

# ЕКЗИСТЕНЦИАЛНА АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

## HUMAN FREEDOM AND FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN THE KURT FRANK REINHARDT'S EXISTENTIAL-THEOLOGICAL REALISM

**Serhii Shevchenko**

Doctor of Science in Philosophy, Professor,  
Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and History of Medicine,  
Bogomolets National Medical University  
*idei.filosofa@gmail.com*  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9713-3402>

[https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2026-1\(27\)-2\(28\)-33-45](https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2026-1(27)-2(28)-33-45)

### Анотация

**Сергий Шевченко. Човешката свобода и свободата на избора в екзистенциално-теологичния реализъм на К. Ф. Райнхардт.** В статията за първи път в украинския историко-философски дискурс се анализират идеите на Курт Франк Райнхардт, които представят спецификата на имплементацията на концептуалните положения на класическия екзистенциализъм във философската култура на САЩ. Неговите “екзистенциална антропология” и “екзистенциално-теологичен реализъм” се интерпретират като феномен на постекзистенциалисткото мислене, т.е. като културологичен синтез, който се отличава с методологически еkleктизъм и стремеж за развитие на екзистенциалистките постулати в процеса на създаване на нова философска концепция за човека, където централна категория е понятието “свобода”, а основен проблем – дихотомията между човешката свобода и свободата на избора. Показва се, че К. Райнхардт взема за основа аристотелово-томистката традиция на рационалистичното разбиране на феномена на свободата в контекста на съотношението “човек – свят – Бог”, но концептуално мислителят се опира и развива ирационалните възгледи на представителите на класическия екзистенциализъм. Такъв синтез, както е доказано в анонсираната статия, подтиква К. Райнхардт да решава проблема за взаимовръзката между свободата и кризата на човешкото съществуване в съвременната епоха чрез преосмисляне на ролята на християнството, а именно чрез тълкуването му в екзистенциален смисъл като “уникална духовна сила”, способна да възвърне цялостта на загубеното “Аз”. Човекът се интерпретира от учения като онтологично и метафизично зависим, но психологически и морално свободен. Без Божия вечен и всепроникващ “промисъл”, според него, не би имало нито хора, нито човешка дейност, нито човешка свобода. Разумът и волята формират основата за интерпретацията на понятието “свобода” в екзистенциалната антропология на К. Райнхард. Съвременната цивилизация, както доказва мислителят, се намира под сериозна заплаха, тъй като вечните ценности, интелектуалните и моралните истини започват все повече да се отдалечават от реалностите на материята и природата, така че материалната реалност, лишена от ръководството на разума и рационално просветената воля, отстъпва пред спящата сила на случая и биологичния подтик на волята към прилагане на сила. В резултат на това К. Райнхард подчертава забравянето от страна на човека на “екзистенциалната” цел на собственото му съществуване. Творчеството на К. Райнхардт представлява своеобразен еkleктичен синтез на томисткия рационализъм с етическите, онтологическите и антропологическите постулати на екзистенциализма, което може да бъде потвърждение за развитието на постекзистенциалисткото мислене в съвременната епоха.

**Ключови думи:** пост-екзистенціалістсько мислене, екзистенціална антропологія, екзистенціално-теологічний реалізм, “свобода на вибір”, “свобода на автономію”, духовна революція

### Анотація

**Сергій Шевченко. Свобода людини та свобода вибору в екзистенціально-теологічному реалізмі К. Ф. Райнгардта.** У статті вперше в українському історико-філософському дискурсі аналізуються ідеї Курта Франка Райнгардта, які презентують специфіку імплементації концептуальних положень класичного екзистенціалізму в філософській культурі США. Його “екзистенціальна антропологія” та “екзистенціально-теологічний реалізм” інтерпретуються як феномен постекзистенціалістського мислення, тобто, культурологічний синтез, який відрізняється методологічною еклектикою і намаганням розвинути екзистенціалістські постулати у процесі створення нової філософської концепції людини, де центральною категорією виступає поняття “свобода”, а проблемою – дихотомія свободи людини та свободи вибору. Показано, що К. Райнгардт бере за основу аристотелівсько-томістську традицію раціоналістичного розуміння феномену свободи в контексті співвідношення “людина – світ – Бог”, втім концептуально мислитель спирається і розвиває ірраціональні погляди представників класичного екзистенціалізму. Такий синтез, як доведено у анонсованій статті, спонукає К. Райнгардта проблему взаємозв'язку свободи і кризи людського існування в сучасну добу вирішувати завдяки переосмисленню ролі християнства, а саме витлумаченню його в екзистенціальному сенсі як “унікальної духовної сили”, здатної повернути цілісність занепащеному “Я”. Людина інтерпретується вченим онтологічно та метафізично залежною, втім психологічно і морально вільною. Без Божого вічного та всепронизуючого “промислу”, на його думку, не було б ні людей, ні людської діяльності, ані людської свободи. Розум і воля формують в екзистенціальній антропології К. Райнгардта підґрунтя для інтерпретації поняття “свобода”. Сучасна цивілізація, як доводить мислитель, перебуває під серйозною загрозою, оскільки вічні цінності, інтелектуальні та моральні істини починають все більше віддалятися від реалій матерії і природи, так що матеріальна реальність, позбавлена керівництва розуму і раціонально просвітленої волі, поступається сліпій силі випадку та біологічного потягу волі до застосування сили. Як наслідок К. Райнгардт наголошує про забуття людиною “екзистенціальної” мети власного існування. Творчість К. Райнгардта уособлює своєрідний еклектичний синтез томістського раціоналізму з етичними, онтологічними та антропологічними постулатами екзистенціалізму, що може бути підтвердженням розвитку постекзистенціалістського мислення в сучасну добу.

**Ключові слова:** постекзистенціалістське мислення, екзистенціальна антропологія, екзистенціально-теологічний реалізм, “свобода вибору”, “свобода автономії”, духовна революція

### Abstract

**Serhii Shevchenko. Human Freedom and Freedom of Choice in Kurt Frank Reinhardt's Existential-Theological Realism.** This article offers the first analysis in Ukrainian historical-philosophical discourse of the ideas of Kurt Frank Reinhardt, highlighting the specific reception and transformation of classical existentialist concepts within American philosophical culture. Reinhardt's “existential anthropology” and “existential-theological realism” are interpreted as manifestations of post-existentialist thought – a cultural synthesis characterized by methodological eclecticism and an attempt to further develop existentialist principles through a new philosophical concept of the human being. In this framework, the notion of freedom emerges as a central category, particularly in relation to the dichotomy between human freedom and freedom of choice.

The study demonstrates that Reinhardt draws upon the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition, which offers a rationalistic understanding of freedom within the “man–world–God” relationship, while simultaneously engaging with and developing the irrationalist perspectives of classical existentialism. This synthesis enables Reinhardt to address the interrelation between freedom and the crisis of human existence in the modern age through a reinterpretation of Christianity as a “unique spiritual force” capable of restoring the integrity of the weakened self.

In Reinhardt's view, the human being is ontologically and metaphysically dependent, yet psychologically and morally free. He argues that without God's eternal and all-pervading guidance, neither human existence nor freedom would be possible. Within his existential anthropology, reason and will provide the foundation for interpreting freedom. At the same time, modern civilization is seen as being under serious threat, as enduring values and moral truths increasingly diverge from material reality, which, deprived of rational guidance, becomes subject to chance and instinctual drives.

Reinhardt ultimately emphasizes that this condition leads to a loss of awareness of the existential purpose of human existence. His ideas thus represent an eclectic synthesis of Thomistic rationalism and existentialist thought, confirming the development of post-existentialist philosophy.

**Key words:** post-existentialist thinking, existential anthropology, existential-theological realism, “freedom of choice”, “freedom of autonomy”, spiritual revolution

**Introduction.** The concepts of “existential anthropology” and “existential-theological realism” proposed in this study are not considered in the traditional understanding of existentialist anthropology, which has developed over a long period of time in the Ukrainian historical and philosophical thought. In the latter, such an anthropology is understood as the anthropology of philosophy of existentialism, as evidenced by the relevant works of the employees of the Department of Philosophical Anthropology of the Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy (Tabachkovskyi, 1996; 2004; Khamitov, 1999; 2021), the departments of philosophy faculties of various universities of Ukraine, and the departments of philosophy or humanitarian disciplines (where even the concepts of “existential anthropology”, “existentialist anthropology” and “anthropology of existentialism” are not distinguished between, but are actually interpreted as synonymous in the syllabi and educational-scientific programs for the specialty “philosophy” for master's and postgraduate students) (*The program of the professional entrance examination ...*, 2021; Khmil; Kovalchuk, 2013).

Professor Yemelianenko in the article “On the phenomenon of existential anthropology ...” (2013) revealed a similar situation with such mixing in the process of distinguishing between the concepts of “existential anthropology” and the anthropological ideas of the “classics of existentialism” in Russian historical and philosophical thought. It was this researcher who made the first attempt at a methodologically new reading of the history of the study of the meaning and content of these phenomena in modern humanitarian and philosophical thinking.

Thus, Emelianenko believes that the interpretation of these terms only as anthropological and religious-anthropological views of the founders of existentialist thinking in our time sharply contrasts with the need to create a new research idea about the essence of modern symbiotic formations of a post-existentialist nature.

A significant transformation of the philosophy of classical existentialism at one time was recorded in Ukrainian historical-philosophical science, where the main attention in the study of this process was paid to the emergence of a system of so-called cultural syntheses of classical existentialism with various branches of philosophy (anthropology, axiology, ethics, aesthetics, phenomenology) and humanitarian disciplines (sociology, psychology, psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, political science, pedagogy), etc. Professor Raida has initiated a systematic historical-philosophical study of this process, which was defined as the emergence of “post-existentialist thinking” in his works (1998; 1999; 2009). The formation of such post-existentialist cultural syntheses as existential phenomenol-

ogy, existential anthropology, existential sociology, existential psychology, psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, existential political science, existential pedagogy, existential theology, etc., in his opinion, was caused by “the need to solve the problems of the further development of modern philosophical and humanitarian knowledge, increasing its volume due to a specific (existential-phenomenological) understanding of spheres of a person’s existence that are not subject to rationalistic methods” (Raida, 1999). Raida connected the emergence of these new and essentially existentialist meditations in the post-existentialist, unexpected form of cultural syntheses with a great number of new problems in the historical-philosophical understanding of this direction of philosophical thinking: “How and why did classical existentialism change the form of its existence? Is it possible to interpret the “invasion” of existentialism into the field of humanitarian knowledge as the emergence of a qualitatively new type of philosophical thinking, or is it simply a phenomenon of the spread of the ideas of classical existentialism in the field of modern humanitarian culture? How does post-existentialist thinking differ from the existential type of philosophizing that accompanied the formation of “theoretical philosophy” throughout the entire period of its development? How does this thinking differ from the philosophy of classical existentialism, the beginning of which is usually associated with the works of Søren Kierkegaard, and finally, from the traditional philosophy?”

One of the first problems that historical-philosophical analysis faces in this situation, as noted by the Ukrainian scientist, is the problem of classification, which would take into account not only external signs, the form of existence of post-existentialist thinking, but also its content, essential expression of its “principles” and “laws”. The difficulties of such a classification, in his opinion, arise not only as a result of the convention, “the ephemerality” of the existence of the very subject of its definition (post-existentialist symbioses in each specific case can with a sufficient degree of probability be included both in the existentialist thinking and in the corresponding humanitarian discipline, to which such a thinking joins: sociology, psychology, ethics, aesthetics, dialectics, theology, etc.), but also due to the conventionality of the boundaries of synthesized concepts, the introduction of ideas from a wide variety of other philosophical trends, concepts, schools, directions into these symbioses. Given this, almost every one of the newly defined post-existentialist syntheses, in his opinion, could be considered a kind of philosophical eclecticism.

Existential anthropology of Kurt Frank Reinhardt (1944; 1960), Stephen Ross (1973), Edgar Bodenheimer (1971; 1980), William Horosz (1975), Michael Jackson (2005) also combines, for example, the ideas of classical existentialism, phenomenology, personalism, philosophy of life, realism and pragmatism – and all this is also “mixed” with modernized theology and religious philosophy. It is undeniable that the definition of the boundaries of anthropological philosophy due to different explanations and interpretations of the term “anthropological”, sometimes extended to the whole philosophy, also affects the possibilities of definitive classification and definition of existential anthropology (Raida, 2009, pp. 263 – 264).

Some researchers (Premawardhana, 2020) try to justify the relevance of existential anthropology for ethnographic approaches in the context of studying world Christianity. This relevance, according to them, lies not only in the ability of existential anthropology to convey the complexity of everyday religion, but also in the connections of existentialism itself with many aspects of the past and present Christian theology. Such an opinion, of course, touches on the practical side of the problem of the correlation of Christian theology and existentialism, which was also studied by Ukrainian scientists (Shevchenko, 2016; Yemelianenko, 2018).

“The practical importance and necessity of using the type of knowledge contained in the system of post-existentialist concepts convinces that its research is a really important and absolutely necessary matter in modern historical-philosophical science” (Raida, 2009, p. 312).

Based on these conceptual and methodological developments, we will try to analyze in more detail this type of philosophical anthropology on the example of the Kurt Reinhardt’s ideas, in particu-

lar, in the context of interpreting his work as a phenomenon of post-existentialist thinking, i.e. cultural synthesis, which is distinguished by methodological eclecticism and an attempt to develop existentialist postulates in the process of creating a new philosophical concept of man, namely, to show what place the concept of “freedom” has in it.

### **Integral realism on the problem of the relationship between “spiritual determinism” and human freedom**

Kurt Frank Reinhardt (1896 – 1983) was an American Germanist of German origin, philosopher and educator, was Professor at the Department of Modern European Languages and of the German Studies Department at Stanford University from 1930 to 1962. His most famous philosophical works are: “A Realistic Philosophy. The Perennial Principles of Thought and Action in a Changing World” (1944) and “The Existentialist Revolt” (1952). His first acquaintance with Kierkegaard dates back to the years of the World War I. From 1919 to 1921, his philosophy teachers were Karl Jaspers at the University of Heidelberg and Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger at the University of Freiburg. Their personalities and their works left an indelible impression on Reinhardt’s consciousness. Immigrating to the United States, Reinhardt became one of the German intellectual emigrants who introduced the ideas of existentialism to the New World.

In his work “*A Realistic Philosophy. The Perennial Principles of Thought and Action in a Changing World*” Reinhardt set himself the goal of formulating the main provisions of the “Eternal Philosophy” (“*Philosophia perennis*”) on the basis of true (integral) realism. The work consists of four chapters:

1. Being and Reality (Metaphysics);
2. Human Action and Moral Values (Ethics);
3. Human Action in State and Society (Political Philosophy);
4. Man, as Producer and Consumer (Economic Philosophy).

In the conclusions, the author examines the issue of the relationship “man – world – God”.

In the second chapter, “Human Action and Moral Values (Ethics)”, Reinhardt addresses the problems of human freedom and freedom of choice. When analyzing this problem, the author relies on the views of Aristotle, Blessed Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, debates with Immanuel Kant, refers to Jacques Maritain and the early Martin Heidegger, the influence of the latter two was of decisive importance in the formation of Reinhardt’s worldview within Catholicism. First of all, the German-American philosopher asks the question how to determine what is the Highest Good and whether its achievement provides the acquisition of happiness? Using the Aristotelian-Thomist approach to solving the question, Reinhardt (1944, p. 123) draws a demarcation between beings “who act with the knowledge” and beings “who act without the knowledge”, while emphasizing that “only a rational being can obtain lasting happiness”. According to the researcher, “action with the knowledge” involves movement in the direction of achieving a certain goal. After all, it is the person who most clearly initiates his own actions and clearly performs them with an awareness of the goal or the future end. The actions of a person, a rational animal, are thereby different from the actions of subrational beings that have spontaneous will in the meaning that it does not contradict their own inner nature, which prompts them at the level of instincts or reflexes.

Thus, Reinhardt proves (1944, p. 124) that human actions, proceeding from an internal source and striving for a rationally known and determined goal in advance, are free. However, not “every action” of a person can be considered “human” or “free” without some guidance from within. Action, as a free manifestation of the will, to become uniquely human, must be caused by “the deliberate judgment of the human intellect”. “Such a free or deliberate intellectual judgment, however, can only be exercised by a being which is capable of knowing the nature of the True as well as the nature of the Good”. Thus, the author persistently substantiates the close relationship and interdependence of metaphysics and ethics. Reinhardt concludes that “human freedom has its roots in human reason

or human judgment, and that without rationality there would be no freedom. Conversely, the denial of human freedom implies the denial of rationality. Any consistently deterministic "ethics" is actually a contradiction in terms because a moral philosophy or ethics is only possible on the basis of human freedom. The entire moral life of man, including the moral qualifications of every specifically human act, rests on the reality of *free will* or *free choice*". Freedom, according to Reinhardt, is completely based on reason, which justifies any free action. Accordingly, every "human action" is an action of free will. Actions of free will, however, are by definition impossible if the will is subjected to coercion or violence. By "free actions" the author understands those actions that are ordered and initiated by the will. In Reinhardt's existential anthropology, reason and will form the basis for interpreting the concept of "freedom".

In his monograph, the author also raises the problems of existential-theological ethics related to the interpretation of the relationship between freedom, human will and human's perception of God: "If, however, the will were to find itself face to face with the Absolute Good or the good as such, it would meet, so to speak, with the sum total of the objects of its desire and would therefore embrace of necessity this ultimate end and object of the "rational appetite." In other words, if an immediate or direct and unobstructed vision of God were possible in this life, the will would no longer "will" or strive but would rest in the attainment and fruition of perfect beatitude" (Reinhardt, 1944, p. 126). Reinhardt interprets ethics or moral philosophy not only as a science of human actions, but, more deeply, as a science of the ultimate goals of human actions. This kind of ethics, according to the scientist, informs us both about the proper use of human freedom and about the adequate means that must be adopted to achieve the goals proposed and presented by reason. Based on these positions, Reinhardt does not accept the thesis put forward by Kant in his "Critique of Practical Reason", by which he postulates an internal and irreconcilable opposition or antagonism between nature, on the one hand, and freedom, on the other. Reinhardt criticizes Kant's complete self-determination or "autonomy" of rational will as the supreme law and condition of morality. Thus, in his opinion, freedom and morality are excluded from the world of phenomena or things, consisting of the data of intramental experience, mediated by innate or a priori forms of reason.

Reinhardt (1944, p. 127) does not share Kant's opinion that "Morality and moral freedom, therefore, cannot be established or substantiated by "theoretical reason". Without moral freedom, however, morality and with it a meaningful and purposive human life would be an impossibility. Moral freedom, therefore, must be "postulated" and its reality affirmed by "practical reason" which bases its certitude on inner experience. For Kant the reality of "the moral law within" is as indubitable as the reality of "the starry sky above".

To Kant's declared primacy of ethics over metaphysics, of action over thought, which exactly overturns the pre-Kantian philosophical position, Reinhardt opposes the Aristotelian-Thomist tradition, which for centuries considered the fundamental function of the "theoretical mind" (metaphysics) to establish the foundations of "practical reason" (ethics) in the study of metaphysical nature and the foundations of human freedom until Kant's personal teacher Christian von Wolff (1679-1754). Kant, on the other hand, as Reinhardt believes (1944, p. 128), finds such foundations in the empirical facts of moral conscience – a practical confirmation of a moral law that does not need any metaphysical justification. Therefore, a man, according to Kant, is a member of two worlds or systems: a natural, physical, material system, in which every thing is strictly defined and in which a man functions as a necessary product of the causal texture of the "phenomenon"; and a supersensible, spiritual and moral system in which a man acts as a free or autonomous being. These two systems the philosopher understands as unrelated, but also defines as strictly opposite to each other. In the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition, on the other hand, the system of reason and spirit, as well as the system of morality or freedom, are rooted in the system of nature, both systems have a common foundation and expression in the system of being. Based on such counterarguments, Reinhardt considers God

the author of nature, in particular, the material or physical nature of man, as well as the rational and moral nature of man: he is the author of human freedom.

Reinhardt also subjects his conclusions (1944, p. 129) to critical analysis, asking the following: "But if thus God is the prime author of all acts, is He not also the exclusive author of all so-called 'free' or human acts? And are we not then committed to a 'spiritual determinism' as rigid as the mechanistic determinism of the positivists and materialists?". This question, the researcher emphasizes, was actually answered in the affirmative by those who attributed freedom only to the world soul (Averroes, Schelling, etc.) or to the world spirit (Hegel), but not to individual souls and will. Fatalists concluded that there is neither freedom nor chance, only necessity (Spengler).

The solution to this problem, according to Reinhardt (1944, pp. 129-130), can be found only in a philosophy that guards the boundaries of both the Absolute and the relative, clarifying their nature and relationship and thus saving the relative from extinction or absorption through the Absolute and vice versa. Such a solution is proposed in Thomistic philosophy, primarily through its deep analysis of the nature of divine transcendence, according to which "...man could neither be nor be free without God. The fact that man in his being and existence depends on God's being and existence, far from preventing him from being fully man, rather firmly establishes him in his human nature and therewith in his freedom".

Therefore, as Reinhardt argues, man depends on God in his essence (in *ratione entis*), but he is independent or free because he is directly involved in the contingency of these deterministic relations and activities that are embedded in his human nature. He then concludes that a man can be considered ontologically or metaphysically dependent, but psychologically and morally free. ...without God's eternal and all-pervading "providence" there would be neither people, nor human activity, nor human freedom.

Reinhardt also addresses (1944, p. 130) the problem of the relationship between values and freedom of choice. According to his position, if a man is free, he can choose between values or goods. This statement in turn means that a man does not choose and in fact cannot choose anti-value, or desire negativity as such. Referring to Aristotle, Reinhardt (1944, p. 132) reminds us that the good in the general meaning is a value, and in the metaphysical meaning it is recognized as one of the transcendental attributes or aspects of being, and the act of free choice is correlated with a "reasonable" desire. However, in this life the human will never encounter the Absolute Good, but only relative and individual goods and values. The will, therefore, seeks cognition of the good as such, but finds the good only in a form of specific goods, seeks these relative goods and values. In other words, a man does not have freedom of choice in achieving the ultimate goal, or perfect and absolute value, but he has freedom of choice regarding intermediate goals, as well as those means that are presented to him in a form of specific goods or values.

To implement the cooperation that exists between human thinking and human will, on the one hand, the reason that provides a vision is used, and on the other hand, the will that causes an action. A man uses his intellect, according to Reinhardt (1944, p. 134), to proceed to will through action, and he uses his will to proceed to thinking (reasoning), intellectual understanding, and moral judgment. If we follow this repetitive interaction or mutually conditioned intellectual deliberation and free decision to its ultimate roots, then we return to the reasoning from which we started: we reach the original act of "rational will" or "intellectual appetite" that as such proceeds from the deepest foundations of human nature. The possibility of this first act of "rational expression of will" or "willed deliberation" through "rational appetite" is determined by the "Primary Cause" or the Primary Mover of human nature and all its abilities and activities, that is, God.

In further substantiation of his own concept of freedom, Reinhardt turns to the existential Thomism (neo-Thomism) of Jacques Maritain, in particular, to his work "Freedom in the Modern World", in which a distinction is made between "freedom of choice" and "freedom of autonomy".

This distinction helps Reinhardt to show the limitations of human freedom. In his opinion, freedom is a distinctive feature of the character of human personality. Thus, since there are different degrees of personality among people, Reinhardt argues (1944, p. 135), there are correspondingly different degrees of freedom. Human freedom itself allows for various degrees of realization or growth, i.e., in fact, it is dynamic, not static, since it is capable of growth in direct proportion to the growth of the perfection of the human personality. Man's obedience meets the requirements of his rational nature. A man, actualizing his possibilities as an individual to a higher degree, is able to realize the potential of his own freedom more and more deeply. Therefore, a man, using his own freedom of choice as best as possible, can approach the highest degrees of freedom, however, "freedom of autonomy" or complete and absolute self-sufficiency and self-determination can only be attributed to the highest form of personality – the Divine Personality.

The theoretical provisions of Catholicism do not provide for the possibility of a mere mortal person reaching the level of the Divine Personality, but this does not mean at all that such an aspiration must be abandoned. According to Reinhardt (1944, p. 136), on the contrary, a man purifies himself by realizing the possibilities of his rational nature, to the same extent he also purifies his capacity for will or freedom of choice. The closer a man gets to the "freedom of autonomy", the less he will be able to use his own freedom improperly, the less he will be subject to the influence of external circumstances, the influence of which only distracts and humiliates, as well as to his own internal uncontrollable emotions and passions. On the contrary, he will acquire more and more control over himself and become "autonomous". A man can be said to be more free, not when he makes right or wrong choices under the pressure of external circumstances, but when he has reached a stage where he is able to always do right or always choose well (or rather "the best"), that is, when natural desire and moral obligation are consistent with one another. Only then can one truly say that a man is free: free from both external and internal limitations and captivity.

As we can see, Reinhardt rejects both absolute determinism and absolute indeterminism in the interpretation of the problem of freedom and freedom of choice. Based on the Aristotelian-Thomistic teaching about the nature of human freedom, the scientist seeks to affirm both the greatness and the weakness of man: his existential ethics honors and exalts one, without denying the other. His concept of integral realism resonates with Jacques Maritain's concept of integral humanism. Reinhardt strives to formulate and develop such a philosophy that would be equally understandable and accessible to both a modern scientist and an average reader, that is, a "living philosophy" in a double meaning: it must be alive, and the one whose principles and concepts could be embodied in real life. The thinker calls such a philosophy realistic, which is both alive and suitable for life, has its roots and is woven into the foundation of our reality. In his opinion, this is its main difference from the philosophy of classical realism and its affinity with classical existentialism. Reinhardt himself (1944, p. 136) was convinced that the philosophy he proposed actually existed for a long time, but it could and should be reformulated in the terms and within the modern thought. Such a philosophy in a human reason and in a human freedom, according to the scientist, finds signs and symptoms of greatness in comparison to which the whole Universe seems small. Human, as an intelligent and free animal, thus acquires an extraordinary significance: he is the end in one respect and the beginning in another; the highest animal and the lowest mortal spirit.

Reinhardt places the relationship "man – world – God" in the sphere of human will, which implies independence, self-determination, autonomy, and freedom. These concepts allow us to talk, on the one hand, about the genius of the human race, and, on the other hand, about various forms of modern social and everyday life, relations between individuals, groups, states and nations, which are far from ideal: in many places, conditions remain terrible and primitive. Such a situation may prompt an unbiased observer to conclude that the entire burden of implementing a man's cultural and social destiny rests on the future generation. Reinhardt considers such an opinion wrong, because it nulli-

fies the greatness of a man. Through his works, he demonstrates that a man, by virtue of his mind and freedom, has often risen and is always able to rise above the sequence of purely physical facts and events, above the processes and laws of nature and history. The time of crisis, according to the scientist, requires us to be ready for new tasks, to solve new issues. Reinhardt predicted that the next generation would feel and be tempted by nihilism. To overcome such a situation, he assigned the great mission of philosophy and religion, which will be obliged to restore, first of all, the image of a man in its original form of purity and its true intentions. This will allow a man to once again face his own true "I" and the reality that he trusts, then a man will be able to get out of his depressed situation with a heightened sense of personal responsibility and a new desire for moral actions in personal and social life.

The German-American thinker is also convinced that "A human existence that has once been shaken to its very depths is usually more willing to face squarely the fundamental problems of life and death than one which knows of neither height nor depth" (Reinhardt, 1944, pp. 241 – 242). Here, Reinhardt's work is clearly influenced by Jaspers with his concept of "boundary" situations. Three words from the saying "Operari sequitur esse" (action follows being), Reinhardt emphasizes (1944, p. 242), "express the relationship which exists between thought and action, between theory and practice, between speculative and practical reason, between metaphysics and ethics. Every "existential" philosophy – whether it be that of St. Augustine or that of Martin Heidegger – will have to subscribe to this truth. And as a philosopher's understanding of "being" determines his understanding of life, so "human being" for St. Augustine has its frame of reference and ultimate term in Divine Being, while for Heidegger both being and life terminate in death and nothingness. ... "Human acts" in the proper sense of the term, on the other hand, have their roots in and emanate from "human being"". In substantiating the foundations of his ontology, Reinhardt relies on St. Augustine, Maritain and polemicizes with Heidegger.

For Reinhardt (1944, pp. 242 – 243) "Life itself, ..., is most luminously manifested in the wise and good man, the lover of truth and goodness and beauty. The interior life of man is strong enough indeed to transform and reform reality in his own image. And this power is the power of pure human "being": being which radiates and begets action". In the conclusions to his book, the thinker calls for the reconstruction of society and civilization through the intellectual and moral efforts of people whose head, heart and hands, intellect, emotions and will function in unison, who are motivated and animated by the primary driver of any physical movement, as well as through all human thinking and activity.

Reinhardt's work *"A Realistic Philosophy. The Perennial Principles of Thought and Action in a Changing World"* is based on the Aristotelian-Thomist tradition (Aristotle, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas) of understanding the phenomenon of freedom, however conceptually the thinker relies on and develops the views of Søren Kierkegaard (the dynamic and active essence of the interiorized spiritual experience of man, existential ethics), Karl Jaspers ("boundary" situations), Martin Heidegger ("life – being" dichotomy), Jacques Maritain (integral humanism, the concept of "autonomous man"). Thus, it can be stated that Aristotelian-Thomist rationalism was combined with the irrational tradition of existentialism in Reinhardt's work, in particular, in his concept of integrative realism.

### **Freedom and the crisis of human existence in the modern age**

The fact that existentialism is important for Reinhardt's work is also evidenced by his "The Existentialist Revolt" (1952). In the preface to the first edition of his monograph, the author explains its emergence as "what Heidegger calls the "necessity of thought", i.e. a matter of irresistible personal urgency", and a revolt against the abstract "essentialism" (or idealism) of modern "existentialists", in his opinion (Reinhardt, 1960, p. VII), can help in a rediscovery of long-forgotten or neglected philosophical truths. Reinhardt describes in detail the main themes and stages of the development of existentialism, analyzing the main features of the Kierkegaard's works (his appeal to "either – or"), Nietzsche (his resolution of the dilemma: "Man-God or God-Man?"), Husserl and Heidegger (their

appeal to truth and being), Sartre (his apery of Lucifer), Jaspers (defining his existentialism as shipwreck or homecoming), Marcel (his renunciation and conversion), etc.

The problem of freedom is implicitly one of the main ones in Reinhardt's analysis of the legacy of each representative of existentialism separately. For Reinhardt, freedom directly relates to the problem of human existence – central to the philosophy of existentialism. The crisis of human existence outlined by existentialism became the subject of Reinhardt's consideration in this work. The researcher states that today no one, even in the most remote and least disturbed parts of the globe, can avoid the alarming consequences of the revolutionary transformations that human civilization is currently experiencing. It became clear that the "modern" crisis affects not only particular sectors or aspects of life and civilization, but also their totality and, therefore, human existence. In the current "progressive" age, the discrepancy between the completeness of scientific knowledge and the helplessness that governments, nations, and individuals face when solving intellectual and moral problems in everyday life is constantly increasing that is both pitiful and tragic to sunder. It is this tragic fate of modern man, according to Reinhardt, that was expressed by General Douglas MacArthur in an unforgettable radio address in 1945: "The problem ... is basically theological, because it volves a spiritual improvement of human character, an improvement which must synchronize with our advance in science, art, literature, and all our material and cultural development of the past two thousand years. It is of the spirit and of the spirit alone that the flesh can be healed" (Citation by: Reinhardt, 1960, p. 1).

Reinhardt, referring to the views of Jacques Maritain and F. S. C. Northrop, convinces that the current era needs a radical spiritual revolution and reformatting. His concern stems from the undeniable fact that the most advanced scientific and technological civilization the world has ever known is nothing more than, to use the words of Albert Schweitzer, "a strange medley of civilization and barbarism" (Citation by: Reinhardt, 1960, p. 1). And this unstable situation in which modern human and modern civilization in general, and the Western world in particular, find themselves, suggests that all various socio-political upheavals in every part of the globe are only external manifestations, symptoms and outbreaks of a creeping and long-lasting spiritual and moral diseases. Modern civilization seems to be under serious threat, as eternal values, intellectual and moral truths begin to drift further and further away from the realities of matter and nature, so that material reality, deprived of the guidance of reason and rationally enlightened will, yields to the blind force of chance and the biological drive of will to use force (Reinhardt, 1960, p. 2).

Just as Kierkegaard called for a return to primary, early Christianity, so Reinhardt writes about man's forgetting the "existential" purpose of his own existence. In this statement he appeals to Goethe, who warned that "Men ... will become more shrewder and cleverer, but they will not be better or happier. I see a time approaching when God will no longer be pleased with man, when He will have to smash His creation to pieces in order to rejuvenate it"; and to Nietzsche's appeal to the man of that time: "Oh thou proud European of the nineteenth century, art thou not mad? Thy knowledge does not complete Nature, it only kills thine own nature. ... Thou climbest toward heaven on the sunbeams of thy knowledge but also down toward chaos. Thy manner of going is fatal to thee; the ground slips from under thy feet into the dark unknown; thy life has no stay but spiders' webs torn sunder by every new stroke of thy knowledge" (Citation by: Reinhardt, 1960, p. 3).

In the interval between these disturbing warnings of Goethe and Nietzsche, as Reinhardt (1960, pp. 3 – 4) argues, Hegel's imposing system of metaphysical idealism arose as a final attempt to unite science, philosophy and religion. Nevertheless, Hegel's own "dialectical method", seized by the radicalism of the "young Hegelians" in Germany and England eventually destroyed the idealistic premises of its master. However, the heaviest blow was dealt to Hegel not by materialists, but by a representative of the religious individualism of the Protestant-Christian tradition, in particular, the Danish religious philosopher Kierkegaard, who considered Hegel's philosophy, on the one hand, and the teachings of liberal Protestantism, on the other, as the two most dangerous anti-Christian

strengths. Opposing to Hegel's pantheistic identification of God and the world, divine reason and human reason, Kierkegaard insisted that Creator and creature, God and world, supernatural and nature were separated by one impassable chasm. Against the Hegelian secularization of Christian dogma, he preached the absolute sovereignty of the Deity, while diagnosing the spiritual and moral illness of his time. Reinhardt is impressed by the Danish thinker's appeal to intellectual honesty, which comes from the deepest foundations of human existence, which is one of the reasons for Kierkegaard's influence on many outstanding thinkers of our time. Therefore, Reinhardt emphasizes, Kierkegaard's thought lives on as a challenge to the twentieth century, heralding to future generations "one more Reformation" in the "existentialisms" of Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, Marcel, etc. no less than in the "dialectical" theology or the theology of "crisis" of Karl Barth and his associates, "and this time it will be a horrible reformation. Compared with it that of Luther will appear as a mere jest. Its battle cry will clamor for the remnants of Faith on earth. And we shall witness millions becoming apostates: truly a fearful reformation. We shall recognize that Christianity is practically nonexistent, and it will be a horrible sight to behold this generation, pampered and lulled to sleep by a childishly deformed Christianity to see this generation wounded once again by the thought of what it means to become a Christian, to be a Christian" (Citation by: Reinhardt, 1960, pp. 5 – 6).

Reinhardt also refers to the ideas of Nietzsche, who lamented the "unspeakable impoverishment and exhaustion of human existence". Although Nietzsche himself was never a systematic philosopher, according to Reinhardt, he first saw the essential difference between science and philosophy, and categorically emphasized the basic distinction between scientific and philosophical goals and methods. For Nietzsche, philosophy was "love of wisdom", strictly in the Socratic understanding of the meaning of philosophizing. Philosopher, first, should be called to realize the virtues of philosophical existence in his own life, and then to shape human behavior in the image and likeness of a true philosopher, whose highest task is to complete the reintegration of thought, life, and civilization. This Nietzschean position is consistent with the views of Reinhardt, who emphasized why Nietzsche calls the philosopher "a physician of culture". Drawing on Kierkegaard's and Nietzsche's ideas, Reinhardt (1960, p. 7) revives their admonitions that actual civilization represents the crossroads toward which modern humanity has advanced. The alternative should be either an unequivocal new paganism or a sincere, integral Christian humanism.

Reinhardt cites (1960, pp. 9 – 10) the opinion of the Spanish representative of classical existentialism, Jose Ortega y Gasset, who compares a modern man to a traveler in a car, the mechanism of which is a complete mystery to him. Indeed, he clarifies: "Man without God resembles the traveler without an experienced chauffeur: the car races at full speed, but the traveler has lost control. The world moves at full speed toward events over which man is no longer master". The general course of transformations that took place in the West during the stages of transition from antiquity to modernity, according to Reinhardt, was brilliantly described by Oswald Spengler: "Europe had experienced the early phases of its life in the sheltering embrace of a closed cosmos and a universal Church". The modern world has lost this security, posing the problem of human existence with new acuteness and urgency. As a result of these changes, existentialism rose in Europe at the time, because the pressure of collectivism and abstract idealism steadily increased, forcing an individual to make a decisive and radical self-assertion. Thus, according to Reinhardt, the growth of existentialism is one of the symptoms of a specifically European crisis, although in its wider ramifications it also indicates the modern crisis of human existence as such. However, Reinhardt (1960, p. 228) specifically interprets the phenomenon of existentialism, considering the early Thomas Aquinas an existentialist. In this statement, he continues the line of existential Thomism of Jacques Maritain, according to which Thomism itself is "the philosophy of existence and existential realism". For this ambiguous statement, Reinhardt (1960, p. 229) gives the following arguments: "The conviction of the primacy of existence is shared by all existentialist thinkers, ancient, mediaeval, and modern". This is somewhat puzzling

and suggests that Reinhardt does not differentiate between existential philosophy (which was manifested to one degree or another among thinkers of different historical eras) and classical existentialism, as a purely European phenomenon that arose between the two world wars in Germany and in France after the World War II, and as a reaction to them. Reinhardt also draws attention to the fact that Kierkegaard, the founder of existentialism, initially tried to turn to rationalism, in particular, to Schelling's "positive philosophy", but was disappointed by it, noting: "I am too old to listen to lectures, and Schelling is too old to lecture", obviously referring to the latter's excessive immersion in abstract idealism, which was too far from "existence". From then on, Kierkegaard polemically opposed any attempt to grasp reality through rational speculation. Reinhardt himself, due to his belonging to the Aristotelian-Thomist tradition of rational substantiation of the provisions of his own philosophy, could not follow the path of Kierkegaard, however, he implemented existentialist ideas in his integral realism, ethics, ontology, and anthropology. Here, the positions of Reinhardt's "theistic and Christian existentialism" coincide with his opinion when solving the problem of comparing human existence and God. He proves that "For Kierkegaard and for theistic and Christian existentialism in general, human existence is grounded in the realization of the eternal in the temporality and finiteness of Dasein. The Danish thinker believed that such a realization was possible only in the religious stage of existence and in the religious personality. If God is omitted (as in Heidegger's speculation) or if God is denied (as in Nietzsche's and Sartre's thinking), then there remains only the yawning abyss of nothingness, a void which cannot be filled because He who alone could fill it is refused admission" (Reinhardt, 1960, pp. 240 – 241).

**Conclusions.** Thus, among those thinkers whose philosophies were considered by Reinhardt in the work "The Existentialist Revolt", the closest to the author are Gabriel Marcel and Søren Kierkegaard. Therefore, Christianity was defined by him in the Kierkegaard-Marcellian tradition of understanding as "a unique spiritual force which, breaking into the temporal and finite self, consumes it, and raises out of its ashes the eternal and infinite self" (Reinhardt 1960, pp. 241 – 242).

In conclusion, using the example of Reinhardt's work, we can talk about the formation of a new eclectic synthesis of Thomistic rationalism with the postulates of existentialism, in particular, with the ethical, ontological and anthropological views of Kierkegaard and Marcel, and as a result – the formation of "integrative realism" (existential-theological realism). Such a synthesis fully testifies to the productivity of the integration of classical existentialist thought with the humanities, which allows us to consider Reinhardt's existential anthropology as a sample for the development of post-existentialist thinking.

## References

- Bodenheimer, E. (1971), "Philosophical Anthropology and the Law", *California Law Review*, Vol. 59, Issue 3, pp. 653 – 682.
- Bodenheimer, E. (1980), *Philosophy of Responsibility*, Colo, F. B. Rothman, Littleton, 147 p.
- Horosz, W. (1975), *The Crisis of Responsibility: Man as the "Source" of Accountability*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, xvi, 324 p.
- Jackson, M. (2005), *Existential Anthropology (Events, Exigencies and Effects)*, Berghahn Books, New York, Oxford, 252 p.
- Khamitov, N. (1999), "The Problem of Existential Anthropology" ["Problema ekzystentsiinoi antropologii"], *Philosophical and anthropological readings*'98, pp. 88 – 96 [in Ukrainian]
- Khamitov, N. (2021), "Philosophical Anthropology: Global and Domestic Contexts" ["Filosofska antropologhiia: svitovyi ta vitchyzniani konteksty"], *Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*, No. 5, pp. 81 – 94. [in Ukrainian]

- Khmil, V. Syllabus for the discipline "Existential Anthropology". Specialization – "Philosophical Anthropology". Specialty – 073 "Philosophy" (Department of "Philosophy and Sociology") [Sylabus z dysypliny "Ekzystentsiina antropohiia". Spetsializatsiia – "Filosofska antropohiia". Spetsialnost – 073 "Filosofiia" (Kafedra "Filosofiia i sotsiologhiia")], viewed 30 June 2025, available at: [http://diit.edu.ua/upload/files/shares/syll\\_u/eg/philosophy/syl\\_ea073\\_mag.pdf](http://diit.edu.ua/upload/files/shares/syll_u/eg/philosophy/syl_ea073_mag.pdf) [in Ukrainian]
- Kovalchuk, V. (2013), "To the Question of the Existential Anthropology" ["Do pytan'nia ekzystentsiinoi antropohiï"], *Bulletin of the Lviv University. Series Philos.-Political Studies*, Issue 3, pp. 14 – 21 [in Ukrainian]
- Premawardhana, D. (2020), "In Praise of Ambiguity: Everyday Christianity through the Lens of Existential Anthropology", *Journal of World Christianity*, No. 10 (1), pp. 39 – 43.
- Raida, C. (1998), *Historical and Philosophical Research of Postexistential Thinking* [Istoryko-filosofske doslidzhennia postekzystentsialistskoho myslennia], Ukrainian Center for spiritual culture, Kyiv, 216 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Raida, C. (1999), *Post-existentialist tendencies in modern foreign philosophy and humanitarian sciences (historical-philosophical analysis): author's thesis of the dissertation of the Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy: specialty 09.00.06 "History of Philosophy"* [Postekzystentsialist-ski tendentsii v suchasni zarubizhnii filosofii ta humanitarnykh naukakh (istoryko-filosofskyi analiz): avtoref. Dys. ... d-ra. Filos. Nauk: spets. 09.00.06 "Istoriia filosofii"], G. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, 30 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Raida, C. (2009), *Existential Philosophy. Tradition and Prospects* [Ekzystentsialna filosofiia. Tradyt-siia i perspektyvy], Parapan Publisher, Kyiv, 328 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Reinhardt, K. F. (1944), *A Realistic Philosophy; the Perennial Principles of Thought and Action in a Changing World*, The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 268 p.
- Reinhardt, K. F. (1960), *The Existentialist Revolt*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 281 p.
- Ross, S. D. (1973), *The nature of moral responsibility*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 270 p.
- Shevchenko, S. (2016), *Christian Theology and Existentialism* [Khrystyianska teolohiia ta ekzystentsializm], G. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, 440 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Tabachkovskyi, V. (1996), *Man – Existence – History* [Liudyna – Ekzystentsiia – Istoriia], Scientific thought, Kyiv, 123 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Tabachkovskyi, V. and others. (2004), *Man in Essential and Existential Dimensions* [Liudyna v esentsiynykh ta ekzystentsiynykh vymirakh], Scientific thought, Kyiv, 245 p. [in Ukrainian].
- The program of the professional entrance examination for obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in philosophy at the third (educational and scientific) level in the specialty 033 – philosophy* [Prohrama fakhovoho vstupnoho vyprovuvannia dlia zdobuttia stupenia doktora filosofii z filosofii za tretim (osvitno-naukovym) rivnem za spetsialnistiu 033 – filosofiia] (2021), Kharkiv National University named after V. N. Karazin, Kharkiv, viewed 30 June 2025, available at: [http://philosophy.karazin.ua/ua/abiturient/program\\_aspirant\\_philos\\_2021.pdf](http://philosophy.karazin.ua/ua/abiturient/program_aspirant_philos_2021.pdf) [in Ukrainian]
- Yemelianenko, H. (2018), *Philosophical Grounds of Existential Theology (Anthropological, Ontological and Epistemological Aspects)* [Filosofski zasnovky ekzystentsialnoi teolohii (antropologichni, ontologichni ta hnoseologichni aspekty)], Autograph, Kyiv, 384 p. [in Ukrainian]