
Lebedev, S., & Lebedeva, G. (2023). Western European philosophy on folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage. *Culture and Arts in the Context of World Cultural Heritage. Klironomy*, 2 (8), pp. 74-95. Ostrava: Tuculart Edition and European Institute for Innovation Development.

DOI: 10.47451/her2023-05-02

The paper will be published in Crossref, ICI Copernicus, BASE, Zenodo, OpenAIRE, LORY, HSLU, J-Gate, ASCI, Academic Resource Index ResearchBib, ISI International Scientific Indexing, ADL, JournalsPedia, Mendeley, eLibrary, and WebArchive databases.



Sergey Lebedev, Full Professor, Doctor of Philosophy, Tuculart Research Center. Ostrava, Czech Republic. ORCID 0000-0002-7994-2660

Galina Lebedeva, Associate Professor, PhD of Philosophical Sciences, Tuculart Research Center. Ostrava, Czech Republic. ORCID 0000-0002-2755-2003

Western European philosophy on folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage

Abstract: Scientific research should always be based on some kind of philosophical basis. Since ancient times, philosophy has also tried to find its answers to questions about pressing social problems, about the relationship of the universe with its laws and people. This fully applies to klironomy as well. Can cultural heritage be considered a philosophical problem? Undoubtedly, after all, figuratively speaking, the philosophical problem is knowledge about ignorance and some subjective assumption about an unknown phenomenon to be disclosed. Cultural heritage is not limited only to the presence of any historical ruins or texts of classical writers. At its core, the cultural heritage of the nation is folk traditional art. It is precisely this that should be considered as the fundamental basis of klironomy. The study object was the Western European philosophical thought about folk art. The study subject was the view of various representatives of Western European philosophy about folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage. The study purpose was to present the evolution of Western European philosophy about folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage. Logical, historical, comparative and deductive methods were used to achieve the set goal and solve the research tasks. The study used materials from prominent experts in philosophy of art, culture, and cultural heritage, e.g., Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Jurgen Habermas, Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Schiller, Valentina Maksimovich, Alexander Buychik, Elena Borzova. The author concludes that for the philosophy of klironomy to be born and develop, it is necessary to first create a philosophy of folk art as part of the philosophy of art. This is the task facing philosophers in the age of globalisation.

Keywords: philosophy of art, Western European philosophy, cultural heritage, klironomy.

Introduction

The cultural heritage of each nation is based not only on the texts of textbooks, museums, and historical monuments. At the heart of the culture of every nation is always something elusive. In the 19th and 20th centuries, both scientists and cultural figures widely used the concept of “spirit of the people” (“*Volksggeist*”) (Lebedev, 2021). This is the name of the most characteristic people’s features, which find expression in their culture and language. At the same time, the “spirit of the people” is often aimed at clarifying the meaning of its existence, at fulfilling a certain mission in the world. A systematic generalisation of national identity and awareness of this mission is called a “national idea”. Just as an individual thinks about what he lives for in this world, what he can get from this world and what he can give him, so nations think about their idea, their path and their

mission on their home planet. Each nation, of course, has its own national idea. Of course, national ideas can change in different historical epochs.

Scientific research should always be based on some kind of philosophical basis. Since ancient times, philosophy has also tried to find its answers to questions about pressing social problems, about the relationship of the universe with its laws and people (*Buychik, 2021a*) This fully applies to klironomy as well. Can cultural heritage be considered a philosophical problem? Undoubtedly, after all, the philosophical problem is, figuratively speaking, knowledge about ignorance and some subjective assumption about an unknown phenomenon to be disclosed. Cultural heritage is not limited only to the presence of any historical ruins or texts of classical writers. At its core, the cultural heritage of the nation is folk traditional art. It is precisely this that should be considered as the fundamental basis of klironomy (*Buychik, 2019; Buychik, 2021b*). It is necessary to consider what Western European philosophy has expressed about traditional art – the beginning of the cultural heritage of any country, any people.

The study object was the Western European philosophical thought about folk art.

The study subject was the view of various representatives of Western European philosophy about folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage.

The study purpose was to present the evolution of Western European philosophy about folk art as the basis of the national cultural heritage.

Based on the study purpose, the following tasks were set:

- trace the transformation of the philosophical thought of Western Europe in the field of art and culture;
- analyse the evolution of the philosophy of traditional applied art;
- determine the main reasons for the formation of the philosophy of cultural heritage from the philosophy of art.

Logical, historical, comparative, and deductive methods were used to achieve the set purpose and solve the study tasks.

The study used materials from prominent experts in philosophy of art, culture, and cultural heritage, e.g., Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Jurgen Habermas, Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Schiller, Valentina Maksimovich, Alexander Buychik, Elena Borzova.

Three revolutions of the 18th century and the birth of the philosophy of art

Up until the 19th century, when the philosopher spoke about cultural heritage, it basically meant only the ancient heritage in its classical forms. Philosophical thought also did not consider folk traditionally applied art for a long time, but not because it arrogantly ignored it. It is just that the concept of “folk art” and art in general were largely synonymous until the industrial revolution of the late 18th century. The difference between the way of life and the culture of the social “upper” and “lower” differed little from each other. Privileged groups of the population wore more expensive outfits made of exquisite fabrics, ate more delicious food from expensive and high-quality dishes, but in general, a person’s place in society and, accordingly, the possibility of joining culture was determined by his class affiliation. Recall that estates are a legal category that denoted the rights or duties of a person belonging to this estate. And yet, under the conditions of the domination of handicraft production, it was difficult to talk about any fundamental difference between “folk” and “elite” art (*Lebedev, 2021; Lebedeva, 2020*).

In the Middle Ages, art was considered both by artists, who belonged to artisans by their class status, and their main customer, the church, as a means of communion with the divine principle. Art is an imperfect image of spiritual, incorporeal beauty. In the Renaissance and in the 17th century, artists still referred to artisans, although the customers of artworks were, along with the church, also royal courts and estates of the aristocracy.

The situation changed only in the second half of the 18th century. During this historical period, three revolutions took place that completely changed the thoughts and deeds of the inhabitants of Europe and, in part, the whole world. It was a philosophical intellectual revolution that remained in history as the “Age of Enlightenment”. Also, the Industrial Revolution played a truly revolutionary role, which meant the transition from handicraft production to factory production. Finally, as the end of the era with the noise of battles, the political Great French Revolution thundered, changing the entire society in Western Europe. Recall that revolution is a qualitative leap in the development of something. It is no coincidence that scientists talk about the cultural, scientific, technical, and computer revolution. The revolution concept is most widely used in the cognition of social and historical processes as stages of the acquisition and disclosure of productive forces and abilities of mankind. In the era described, everything dramatically changes, and the changes were truly revolutionary. And it is now possible to talk about folk art.

It is necessary to consider all these revolutions in more detail.

What is the essence of Enlightenment philosophy? As it is easy to conclude from the name, enlightenment philosophers proceeded from the idea that all the disasters, sufferings, and misfortunes of mankind are caused solely and exclusively by people’s ignorance. Therefore, it is necessary to educate the people. Some educators even believed that as soon as the number of literates in Europe exceeds 51% of the population, all vices and crimes will immediately disappear. At the same time, the enlighteners themselves considered the people to be a bunch of unreasonable people, resembling children in their intelligence. It is clear that it is impossible to give free will to the people, just as it is impossible to give matches or weapons to children. All hope is for a philosopher on the throne, for enlightened absolutism, who will have enough power to enlighten the people and prevent any shocks caused by the darkness and rudeness of the social lower classes (*Lebedev, 2013, p. 43*). In general, educators paid considerable attention to the upbringing of a person. At the same time, all pedagogical directions of the enlighteners were characterised by a sharply negative attitude to folk traditions and everyday life. It is not by chance that in their pedagogical writings, the enlighteners, in particular, J.-J. Rousseau generally wrote that a child should be brought up on the island, so that no traditional customs, rituals and religion would interfere with the formation of a person’s personality. The ideal of man for the enlighteners was a kind of “natural man”, not connected with the whole antiquity. The “tradition” concept was evaluated by the enlighteners as something very negative, preventing the development of “natural man”.

The enlighteners were the first to use the “progress” concept, believing that humanity is moving forward to a brighter future, overcoming the inertia of religiosity, old prejudices and traditions. The “progress” concept in the historical conditions of the century sounded truly revolutionary. Thinkers of previous eras proceeded from the fact that the mankind development goes in a circle, everything repeats itself and there is nothing new under the sun. More pessimistic thinkers generally believed that the “golden age” was in the past, and now everything is getting

worse and worse. It is no coincidence that the ancient Greek poet Hesiod wrote, “The earth is now inhabited by iron people. There will be no respite for them either at night or during the day from work and from grief, And from misfortunes. The gods will give them heavy cares” (*Hesiod, 2001, p. 180*). Thus, the best life of mankind was in the mythologized past.

In the Bible, in the book of Ecclesiastes, it was said, “What has been, will be; and what has been done, will be done, and there is nothing new under the sun. There is something about which they say, “look, this is new, but it was already in the centuries that were before us...” (*Bartholomew, 2009, rh. 9-10*). Such were the judgments of the thinkers of traditional society. Over the past many centuries, most thinkers have continued to believe that the “golden age” can be returned only by returning to the bright past.

Now, enlightenment philosophers have given a very optimistic picture of the future mankind development. Progress, according to the enlighteners, goes linearly, i.e., a continuous line up. At the same time, the enlighteners introduced the “civilization” concept. This word itself comes from the designation of civil law. Thus, it was not the arbitrariness of the monarch, not religious prohibitions and permits, but the decisions of the citizens themselves about their fate – that meant a civilised country that had reached the highest level of social development. However, at that time, no country in the world met these criteria (*Lebedev, 2013, p. 43*). The famous Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary gave its classical definition of “civilization” from the viewpoint of 19th-century enlighteners and thinkers. With all categoricity, D. Karinsky, the author of the article claimed that “civilization is from the Latin word “*civis*”, “citizen” (adj. *civilis*, *civil*, from where “citizenship” is) is the state of the people, which they have achieved through the society development, life by society, and which is characterised by a departure from the original simplicity and savagery, improvement of the material situation and social relations and high development of the spiritual side” (*Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1903, p. 144*). The words “simplicity and wildness” in this definition meant, among other things, all folk art.

It should note that the “civilization” concept was originally inherent in French, and then British philosophical thought influenced by it. German philosophers continued to use the word “*culture*”.

The philosophy of the enlighteners was based on free thinking, i.e., there were no authorities for them, and rationalism, i.e., the desire to proceed from common sense in everything. The French enlightenment philosophers further elevated the authority and importance of reason and science. The enlighteners developed the “new society” concept, the core of which consisted of universal principles, ideals, and values: freedom, equality, justice, reason, progress, etc. The most important feature of this concept was futurism in the broad sense of the word, i.e., a radical break with the past and an aspiration to a “bright future” in which these ideals and values should prevail. Traditional culture, from the viewpoint of educators, also referred to “remnants of the past”.

Enlightenment philosophers believed that the ideals and values they proclaimed, thanks to the progress of reason and enlightenment, would cover all of humanity, since all people have the same nature, the same mind. The enlighteners sincerely believed that reason would provide solutions to all problems and tasks, three of which were the main and fundamental. Firstly, the highest form of reason – science – will give a rational explanation of the laws of nature and will open access to its untold riches. Nature will be conquered. Secondly, science will make interpersonal relations clear and understandable, which will allow building a new society based on the principles of freedom,

brotherhood, and justice. In the new society, all national and religious differences between people will disappear. Thirdly, thanks to science, a person will finally be able to know himself, master himself, put all his actions and actions under conscious, rational control.

As it can see, the enlighteners were fundamentally against tradition and traditional culture. However, since it was the enlighteners who laid the foundation for the entire modern philosophy of culture, it is necessary to state their views in detail.

Many educators considered the gap between the culture of the “upper” and the culture of the “lower” to be the main drawback of their time. The art separation from the people, their interests and needs, was first thoroughly considered in the treatise J.-J. Rousseau’s *“Discourse on the Sciences and Arts”*, written in 1750. In 1750, in Dijon, the local academy held a contest of scientific papers on the question “Did the revival of sciences and arts contribute to the purification of morals?” Most of the enlighteners, of course, said that material progress leads to progress in morality. J.-J. Rousseau negatively answered. He wrote, “Our souls have become corrupted as our sciences and arts have advanced to perfection” (*Berthier, 1789*). What gives rise to science and art? Only pride, vanity, and idle curiosity cause the science development. However, these vices lead to a weakening of courage and, ultimately, to slavery. J.-J. Rousseau noted that the sciences and arts serve despotism, “Sciences, literature and art... they cover the iron chains with which these people are entangled with garlands of flowers; they suppress in them the feeling of that primordial freedom for which they seem to have been born; make them love their slave state” (*Berthier, 1789*). So, J.-J. Rousseau rigidly opposed the natural, created by nature, and the cultural, created by man. Rousseau came to the conclusion that contemporary “learned”, “elite”, “high” art is useless for the people, lives at their expense and serves idleness and luxury. Therefore, art, divorced from the existence of the plebeian strata of the lower social classes, J.-J. Rousseau believed, should be abolished (*Lebedev, 2013, p. 119*).

At the same time, it is necessary not forget about the noble intentions of the enlighteners in their works and deeds.

However, it is not for nothing that Dante wrote that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. It appeared, if we literally proceed from the enlighteners’ philosophy, then the carriers of “wrong”, from their viewpoint, knowledge, should simply be destroyed in the name of a bright future. That is how the ideas of the physical elimination of “wrong-thinking” people who stood on the progress way were justified. Such indicator was the Great French Revolution of 1789. This revolution was the first example of an attempt to reorganise society on the basis of a predetermined scheme, based on the most advanced progressive principles of rationalism, which sharply opposed itself to all ancient traditions, e.g., during the revolution, a policy of “de-Christianisation”, during which many ancient Catholic churches and monasteries were destroyed and public buildings symbolising the “old regime” were ruined, was performed. The division of France into historical provinces was eliminated. Instead, departments bearing purely geographical names, such as the Upper Alps and the Lower Pyrenees, were formed. However now a man cannot see any Brittany, Provence and Languedoc on the administrative map of France.

A new revolutionary calendar, which abolished the chronology of the birth of Christ, was introduced. The new year began on September 22, the day of the proclamation of the republic. Instead of weeks, decades (ten days) were introduced, months were named like “*Germinal*” (spring shoots), “*Floréal*” (month of flowers), “*Prairial*” (month of meadows), “*Thermidor*” (month of

heat), etc. The revolutionary calendar did not last long (from 1792 to 1806), but people still use the metric system of measures introduced during the Great French Revolution. The modern legal system of the West except for the Anglo-Saxon countries is based on the Code of Napoleon, which, strictly speaking, is the brainchild of the revolution generated by the philosophy of Enlightenment.

At the same time, the revolutionary authorities attacked provincial local cultural traditions and dialects. In the name of “progress”, the revolutionaries fundamentally eradicated all local customs and crafts. One may be surprised that, despite two centuries of persecution, some artistic crafts have still been preserved in France.

The ideals of the Age of Enlightenment were widely spread in Russia throughout the 18th century. With all the enthusiasm of the neophytes, the Russian nation, more precisely, the enlightened nobility, attached to the latest achievements of Western civilization since the reforms of Peter I, caught all the latest innovations of philosophical thought emanating from France, the center of Enlightenment. The noble “Gallomania” became an occasion for ridicule by D. Fonvizin and some other writers of Catherine’s time.

However, in general, the philosophy of the French Enlighteners was met with the sincerest respect, since Empress Catherine II the Great herself set an example in respect for philosophers to her subjects (*Lebedev, 2007, pp. 21-22*).

The best agitation against the Enlightenment and the revolution was the revolution itself, the symbol of which was the guillotine. According to demographer B. Uralnis, 40% of the revolutionary generation of French men, who lived in 1789-1815, died. Even the height of the average Frenchman became less by six centimeters because all the tall ones were taken into the army, and they died under the tricolor banners, leaving no offspring, and the undersized stragglers remained in the rear, breeding their own kind. Facts such as the genocide in Vendee, a historical region in the west of France, in which at least 15% of the population was destroyed by the authorities of the republic during the pacification of the royalist rebellion, mass executions in Lyon and Nantes are widely known (*Lebedev, 2007, pp. 22-23*).

The following details were given in the book of the great English thinker Thomas Carlyle: “Let us note... two things, no more: blond wigs and leather production in Meudon. There was a lot of talk about these blond wigs. Oh, reader, they are made from the hair of guillotined women! ... The leather workshop in Meudon, which is not mentioned among other wonders of the leather business, strikes the human heart even more deeply. In Meudon ... there was a tannery for the manufacture of human skins; amazingly good suede-like leather was made from the skin of those guillotined who were found worthy of being stripped” (*Carlyle, 2007*). And then the Napoleonic Wars, which were a continuation of the wars of conquest of the French Republic, followed. In 1812, the whole of Europe tried to bring Western democracy to Russia with bayonets (*Lebedev, 2007, p. 23*).

The terror of the French Revolution was caused not only by the rampant passions or the response to the counter-revolution. In many ways, the future terror was justified, contrary to their own desires, by the ideologists of the Enlightenment. Since, roughly simplifying their philosophy, all the troubles and sufferings of humanity are caused by ignorance and superstition, it will be enough to divide all the ideas into right and wrong, and expose the latter. And what about the supporters of “wrong” ideas? The enlighteners themselves were models of tolerance and tolerance,

but not their epigones in politics. Terror is a natural means of affirming any “true” and “only correct” teaching (*Lebedev, 2007, p. 23*).

The end of the Enlightenment century caused N.M. Karamzin, an eyewitness to the events of the French Revolution, a remarkable Russian writer and thinker, very bitter feelings, “Who more than ours praised the advantage of the 18th century, the light of philosophy, the softening of morals, the widespread spread of the spirit of the public, the closest and friendliest connection of peoples, the meekness of governments?... We considered the end of our century to be the end of the most important disasters of mankind and thought that it would be followed by a combination of theory with practice, speculation with activity... Where is this consolation system now? It has collapsed at its base. The 18th century is ending, and the unfortunate philanthropist measures his grave with two steps to lie down in it with his deceived, torn heart and close his eyes forever... The Age of Enlightenment, I do not recognise you; in the blood and flames among the murders and destruction, I do not recognise you” (*Karamzin, 1964*). Many other great thinkers of Europe experienced similar feelings.

As a reaction to the French Revolution with all its terror, Romanticism arose in the countries of Europe, glorifying the primordial national roots of culture. All the events described in many ways also created the German classical philosophy.

The second half of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century were also marked by the Industrial Revolution. The main result of this revolution, which was not immediately appreciated by thinkers, was industrialisation, the transition from manual labour to machine production. Actually, industrialisation, which began in England, later spread to the countries of Europe and North America, encompassed the entire 19th century. The industrialisation result was not only the transition to mass machine production, but also a radical change in the whole society. A class society has come in place of the good old traditional estates.

The beginning of the industrial revolution was the weaving industry development in which machine tools began to be used. At the same time, the widespread use of the steam engine began, which, in turn, caused the rapid development of metallurgy, coal mining, the appearance of the first steamships and steam locomotives. Smoky chimneys, the whistle of locomotive horns, the fetid slums of big cities increasingly came in place of bucolic landscapes. The traditional society with its old customs and traditional art was a thing of the past. Modernity was coming. It was not just the industrial revolution that was taking place. Together with it, market relations triumphed, subjugating all previous human ties. There was a society secularisation, which largely displaced religion from public, cultural and political life. Man’s attitude to nature has also changed. Now everything natural was viewed from utilitarian positions. Tradition has become considered something outdated, worthy at best to be placed on the pages of textbooks.

The birth of the philosophy of art. Immanuel Kant

The new era has affected both philosophy and art. Actually, it has only now become possible to talk about the philosophy of art. An indicator of social changes was, e.g., a change in the meaning of the old philosophical concept of “*techne*”. Previously, the word “*techne*” and its Latin translation “*ars*”, as already mentioned, meant art in the broadest sense of the word, including science and intellectual activity. It is no coincidence that seven liberal arts (in Latin, *Septem Artes Liberales*) were taught in medieval educational institutions. These were the arts of words (grammar and rhetoric),

thinking (dialectics) and numbers (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy), and, finally, music. It should note that only music can be attributed to art in the modern sense.

Thus, *techné* is everything made by human hands. However, in the second half of the 18th century in Germany, reflecting the new reality, the word “*technology*” appeared. This word still meant art, but was increasingly regarded as an applied science. The main difference between technology and art (*ars*) was that technology means collective work, and is based on the material progress of mankind, while art remains the work of a single creator. That is how *techné* and *ars* concepts, which previously had a common meaning, diverged.

The creators of the new philosophy were outstanding German thinkers, the first of whom can be called Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Among his works, one can single out the book “*Criticism of the Faculty of Judgment*” (in German, “*Kritik der Urteilskraft*”), dedicated directly to the theory of art. In aesthetics, I. Kant distinguishes between two types of aesthetic ideas – the beautiful and the sublime. Aesthetic is what one likes in an idea, regardless of the presence. Beauty is perfection associated with form. Sublime is perfection associated with infinity in power (dynamically sublime) or in space (mathematically sublime). An example of the dynamically sublime is a storm. An example of the mathematically sublime is mountains. A genius is a person capable of embodying aesthetic ideas (Boržova, Buychik et al., 2015, p. 163; Kant, 2012). According to the philosopher, “art refers only to the fact that the most perfect knowledge, which does not immediately give the ability to make it. Kamperer (a Dutch doctor, an acquaintance of I. Kant) describes very precisely how the best shoe should be sewn, but he himself, of course, could not sew any” (Kant, 1963-1966, pp. 318-319). I. Kant noted that technical industrial production requires the fulfillment of certain rules, while genius itself gives art a rule (Kant, 1963-1966, p. 323). About these rules, he said, “Since the natural gift of art (as fine art) should give a rule, what kind of rule is this? It cannot serve as a prescription expressed by any formula, otherwise the judgment of the beautiful would be defined by concepts; this rule should be abstracted from the case, that is, from the work” (Kant, 1963-1966, p. 32). A genius is able to create rules where there are no pre-established rules.

At the same time, Kant noted the difference between the work of a craftsman and a lone genius: “imitation becomes aping when the student repeats everything exactly up to the ugly” (Kant, 1963-1966, pp. 335-336). This is how the period of contrasting “high art” and artistic crafts begins with him. Strictly speaking, such an opposition was characteristic of Renaissance thinkers, but I. Kant gave it a clear definition and philosophical interpretation. The activity of a craftsman working for the sake of income is opposed to the artist’s creativity, since, according to I. Kant, the artist performs “expediency beyond any purpose”, “the realm of visibility” (Kant, 1963-1966, pp. 223-224).

This is how I. Kant approached the theory of “pure art”, the meaning of which is that aesthetic pleasure is disinterested pleasure. The beautiful is not a property of things (Kant, 1963-1966, p. 214). Beauty is only beautiful; it is neither good nor bad as an end in itself.

As it can see, the philosopher contrasted the art of the artist and the work of the craftsman including the craftsman who creates in the field of artistic craft. “Art for art’s sake” is the goal of the artist’s creativity.

However, I. Kant did not strictly distinguish between “pure art” and products of folk-art crafts. It was no accident that he emphasised that every artist begins with imitation, that is, at the beginning of his creative path, he “fills his hand” by copying the works of his predecessors. At the time of I.

Kant, it was folk art that was the most accessible and understandable for all novice artists. Thus, it is possible to trace from Kant the ingrained idea that folk art is only an “early stage”, the beginning of “real” and “pure” art (Lebedev, 2020).

“Letters on Aesthetic Education from Munich” by Friedrich Schiller

Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805) was not only an outstanding German poet and playwright. Schiller can also be considered an outstanding philosopher. Among the theoretical works of Schiller, “*Philosophical Letters*” (“*Philosophische Briefe*”) and a number of essays stand out – “*On the Tragic in Art*” (“*Über die tragische Kunst*”), “*On Grace and Dignity*” (“*Über Anmut und Würde*”), “*On the Sublime*” (“*Über das Erhabene*”). The main work of F. Schiller on art was “*Letters on Aesthetic Education from Munich*” (“*Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*”). The Letters, published in 1795, formed the first programmatic work containing aesthetic criticism of modernity (Habermas, 1990).

Schiller’s philosophical views were strongly influenced by I. Kant. It is no accident that F. Schiller wrote in terms of Kantian philosophy and attributed a socio-revolutionary role to art. Art, he believed, can act as a unifying force instead of religion if it is understood as a “form of communication” that actively participates in people’s intersubjective relationships. F. Schiller understood art as a kind of communicative intelligence that would be realised in the “aesthetic state” of the future (Habermas, 1990). The philosopher understood art as the true embodiment of the collective mind of the nation. He justified the transition of a person from the physical to the aesthetic, and then to a reasonable state.

F. Schiller wondered whether it is timely to allow the beautiful to precede freedom, if “the events of the moral world are of much greater interest and the circumstances of the time so persistently urge philosophical curiosity to engage in the most perfect of works of art, namely the construction of true political freedom” (Schiller, 1875). As it can see, he believed that art is an environment in which the human race is preparing for true political freedom. The process itself does not relate to the individual, but to the collective interconnection of the life of the people (Habermas, 1990).

F. Schiller had a negative attitude towards highly specialized science, which is eliminated from the problems of everyday life: “The spirit of speculation sought eternal acquisitions in the world of ideas, but at that time it became an outsider in the sensory world and lost content for the sake of form. The spirit of practical activity, limited by a monotonous circle of objects, and in this circle even more limited by formulas, inevitably loses sight of the free whole and becomes impoverished with the whole sphere... The abstract thinker therefore often has a cold heart, because he dissects impressions that can touch the soul only in their integrity. The practitioner very often has a narrow heart, because his imagination, enclosed in the monotonous sphere of his studies, cannot adapt to someone else’s way of representation” (Schiller, 1875).

According to F. Schiller, only aesthetic education can make a person truly reasonable, since the aesthetic state of a person is in relation to a reasonable state intermediate between it and sensuality. It acts as a bond between the physical (passive) and moral (active) life of a person: “... the transition from the passive state of sensation to the active state of thinking and will is accomplished only through the medium of the average state of aesthetic freedom, and although this state in itself does not affect our understanding or the our beliefs and, consequently, leaves our

intellectual and moral dignity completely unaffected, yet this state is a necessary condition without which we cannot achieve understanding and beliefs in any way” (*Schiller, 1875*). To evaluate a person in a rational sense, one should first evaluate him as an aesthetic being. To bring up aesthetically means to bring up free, because beauty is always free (*Antiseri & Reale, 1997, p. 20*).

Romanticism and creating the foundations of the traditional applied art philosophy

I. Kant, F. Schiller and a number of other thinkers and cultural figures laid the foundations of the philosophy of art. Although they opposed the artist and the craftsman, but the very fact of comparison meant to recognise folk art as an independent direction in the artistic life of a person. A trend could have appeared in philosophy that made folk art central in its philosophical reflection.

However, European thinkers sooner or later should have paid their attention to the “low” art of the social lower classes. More precisely, initially philosophers paid attention to national identity, which largely determines folk art (*Lebedev, 2020*).

Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) was the first to do this. A native of East Prussia, who studied at Kant’s courses at the University of Königsberg, Herder lived in Russia for 12 years (from 1764 to 1776) and returned. J.G. Herder reproached scientists for not collecting the songs of their peoples. According to him, folk songs “... they would thereby give into their hands a living grammar, the best dictionary and the natural history of their people”. J.G. Herder’s philosophy was based on the concept of the “people’s spirit” (“*Volksgeist*”). This is the name of the most characteristic features of the people, which find expression in their culture and language. He was one of the first to use the concept of “culture” in its modern meaning – as a set of customs, rituals, value orientations. Previously, this concept, known since the time of Ancient Rome, meant what is done by man, as opposed to what is done by nature.

J.G. Herder’s philosophy of history looks completely different from the enlightenment one. Since nature is an organism developing according to the finalist project, then history can be explained only within the framework of this project, where God rules everything. Therefore, history necessarily realises the goals of Providence and God, and progress is driven not by human will, but by God, who leads humanity to the realisation of goals in their entirety. In the historical path, each phase has its own meaning. In contrast to the educational idea of the state, he puts forward the concept of “people” as a living organic unity (*Antiseri & Reale, 1997, p. 27*).

J.G. Herder preached the national identity of art, asserted the historical originality and equivalence of various epochs of culture and poetry. He noted there is no supranational or superhistorical criterion for assessing happiness and beauty. Each nation contains the center of its happiness within itself, just as a ball contains its gravity center within itself. All criteria are determined by historical and geographical circumstances. The philosopher believed that natural conditions have a predominant influence on the individuality of peoples. Climate, geographical conditions and habitat determine the nature of various historical phenomena. When the “distance” between two nations is large enough, they mutually evaluate each other’s ideals as prejudices. But such prejudices are not necessarily negative. According to him, “prejudice is good in its place and in its time, because it makes us happy” (*Lebedev, 2013, p. 119*).

However, how can we come to a genuine historical understanding of other unique nations and cultures? According to J.G. Herder, this understanding or assessment cannot be based on general or universal standards. He also rejects the notion that one era or nation can serve as the norm or

ideal for others. In this one can clearly see the criticism of the fascination with classical antiquity, which was so characteristic of thinkers and artists of that era. J.G. Herder also opposed the negative attitude towards the Middle Ages inherent in the philosophy of Enlightenment. In his opinion, the Middle Ages cannot be placed either above or below any other epoch. Like all historical epochs, it is an end in itself.

He introduced the concept of “folk song”, interpreting it very broadly – as “folk art”. In his opinion, the “folk song” is designed to revive the “imitative” forms of “learned” art, to give it a national identity. Composing the collection “*Voices of Peoples in Songs*” (“*Stimmen der Völker in Liedern*”) (1807), he included in it, along with ancient and contemporary folk songs, authors poems including Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, thereby striving to emphasize the unified nature of folk poetry and “high art”. At the same time, J.G. Herder collected folk songs of the Western Slavs.

In his main work “*Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*” (“*Ideen zur Philosophie der Menschheitsgeschichte*”), J.G. Herder outlined the project of a universal philosophical history of mankind. From his viewpoint, there is not and cannot be a single progress for all peoples. To the Slavs, as the young peoples of Europe, unburdened by centuries of “civilization”, the philosopher predicted a great future.

J.G. Herder sought to draw the attention of the Slavic peoples to their own national culture, which, undoubtedly, will soon bear abundant fruit. It was the Slavs, Herder believed, who would show the way “... to Europe immersed in sleep and force it to serve the same spiritual principle” (Herder, 1959, pp. 324-325). In that work, he devoted a special chapter to the Slavic peoples, noting the diligence of the Slavs, their desire for peaceful relations, condemning the enslavers, including the German ones.

However, J.G. Herder attributed only folk poetry and music to the folk spirit. In his opinion, language is a great humanity organiser. It is thanks to a common language that a nation arises. In folk poetry and song, the “spirit of the people” is manifested. However, J.G. Herder ignored folk art crafts (Lebedev, 2013, p. 120).

An incomparably more important contribution to the philosophical understanding of folk traditional art was made by Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814). He was one of the most prominent philosophers, notable even for the era when German classical philosophy was developing and rising. However, his first works were devoted to very abstract topics. Nevertheless, the defeat and occupation of the German states by Napoleon in 1806 dramatically changed J.G. Fichte both as a person and as a philosopher. From now on, the German nation and its “people’s spirit” became the basis of his creativity.

In the Age of Enlightenment there was no Germany as a state, there were many states of various sizes and political arrangements. The fragmentation of Germany was out of the ordinary: in 1789 there were 366 German states. Among them were Prussia and the Austrian Empire, which had the category of great powers, but most of Germany was a tiny entity. The “average” German state had several square kilometers of territory and several hundred subjects. Germany was also divided religiously: the Protestant north and the Catholic south had been at war with each other for centuries. At the same time, the Germans spoke a variety of mutually intelligible dialects, and the literary language created by Martin Luther was still quite artificial at that time, in which only educated people communicated with each other. Finally, in a country with centuries-old fragmentation, there were local cultural peculiarities. The Germans themselves half-jokingly, half-

seriously say that there are four Germanies: Germany of dark beer and Germany of light beer, Germany of red wine and Germany of white wine. And what united the Germans? Not citizenship, not religion, but culture. Germany was created not by rulers and generals, but by philosophers and poets.

In 1808, in French-occupied Germany, J.G. Fichte made his famous “*Speeches to the German Nation*” (“*Reden an die deutsche Nation*”), in which he expressed views not only on the nation as an object of research, but also on the role of folk art, including folk crafts, in which the “people’s spirit” was manifested. Since the Germans had no single state, no legal unity, or even a single religion, the foundation of the nation is determined through something that was not political, which, however, was then redefined as political. This something that united all Germans became language.

J.G. Fichte also drew attention to the need to educate national feelings. He noted, “... The means of salvation ... consists in the formation of a completely new self, which existed before, perhaps, only as an exception among individuals, but never as a universal and national self, and in the education of a nation whose past life has faded away and has become an attachment to someone else's life, which either will belong exclusively to her, or if it has to extend from it to others, it will remain intact at any division and will not suffer damage.; in a word: what I propose as a means of preserving the existence of the German nation is a complete change of upbringing” (*Fichte, 1808*). Fichte bluntly said that “my speech addresses this proposal primarily to the educated estates of Germany, since it is from their side that one can hope for understanding, and calls mainly on them to become the authors of this new creation and thereby, on the one hand, reconcile the world with their former activities, on the other – to deserve the continuation of their existence in the future” (*Fichte, 1808*).

He said that “... we are not talking about the upbringing of the “people” as opposed to bringing up the “upper classes”, because we do not want to use the word ‘people’ in the sense of “common people”, and it is not in the interests of the German nation to tolerate further use of this word in the latter meaning; we are talking about the education of the nation as a whole. If it ever comes true, there will be no need for a verbal designation of the miserable dream of finishing the child’s education as soon as possible and sending him back to work; this word usage will be eliminated as soon as they begin to study the essence of the matter” (*Fichte, 1808*).

According to the philosopher, “the education of the whole nation will not be expensive; the relevant institutions will be able to pay for their maintenance to a large extent, and their effectiveness will not suffer from this... However, even if this did not happen, the pupil, of course, unconditionally and at any cost, must receive a full and completed education. For half-upbringing is not one iota better than his perfect absence: it does not change anything, and if anyone demands such a half-upbringing, then it would be better if he also refused this half and from the very beginning would clearly state that he does not want humanity to be provided with assistance. Well, if we assume that the student remains in school until his education completion, then for the upbringing of the nation as a whole, while it is not yet fully implemented, teaching reading and writing alone is useless” (*Fichte, 1808*).

J.G. Fichte wrote about the active role of the German people, who themselves created history: “... in Germany, all education came from the people and succeeded only because it became their business” (*Fichte, 1808*).

He somewhat idealised the ancient Germanic tribes, believing that, living in the forests, they were at the same stage of culture that the Greeks were at in their heroic period. He believes that thanks to the ancient Germanic peoples, the best features were preserved in the national character of the European peoples, and these peoples themselves differed from others by the presence in their character of such traits as the love of freedom, equality, independence. According to J.G. Fichte, “for the emerging state not to return to Asian despotism, but to take in itself the universal equality of law already developed among the Greeks and Romans, it was necessary that its main elements imbued with a common European national character, a lively sense of law and freedom and love for them and combined with these features there is also a subtle sense of honor to make the state susceptible to the above-mentioned legitimate influence of Christianity on public opinion” (*Fichte, 1806*). The philosopher noted with patriotic pride that “It was precisely such elements that appeared on the face of the Germanic peoples, as if they had been preserved for these great purposes. I call here only the Germanic peoples; for the devastating invasions of other tribes did not have lasting effects, while the states of other origin that became part of the then European republic of peoples adopted Christianity and culture, for the most part, from the Germanic peoples” (*Fichte, 1806*).

J.G. Fichte had a huge influence not only on German thought during the struggle against the Napoleonic conquests, but also on philosophy as a whole. The comprehension of folk art that he started was developed by new generations of thinkers.

At the very beginning of the 19th century, under the influence of disillusionment with the Enlightenment philosophy with its belief in boundless progress, which ended with the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, Romanticism emerged – a special trend in art that opposed itself to Enlightenment in philosophy and classicism in art. If in Russia romanticism was primarily a literary trend, then in Western European countries, especially in Germany, romanticism embraced almost all aspects of human artistic activity.

For this topic, it is especially important that, in contrast to the enlighteners with their calls to discard everything old in the name of progress, the romantics, on the contrary, paid great influence to national folklore and traditional crafts. Representatives of the romantic school emphasized the primordial character of folk art, contrasting it as something natural, refined professional art. This was especially notable for the circle formed in 1805-1809 in Heidelberg, whose members turned to antiquity and folklore. For example, two of the members of the circle, brothers Wilhelm and Jacob Grimm, diligently studied the peculiarities of the language and folklore of the German people.

The emphasis on language learning was not accidental. As the great scientist of that time, the founder of the University of Berlin, the outstanding philologist Wilhelm Humboldt put it, “language is the spirit of the people, and the spirit of the people is its language”. W. Humboldt’s thesis about language as the spirit of the people should be understood in such a way that language finds its embodiment in the way of thinking of the people, and the way of thinking of the people is embodied in its language. Therefore, language is an external manifestation of the “people’s spirit”, since it reflects its national character, a complex of intellectual values and the totality of the culture of the people, its spiritual education.

Romantics, however, looked at folk art only as a source of their inspiration and as a manifestation of the “folk spirit”. They began to explore folk art somewhat later.

The 19th century was the time of forming most modern humanities, including ethnology. In Germany, not without the influence of J.G. Herder, J.G. Fichte and the Romantics, two scientific disciplines that study folk art have developed at once – ethnology proper, which studies the way of life and culture of the peoples of the planet, and the “science of the people”, or “folk studies” (in German, *Volkerkunde*), describing the folk culture of the German lands.

The most prominent of the German classical philosophers, Georg Hegel, was also interested in the “people’s spirit” and its reflection in folk art. The content of the national spirit, from the Hegelian viewpoint, had three sources:

- 1) “the initial disposition of the national character”, as something innate. Anthropology serves as the basis of scientific knowledge. The initial ones are racial differences that are modified into a national character;
- 2) they are directly related to the second source – the natural environment. The natural environment influences the process of formation of national character. G. Hegel considered the natural environment an important factor, although he attached less importance to it than J.G. Herder. He distinguished three types of natural environment – mountains, plains and the coast and tried to show how a certain type affects the specifics of the national character;
- 3) the conditions of time, i.e., traditions and historical circumstances.

G. Hegel believed that every nation has its special spirit, but not everyone is aware of it. Peoples with a developed culture can realise the uniqueness of their own spirit. The national spirit is aware of itself in religion, art, the system of law, politics, philosophy. The state is an organisation of a certain people, an objectified expression of the originality of the national spirit.

Speaking about the problem of intercultural dialogue, G. Hegel noted that a developed culture accepts foreign cultural elements externally, while undeveloped ones perceive other people’s ideas organically. He emphasised that people who actively accumulate other people’s ideas receive a kind of double upbringing (*Timofeev, 1996*). Thus, borrowing elements of someone else’s culture is a very useful phenomenon for people who are strong in their spirit.

Gottfried Semper and the definition of “artistic crafts”

The rapid development of the factory industry in Europe led to a rapid decline, and then to the almost complete disappearance of traditional artistic crafts. Meanwhile, even factory products need their own beauty, their own aesthetics. The good old examples of the art of classicism, dating back to ancient samples, in the new conditions clearly could not satisfy the craving for beauty, especially among the mass consumer who had just moved to a big city. Thus, a crisis has arisen in the art industry caused by the need to create a new art that requires establishing a relationship between artistic creativity, aesthetic awareness of the world and rapidly developing technological progress. Along with the revival of interest in various historical national styles, industrial products imitated the works of artistic craft of past eras.

The first to draw attention to this in 1805 was in Napoleonic France, when the work of the French writer Toussaint-Bernard Émeric-David (1755-1839) “*On the Influence of Painting on the Art Industry*” (“*Recherches sur l’art statuaire, considéré chez les anciens et chez les modernes, ou Mémoire sur cette question proposée par l’Institut national de France: Quelles ont été les causes de la perfection de la sculpture antique et quels seroient les moyens d’y atteindre?*”) was published. However, David was somewhat ahead of his time, the real interest in the art industry manifested itself somewhat later. Since 1849, the Journal

of Design, published by art theorist Henry Kohl, has been published in London on aesthetic problems of the subject world. At this time, the concept of “industrial art” came into use – industrial art, and even earlier “applied art”.

In 1851, the *World Industrial Exhibition* was held in London, which had a huge impact on many types and trends in art. Industrial goods and various handicrafts, machines, production methods, as well as minerals and works of fine art were presented at the first world exhibition. Although the main sensation of the exhibition was the Crystal Palace (a structure made of glass and metal, which became the 20th-century architecture prototype), great interest was aroused by works of folk art from different countries, and those that were quite combined with the most modern for that historical period.

Among those who were able to appreciate the results of the exhibition was the German architect Gottfried Semper (1803-1879). A participant in the revolution of 1848-49, a friend of the composer Richard Wagner, well acquainted with Michael Bakunin and Alexander Herzen, a renowned architect who influenced Art Nouveau artists who turned to applied art and the creation of everyday things, in the ideas of functionalists, Le Corbusier, Bauhaus, etc., G. Semper became famous as an art theorist. Shortly after the London exhibition, he published the book “*Science, Industry and Art*” (“*Wissenschaft, Industrie und Kunst*”), which provides a comprehensive artistic analysis of all contemporary culture through the analysis of those works of art that were presented at the exhibition in London. In it, G. Semper tried to give an analysis of modern culture from the point of view of the connection between mass industrial production and artistic creativity. Semper wrote that “Science is constantly developing and enriching life with newly discovered materials and natural forces that perform miracles, as well as new methods and technologies, new tools and machines. It is already clear that it is not the discoveries of science that now serve to satisfy demand, as it used to be in former times. On the contrary, demand and consumption cause the emergence of more and more new discoveries. The order of things has turned upside down” (*Semper, 1852*). Semper considered the style as a historically established phenomenon; he saw the reasons for the decline of architecture and crafts in the 19th century in the separation of technology and art, in the separation of decoration from construction. Linking the laws of shaping with the functions of works of art, Semper understood the artistic principle as a symbolic “garment” of construction and materials (*Lebedev, 2013, pp. 124-125*). He argued that there are and cannot be fundamental differences between architecture and applied art. There is no “high” or “low” art. All of them are equal in that they completely obey the general laws of nature and cannot go above it.

According to G. Semper, the shape of each thing is determined, firstly, by its function; secondly, by the material from which it is made; thirdly, by the technology of production of this thing.

Practically only G. Semper gave the concept of “artistic craft” (“*das Kunstgewerbe*”), reflecting the artist’s intervention in the production of material things to achieve a lost correspondence between the aesthetic and purely physical qualities of the forms of the objective world.

John Ruskin, William Morris and attempts to revive folk art crafts in Western Europe

In England, John Ruskin (1819-1900) was a prominent art theorist who turned to folk traditional art. One of the most famous classics of the history of art and the theory of aesthetics, the first professor of the Department of Fine Arts at Oxford University, J. Ruskin was very critical

of mass factory production, which killed traditional crafts. Factory production, in his opinion, led to the degradation of both the creator and the buyer of the goods. Ruskin not only wrote solid scientific articles, he also founded the monthly publication “*Fors Clavigera*”, published from 1871 to 1886, addressed to the workers and artisans of Great Britain.

J. Ruskin urged artisans to defeat the dehumanising effects of mechanised labour with the help of art and industrial workshops. Ruskin himself headed a craft workshop, in which wonderful examples of decorative and applied art were created. Ruskin said this about his views on science, art and literature, “Science is the knowledge of objects, both ideal and real. Art is the modification of real objects by our real power. Literature is a modification of ideal objects by our ideal power” (*Pisigin, 2018*).

J. Ruskin’s merit lies in the fact that he was the first to address the issues of industrial art. Before him, philosophy dealt only with the “fine arts” – music, poetry, painting. He, on the other hand, considered the art of everyday things to be a kind of fundamental in the hierarchy of arts. As he explained, clothes, utensils, furniture appear first, and only then paintings and statues. Thus, J. Ruskin attracted public attention to the art of household items. So, one of the main and first design theorists drew attention to folk art in the homeland of the industrial revolution.

J. Ruskin’s friend and follower, William Morris (1834-1896), a poet and artist, considered the forerunner of design, created the Arts & Crafts Movement, whose participants were engaged in the manual production of objects of decorative and applied art, striving to bring art and craft closer together. The movement aim was to popularise traditional handicraft production. The movement members were artists, architects, writers, designers, artisans, united by the belief in the superiority of handmade items over factory-made products. The Arts and Crafts Movement supporters’ works were distinguished by external simplicity, conciseness of forms, the desire of the creators to harmoniously combine form, functionality and decor. Following the example of medieval craft workshops, the movement supporters created guilds and craft societies, each with its own style, specialisation and leaders, in which they discussed their ideas and shared their experience. W. Morris, being a socialist in political views, demanded full equality of the movement members, the absence of official positions in it. The movement was organised according to the principle of the commune, in which the harmony of two types of labour – physical and intellectual – was realised.

It was not possible to create socialism in a single organisation of artists and artisans, but the contribution to the art of the Morris Movement was enormous. Furniture design, interior design, new approaches in a number of other applied arts – all this had an impact on many areas of 20th-century art.

Morris advocated the upbringing of the people’s artistic taste, the interpretation of creative work as the basis of morality, while offering a practical program for creating a new lifestyle. He proved that there is a relationship between the beautiful and the useful, that art can be socially useful, that the aesthetic is always connected with work. Morris was able to clearly prove that many elements of folk art can not only be preserved, but also develop new artistic products and entire trends in art based on them.

It should note that similar organisations have arisen not only in the United Kingdom. So, back in 1882, the international organisation *Les Arts Décoratifs*, which exists to this day, appeared in France. It was created with the aim of preserving works of decorative arts, as well as strengthening ties between authors-designers and manufacturers.

To a modern reader, it may seem strange that G. Semper and W. Morris are so fiercely committed to manual labor. This may look especially strange, given that many of the artistic achievements of their followers from among the artisans then began to be widely used in factory production. However, in reality, this is one of the reasons for artistic achievements. According to the doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor V.F. Maksimovich, “the basis and essence of each type of traditional applied art is manual labour and the conditions of creative success that follow from this: concentrated attention, perseverance, tension, endurance, passion for work, desire and ability to correct what is spoiled, incorrectly performed; search for a historical and theoretical basis or the basis of centuries-old artistic heritage; fatigue and joy of what they saw, performed of their own labour, and most importantly, after all this, there should be a desire to do this and nothing else again” (*Maksimovich, 2008, p. 9*).

Thus, contrary to the simplistic vision of the “progressives” who believed that the inexorable pace of technological progress would sweep away “backward” forms of artistic life from the face of the earth, even in European countries traditional art turned out to be very capable of existing and flourishing in conditions of industrial production.

20th-century Western Philosophy: Oswald Spengler, Julius Evola and the “new right”

The last century, with its wars, genocide, environmental problems, had a hard impact on art and philosophy. The names of the largest philosophical works devoted to the state of art are indicative – Oswald Spengler’s “*The Decline of the West: Outlines of a Morphology of world history*” (“*Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umrisse einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*”) (1918), Jose Ortega y Gasset’s “*Dehumanization of Art*” (“*La deshumanización del arte*”) (1925), Reinhold Niebuhr’s “*Moral Man and Immoral Society*” (1932), Vladimir Weidle’s “*The Dying of Art*” (1936), Romano Guardini’s “*The End of the New Time. An Attempt to Navigate*” (“*Das Ende der Neuzeit. Ein Versuch zur Orientierung*”) (1950), Paul Tillich’s “*The Courage to Be*” (“*Der Mut zum Sein*”) (1952). The dominant theme of philosophy was the problem of the crisis of arts and culture in general, as well as the search for the root causes of this. The legacy of the 20th-century philosophy of art is very great, but practically none of those who wrote on the topic of understanding the state of art did not touch folk art. If the previous 19th-century philosophers sharply distinguished “high” art from “common people”, then due to historical and economic circumstances it became meaningless to write about folk art in Western European countries due to the almost complete disappearance of folk art as such. Actually, folk art still existed in some lands of Germany, Spain, Italy, although the First World War of 1914-1918. The 1929-33 Great Depression, large-scale urbanisation largely finished it off.

In addition, folk art still existed in the countries of Eastern and Southern Europe until the Second World War. Moreover, in peasant countries folk art generally remained the only art available to the bulk of the population. However, the ruling elites of these countries pursued a policy of “modernisation”, “Europeanisation”, subjecting folk art to real persecution, imposing very simplified versions of Western art. In the Balkans or in the foothills of the Carpathians, folk homespun clothes, home-made shoes on their feet, a traditional musical instrument in their hands, along with the local dialect in their mouths, were the main difference between a “simple” person, separating him from gentlemen dressed “urban”, in bowler hats and ties. Most thinkers in these countries also saw folk art as evidence of backwardness. It is significant that even the deep

researcher of archaic myths and cultures, the Romanian-French philosopher Mircea Eliade, almost completely ignored Romanian folk art.

The 20th century was a century of great ideologies. Communism, fascism, social democracy, anarcho-syndicalism, various nationalist theories, possessed the masses. At the same time, all these ideologies shared an enlightening idea of the “civilization” progress and triumph, in which the “primitive” art of ordinary people was considered a relic of the past.

One of the most significant philosophers of the first half of the 20th century was Oswald Spengler (1880-1936). In 1918, when Germany was defeated in the First World War, Spengler published the first volume of the book “*The Decline of the West: Outlines of a Morphology of world history*”, which instantly became a sensation. This book was one of the most significant works of the last century. The philosopher opposed the single world-historical progress concept. According to O. Spengler, concepts like “humanity”, “progress”, etc., are empty words that generally need to be eliminated from the circle of historical problems. Only by getting rid of the magic of words a man can see the amazing wealth of “real forms” of cultural life. He understood history discretely (from Latin “*discretus*”). He believed that world history is not a single, infinitely ongoing process. On the contrary, world history itself is indefinable. It can be understood only as a set of neighbouring and changing each other, local cultures. These cultures are subject to certain laws in their development, passing through the stages of origin, development, flourishing and decline. Each local culture develops according to the laws of the development of a living organism and is endowed with its own soul. World history, according to Spengler, has only 8 great cultures. All of them have passed, are passing or will pass the era of their own heyday (*Spengler, 1993*).

Culture, according to O. Spengler, is a historical and cultural integrity that has developed over the centuries, a kind of internal unity of thinking, imprinted in the forms of economic, political, spiritual, religious, practical, and artistic life. The movement of history, its logic is the development and natural transformations (youth, flourishing, decline) of extremely generalised cultural and historical forms. However, at the same time, the philosopher used the concept of “culture” in a different way: a single culture of the same historical whole (according to him, a millennium is allotted to it) to the boundary that separates it from “civilization” within this millennium – a late stage of development, the rebirth of culture, a sharp fracture of all creative forces and the transition to processing already the material used by history. Civilization is a symptom and expression of the withering away of the whole as an organism, the decay of the culture that animated it (*Arndt, 1995*).

At the stage of civilization, O. Spengler believed, culture is only capable of improving technology and organisation. This temporarily allows her to even increase her own power. However, this will inevitably be followed by a complete collapse of civilization. At the same time, culture falls into a state of “fellohship”. So, by the name of fellah, an Egyptian beggar peasant, a direct descendant of the ancient Egyptians, who did not retain any memories of the great past of his country, his language and ancestral religion, O. Spengler called the state after the collapse of civilization. “Fellohship” precedes the birth of culture, and it also absorbs the remains of culture.

Although O. Spengler, who was clearly inspired by the ideas of Russian Slavophiles about a multitude of local civilizations, singling out culture as the basis, or “soul” of a separate civilization, still ignored folk art. The reason was simple: characteristic of the philosophers of Western Europe contemptuous attitude towards the peasantry, and it is the peasantry – the main creator of folk art.

The philosopher wrote about the villagers: “The peasant has no history. The village stands apart from world history, and all development, from the Trojan to the Mithridatic Wars and from the Saxon kings to the World War, bypasses these points of the landscape, sometimes destroying them, using their blood, but not touching the inner in them. A peasant is an eternal person, independent of any culture nesting in cities. It is a mystical soul, it is a dry, practical reason, the original and ever-flowing source of blood that makes world history in cities. He preceded culture, and he will survive it, stupidly continuing his kind from generation to generation, limited by grounded professions and abilities. Everything that culture invents there, in the cities, in the sense of state forms and economic customs, dogmas of faith, tools, knowledge and art – all this he eventually takes over incredulously and hesitantly, without, however, changing his essence... Remove the oppression of big cities from him, and he, having lost nothing, will return to his primitive state. His real ethics, his real metaphysics, which no urban scientist considered worthy of discovery, lie beyond any history of religion and spirit” (*Spengler, 1993*).

O. Spengler explained his contemptuous attitude towards the peasantry as follows: “The decisive and unappreciated fact is that all great cultures were urban. The “tall” man of the second millennium is an animal that builds cities. This is its own criterion of “world history”, radically different from the history of mankind in general. World history is the history of the urban man. Peoples, states, politics and religion, all kinds of arts, all sciences are based on one ancient phenomenon of human existence – the city” (*Spengler, 1993*).

As it can see, one of the greatest thinkers of the last century, who put the development and decline of culture as the basis of his work, nevertheless defiantly ignored folk art.

The Italian Julius (Giulio Cesare Andrea) Evola (1898-1974) can be attributed to the number of the century thinkers who turned to the primordial traditions, but again did not see and did not appreciate folk art. He is considered one of the founders of philosophical traditionalism, skeptically assessing progress and putting forward the idea of reviving ancient traditions. Culture and society are interpreted by J. Evola as traditional, “if the latter are guided by principles that simply transcend the human and individual level; if all public spheres are formed by the influence from above, are subordinated to this influence and are oriented towards the highest world” (*Evola, 1961*). In 1934 his book “Revolt against the Modern World” (“*Rivolta contro il mondo moderno*”) was published. J. Evola examined in detail the history of traditional societies, among which he particularly singled out the Indian caste society (*Evola, 2013*). The deep essence of his anti-modern traditionalism was that the traditionalist approach to history was not limited to the desire to preserve the outgoing image of social and political existence and the fear of the further development of technical civilization. J. Evola also raised problems unknown to the progressive paradigm of thinking, in particular, the problem of the correlation of politics, tradition and history, which later, at the end of the century, were destined to be firmly rooted in Western philosophical thought. However, the thinker and his very numerous followers and epigones talked about some abstract Tradition (with a capital letter), representing a very subjective interpretation of the traditional values of various societies. Italian folk art (at that time numerous artistic crafts still existed and were created in the country) did not receive attention in the works of the thinker.

In the second half of the century, the philosophy of art basically stopped writing about the crisis of culture. This, however, did not mean the beginning of a new prosperity. Political correctness, which in fact introduced the most severe self-censorship for any artist, the ideology of

postmodernism, which fundamentally abandoned the search for truth, and the policy of “*multiculturalism*”, led to the fact that the meaning between the categories of beautiful and ugly, between national and international culture, was lost. The philosophical thought of Western Europe in the late 1960s tried to find its answer to overcoming the spiritual and artistic crisis, to the loss of identity, eroded by mass immigration from non-European countries, as well as “pan-European” cultural policy. The result was the emergence of an intellectual group of the “new right”. The “new ones” differed from the usual rightists in their critical attitude towards capitalism as an economic system and liberal democracy. The main idea of the “new right” is that the modern West is experiencing a regression, which is reflected in the decline of culture, the degradation of education, the dominance of primitive tastes and the complete oblivion of historical traditions. The “new right” criticised individualism, universal “European values”, which from their point of view were only “metaphysics of subjectivity”. As one of the main theorists of the “new right” Alain de Benoit wrote in an article under the meaningful title “*The Religion of Human Rights*”, “Man is a cultural being. However, at the cultural level, there is no model for all of humanity. Historically, cultures have always developed in large numbers. In a purely human cultural sense, talking about “humanity” does not mean anything other than reducing culture to nature, simplifying history to biology. It is quite remarkable that adherents of the ideology of human rights fall just under this biological “reductionism” when they derive moral precepts from a circumstance related only to zoology” (Benoist, 2011).

As a positive ideal, the “new right” proposed a return to the original values of Europe, including even paganism. It would be logical to appeal to the “new right” to support and develop folk art in European countries, but this art is practically gone. There are interest groups that, in their free time, are engaged in, say, lace weaving, but this is only a hobby. In tourist centers, all visitors are offered “real” works of art crafts, but this is only kitsch. Unfortunately, in European countries folk art disappeared before philosophy paid attention to it.

Conclusion

So, for the philosophy of klironomy to be born and develop, it is necessary to first create a philosophy of folk art as part of the philosophy of art. This is the task facing philosophers in the age of globalisation. This does not negate the relevance of developing the direction of the philosophy of klironomy (klironomical philosophy), or the philosophy of cultural heritage, but warns of the need for an integrated approach to various areas of this direction, which for the 2020s have been developed and developed with varying degrees of depth and in some cases are extremely poorly developed.

References:

- Antiseri, D., & Reale, D. (1997). Dal romanticismo ai giorni nostril (Vol. 4). In D. Antiseri, & D. Reale, *Il pensiero occidentale dalle origini ad oggi*. La Scuola: Brescia. (In Italian)
- Arndt, M. (1995). Oswald Spengler. In Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon (BBKL). Band 10, Bautz, Herzberg.
- Bartholomew, C. G. (2009). *Ecclesiastes. I: Kobelet's investigation of life*. Baker Academic.

- Benoist, Alain de. (2011). *Au-delà des droits de l'homme: politique, liberté, démocratie*. Pierre-Guillaume de Roux Editions. (In French)
- Berthier, G. F. (1789). *Observations sur le contrat social de J.J. Rousseau*. Mérigot le jeune. (In French)
- Borzova, E., Buychik, A., Golikov, A., Orlov, I. et al. (Comp.). (2015). *Philosophy: A textbook*. St. Petersburg: SPbKO.
- Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary (Vol. 38 (75)). (1903). St. Petersburg.
- Buychik, A. (2019). *Klironomy as a science of preservation of cultural heritage*. Mauritius-France-Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Buychik, A. (2021a). The formation of klironomical thinking in the system of the social outlook. *Eastern European humanitarian collection of mini monographs. European Scientific e-Journal*, 1(7), 108-154.
- Buychik, A. (2021b). The relevance of the formation of the science of the cultural heritage preservation as the evolution of social and scientific thought. *Scientific View on the Modern Problems of Cultural Heritage and Arts in the Context of Social Development. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference. Klironomy*, 1(1), pp. 7-21.
- Carlyle, Th. (2007). *The French Revolution. A history*. Random House Publishing Group.
- Evola, J. (1961). *Cavalcare la tigre*. All'Insegna del Pesce d'Oro. (In Italian)
- Evola, J. (2013). *Rivolta contro il Mondo Moderno*. Edizioni Mediterranee (In Italian)
- Fichte, J. G. (1806). *Die Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters*. Im Verlage der Realschulbuchhandlung. (In German)
- Fichte, J. G. (1808). *Reden an die deutsche Nation*. In der Realschulbuchhandlung. (In German)
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Der Philosophische Diskurs Der Moderne: Zwölf Vorlesungen*. Polity Press (In German)
- Herder, J. G. (1959). *Selected essays*. Moscow, Leningrad: State Publishing House of Fiction. (In Russian)
- Hesiod. (2001). *Theogony. Labors and days. Shield of Hercules*. Moscow: Labyrinth. (In Russian)
- Kant, I. (1963-1966). *Essays in six volumes* (Vol. 5). Moscow: Mysl. (In Russian)
- Kant, I. (2012). *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Tredition.
- Karamzin, N. M. (1964). Melodor to Filalet. In N. M. Karamzin, *Selected works in 2 volumes* (Vol. 2, pp. 245-251). Moscow, Leningrad: Art Literature. (In Russian)
- Lebedev, S. V. (2007). *The word and deed of national Russia. Essays on the history of the Russian patriotic movement*. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization. (In Russian)
- Lebedev, S. V. (2013). *Philosophy and traditional applied art of Russia. A textbook for students of higher educational institutions studying in the direction of "Decorative and Applied Arts and Crafts"*. St. Petersburg: Higher School of Folk Arts.
- Lebedev, S. V. (2020). Folk art as a phenomenon of philosophical understanding. *Eurasia: Current Issues of Cultural Heritage. European Scientific e-Journal*, 3(3), pp. 15-36.
- Lebedev, S. V. (2021). Cultural heritage protection in the globalization context. *The Collection of Mini Monographs. Klironomy*, 2(2), 7-26.
- Lebedeva, G. N. (2020). Philosophy of cultural heritage: scientific and public organizations of the Russian Empire. *Eurasia: Current Issues of Cultural Heritage. European Scientific e-Journal*, 3(3), pp. 51-61.

- Maksimovich, V. F. (2008). Folk art of Russia is a national fact. *Traditional Applied Arts and Education. Materials of the 14th International Scientific and Practical Conference*. Moscow: Institute of Traditional Applied Arts. (In Russian)
- Pisigin, V. (2018, October 29). Illiers-Combray: in the footsteps of Marcel Proust's childhood. (In Russian). <http://pisigin.ru/photostories/phonograph/138/ile-kombre-po-sledam-detstva-marselya-prusta-2017/>
- Schiller, F. (1875). *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*. B.G. Teubner.
- Semper, G. (1852). *Wissenschaft, Industrie und Kunst*. Braunschweig.
- Spengler, O. (1993). *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*. Dt. Taschenbuch-Verlag.
- Timofeev, A. I. (1996). The concepts of the national spirit by G. Hegel and I. Ilyin. *Russia: Past, Present, Future. Materials of the All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference*, p. 67. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the Baltic State Technical University.