “show on myself” how I myself take care of myself in the face of these realities. The listener’s reflection is their own attempt to determine their basic state, their authenticity.

After a person has decided on this, they already began to imbue themselves with an object, realising their personal interest, they begin to understand that everything that I say and offer to them is not for the sake of informing about philosophy, as a certain subject area, but as advice or spiritual exercises for their self-care practice. This makes it possible to perceive philosophical knowledge personally, to open the way to self-knowledge. There should be constant feedback – for someone, it is easier to speak out during the dialogue in the audience, someone else prefers to be silent, but for them, there is a chance to speak in writing. As a rule, this is a very balanced, well-thought-out position, which was formed during an active hearing, a silent participation in the dialogue.

When the circle of basic problems is determined, when the sources of philosophy are discovered, we can begin to dive into the historical and philosophical problems. This material is not important in itself, and I do not structure it in chronological order. Still, most of those who come to me will not study philosophy professionally, for them the idea of philosophy as a knowledge system is not as important as it is important to practice philosophising. For this one needs to get acquainted with at least some the basics of philosophical tradition. Therefore, historical and philosophical material is built into my consideration and development of a particular problem. The path to the problem goes through those or others that have left a mark in culture, for example, in literature or art, philosophical subjects, philosophical statements and philosophical allegories or metaphors. All this serves as the beginning of a conversation, a “gateway” to philosophical problems. How deeply we plunge into it depends on how widely personal interest is involved and how feedback will work effectively. Of course, this does not always work out, but I believe that my profession as a teacher requires going from the public.

Each lesson is devoted either to some main topic, or a problematic issue or to some plot from the history of philosophy. A dialogue or workshop unfolds around this. It may be a short lecture. From 10 to 15 minutes before the end of the lesson, participants are offered time for personal reflection on a key topic,

Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on Social Sciences and Arts, book 3, vol. 2, *SGEM2016 Conference Proceedings*, Bulgaria 2016, pp. 753–758.

13 (1995) 3–4, pp. 203–212, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01077679>.

problem or plot. This reflection can be carried out in various forms. It can be just a statement of thoughts, ideas; for the third or fourth lesson, I ask them to formulate their thoughts as briefly as possible in 2 to 3 judgments, which succinctly and at the same time express the main idea as deeply as possible, where every word is worth its weight in gold. Perhaps this will be presented in a figurative, poetic form. It is necessary to carry out the maximum “contraction” of the presentation of thought and convey the whole quintessence of meaning. Oddly enough, how then the participants themselves share, writing short is much more difficult than writing in length, but it gives this very important ability to value words, to appreciate the semantic and mental capacity of words. If the “precious judgment” succeeds, it no longer needs to be fussily explained. There is a special philosophical aesthetic in this.

The main method is dialogue. Dialogue is necessary, if not external, then internal, because it just clarifies the basic relationship of man with being. There is “something important between”, which is the centre of gravity for dialogue. Such a philosophical attitude towards being can only be established in dialogue. The dialogue takes from different forms of objectification, isolation, alienation (either fixation on oneself or on the object) into the sphere of “I-You” relations.

Concluding Observations

Of course, the modern educational system is very different from all this. This system is a cast of the industrial model of mass society. The fact that the teaching of philosophy is somehow built into this system is rather a minus than a plus for us. This is a discredit of philosophy, because in such a system it cannot exist, there is simply no place or conditions for philosophy. It is really interesting for me to discuss something in the group, but for the birth of some thoughts and ideas, I need privacy. For a successful educational process, such conditions are necessary. Of course, this does not mean that philosophy as an educational subject is impossible, but special conditions are necessary for engaging in philosophy. Nothing prevents us from creating such conditions: setting the necessary mood, preparatory exercises, so that people understand that this is real practice, searching for oneself, taking care of oneself, and not just a set of template knowledge for general erudition. The educational process seems to us just such, especially since everything related to the study of philosophy is very individual, personal and even intimate.

Philosophising requires individual work. Of course, in academic terms, this means “working overtime”, but I am satisfied. Thus, the feedback has been established. It is clear that such feedback cannot be established in droves. This does not need to be done. But when a personal interest arises, then my advice on what can be read and discussed, for a deeper understanding, makes sense. The most important thing is that a person understands that philosophising is their own work with themselves, no one will carry out this work for them, work that can bring them personal liberation, the ability to be authentic. If I notice these moments of self-transformation, communicating with my listeners, I feel useful, and my activity makes sense. Philosophy as a subject of study fulfils this unique function. It is hard for me to imagine any other subject that would be so suitable for this function. Unlike other academic subjects, philosophy is specific not only by some invariantly rigid subject area but by its own method, the way of working with its subject content.

Sergey Borisov

Rođenje dubinske filozofije iz duha onto-dizajniranja

Sažetak

Rad ocrtava temeljne principe »dubinske filozofije« – jednog područja suvremene filozofijske prakse. Autor te principe razmatra u kontekstu »onto-dizajniranja«, fenomenološke metode koju je razvio Juri Mihajlovič Reznik. Daje se detaljno objašnjenje glavnih pojmova dubinske filozofije, kao što su dubinska dimenzija, kontemplacija, osobnost, rezonancija itd., iz pozicije korelacije ontičkog i ontološkog, svijeta u-sebi i svijeta za-sebe. Dodatno, dijeli se iskustvo filozofijskog povlačenja u dubinskoj filozofiji, koje se odvijalo u rujnu 2019. godine.

Ključne riječi

ontologija, dubinska filozofija, filozofijska praksa, filozofiranje, filozofijska kontemplacija, dijalog, filozofijsko povlačenje, Juri Mihajlovič Reznik

Sergey Borisov

Die Geburt der Tiefenphilosophie aus dem Geist des *Onto-Designs*

Zusammenfassung

Die Arbeit umreißt die Grundprinzipien der „Tiefenphilosophie“ – eines Bereichs der zeitgenössischen philosophischen Praxis. Der Autor zieht diese Prinzipien im Kontext des „Onto-Designs“ in Erwägung, einer phänomenologischen Methode, die von Juri Michailowitsch Reznik entwickelt wurde. Es wird eine detaillierte Erklärung der Hauptbegriffe der Tiefenphilosophie wie Tiefendimension, Kontemplation, Persönlichkeit, Resonanz usw. gegeben, und zwar von der Position der Korrelation des Ontischen und Ontologischen aus, bzw. der Welt in-sich und der Welt für-sich. Darüber hinaus wird die Erfahrung des philosophischen Rückzugs in der Tiefenphilosophie, der im September 2019 stattfand, geteilt.

Schlüsselwörter

Ontologie, Tiefenphilosophie, Philosophie der Praxis, Philosophieren, philosophische Kontemplation, Dialog, philosophischer Rückzug, Juri Michailowitsch Reznik

Sergey Borisov

La naissance de la philosophie profonde à partir de l'esprit *onto-design*

Résumé

Ce travail présente les principes fondamentaux de la « philosophie profonde » – un domaine de la philosophie pratique contemporaine. L'auteur analyse ces principes dans le contexte de « l'onto-design », une méthode phénoménologique développé par Iouri Mikhaïlovitch Reznik. Les explications détaillées des concepts de la philosophie profonde sont énoncées, tels que la dimension profonde, la contemplation, la personnalité, la résonance, etc., à partir du point de vue de corrélation de l'ontique et de l'ontologique, du monde en-soi et du monde pour-soi. De plus, l'expérience du retrait de la philosophie dans la philosophie profonde qui s'est déroulé en septembre 2019 sera évoquée.

Mots-clés

ontologie, philosophie profonde, philosophie pratique, acte de philosopher, contemplation philosophique, dialogue, retrait philosophique, Iouri Mikhaïlovitch Reznik