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The article is devoted to the peculiarities of the foundation and development of the Odesa’s Research School during the Soviet period. The main attention was focused on topical issues studied by Odesa scientists in the period 60-80 of the 20th century. The problems are outlined, and the specifics of the Odesa’s Research School of this period are clarified to reproduce a holistic picture of the development of philosophical thought in Soviet Ukraine. For this purpose, historical and philosophical description and reconstruction of the main trends, features, and directions of research conducted by Odesa scientists were made, which made it possible to determine the methodological principles and ideological guidelines for the development of Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet era. The key points of research of Odesa scientists are traced and it is established that they were carried out in the field of philosophical problems of natural science, logic, epistemology, scientific knowledge, as well as aesthetic, sociological, and historical-philosophical issues. A worthy continuation of these studies was the founding of the “Philosophical School of Uyomov,” which is still working and developing.
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Introduction

Today, the research interest of scientists is increasingly focused on studying the history of Ukrainian philosophical thought. Studies of the philosophical heritage of the Soviet era, determining its impact on modern domestic cultural practices, are becoming increasingly important. Systematic study and holistic theoretical reconstruction of the scientific view of functioning in the system of science and education of philosophical research of the Soviet period, due to the need to develop new ideological and theoretical foundations for the development of philosophical knowledge, increase the professional level and practical significance of scientific research. Coverage of scientific-theoretical and methodological achievements of representatives of philosophical schools will help to overcome the mass consciousness of citizens mythologists about the Soviet past. To achieve this goal, this article will focus on the study of the Odesa’s Research School, the peculiarities of its functioning as a center of philosophical thought, and determining its place and influence on the culture of Soviet Ukraine.

It should be noted that the history of the Odesa’s Research School includes a whole pleiad of scientists from the humanities and natural sciences, who worked productively and conducted research, among them — A. Uiomov, L. Sambirskyi, I. Savchuk, L. Rosenthal, V. Zhukova, F Pryduvalov, V. Kobetskyi, G. Pylypenko, Yu. Stempurskyi, V. Yeremenko, V. Voychuk, L. Roskolotko, S. Gurvich, P. Lobazov, L. Anufriiiev, V. Podshyvalkina, G. Angelov, A. Yareschchenko, M. Iordatii, L. Bondarev, G. Tereshchenko, A. Cherdenichenko, I. Mysyk, S. Yakovenko, I. Donnikova, R. Chernega, I. Zhukovskyi, O. Kovalenko, R. Maksimova, L. Zhelkova, T. Berestetska, S. Kornienko, and many others. Chronological reproduction and author’s interpretations of the development of philosophical and socio-political research of the Soviet era were presented in the works of these modern scientists — V. Ignatov, P. Yolon, V. Lisovyi, O. Mayboroda, Y. Rymarenko, A. Loia, S. Rudenko, S. Yosypenko, O. Vdovina, S. Proleiev, M. Minakov, P. Sytnyk, D. Dokuchaiev, P. Kraliuk, M. Tkachuk, O. Nakonechnaia, A. Tsofnas, L. Terentiev, A. Afanasiev, A. Saraieva, N. Borodina, and others. However, these studies do not exhaust all possible ways to study the history of Soviet Ukrainian philosophical thought, which necessitated historical and philosophical research and explications of defining such a phenomenon as the Odesa’s Research School. Based on this school’s scientific achievements, we will identify and reconstruct the research field in which Odesa scientists worked; it will help explore the dynamics of functioning and factors of development of this school and historical and philosophical thought of Ukraine of the Soviet period.

Theoretical reconstruction of logical and epistemological research of scientists of the Odesa’s Research School of the second half of the 20th century

Odesa’s Research School began to crystallize in the late 60s and early 70s. of the 20th century, although still unofficially, but it is beginning to talk about as a philosophical school. In the same period, “Philosophical School of Uiomov” is formed, which still exists today, and its followers continue to develop ideas and explore the systemic approach that was initiated by A. Uiomov himself. A significant contribution to the development of domestic philosophy was made by scientists of Odessa State University when in the late ‘60s at the Department of Philosophy opened a laboratory in which A. Uiomov with a group of staff and graduate
students brought the idea of understanding objects as systems to the level of general systems theory. It is a systematic approach in the study of objects as systems, that opened new horizons for further research. Continuing the work on establishing the interdependence of different values of system parameters, the scientists of this laboratory were able to formulate several dozen system patterns and find a place for their practical application (Tsofnas, 2003).

In general, it is impossible to imagine the Odesa’s Research School without A. Uiomov. Being a recognized Ukrainian philosopher, a specialist in logic, methodology of science, and systems theory, he created the theory of conclusions by analogy. This is confirmed by his published monograph “Analogy in the practice of scientific research.” From the “History of Physical and Mathematical Sciences” (1970), in which the scientist considers the structure of inferences by analogy, giving classification and proving the importance of the role of analogy in scientific knowledge, expounds the history of conclusions by analogy and analyzes these processes in modern physics, cybernetics, and mathematics. Having studied different forms of conclusions by analogy on materials from the history of physics, Uiomov goes by identifying different types of conclusions by analogy, which involves analyzing these conclusions’ logical structure. He tries to find out what is a conclusion in general, and what is its logical structure. However, to finally clarify, the logical analysis of inference by analogy prevents the uncertainty of several basic concepts of logic, including — inference, premise, and basis of inference, structure, and rule. Inference, in the broadest sense of the word, is — “the process of finding thoughts, the true purpose of which is in some given relating to the true meaning of other thoughts — premises. Usually, the premises are presumed to be true, and the inference is a search for true conclusions” (Uiomov, 1970: 3-5). Whereas “analogy is an inference in which the conclusion relates to another subject, then that referred to in the premise” (Uiomov, 1970: 19). Uiomov sets himself the task — to explore how the principles can be used as a basis for the classification of inference and how they differ from each other. To do this, it is determined with the classification of conclusions by analogy and classification of models. But the most important task in the field of the logic of science for Uiomov was to determine the conditions of the legitimacy of various forms of conclusions by analogy, which will allow a different look at the problem of substantiation of scientific theories. (Uiemov, 1970).

It should be noted that in the early 60s of the 20th century, A. Uiomov works intensively on solving a wide range of problems. In particular, he explores philosophical categories (matter and consciousness, motion, space and time, cause and action, etc.), which in one way or another, are included in the content of the basic concepts of each science. Such concepts are things, their properties, and relations, according to Uiomov. But this does not mean that these categories are the main philosophical categories. Such categories rather include matter and consciousness, the interrelation between which determines the solution of major philosophical issues. “With the help of these categories is revealed the essence, the nature of the world around us. The concepts of things, properties and relationships are important for its disclosure structures” (Uiemov, 1963: 3-4). Misunderstanding the categories of things, properties, and attitudes will certainly lead to complications and errors in solving many scientific problems. To avoid them, a careful philosophical and logical analysis of these categories should be made.

It is worth paying attention to the fact that several works by A. Uiomov, in the early period of his work, were devoted to covering issues related to the knowledge of truth and clarifying how this problem is posed in the history of philosophy, along with he explores quite complex logical philosophical questions of the theory of knowledge, makes a philosophical analysis of the concept of truth.
In Soviet times, the research of scientists was carried out in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist historical and philosophical concept, from which it followed that the criterion for the truth of knowledge is not in the senses and not in mind. It should be sought its results in practice. Notice that Uiemov was not so categorical about the practical knowledge of the truth. He noted that the practice is certainly the most convenient, but not necessarily to bring everything to the production practice level because the experiment and observation of the phenomena that were predicted by the theory can have the greatest value (Uiemov, 1970: 57-58).

It should be noted that, in general, the study of the problems of the epistemology and methodology of science in the 60-80s of the 20th century is experiencing a significant rise. Odessa scientists dedicate their research to this problem. They intensively study the humanistic nature of scientific knowledge. Thus, G. Pylypenko researched the activity based on the understanding of the way of human existence, which requires the analysis of cognition as a creative goal-setting. He analyzes the nature of scientific knowledge, taking into account the provisions of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, who made instructions — to develop the activity and creative side in the study of the relationship between human being and the world as the main, defining essence of human knowledge because of the process of cognition in historical terms formation of “humanized human” (K. Marx). It can be considered in terms of two main stages: “naturalism (the process of human knowledge of nature and, thus, self-discovery in it), and humanism (human self-knowledge through the development of nature)” (Pylypenko, 1969: 4-6). However, Pylypenko notices that this does not mean that modern epistemology should be understood only as a human self-knowledge theory. It is necessary to make human existence a major reference point in understanding its cognitive activity. The scientist concludes that the essence of knowledge can be explained only by analyzing the way of being that distinguishes and distinguishes the human being from all nature, that is, through creative, purposeful being. The essence of human beings, their social essence can be understood and theoretically comprehended only through the disclosure of the meaning of their existence as a creative activity. Only the analysis of the epistemology, as the theory of human activity, allows us to comprehend not only the practical but also the theoretical, material, and spiritual sphere of human life through its creative essence (Pylypenko, 1969: 7-8).

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that in the Odesa’s Research School, a gradual emergence and search for new growth points of philosophical knowledge is observed, the culture of scientific work is formed and the focal points of all philosophical research are defined, which are related to the theory of knowledge and methodology of science.

Scientific-atheistic and sociological research of the Odesa’s Research School in the Soviet period

Analyzing Odessa scientists’ scientific heritage, it should be noted that a certain place was given to research on the theory and history of atheism, criticism of religious ideology. This is not accidental because, in the USSR, there were even Institutes of scientific atheism, and materialism was recognized as the only one worthy of a Soviet human being. From the very beginning, Soviet ideologues fought against those philosophers who denied materialism. To build communism, restructure human thinking, and create a new society, it was necessary to destroy the religious worldview, which, according to Karl Marx, strongly hindered this goal’s achievement. Therefore, atheistic propaganda and struggle were of country-wide importance, and atheism became scientific because of belonging to the Marxist worldview.
In Odessa scholars’ research literature, atheism was considered in various aspects as a social phenomenon, as a side of the materialist worldview, as a worldview of the individual, and others. Thus, L. Anufriiev on life examples shows how the principles, rules of human behavior, and moral norms reflect people’s real living conditions in each of the historical periods, noting that their content has a class character. He also covered communist morality, the laws, and norms of the Soviet person’s behavior, showing its superiority over religious morality.

Note that in the Soviet period, it was necessary to follow the principles of the moral code of the builder of communism, which stated that only communist morality would help to clarify the meaning of human life on earth, attitudes to work, family and marriage, war and peace, good and evil, etc. From the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist science, life is meaningful and brings happiness when there is no exploitation of humans by humans when all people have the opportunity to work and meet their material and moral needs (Anufriiev, 1972: 24-25). Putting in such an ideological framework, scholars had to compare the biblical commandments with the way of life of the Soviet human, elevating the greatness of the principles of communist morality, showing their undeniable superiority over individualistic, inhumane, in essence, the principles of any religion. They were called upon in the daily struggle against religious ideology, against moral precepts alien to socialist society.

Trying to explain the reasons for the emergence of religious faith in people in a socialist society, L. Anufriiev and V. Kobetskyi dedicate their joint research to the mechanisms of religion’s influence on human consciousness. They determine the direction, forms, means, and atheistic education methods based on a deep approach to solving problems of religiosity and atheism. These and other issues they try to solve based on a sociological study of religiosity and atheism. After analyzing the religiosity of the first decade of the Soviet period and tracing the spread of atheism among various categories of the population, L. Anufriiev and V. Kobetskyi conclude that the study of social problems, including problems of religion, in pre-Marxist philosophy and sociology, was based on speculation. Only Marxist-Leninist religious studies are based on constant analysis of real social processes (Anufriiev & Kobetskyi, 1974: 6-7).

The multifaceted sociological activity of scientific and social organizations has a beneficial effect on the successful development of the theory of scientific atheism and allows us to analyze the peculiarities of the process of overcoming religiosity in certain periods among various categories of the population of Soviet society. This experience of sociological research shows that in the practice of studying the problems of religion and atheism, there are several thematic areas, the main of which are — the study of religious consciousness; study of religious behavior; typological analysis of religiosity; study of the religiosity of young people, etc. Such sociological studies confirm the conclusion of Marxism-Leninism about the historically transitional nature of religion (Anufriiev & Kobetskyi, 1974: 135-140).

In general, the problems of atheistic education in Soviet times were given special attention. Such education had to be based on the work of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, who revealed the social essence of religion, showing that it, as well as politics, law, morality, science, art, is a form of social consciousness, each of which reflects a certain aspect of the life of society. In other words, people’s consciousness reflects the objective world. But this reflection, Anufriiev notes, can be both true and false. Here, religion is the specific form of social consciousness that reflects the objective reality distorted. At the same time, atheism is a system of views that prove any religion’s provisions’ failure. Atheism contains a philosophical, historical, scientific critique of religion (Anufriiev, 1978: 6-63).
In general, Odessa scientists’ scientific achievements include a wide range of research issues that, in one way or another, related to atheistic education. O. Kovalenko’s research in the field of interrelation and specifics of persuasion and suggestion and their manifestation in art is quite interesting. The scientist reveals the suggestive aspects of cult art through the psychological mechanisms of its influence, considers the integrative system of “television — cinema,” explaining its influence on some aspects of the formation of atheistic education. According to Kovalenko, the main method of atheistic propaganda (socialist) is the method of persuasion. In his research, he tries to show the specifics of persuasion and suggestion; tries to explain the mechanisms of the suggestive influence of cult art; analyzes the psychological mechanisms of religious consolation and shows how the integrative system of the then “television — cinema” on the formation of atheistic education (Kovalenko, 1989: 3-4). Knowledge of the psychological mechanisms of the suggestive influence of art will help to reveal the potential of suggestion as a means to develop counter-suggestion.

It should be noted that in the early ’80s of the 20th-century studies of Odessa scholars no longer have a categorical denial of religion; they offer the opportunity to rethink several issues regarding the position of religion and the church in society. There is some criticism in atheism, condemns harsh atheism and religious bigotry and intolerance (Kovalenko, 1989: 29-30). In general, works on scientific atheism only in the introduction and conclusions pointed to the anti-scientific worldview of religion and confirmed its dying nature, and the text itself scholars devoted to the objective presentation of religious material, which was analyzed in detail. However, such actions could not reduce the high scientific quality of these studies, as evidenced by Odessa scientists’ scientific works.

**Studies of philosophical problems of natural science, which were conducted by Odessa scientists in the second half of the 20th century**

In the early ’60s of the 20th century in the Odesa’s Research School, philosophical problems of natural science are developed rather intensively. In this area, there is a large direction with a variety of branches. Thus, S. Gurvich worked on the study of the relationship and connection between philosophy and medicine. He studied the history of the development of philosophical issues of medicine in literature, trying to justify the heuristic significance of dialectics as a general method of research in this area and show the importance of “connection” and “law” to define “disease” and “health.” The scientist focuses on developing problems of Marxist dialectics on the materials of specific sciences, giving a special place to medicine, which is part of the human sciences and is part of anthropology, as human problems are fundamental problems of Marxist philosophy. Medical science’s progress proves that medical thinking cannot be without philosophy because, for its development, it requires a synthetic study of the human body and objective laws of its functioning both in norm and in pathology (Gurvich, 1968: 3-7). Based on the development of major and minor laws and categories of dialectics, S. Gurvich shows the relationship and interaction of philosophy and medicine. He explains that specific medical material is important to consider in the light of the laws and categories of dialectics in terms of the creative application of these laws and categories as an effective basis for knowledge of reality (Gurvich, 1965).

In Soviet times, the community of Odessa scholars successfully studied the problems of systematization of philosophical categories. They explore dialectical thinking, which
is increasingly beginning to penetrate various fields of scientific knowledge, and focus on
the development of various philosophical categories. The greatest preference is given to the
problems of the category of time. Some researchers conduct a differentiated study of various
aspects of the manifestation of time factors in biological and social systems, as evidenced by
the study of biological time by naturalists. This category was studied by L. Roskolotko, whose
scientific interests were related to the development of philosophical problems of science.
He joins the concept analysis, which developed in classical mechanics, based on the study
of “physical time,” namely its geometrization. However, the scientist points out the main
drawback of which the essence of time is to try to measure the length of existence of the object
and establish a sequence of changes in its phases and states, while the dialectical-materialist
statement “time-form of the existence of matter” and “essence time-motion” to be revealed
more deeply when the movement will be considered as the development and formation of the
material world. Thus, the essence of time is revealed when its connection with the development
of matter and the formation of material things is established (Roskolotko, 1983: 5-7).

Yu. Stempurskyi devoted his scientific works to the study of philosophical problems
of natural science. He develops the process of cosmization of science, considering its
manifestation in biology and medicine, recognizing it as an important element in science
development. The essence of cosmization, the scientist notes, consists of overcoming
glocentrically limited views in science. The current stage of cosmism, associated with
overcoming geocentrism is one of the historically determined types of limited knowledge about
the world. The concept of “cosmization,” notes Stempurskyi, “is a process of overcoming the
historically determined limitations of human activity and knowledge, which is contained in
the transition from geocentrism to new types of non-geocentrism” (Stempurskyi, 1968: 3-7).
The process of cosmism leads to the unlimited expansion of human cognition, as evidenced
by its connection with the processes that characterize the stage of scientific progress of that
time — mathematization, cyberization, and industrialization of biology and medicine, with the
processes of differentiation and integration in its. This means that cosmism has an integrative
nature and contributes to the formation of synthetic knowledge, and leads to strengthening the
relationship between science and philosophy.

Historical-philosophical and aesthetic researches
in Odesa’s Research School in the Soviet period

Historical and philosophical research during the Soviet period was radically different
from the history of philosophy to which we are already accustomed. There was no point in
researching topics that had no prospects in the Soviet country, namely the history of Ukrainian
philosophy. Therefore, the scientific research of Soviet scholars mainly revolved around the
development of Lenin’s theoretical heritage and culture problems, which were one of the main
directions of Marxist science, and the history of Western philosophy was studied in the spirit of
“critique of bourgeois philosophy.” Therefore, the Odessa researcher R. Chernega focused her
research on the study and analysis of Lenin’s theoretical heritage on socialist culture, studied
its formation and development, considered issues related to the origin and development of
proletarian culture, studied the problems of its class character, heredity, the need to transform
the spiritual world of human beings and improve they personality based on revolutionary
transformations of the 19th century. (Chernega, 1969).
In the late 60s and early 70s of the 20th century, the rise in the study of ethical and aesthetic problems begins. This was the inclusion in the curriculum of universities of the USSR teaching courses in ethics and aesthetics. Scholars are actively developing aesthetic problems in the tendency of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. Thus, the Odessa scientist I. Zhukovskyi focuses on studying art in all its forms, paying special attention to the art of cinema. Notice that this type of art has always been under the close attention of party leaders, who controlled its ideological and artistic level, recognizing its mass, universality, and ability to influence peoples’ spiritual and emotional world. However, according to Zhukovskyi, to perform the social function of cinema is prevented by mechanistic determinism, which underestimates the mediating cause in the causal relationship of object and subject, which in this case is reduced to underestimating the role of the perceiving subject, and is ignored, that the latter refracts the object, which is perceived through the prism of a number of their psychological states, consciousness, needs, interests, and so on. It is the psychognoseological aspect, which reveals the course of reflective activity of the perceiving subject at all its levels — psychological and epistemological, reveals the complexity of the process of perception of films, the effectiveness of which depends not only on its ideological and artistic qualities but also on the level of spiritual development of the one who perceives it, including worldview, ideals, beliefs, tastes, etc. The viewer is not born with the ability to perceive the art of cinema. This ability should be educated (Zhukovskyi, 1977).

The problem of artistic creativity has always been at the center of the study of various areas of aesthetics. In her scientific works, Odessa researcher R. Maksymova tried to show how materialist views affect the process of artistic creation and the form of reproduction of reality. Artistic creativity, she notes, is a special kind of cognitive activity that reproduces reality in artistic images, and art and science are important independent means of cognition of reality. Art, being the highest form of aesthetic attitude to reality, at the same time is a kind of knowledge of the world around, and artistic and figurative reflection of reality is the active interaction of the artist’s consciousness with the objective world, and the deeper the artist penetrates the real world, his individuality is more revealed (Maksymova, 1973: 16-28).

In summary, it should be noted that an important place in the development of aesthetic problems was occupied by a comparative analysis of aesthetic traditions, features of classical and non-classical aesthetics, and many other research topics. In general, the growing interest among scientists in various sciences to aesthetic problems, and especially to the problems of creativity, led to the emergence of new sciences that were engaged in modeling mental processes.

**Conclusions**

It should be noted that in some places in the research conducted by scientists of the Odesa’s Research School, the social practice of that time was often embellished, many aspects of human existence were omitted from the field of research, and maximum ideological commitment was followed. However, it cannot be said that Odessa scientists’ scientific research was limited to such positions because the complex problems raised by scientists were much wider. Their solution was not based only on the ideological component but touched on various issues of universal problems. Thus, it can be argued that the research of the Odesa’s Research School, it is not engaged, ideologically, scientific research, but historically determined stage of development of national thought, in which the tradition of scientific thinking was not interrupted even in the...
most difficult times, there was a search for new growth points of philosophical knowledge, the culture of scientific work was formed in the difficult conditions of the totalitarian regime and enslaved freedom.
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