

дослідження з теорії знання про минуле. (Пер. з польск. та англ. В. Склокіна; наук. ред. В. Склоків, С. Троян). К.: Ніка-Центр. Зубрицька (ред.). (1996). *Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* Л.: Літопис.

Кулик, А. (2020). Маяки. *KOINE*. Отримано з: https://www.koine.community/root/%d0%bc%d0%b0%d1%8f%d0%ba%d0%b8/?fbclid=IwAR2hG5ueh0JUSb6W0G4OQKPIAprWY11RGAPТ_nPOJF15R_dkcd9HW3WmTnU

Томпсон, Е. М. (2006). *Трубадури імперії: Російська література і колоніалізм.* (Пер. з англ. М. Корчинської). К: Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи».

Diversity as a value in philosophy of science

Veronika Puhach

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (Kyiv)

Over the last few years, diversity became a trend. In fact, Merriam-Webster made it one of the words of the year 2011 (Word of the Year 2011), while another related word ‘feminism’ ranked #1 in 2017 (Word of the Year 2017 – Feminism). However, diversity is more than a word, it is an important value that has been implemented in different areas. What is worth noting is that it is not only implemented because of its moral value but also because it is beneficial to do so. For instance, according to research conducted by The Peterson Institute for International Economics and a report by McKinsey&Company, “a company with more diverse representation in senior management will likely achieve greater profits” (Strauss, 2018). Here, however, I want to draw attention to another potential benefit of diversity that has been explored in the area of philosophy of science: scientific research benefit.

Helen Longino puts forth the features of community structure which she finds important in the production of knowledge. These features are ways of expressing criticism, responding to it, assessment criteria of theories and equality of intellectual authority (Longino, 1995, p. 384). The last one is of interest to us since it is “intended to

require representative diversity in the community” (Longino, 1995, p. 385). She maintains that if diversity of the members of the scientific community is not required, it leads to biased views affecting the research because the values that affect it are shared among all of the participants in the research and are thus not noticed (Longino, 1995). A more recent paper by Daniel Hicks defends the influence of feminist value on scientific research. He explores a case of feminist influence in archaeology, where female accounts allowed to form a more accurate representation of the past than the ones formed by men (Hicks, 2014). He explains how this happened the following way, “the stone tools studied and assumed to be constructed and used by men are regarded as the most important kind of evidence about the Paleolithic human societies and “human origins”, and used to support androcentric hypotheses; while evidence that might challenge these androcentric hypotheses – such as stone tools assumed to be constructed and used by women – are regarded as less important and studied primarily by women” (Hicks, 2014, p. 3278). Both Longino and Hicks claim that feminist values helped to formulate more empirically adequate theories, whereas the criterion of empirical adequacy is largely recognized as important, says Longino (Longino, 1995, p. 386).

Making people from marginalized groups participants of scientific research seems to help to avoid biases that otherwise plunder the results of the research. What diversity tends to do is to pay attention to the diverse world that science explores, avoiding generalizations and simplifications. This, however, poses a challenge to traditional science, since without neglect of some details it is difficult to see the bigger picture and offer general laws. Longino explores this topic a bit and calls feminist values “pockets, ‘niches’, in which it is possible to practice alternative science that satisfies at least some feminist criteria” (Longino, 1995, p. 396). She calls the science that embraces diversity ‘alternative’, but can it become mainstream? I think that, eventually, it should, and what is now on the margins should become mainstream, but for that we need to recognize that it is impossible to account for every difference without simplifying anything. In that case, what we need is criteria to determine the basis on which some details can be dismissed, and others cannot. This could potentially improve the empirical adequacy of science but determining these cri-

teria (and whether it is even possible to set them) is hard work ahead for philosophers of science.

Reference list:

Hicks, D. J. (2014). A new direction for science and values. *Synthese*, 191, 3271–3295.

Longino, H. E. (1995). Gender, Politics, and the Theoretical Virtues. *Synthese*, 104 (3), 383–397.

Strauss, K. (2018). More Evidence That Company Diversity Leads To Better Profits. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karstenstrauss/2018/01/25/more-evidence-that-company-diversity-leads-to-better-profits/#420333df1bc7>

Word of the Year 2011. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20120112104337/https://www.merriam-webster.com/info/2011words.htm>

Word of the Year 2017 – Feminism. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/word-of-the-year-2017-feminism>

«Філософія підпілля» в інтерпретації Льва Шестова

Ірма Реріх

Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська академія»
(Київ)

Л. І. Шестов, його інтелектуальний спадок відкривають і тлумачать для нас світ тих, хто філософує з підпілля: світ тих, хто остаточно звільнився від мезотесу (відкинув його «доброчесну» необхідність), але ув'язнених в екстремумах, світ «отрешившихся», але «отреченных».

М. О. Бердяєв, близький друг Л. Шестова і його опонент у філософських дискусіях, окреслив шестовську думку так: «Філософія його належала до типу філософії екзистенційної, тобто не об'єктивувала процесу пізнання, не відривала його від суб'єкта пізнання, пов'язувала його з цілісною долею людини» (Бердяєв, 1939, с. 44). Варто відмітити, що з особли-