Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională
ISSN: 2066-7329 | e-ISSN: 2067-9270
Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 14, Issue 3, pages: 502-509 | https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/14.3/622
Submitted: January 25th, 2022 | *Accepted for publication:* June 10th, 2022

Physical Culture as a Basic Component of the Integral Cultural Act

Veaceslav MANOLACHI[1],
Nicolai VIZITEI[2],
Victor MANOLACHI[3]

[1] Dr.habil., university professor, State University of Physical Education and Sport, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, anticamerausefs@mail.ru
[2] Dr.habil., university professor, State University of Physical Education and Sport, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, +373 22 310586.
[3] Dr.habil., university professor, State University of Physical Education and Sport, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, usefs-drept@mail.ru

Abstract: The problem on the essence of the "physical culture" phenomenon is central in the sciences of physical education and sports. In recent decades, it has been given special attention, an eloquent proof being the fact that in the curricula a new discipline of study has been widely implemented: "Theory and methodology of physical culture". At the same time, there are conceptual difficulties: "physical" and "cultural" are already revealed in the initial treatment of the "physical culture" notion. It should be noted that the situation as a whole is, at the same time, paradoxical, because, in the sphere of philosophical-cultural knowledge, there is a lasting tradition of considering the physical as a basic, immanent component of physical culture itself. Practically the analysis of culture leads, always to the confrontation of the social with the material, sharpening the question regarding their real correlation, fact that arises in the broad context of the fundamental problem discussion.

Keywords: *Physical culture; knowledge; science; integral cultural act.*

How to cite: Manolachi, V., Vizitei, N., & Manolachi, V. (2022). Physical Culture as a Basic Component of the Integral Cultural Act. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională, 14*(3), 502-509. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/14.3/622

©2022 Published by LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Introduction

The problem on the essence of the "physical culture" phenomenon is central in the sciences of physical education and sports. In recent decades, it has been given special attention, an eloquent proof being the fact that in the curricula a new discipline of study has been widely implemented: "Theory and methodology of physical culture". At the same time, there are conceptual difficulties: "physical" and "cultural" are already revealed in the initial treatment of the "physical culture" notion. It should be noted that the situation as a whole is, at the same time, paradoxical, because, in the sphere of philosophical-cultural knowledge, there is a lasting tradition of considering the physical as a basic, immanent component of physical culture itself. Practically the analysis of culture leads, always to the confrontation of the *social* with the *material*, sharpening the question regarding their real correlation, fact that arises in the broad context of the fundamental problem discussion.

Results and discussions

1. Culture as a conjugation of the social and the natural. Society, in the ordinary sense of the word, does not mean nature, the social is not equivalent to the biological. At the same time, inevitably, the first has its origin in the second one. The notion of "culture" fixes the content of this process, reveals the general distinctive features of the physical and social in human being. And these features lie in the fact that the natural, generating the social, *is transformed* by that act and, in essence, acquires a newer, higher ontological status, and this is due to the fact that the social, in essence, is realized *reflexively* and thus , discovering its naturalness as *its own source*, which, however, ceases to be "simply natural". The physicist acquires the status of a *metaphysician* - a circumstance that remains outside the visual field in the sciences of physical culture and sports.

The cultural event appears at the point where two actions meet: from the natural to the social, from the social to the natural. At the same time, if the first action is realized as a "natural process", the second - as an "observable process" and implicitly, it manifests itself as something "supernatural". This kind of duality has been repeatedly attested in philosophical anthropology as the basic situation of human existence (and general-natural). M. Scheler stated: "Human being is a place of encounter… The primordial principle is perceived in human being in the same act in which human being is rooted in him" (1988, pp. 93-94). Culture is a situation

of production and self-production (this specification is absolutely mandatory) of human being. Human existence in its *bodily embodiment* is the place of the junction of the social and the biological, of a junction conditioned by the mutual attraction of the natural and the social. This encounter, in terms of all its dynamic moments, is the *process of* culture, but statically it is the measure of *the natural character* of the human being as a social being and it is the measure *of* its *social character* as a natural being. K. Marx mentioned: "The culture of human being can be judged by the extent to which its human essence has become nature and the extent to which nature has become the human essence of man" (1959, p. 58). The cultural process, according to the above-mentioned, has the character *of a shuttle:* it offers the *natural*, the physical the possibility to be realized in its higher forms - in forms of reflexive, conscious existence; it also gives the possibility to *social* to manifest in essence, namely, to realize as a reality that observes its own presence, to head to its origin, to take root in it and, in fact, to actualize the primordial of Nature, as well as of itself as the personification of this primordial. It could also be said that culture, being performed as a process, gives the social the possibility to be realized in its superior manifestation, to fulfill its unique role of space of a special "ontological collaboration". Therefore, society is "the definitive unity of human being 's essence with nature, the true revival of nature, the realized naturalism of man and the realized humanism of nature" (Marx, 1959, p. 118).

2. The function of human formation of the cultural act. The line of reasoning, which fixes the internal communion of the cultural and the physical, is marked even more clearly within the limits of the analysis in which it is about the cultural content of different types of human activity. Thus, M. Mamardashvili, analyzing the problem of "science and culture", states: "The purpose of science - to obtain objective knowledge - is achievable only because science itself produces the *subject of* this knowledge, which in no way is devoted to it and never it does not flow into any final form" (1982, p. 51]. H.G. Gadamer, analyzing the phenomenon *of* human *game*, states: "The subject of the game is not the player; at best, the game achieves its own embodiment through players… The mode of existence of the game is not one that involves the presence of a subject with a game behavior… Any game is the formation of game states… In the game, it is achieved by therefore, the way of its existence - this is the self-presentation, which, however, constitutes a universal aspect of the Nature existence " (1988, pp. 148-150). Therefore, the game itself produces its subject, and this becomes possible by virtue of the fact that the game process carries in itself,

as a basic inner impulse, the capacity of the nature of- *self-actualization*, *self-movement*. We will add that this capacity manifests itself more completely and more consistently in the space of human *corporeality*. To the extent that game is such a process, it is *culture*. Thus, the cultural process, in all cases, manifests itself as a *factor* of human formation, as a means of producing and reproducing the subject in all its fullness of its essential manifestations (and, therefore, inevitably, *corporeal one*).

Here, we discover something else: all kinds of human activity, considered as *cultural* phenomena*,* in a certain respect, have the same essence. Culture is a phenomenon, which is made up of objective, subjective and transcendent components. In terms of its subjective content, it presents itself as a special *matrix*, above which the human body is specifically superimposed, transforming at the same time (including the respective psychophysical processes) and creating the necessary premises for the manifestation of the transcendent. At a *subjective* level, the existence of culture presupposes the existence in human being of a spiritual-practical *image*, according to which he has an internal orientation towards the discovery and actualization of his primordial origin.

3. Corporeality as a basic reality in contemporary science about human being.

The problem of corporality, in fact, is fundamental in the sphere of humanistic knowledge as a whole. F. Nietsche also emphasized the need for a reorientation: "Faith in the body is more fundamental than faith in the soul. The phenomenon of the body is a richer, clearer and more perceptible phenomenon, which, from a methodical point of view, is suitable for advancing in the first place, without any prior determination of a meaning" (1990, p. 378). The reorientation towards the "body" is clearly delimited by authors who share philosophical conceptions different from those of F. Nietsche. Thus, L. Fejerbah mentions: "The initial position of the *previous philosophy* is the following sentence: The *ego is an abstract being, only contemplative, the body has nothing to do with my essence;* as for the new philosophy, it emerges from sentence: The *ego is an authentic, sensory being; the body enters in my essence; the body, in the fullness of its component, is my Ego, it represents my essence*" (1995, p. 186). By virtue of this fact, cognitively, the reasoning is just: "The first concrete fact, which must be noted, is the body organization of individuals and their attitude, conditioned by this organization, to the rest of nature" (Marx & Engels, 1945, p. 19). (Practically, the same position is occupied by the authors who propose that, as a basic object in the process of studying the essence of man, should be taken *the motor action* of the individual).

4. Culture as a metaphysically oriented process.

By virtue of the reflexive character, of specific self-confinement of human existence, everything that is natural in man proves to be defeated, taken out of the limits of "pure physics", acquiring the status of *metaphysical*. M. Mamardashvili mentioned: "In us only the metaphysician is truly human" (1993, p. 234). Culture even represents that in connection with which (or, one might say, within the limits of which) human being exists for himself as a metaphysical reality, with the status of a metaphysical subject. Therefore, culture, in its true forms, is always oriented towards the *reproduction of the metaphysical*. J. Hejzinga: "Culture must have a metaphysical orientation, or it does not exist in general" (1992, p. 264). *From the bodily point of view, human being is a metaphysical being.* This thought, in different terminological variants, is expressed in philosophy by many authors, who have analyzed the question on the essence of the phenomenon "human being". K. Jaspers considered that man is a being who must be able to "live from the depths of his means" (1994, p. 54), that is, from the transcendental; M. Heidegger: "The way where human being, in his authentic being, is in existence, is the ecstatic state in the existence truth " (1988, p. 328). M. Scheler: "Man's personality must be thought as a centre, which rises above the opposition of the organism and the surrounding world" (1988, p. 94).

The metaphysical state is a norm of human existence. The loss of the metaphysician or the diminution of his tone at the level of the society life as a whole, in the history of mankind, has always had the most serious consequences, being felt as a fatal disease of society. F. Nietsche wrote of the western culture of ancient Greece: "It is unlikely that any loss will be greater than the loss of the supreme possibility of philosophical life" (1990, p. 378). M. Heidegger, characterizing the situation of *modern* culture as a *crisis*, speaks about the loss of human being's *roots* in existence, in fact, of the loss, at the level of his existence, of his metaphysical dimension: "Now the very" root of today human being "is in danger (1991, p 106). M. Mamardashvili raises the issue of the importance of "individual metaphysics" - the need of man to preserve and strengthen his metaphysical orientation, as "elementary and minimum conditions of viability and fullness of the existence of social structures" (1982, p. 311), it is a very current statement in the context of today's events.

Considering man as a being of metaphysics and culture as a means of ensuring the reproduction of the metaphysical essence of man, allows us to look differently, more broadly at the very phenomenon of metaphysics (philosophy), in particular, to turn our attention to what, in fact, it happens

in the metaphysical act in all the fullness of the respective event. M. Mamardashvili, in this context, speaks about a *real* metaphysics, emphasizing that it is a "constructive metaphysics, and not descriptive or naturalistic… Whether it is a perception, a thought, love, bravery, anything, whether it is consciousness - all these, of course, represent the metaphysics in us. But not in the form of theory… Not. Metaphysics can act only through incarnations. Our body is put to work" (1993, p. 349). Thus, man is a metaphysical being not as a subject who reasons, but as a subject who realizes himself fully *bodily*. "Our body is put to work" - this is the vital clause for understanding the phenomenon of culture. Culture always works with the human body, recreating it, transforming it into *corporeality*. The cultural act is the main event of individual human existence, *mainly* already in the sense that it cannot be replaced by anything else, because it transfers the activity of the human body in a special regime, only on the basis of which the essential awareness and moral sense needs of the individual can appear

5. About the means of improving the personality physical culture.

Culture always has a *bodily orientation*, that is, it is always a *physical* culture. But, of course, it's not just physical. In any cultural situation, insofar as it has been fully realized, there are always present, in addition to the physical culture component, and others, no less fundamental: moral, theoretical-cognitive, aesthetic, relationships related to the phenomenon of faith. Culture is an *integral phenomenon*. Dividing it into separate types can only be conventional. If, for example, we are talking about aesthetic culture, in this case we must first of all discuss the fact that, in any activity, in which an aesthetic emotion is present (for example, in an artistic act), we get the opportunity, updating this emotion, to recreate the phenomenon of physical culture in all its fullness of manifestations, including (even first of all) the bodily manifestations. Also, one must understand the essence of the existence of any other case of culture: this is not a separate, independent type of culture, in the strict sense of the word, but a *specific component of the "general-cultural" event*. In one situation or another, we can, of course, be interested first and foremost in the specific role of a concrete component in becoming or maintaining an integral cultural event, but at the same time we will repeat that we must always keep in mind that it is, practically, a special case of existence of the cultural phenomenon in itself, and not of an integral, separate cultural act, which exists broken by the indicated phenomenon. And any case of culture proves to be fully understood by us only when it begins to be treated as a *corporeal metaphysical manifestation*.

From the above results a certain answer to the question: what would be the real means of acquiring and perfecting the culture of a certain type? This can be practically any activity - insofar as it proves to be able to recreate or strengthen the *situation of the culture itself*. M. Mamardashvili speaks of science: "Seen through the prism of culture, it resembles all other types of human activity (art, morality, law, etc.)" (1982, p. 42). In this context, it should be mentioned that, in general, no one has much objections, such as that, for example, *artistic* activity can really manifest itself as a means of moral or intellectual cultural development of the personality. Usually, no one protests even when in the scientific activity there is a possibility to manifest, supposing, as a means of aesthetic or moral improvement of man. But only in some separate philosophical works (and, practically, never, in works with a profile of physical culture and sports) is the statement regarding the possibility, for example, that the scientific act is a means of improving the physical culture of the personality. At the same time, it always happens in this way. (The opinion that we can consider theoretical-cognitive actions as a means of development and improvement of the physical in man shows, we realize, it is exotic. However, if, in trying to understand the physical in man, we will not place ourselves exclusively on positivist positions, then this perplexity can be easily overcome).

It should be noted, in particular, that the separation in the understanding of "physical" and "cultural", characteristic today of the physical education and sports sciences, can have absolutely undesirable consequences both practically and theoretically, if the *physical* component is analysed separate from the cultural-moral one. Or, the components of culture form a unity only in the context of a *moral experience,* in which man is presented as a man in an integral, authentic way.

Conclusions

The designation of the concept "physical culture" for the semantic core role of the complex of sciences about physical education and sports is fully justified. It opens up good prospects for modernizing that knowledge. But it is absolutely necessary to overcome the conceptual separation between the representations about the essence of the "culture" phenomenon, existing in these sciences, on the one hand, and in the philosophical-cultural sciences, on the other.

References

Fejerbah L. (1955). Osnovnye polozhenija filosofii budushhego [Basic provisions of the philosophy of the future]. In L. Fejerbah (ed.), Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedenija [*Selected philosophical works*], Vol. 1 (pp. 101-365). Politizdat.

Gadamer H-G. (1988). *Istina i metod. Osnovy filosofskoj germenevtiki* [Truth and method. Fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics] Progress.

Heidegger M. (1991). *Otreshjonnost'. Gelassenheit* [Secondment. Gelassenheit]. Vysshaya Shkola.

Heidegger, M. (1988). Pis'mo o gumanizme. V: Problema cheloveka v zapadnoj filosofii [Letter on humanism. In M. Hajdegger (ed.), *The human problem in Western philosophy*] (pp. 314-357.). Progress.

Hejzinga J. (1992). *Homo ludens. V teni zavtrashnego dnja* [*Homo ludens. In the shadow of tomorrow*]. Progress.

Jaspers K. (1994). *Nicshe i hristianstvo* [Nietzsche and Christianity]. Medium.

Mamardashvili M. (1982). Nauka i kul'tura [Science and culture]. In M. Mamardashvili (ed.), *Metodologija istoriko-nauchnyh issledovanij* [Methodology of historical and scientific research] (pp. 34-54). Nauka.

Mamardashvili, M. (1993). *Kartezianskie razmyshlenija* [Cartesian reflections]. Progress.

Marks K. (1959). Jekonomichesko-filosofskie rukopisi 1844 goda [Economic-philosophical manuscripts of 1844]. In K. Marks & F. Engel (eds.), Iz rannih proizvedenij [*From the first works*]. Politizdat.

Marks, K., & Engel, F. (1945). *Nemeckaja ideologija. Sochinenija* [German Ideology. Compositions], vol.3. (pp. 7-144). Politizdat.

Nietsche, F. (1990). *Chelovecheskoe, slishkom chelovecheskoe* [Human, too human]. Progress.

Sheler M. (1988). Polozhenie cheloveka v Kosmose. V: Problema cheloveka v zapadnoj filosofii [Position of man in Cosmos. In M Sheler (ed.), *The human problem is in Western philosophy* (pp.31-95). Progress.