

B.J.Zhusupova

*Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University (E-mail: zhusupova2013@mail.ru)***On the question of the status of the uncertainty principle in social cognition**

Modern social world dramatically accelerated over time, extended in space, filled with a huge amount of new processes, inexplicable in terms of the traditional worldview, sharp contradictions, apparent paradoxes. Unaware of what awaits us in the future, we are already seeing a lot of unusual phenomena, showing the humanity immersed in a completely new, unknown to us the reality. Therefore, in the field of social cognition is particularly acute uncertainty principle, which indicates the limitations and inadequacy of even the classical theory of knowledge, forced to transform into a social paradigm postnonclassical social studies. A selection of her keynote depends on the resolution of the status of the principle of «uncertainty» in cognition.

*Key word:* Uncertainty, social, relations, culture, society, human, ontological, status, epistemological, philosophical, postmodern, synergetic.

What is the status of the uncertainty principle in social cognition — the ontological or epistemological — not a simple question and discussion, widely discussed in the philosophical literature. German physicist Werner Heisenberg, who discovered the uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics, and thus brought to life in his philosophy, gave him unique ontological status. A ontological uncertainty unwittingly brings to the concept of chaos. Therefore the status of uncertainty has a deep philosophical meaning to solve all knowledge, including the social. He involuntarily rests on the fundamental epistemological and epistemological problem in principle the possibility or impossibility of knowing the world man, raises the question of determinacy or indeterminacy of world development, it causes uncertainty. These reasons are rooted in the very ontology of the world, objective, leading to the approval of its randomness, or they are subjective, that is directly related to the limitations of human abilities in his reflection. Hence, it becomes an actual problem shifts paradigms of both scientific and social research. In addition, the solution of these problems depends very definition of a philosophical category «uncertainty», which is still undefined.

The etymology of this concept until disproportionately affects its epistemological dimension, so there is a lot of work examining the problem of uncertainty through epistemological epistemological aspect. However, in the history of philosophical thought and uncertainty considered as an objective characteristic of being that allows speak about the ontological status of this category. And this is obviously reflected in ancient mythology.

In the works of A.F.Losev, M.Eliade, V.B.Poizner contains mythological interpretation of chaos. So, A.F.Losev writes: « To summarize the ancient notion of chaos, we must say that it seems as majestic tragic image pervoedinstva space in which all being melted from which it comes and where it dies, which by virtue of a universal principle of continuous and uninterrupted infinite and limitless development. Antique chaos is the limiting dilution and dispersion of matter, and therefore he — eternal death for all living things. But it is also a limiting condensation of all matter. He — a continuum, devoid of any gaps, any empty spaces and even any distinction at all. And because he — the principle and source of all becoming, always living the creative womb of life for all decorations. Antique chaos almighty and faceless, all making out, but the formless. This — the monster world, the essence of which is emptiness and nothingness. But it is nothing that has become a global monster. This — infinity and zero simultaneously. All these elements are fused here into one indivisible whole, and in this synthetical is precisely the solution of one of the most original images of the ancient mythological and philosophical thinking... there is no doubt that all the Greek attitude should be interpreted as elements infused skepticism, surprise, uncertainty, and any kind of chance» [1; 389].

In Greek mythology, cosmogony Chaos portrayed as pristine boundless emptiness, gaping space that existed before the world, its contents were material fog and darkness. Over time, this mist in the rotational action took the form of eggs, consisting of ether, the rapid rotation of the egg was split into two parts — the sky and the earth. According to the beliefs of others, chaos — is the element of water. In gesiodovskoy cosmogony Chaos gave birth to Erebus, nobody, Eros, Gaea, Tartarus, and Moira [2; 123, 124].

Thus, Chaos — period openness of heaven and earth. Time came out of nothing, out of Chaos. According M.Eliade, «In terms of cosmology gloom identity chaos, and the new ignition lights symbolizes creation, revival shapes and borders. Masks that depict ancestors, spirits of the dead, visiting, according to

the ritual ceremony live (Japan, Germany, etc.), also indicate that the former borders were abolished and replaced by a mixture of all levels and types of existence. In this paradoxical gap between the two «times» (= two states Cosmos) it becomes possible to communicate between the living and the dead, ie, between «forms» and to implement -shaped, potential, inchoate way of existence. In the «darkness» and «chaos», returning to the world by the destruction of the old year, all forms are identical, this universal merger («night» = «flood» = «decay») is possible without effort, «automatically» achieve coincidentia oppositorum for all levels of reality [3; 205].

Rich material associated with the comprehension of the ontological status of the uncertainty present in ancient esoteric and philosophical teachings. Paramount importance is the canonical book of Taoist philosophy of «Tao Te Ching», and also one of the main books of Tibetan Buddhism «Tibetan Book of the Dead». The book Tao Te Ching we find the idea of the inclusion of certain indefinite into the darkness: «The Tao of incorporeal. Member vague and uncertain. However it nebulae and uncertainty hidden things. It is deep and dark. However, its depth and darkness hidden finest particles. These particles have the finest supreme reality and authenticity. «A famous U-Wei (the principle of non-action) is largely dictated by the space of uncertainty» [4; 101].

The Tibetan Book of the Dead, describing an intermediate state between human life and death, called the bardo experience, says: «The first main bardo experience — experience the state of uncertainty: someone or that he really umiraet, ie loses kontakt this material world, or that shall live. This uncertainty oschuschaet people not in the sense that he would leave, leaving his body, but is unique in that it can utratit any ground under nogami — mira realnogo exit and enter nerealny» [5; 213].

Indians invented the number «zero» as the embodiment of eternal primordial emptiness, is the beginning of the birth of the world of things. With no boundaries, parameters, variables by Zero — have not a number. Different nations designated void differently: Indians — Sunyata, Jews — Ain, Greeks — Chaos. Formless emptiness, nevosprinimaema and untouchable, neosoznavaemo has no eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, mind, shape, sound, color, smell, taste, touch, quality unlike other number. All the worlds and even the gods came from Zero not — number. Do not have a zero — Genesis of it at the same time, periodically appear Genesis and Antitytie that eventually vzaimounichtozhayutsya. Zero — is a kind of reference point, any final predetermined value, without it there is no negative or positive number.

Yet the first rational philosophical problems to reflect uncertainty about the ancient philosophers. It was in ancient Greece for the first time most clearly emerges epistemological and ontological relationship of the uncertainty. Confirmation of this relationship is «Apeiron» Anaximander — is inherently uncertain, vseporozhdayuschaya substance. On the uncertainty of motion and development show and paradoxes — paradoxes of Zeno of Elea.

Interesting extensive material containing an attempt to understand the uncertainty through its connection epistemological and ontological aspects is our famous dialogues of Plato, in which we find the original sites associated with the concepts of «Chora», «MeOH», «Ukon».

«Chora» — this is the third type of being placed between the idea and the copy — eidos — things of the material world, which is the intermediary between the speculative and sensual data. It is in Chora (special place) the transition from intellegibel'nogo in tangible material where the matter becomes imprint ideas is a place where ideas materialize. In the dialogue «Timaeus» Plato wrote about the Chora: «Always seeing everything, she never and in no way acquires any form that would be similar to the shape of its constituent items. Nature this inherently such that accepts any prints while moving and changing shape under the effect that it includes, and hence it seems that it is different in time is different; and entering into it or out of the thing — it's imitation vechnosuschemu, prints on a sample taken a surprising and inexplicable way... Or it can be compared to the way when drawing shapes on any soft surfaces do not admit to them in advance could see this or that figure, but to start doing everything possible to smooth. Similarly, the beginning, the purpose of which is to in its entirety well take forever prints all existing things must itself be inherently alien in any form. And because we do not say, if my mother and vospriemitsa all that is born and visible at all sensual — this earth, air, fire, water, or some other [kind], which was born out of four [elements], or from which they themselves were born. On the contrary, denoting it as the invisible, formless and vsepriemlyuschy view, it is extremely involved in a strange way conceivable and extremely elusive, we do not really go wrong» [6; 291].

Thus, Chora — is a cross between eidos and material thing, has no form — formless. Chora — This is absolutely nothing absolute otherness. If there were no Chora, ideas worked to exactly the same things, indistinguishable. But in reality, many non-identical things, the reality is diverse and varied. So, what exactly

is born in Chora individual, even unique things. Choir « deforms idea» moment produces bias, whereby occurs diversity of the material world. Plato presents it as a smooth surface, devoid of borders and outlines of shapes. Without Choirs world would represent a cluster of copies. On the one hand, an expression of absolute ignorance of the great project of the multiplicity of the world, and on the other, without which it would be impossible to make a total change.

Plato Meon — the exact opposite of Eidos. It is not available for thinking umopostiganiya, but manifested in Eidos. And Eidos, in turn, may think only in conjunction with MeOH. Meon — is a formless set the principle of evolution and isolation. Meon from the Greek word « non-existent, non-existent,» akin to nothingness. It is both a philosophical concept that reflects all the uncertainty, the opposite limit, nonidentical himself and neintellegibelnoe. If, for example, Parmenides believed that being is, and not nothingness, Plato said about the existence of nothingness as something indefinite.

Development problems of uncertainty present in the philosophy of Aristotle in his concept of «entelechy», which represents the ultimate expression of the ontological, epistemological and teleological certainty, which includes some uncertainty — «Gil» — matter, which the philosopher called lower construction form of being.

Category «uncertainty» Aristotle is present at a ratio of her with such categories as «matter» and «form», «possibility» and «reality». «Form» — is a relative term, and this relativity is due to the fact that the relationship between generic and sensual manifested in the middle between them, namely in certain things, this concept through her. The notion of being an intermediate link between the essence of a thing and its specific phenomenon manifests itself in the development. Being so, according to Aristotle, is manifested in the fact that it is the fundamental entity of the things some unspecified state into reality. Uncertainty so — it uncertain possibility. The essence of the matter passes through a specific difference and becomes a reality. Aristotle builds a kind of ladder hierarchy of things, which is the form of every thing for the lower things, and at the same time standing up for the matter. It is in the form of relativity considers the relative uncertainty.

Thus, the dialectic of possibility and reality Aristotle sees through the category of 'uncertainty', thereby bringing the theory of «not-yet-being» [7; 85]. This theory he regards as the third part of the ontology, while the first two sections are devoted to the analysis of existence and causal analysis of substance.

Plato's ideas about the existence of MeOH, which bind with otherness uncertainty continue to evolve in the Neoplatonists, especially Plotinus. So, using the idea of emanation, in which degradation occurs in the process of the emergence of matter, Plotinus interprets it as a set, devoid of metaphysical self. Matter — just a copy of Eidos, devoid of quantity, quality and presents a framework, endless uncertainty. Compared with the eternal principle it is Eidos their destruction, the primary necessary evil. But at the same time sensual world is beautiful and intelligent, as yet involved in the divine essence — there indefinitely and is known through uncertain [8; 567].

Like Plato and plotinovskie ideas were echoed in contemporary philosophy of postmodernism, where the idea of uncertainty plays a key role in explaining the dynamics of the modern world. In Derrida, for example, there is the idea of Choirs, while Zh.Deleza — MeOH idea when building his concept of the simulacrum.

Great importance attached to the uncertainty relating to Christian theologians and philosophers who have experienced the impact of the Greek ancient philosophy. They dominated epistemological its consideration. On the one hand, these considerations led to the pole apophatic, and on the other, to the development of the theme of the fall of man, the ontological cleavage of human nature that can be overcome only through transcendence. Indeterminacy problem apophatic Absolute detail puts Dionysius. Christianity claims that there are two ways of knowing God: cataphatic or positive and apophatic or negative. Positive way to know God is presented in the revelation and he testifies of God as Love, Wisdom, Power. And this is the path to knowledge of God's names. But at the same time, God is transcendent, it is the mystery hidden, Nothing is different from the created world. « Therefore, those who loved the truth — says Dionysius — regardless of whatever was the truth, should chant presuschestvennoe Bogonachalie, which is higher than some being Sverhblagostyu not as Reason or Power, not as thinking, or Life, or entity, but as (something) completely excludes what — or change the property, life, imagination, idea, name, reason, thought, thinking, nature, condition, base, limit, boundlessness, that is all that is inherent to existence... what we know God is His energy, his world of acting. However, we can not know God in himself. We can not think of God in Himself, in His essence, in his innermost secrets. Attempts to think of God in Himself plunged us into

silence, because no thought or verbal expressions can not conclude in the infinite concepts that defining limit» [9; 306].

On this occasion, V.N.Lossky wrote that «the Greek Fathers in the knowledge of God went through the negatives... the way to talk about the negatives makes lifting mystic to God as to join the «divine darkness» where all sorts of images and fading names, where the Divine acts like a bottomless mystery [10; 209]. Writer and theologian says that all definitions of God is a relationship between the finite and the infinite.

As the main problem is the uncertainty in the knowledge of God and therefore human life is mainly engaged in the work of Nicholas of Cusa and his doctrine of Learned ignorance. «Our finite mind, moving through similes, can therefore not exactly understand the truth of things. Because the truth is there is no more or less, it is something indivisible and, except as the very same truth, nothing exactly measured can be like a circle, whose existence is something indivisible, can not be measured in terms of non-. Not being true, our mind, too, never grasps the truth so precisely that he could not comprehend it all precisely without end, and belongs to the truth as a polygon to the circle: being inscribed in a circle, he is so like him, the more angles has but even multiplying their corners to infinity it will never be equal to a circle, if not resolved to an identity with it... So, the truth we clearly know is that exactly as it is, it is elusive: our mind relates to the truth, as an opportunity — to the absolute necessity of not being able to be neither more nor less than what it is. No wonder the essence (quidditas) things, the truth of things, incomprehensible in its purity, and even philosophers searching for her, no one has found it as it is. And the deeper will be our learning in this ignorance, the closer we get down to the truth» [11; 24].

Epistemological status of the problem of uncertainty, its advantage over the ontological gave in modern philosophy. The world seemed like Aristotle closed, but the dominant epistemological problems. David Hume says of the limited cognitive abilities of the subject and outputs the impossibility of objective knowledge about the world in general, and Dzh. Berkli solipsistic claims about the illusory nature of the known world and the immaterial.

The problem of uncertainty in the logical and epistemological aspect, interpreted as the result of limitations of human nature ontologically presented in Kant's transcendental philosophy, which determined the further development of German classical idealism, but at the same time and subsequent European philosophy. Kant leads the concept of «thing in itself», antinomy, design of any subjective forms of knowledge, raises the question of the interdependence of science and morality.

During the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant realized that science is the destroyer of false omniscience, but in order to realize this and want to save the moral position of the person. This doctrine is called a philosopher genuine enlightenment that unlike naive education, on the one hand, the man pulls out of the traditional superstitions, and on the other, eliminating the optimistic hopes for the absolute strength of the theoretical reason, from the fanatical belief that the mind is able to solve any problem human life. And most importantly, the scientific reason he did not give a reason for such confidence.

Kant's doctrine that the mind has its own borders denies skeptical agnostic David Hume, but also destroys the audacity research scientist, his unsubstantiated claims on prophecy and people management. «What can I know? — This question was for the philosopher had not only methodological, but above all an ethical component, which should keep scientists from the scientific conceit. «What temperament and talent... — Kant wrote in the» Critique of Pure Reason «-need some respects in the discipline, with this easy to just agree. But the idea that the mind, which, in fact, obliged to enforce its own discipline to all other endeavors, he still needs discipline, can certainly seem strange; in fact, he still avoided the humiliation precisely because seeing solemnity and serious posture with which he speaks, no one suspected that he was lightly playing creatures of the imagination instead of concepts and words instead of things» [12; 113].

Triumph of human reason in the Enlightenment to the fact that even the general scientific built regulatives human behavior in situations of human choice. Especially Kant opposed attempts to justify scientific ideas of God's existence and immortality of the soul, that practiced not only theologians, but also philosophers (recall Descartes). According to Kant, these studies can not be conclusive, not only, but also lead to antinomies — uncertainties — insoluble.

It is important to note that the phenomenon of uncertainty is present explicitly or implicitly in various statuses (ontological and epistemological) in different types of mythological and historical philosophical outlook in both the East and the West. No exception and Turkic mythology. Cosmogonic mythology of the Turks who inhabited southern Siberia, has a scene that was born from Chaos Space, personified in the water, which in turn gave birth to the triune Cosmos (Heaven, Earth, Underworld).

But the water is not only spawned the world, but also joined him. Hence the great importance in Turkic mythology is the World River. It is important mythological symbol, the rod of the universe, the world's way, penetrating the three worlds. Source of the river, the middle and the mouth correspond to the three worlds. However, the water — it is original chaos spawned life. According to mivopoeticheskoy tradition sees chaos in water, it connects with it something hostile, alien, contrary to the cosmic order. Water — other, unspecified world. Underwater World — a secret something opposite of life. Mythological tradition says that washing your face like death». We Khakases there is an expression: «Khakassia evolved from land, and Russian — from the water. «In this case, the contrast between land and water used to refer to ethnic differences «-another's». It is believed that the name of one of the tribes have joined the Kazakh people — Usuns mentioned yet about 176 BC, dates back to the Old Turkic usun — «water, the crowd, the people» [13; 157].

Fruitful approach for understanding the peculiar epistemological status uncertainty, which brings them developed Russian philosophers, BC Soloviev, PA Florensky, V.Ern, NA Berdyaev, C.JI. Frank, Acting Lossky. Being religious philosophers, they are closely analyzed any uncertainty, uncertainty in knowledge, one accompanied by criticism of European rationalism. Truth as seen by them as Estina substantiate the beginning of being heuristically valuable in searching and finding opportunities to find existential grounds of uncertainty. In the philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov assotsiiruetsya uncertainty and chaos, and in the philosophy of P.Florensky, S.Frank and H Lossky — with «incomprehensible».

Epistemological uncertainty has become particularly relevant in the twentieth century after occurred entirely new scientific discoveries in quantum physics, questioning the traditional principles and ideals of classical science. Clarify the meaning of uncertainty in quantum physics and philosophy further in using a wide range of works of foreign scientists and philosophers.

Understanding existential component of the problem of uncertainty in social philosophy in the works of such thinkers of the twentieth century as representatives of existentialism, personalism, philosophical anthropology Martin Heidegger, J.-P.Sartre, Camus, E.Mounier, Ortega y Gasset and others. Ontology of Martin Heidegger treats uncertainty as original or acquired through concealment time category.

Original interpretation of the uncertainty principle we find in postmodern cultural studies, which proclaims it as the fundamental ontological principle. Postmodernism as if meditating over chaos, to understand the semiotic meaning of culture, describing the cognitive process as knowledge on fractals and apply the concept of fractals as the argument of the uncertainty principle in social philosophy. Here are allocated work Derrida, Deleuze, J.-F.Lyotard. Jean Baudrillard examines the concept of fractal values inherent in social processes, hence it 's called modern society as unstable and uncertain.

Toffler formulates his famous concept of «futuroshok» future shock, or to emphasize the uncertainty in the vision of the future of humanity. Such a shock — an essential feature of modern life. Its appearance is associated with accelerating climate variability and instability of cultural and social processes that are open and uncertain in futurological term.

Of key importance is attached to the problem of uncertainty in the synergy and the theory of dissipative systems. From the perspective of these new concepts are called critical points uncertainty Development (bifurcation point), or appearing in the upcoming self-organizational processes, to which are, of course, all human processes. Conceptual and theoretical basis for synergy and theories of dissipative systems create jobs I.Stengersa, G.Hakena, Prigogine. In turn, the theory of Prigogine arose largely due to a critical understanding of the philosophy of life Bergson, which is based on an interesting assumption that life is made of inert matter in uncertainty as a condition for the free creative act [14; 74].

On uncertainty and instability as the fundamental properties of life in general and of human existence in particular are among numerous supporters among modern scientists and philosophers. Twentieth century science proves that in addition to subjective and objective uncertainty exists, which, unlike the first does not depend on the subject. In other words, randomness and uncertainty are not only the result of ignorance. This is clearly confirmed by the uncertainty principle as a fundamental W.Heisenberg of quantum mechanics, according to which it is impossible to coordinate the simultaneous measurement of the elementary particles in space and speed in time (this also applies to the measurement of other parameters). Hence, the main conclusion of the opening of the Heisenberg following: the interaction between the measured object and measuring instrument, which affects the measurement results, and unpredictable; uncertainty principle has an objective (ontological) status and does not depend on the person who performs the measurement.

On the existence of objective chance in the early twentieth century physicist spoke M.Smoluhovsky, together with Albert Einstein created the theory of Brownian motion. In his article «On the concept of the origin of the laws of chance and probability in physics», he writes that «... this article is in no way purports to

full and final resolution of the whole complex philosophical issues related to the concept of probability; however, it may be, to encourage further research in a particular direction that it pushed to the forefront and properly lit main guiding idea of the objective side of the concept of probability, which is still almost no attention» [15, 330]. Since the recognition of absolute chance went against determinism scientist appeals to philosophical formulation of the problem, stating that « the philosopher turns his attention primarily on the subjective, psychological aspect of the concept of probability, analyzes the epistemological meaning it explores how probable statements, together with reliable and false statements included in the system of formal logic. But he does not address the nature of objective phenomena underlying the concept of probability» [15; 331]. He believes that «all of probability theory, which is considered an accident, the risk and uncertainty in philosophy, science, and management of both the unknown part of the reason must be found to be unsatisfactory in advance. Physical probability of an event can only depend on conditions affecting its appearance, but not the degree of our knowledge» [15; 332]. In his work, the work of M.Smoluchowski demonstrates the existence in nature of objective chance: « In order to make more clear the physical laws of chance and the concept of objective completely independent of human cognition likely consider in conclusion another phenomenon, which can be considered the most perfect type of what we have called «random» namely, the radioactive decay of an atom. As you know, over time radium atoms undergo a transformation, throwing each  $\alpha$ - particle and converted into atoms of emanation; while in the atoms of radium is not observed the slightest progressive evolution modeled on aging. On conversion, we can not affect any means and it can not be predicted in advance» [15; 346].

We conclude that in the early twentieth century, science has proven that objective uncertainty and randomness exist objectively. British philosopher and mathematician, RB Russell defined philosophy as «no man's land «between science and religion, arguing that the divide between them constantly moves in one direction and then the other, and this means that the philosophical problem may eventually become scientific. That is what happened with the problem of uncertainty, which came out of the womb of the philosophical, became a scientific and science has given her an affirmative answer. Later they move again, this problem has moved to the philosophical field.

Philosophical reflection on the uncertainty principle allows you to look at this phenomenon from all sides and comes to the conclusion that it has as a separate epistemological and ontological status, and their unity. This can be seen clearly and actually expressed in a social context, namely the structure of decision - making social.

In a state of uncertainty in the process of making important social decisions much depends on how a native of uncertainty has to do a subject that decides. It affects the decision-making method. When it is necessary to receive and be aware of the uncertainty of an objective with one hand. On the other hand, it is obvious that it is impossible to ignore the subject, in fact it will formulate the purpose and mode of action. Therefore, in the process of decision-making in social processes, there are such kinds of uncertainties, as both objective and subjective, ontological and epistemological.

At first glance, the uncertainty principle inadvertently runs into the problem of determinacy or indeterminacy of social development, which makes it possible or impossible social cognition in general. But this dilemma arises if the use of the linear paradigm of social research. If the use of other research paradigms, such as postmodern « rizomorfnyuy « in which there is no principle of centering and a single code, or synergistic, the uncertainty in social cognition as well as in social development clearly emerges as an indispensable attribute them, without questioning and certainly not denying the importance and possibility of social sciences themselves. And this is not just another clever paradox of human cognition, and an indication of the specificity of the object and subject of social cognition — society and its media rights, which grasp the essence and existence which not only reached its logical conclusion, as overgrown even greater uncertainty explicitly present in the modern era.

#### References

- 1 Losev A.F. *History of ancient aesthetics, Early classics*, Moscow: Iskusstvo, 2001, 583 p.
- 2 Hesiod. *Complete collection of texts*, Moscow: Labyrinth, 2001, 256 p.
- 3 Eliade M. *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, Moscow: Academic Project, 1998, 258 p.
- 4 The Tao Te Ching. *The book and the way of grace*, Moscow: ABC — classic, 2002, 144 p.
- 5 *Tibetan Book of the Dead*, Moscow: Otkryty mir, 1999, 352 p.
- 6 Platon. Op.: In 3 t., Moscow: Mysl, 1998, vol. 3 (1), 798 p.

- 7 Aristotle. *Metaphysics*, Moscow: Eksmo, 2006, 193 p.
- 8 Plotin. *Ennead*, Moscow: Oleg Abyshko, 2004, 2880 p.
- 9 Sv.Dionisy Areopagite. *Divine names*, Kiev: Mysticheskoe bogoslovie, 1991, 593 p.
- 10 Lossky V.N. *Dogmatic theology*, Kiev: Publ. Svyato-Troizkoy Sergius Lavry, 2012, 586 p.
- 11 Kusansky N. *On Learned ignorance*, Moscow: Azbuka, 2001, 320 p.
- 12 Kant I. *Critique of Pure Reason*, Moscow: Eksmo, 2010, 736 p.
- 13 Krause V. *Tocharian language*, Moscow: Publ. Inostr. Literatury, 1959, 157 p.
- 14 Bergson A. *Creative Evolution*, Minsk: Harvest, 1999, 1408 p.
- 15 Smoluchowski M. *On the concept of randomness and probability of the origin of the laws of physics*, Moscow: Nauka, 2006, 234 p.

Б.Ж.Жүсіпова

### Әлеуметтік танымдағы белгісіздік принципінің дәрежесі туралы

Мақалада қазіргі әлеуметтік әлем жан-жақты жаңаруда, өзгеру үстінде екіндігі туралы айтылған. Зымыраған уақыт, шексіз кеңістік, дәстүрлі көзқарасқа бағынбайтын түсініксіз қарама-қайшылыққа толы көптеген құбылыстар. Белгісіз болашақтың алдында тұрған адамзат ойдан тыс феномендермен ұштасуда. Сондықтан автор әлеуметтік таным саласында белгісіздік принципін айқындап, классикалық парадигманың шамасын кемітуге болады деген қорытындыға келген. Классикалық таным теориясы постклассикалық әлеуметтік парадигмаға айналып, күрделі өзгерістер үстінде. Сол себепті танымда «белгісіздік» атты принциптің дәрежесін шешу мәселесінің өзектілігі анық.

Б.Ж.Жусупова

### К вопросу о статусе принципа неопределенности в социальном познании

В статье отмечено, что современный социальный мир кардинально ускорен во времени, расширен в пространстве, наполнен огромным количеством качественно новых процессов, необъяснимых с точки зрения традиционного мировоззрения, острых противоречий, явных парадоксов. Подчеркнуто, что уже сегодня наблюдается масса необыкновенных феноменов, свидетельствующих о погружении человечества в совершенно новую, неведомую нам реальность. Автором сделан вывод о том, что в области социального познания особенно остро проявляется принцип неопределенности, который указывает на ограниченность и даже неадекватность классической теории познания, вынужденной трансформироваться в социальную парадигму постнеклассического социального исследования, а выбор ее лейтмотива зависит от решения вопроса о статусе принципа «неопределенность» в познании.

### References

- 1 Лосев А.Ф. История античной эстетики. Ранняя классика. — М.: Искусство, 2001. — 583 с.
- 2 Гесиод. Полное собрание текстов. — М.: Лабиринт, 2001. — 256 с.
- 3 Элиаде М. Миф о вечном возвращении. — М.: Акад. проект, 1998. — 258 с.
- 4 Дао Дэ Цзин. Книга пути и благодати. — М.: Азбука — классика, 2002. — 144 с.
- 5 Тибетская Книга Мёртвых. — М.: Открытый мир, 1999. — 352 с.
- 6 Платон. Соч.: В 3 т. — М.: Мысль, 1998. — Т. 3(1). — 798 с.
- 7 Аристотель. Метафизика. — М.: Эксмо, 2006. — 193 с.
- 8 Плотин. Эннеады. — М.: Олега Абышко, 2004. — 2880 с.
- 9 Св.Дионисий Ареопагит. Божественные имена. — Киев: Мистическое богословие, 1991. — 593 с.
- 10 Лосский В.Н. Догматическое богословие. — Киев: Изд-во Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры, 2012. — 586 с.
- 11 Кузанский Н. Об ученом незнании. — М.: Азбука, 2001. — 320 с.
- 12 Кант И. Критика чистого разума. — М.: Эксмо, 2010. — 736 с.
- 13 Краузе В. Тохарский язык. — М.: Изд-во иностр. лит., 1959. — 157 с.
- 14 Бергсон А. Творческая эволюция. — Минск: Харвест, 1999. — 1408 с.
- 15 Смолуховский М. О понятии случайности и о происхождении законов вероятности в физике. — М.: Наука, 2006. — 234 с.