літики найголовнішим понятєвим критерієм є "політико-владний ресурс". Геоекономіка – це похідна від геополітики наукова дисципліна, що базується на застосуванні методу "аналізу економіко-владного ресурсу". Отже, з точки зору змістовного критерію поняття у логіці ми виділяємо базові категорії для геополітичних і геоекономічних досліджень: а) політико-владний ресурс і б) економіко-владний ресурс. Політологофілософська зумовленість обох географічно детермінованих дисциплін змушує нас наділяти особливим значенням поняття "влада". За логічним об'ємом ці поняття є загальними. Однак їхня загальність залежить від контексту. Влада – поняття загальне, але водночас і пусте, адже множинне. Тут доцільно пригадати філософський дискурс Мартіна Хайдеггера, відповідно до екзистенційної сутності якого ми можемо назвати владу пустим поняттям. За логічним змістом, влада у геополітиці та геоекономіці є поняттям теоретичним.

Однак, ми з позицій міждисциплінарного підходу вважаємо за необхідне класифікувати "владу" як "емпірико-теоретичне" поняття. Логічне поняття розкриває, за Гегелем, "істинну природу речей". Істинна природа влади якраз і є головним проблемним запитанням геополітики та геоекономіки.

Mozgova N. G.
mozgova@gmail.com

FROM THE HISTORY OF TEACHING OF LOGICS IN THE SYSTEM OF DOMESTIC EDUCATION IN THE XX CENTURY

The logics as a science and academic discipline had many collisions in domestic education in the twentieth century which we can compare with the same big collisions that had happened to such potencial today sciences as genetics and cybernetics. The reason of these conflicts was the unique history of Russia and Ukraine, where the last was the part of the Russian Empire till the 90-ies of the XX century. This conflict is still mainly incomprehensible to Western historians of science. In rigid totalitarian system the truth was transformed into a subject of purely ideological manipulation and demerit, but lies and terror have become an end in itself of the totalitarian system.

Till 1917 logics as a subject was taught in all schools and universities of the Russian Empire, and the logical education considered to be as spiritual and as secular at once. After 1917 the attitude to logics radically changed and it found itself in complete neglect.

For almost 30 years in the Soviet Union young people didn't have elementary logic education that led to the young generation that is guided in their thinking and actions, by the revolutionary "logic chaos", "logic" of the totalitarian state, when any arbitrariness was justified. Returning of logics to the educational system of the USSR in the 40-50's of the XX century by J. Stalin was because of an urgent need to streamline and

strengthen the authoritarian state discipline on citizens of this state, when the truth of the premises unconditionally accepted and conclusions should enforce a peremptory manner.

Navrotskyi V.
navrotsk@gmail.com

CONTENT OF ASSERTIONS: TWO SEMANTIC THEORIES

Here I juxtapose inferentialism of mental statuses [Brandom R. B. Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 2000.] and argumentation semantics [Pollock J. Defeasible Reasoning // http://www.oscarhome.soc-sci.arizona.edu/~pollock]. The former explicates the conceptual content of assertions by the consequences of material inferences resulting from their performances. Formally, the transitions from premises to conclusion are represented by conditionals. However, modeling the material inferences by conditionals does not guarantee that these inferences are thereby the good ones. The transitions need justification. Argumentation semantics is the theory which can do this job. As a manipulating practice with conditionals, argumentation semantics has more resources for explication of "a game of giving and asking for reasons" [Brandom R. B. Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 2000.: 189]. Argumentation procedure particularly regulates the application of the inference rules, thus increasing the expressiveness of such explication. Therefore, the argumentation articulation naturally and essentially completes the formally good articulation of the materially good inferences [Brandom R. B. Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 2000.: 37].

Robert Brandom emphasizes non-monotonous character of the material inferences, which constitute the content of assertions. As a theory of defeasible reasoning, argumentation semantics proposes more detailed characteristic of non-monotonous inferences. Application of argumentation semantics excludes whatever suspicion about "automatism" in transferring mental statuses (commitments and entitlements) from the speaker to the listener. The reasons for this suspicion are the following postulates of inferentialism of mental statuses: "in asserting a claim, one is committing oneself to its being true", "endorsing or committing oneself to one proposition (claimable) is implicitly endorsing or committing oneself to others, which follow from it" [Brandom R. B. Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 2000].

On the other hand, inferentialism of mental statuses essentially contributes to understanding the normative dependences between the opponents of