

*A. Ivakin**Doctor of Philosophy Sciences,
Head of the Department of Philosophy,
National University "Odessa Law Academy"***THE CRITIQUE OF HEGEL'S DEFINITION OF DIALECTIC**

Attentive readers of Hegel's philosophical works will agree that Hegel's system of Existence is both self-identical and self-sustaining. Thus, it follows that the Hegel's dialectical method is a method examining the process of change of Existence, and the stability (i.e., it is "set once and for all", "absolute") in it.

The author is critical of those definitions that Hegel gives to dialectic, as well as to reason and mind. In this respect, this article acts as a supplement and an explanation of those claims to the great dialectic scholar that have already been expressed by the author earlier.

Of course, the reason should be recognized as inadequate, abstract historical beginning of dialectical thinking, i.e., as a concept without which it (dialectical thinking) would not occur.

Therefore, being abstract in relation to mind, reason, already existed before the appearance of mind, gave (and still gives) more definiteness of human thought, making

it rational. Therefore, both definiteness and abstractness are relative, but not absolute. It is abstract in relation to mind, being considered in isolation from the latter. However, it is definite in relation to the mythological consciousness. It is also definite within mind as part of "right minded reason". That is why it is inappropriate to attach to reason, even when taken before and beyond the mind, the label of eternal abstraction, which actually was only conditioned by history. It is especially unfair to oppose activities of abstract determination to, no less abstract, inherent to skepticism denial of definiteness and strength as supposedly something higher. Reason holds accepted definition because this is its function – to "be steady". There comes a time, and being already within the mind (dialectical thinking), it continues to do the same, but already understanding and taking into account the fact that retained by them definition historically changes itself, leaving, however, its original essence untouched.