

B.J.Zhusupova

*Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University  
(E-mail: zhusupova2013@mail.ru)*

### **Attributes of social integrity**

The author raises the problem of the search of social integrity through an adequate understanding of it. In modern social philosophy there are many definitions, concepts and approaches in understanding of society, sometimes conflicting. One hand, the society is represented by an integrated organization by definition, but, on the other hand, this unity in the history of mankind has always broken. Then what do «integrity» as an attribute of the social structure and how to create it? It is necessary to have a correct understanding of the difference between such concepts as «society», «community», «state». The determining factor is also the using of the successful methodology of social cognition of study social life, especially today. All this is not only cognitive interest. The search for the integrity of society is a necessity for solution of social problems and disasters.

*Key words:* society, community, state, paradigm, truth, reductionism, integrity, synergy, knowledge, technique.

Nothing in the world does not exist singly. Under the category of «individuality» should be understood not only the quantitative aspect («single»), but also qualitative. In a quantitative sense, there is nothing in one copy (not to be confused with the concept of 'uniqueness'), and in the quality — everything in it is interconnected, is in alliance with like itself. In other words, when we talk about the existence of the world, we mean by that co-existence in the world, one of the particular cases of which is the principle of «corporate». Everything lives, there is functioning within the general «corporation» and its separate. This is a prerequisite, an attribute, a way of being of the world, but otherwise the world would not exist. At the same time it is a clear prerequisite for the possibility to know it (although to what extent — is another question). After all, what is the process of understanding the world? This finding in it laws, laws, development trends, and possible evidence only if it interconnectedness and interdependence. We take a look around and find all this mass of evidence.

The exception to the rule in this world can not be a person who is also in spite of the many conflicting hypotheses about its appearance it is part of a whole part of the World building. Another thing, a way of being human — specific, markedly different from the others.

The main and defining feature of the human factor, and education is the presence of intelligence, consciousness («consciousness» is used here in the sense of consciousness in general, and not as a degree of sophistication among men). And call it education — society.

The concept of «society» should not be confused with the concept of «community». The difference between them is significant in spite of the single root «Society» — «general». Russian term «shared» dates back to ancient Russian root «obchy», meaning «what's around». Latin verb «socio» means «connect», «combine», «conceive joint work». Hence the original meaning of the concept «society» — a community alliance cooperation.

Community is a form of co-existence of people related by common descent, language, and the fate of views. These are gender, race, nationality, nation, family, class, caste and many other communities.

Society is a product targeted and intelligently organized joint activities of large groups of people united not on the basis of common and shared interests, and the contract.

German sociologist, one of the pioneers of professional sociology in Germany, founder of the «understanding sociology», a supporter of «formal sociology» Ferdinand Tonnies (1855–1936), distinguishing between these concepts, a community characterized by two essential features. This, above all, a social association, based on proximity, proximity (solidarity by similarity as Durkheim would say). This may be the geographical proximity: the village, commune, parish nation. It could be a psychological proximity or consanguine (especially persistent Tennis stresses common blood) — the best example of this is the family. Finally, we can talk about spiritual intimacy, a kind of consanguinity of minds, which is close by, and their kind: friendship, by Tonnies, almost fits into the concept of community. It goes beyond the extent that it has a point of «selective affinity» associated with freedom of choice, while the community — the social association of natural, spontaneous, prior individual; it is the second essential characteristic. Commonality not create

— it find open. In the community, strictly speaking, do not come — it will automatically turn, want it or not. With a community linked by generic ties, it is impossible to avoid. «Individual course belongs to his family, his village, his country, his race — and ownership of this natural, involuntary» [1; 89].

Tonnies characterized society by antithetical traits. It is a conscious social union based on the contract and joining the members. It includes free, on their own — but may not enter. Society — the product is entirely artificial — in nature, in a natural way, it does not exist. His pose, because they see in it a certain interest. What interest? The logic of common human sense tells us that initially, at the beginning of human existence, our ancestors decided to create their own association as the need to get away from the wildness of nature, spontaneity, randomness, unpredictability, deceit, that certainly poses a great danger to human life. The Company is not based on proximity, proximity or kinship — it is based on interest. Membership in the society is associated in this case with the benefits that can be drawn from this. But the concept of interest is to be understood broadly and comprehensively. It includes material interests that form the basis of trade associations, trade unions, insurance companies, associations of solidarity; intellectual interests, which are the source of the creation of scientific associations, literary or philosophical circles, academies, art associations; moral interests, brings to life the charitable associations, temperance societies, associations, mutual aid.

But here again, we need to take into account the hierarchy of criteria in determining society. If the key criterion we call the artificiality of any public association, it should not be ignored, for example, a quantitative criterion in determining society. And then society understood as a universal association, not a society understood as a philosophical or literary circle.

It should also distinguish between the concepts of «society» and «state». For a long time in the philosophical knowledge of these concepts are not disconnected. It was only with the emergence of bourgeois relations, where social structure has become complicated, namely to develop the political sphere, in which, as we know, the key issue is the question of power in society, scientists began to share (though initially only terminology) them.

It turned out that the state is a product of society at a certain stage of its development. It occurs in the process of social division of labor, when, along with artisans, herders, traders, allocated in an isolated group of people whose profession — management.

Thus, if a society — is a historically evolving system of human relations that developed as a result of their interaction in the process of life together, the state — a means of social control.

The term «Company» is thus clearly derived from the ratio of the concepts of «society» and «community»; «Society» and «state»; «Society» and «nature». This is a human education, on the one hand inscribed in the natural reality, and, on the other hand, opposes it. This discernible specific features of social reality.

What are they? From the viewpoint of classical social philosophy specificity society in relation to the nature characterized by the following features:

- the presence of the factor of consciousness, rationality;
- hence the complex interplay of natural (natural) and artificial (culture) factors in the social organism (because man — the unity of biological and social);
- the existence of objective and subjective processes of human activity, their complex dialectic;
- availability of employment as the basis of society;
- the history of society in contrast to the natural processes made by people;
- the society to study harder than nature;
- social forecasts have a huge range of probability that distinguishes them from the forecasts of nature;
- evolutionary for a much smaller amount of time, unlike nature, dominated by the principle of cyclicity and repetition;
- limit the action of social laws in time ...

But the classical paradigm in the study of society in the XX–XXI centuries, began to lose its relevance in many of its provisions. It is found in many metaphysical, straightness, idealization, in many respects opportunistic, certain lifelessness. This is not surprising. Classical social paradigm absorbed sound facility in the knowledge society and the world as a whole. But at the turn of 19–20 centuries in all spheres of knowledge in the natural sciences, as well as humanitarian, discovered a whole new trend in the development, indicating a more complex functioning of the world of nature and society, the presence in it of factors such as relativity, subjectivity, irrationality, chance and even uncertainty. For the first time the uncertainty in the development of the world talking naturalists, scientists, when in 1927 Heisenberg was discovered the principle of the uncertainty relation in the order of the the principle of subsidiarity Bohr. In quantum physics

was the discovery of the antiproton, proving the existence of two forms of matter — particles and antiparticles. According to one of the key provisions of the new theory, we can assume probability of the existence of another world, or the anti-world, consisting of antimatter. For this discovery was awarded the Nobel Prize award to two American scientists — nuclear scientists Emilio Segre and Owen Chamberlain. This has led to fundamental changes in both the natural sciences and especially the social picture of the world. And it is even more aggravated by dramatic changes in the world of human activity caused mainly grand scientific discoveries.

In an era of scientific and technological revolution the world has changed society in many ways — its quantitative change such as the acceleration of social time with dialectical inevitably led to tremendous qualitative transformation. We are on the «threshold» completely unknown reality that frightens us greatly. For example, now it is found that nature also socialized. Due to large-scale human activities, penetrated deep into its structure, nature has changed. Now she is not the one that was up to the individual — pristine, untouched. At the same time it changed its relation with the quality of society. Unbiased confrontation between nature and society is mediated by a man, his influence on her. Nature acts so humanized material, anthropomorphic, unlike the myth, reality becomes apparent. Nature is actively involved in the human space, thus expanding the social reality. As it turns out, nature also has its own history. But more precisely, under the influence or pressure, human nature gets its own history. And now that has changed, it is in turn a completely new, unknown to us, affects society.

We live in a period of acceleration of social time, which led to a natural change in the social space. In addition, the trend of the maturing of the usual ratio of social time and space under the influence of a high level of development of information technologies (being here and now, to chat over a vast area, including past and future). This century has got a lot of epithets, these thinkers — contemporaries: «post-industrial society», «information society», «post-modern society», «postmodern society» and represents a qualitatively and quantitatively new education than we know in the history of mankind.

The term «postmodern society» was introduced in the philosophical literature of the French post-structuralism (G.Deleuze, Jean-F.Liotar, Derrida, R. Barthes, etc.). As a symbol of the state of the spiritual life of society, associated with the destruction of metanarratives (the «rules of the game» culture) that justify human life and society in general.

As you know, the twenty-first century — the era of radical changes in all spheres of human life. Age of dynamic variety of events, ups and accidents, controversial and amazing, «energy» in various senses of the word. «The twentieth century did not live by the clock, and a stopwatch ...» — sung in one of the songs. It requires maximum mobility of modern man, concentration, alertness, constant tension, change the traditional landmarks of life, breaking stereotypes — in general, innovative thinking. The reality that emerged suddenly around us, often paradoxical and absurd. There is a total break-up lifestyle, worldview. Man is in the face of the new reality, which has not had time to adapt, which in many ways seems to be alien and hostile to him, it is very difficult to comprehend everything in a timely manner.

The man «ripped» from your own life. In accelerating the time he lives or past, yearning for it and calling it often «good», or the future, laying on a large bright hope. He does not live here and now. All the time he is only willing to live. Therefore, the end perceives as a surprise.

This is reflected in the nature of relationships between people. Human life, according poststructuralists, within a pre-industrial society was a game between man and nature. At that time, people were working in small groups and were dependent on the nature. In industrial society, the nature of the machine is replaced. The main type of interaction becomes the interaction between man and man. However, this interaction does not mean communication that focuses on communication. During this communication are the only people in certain social roles. We are talking about the relationship between the subjects of society, that is a relationship with a purely practical value and not for the sake of dialogue communication. In the post-industrial society is a situation in which the length of human relationships is growing, people are carried on our life as the things and places. The thing can be thrown away and replaced with a new one. In the same way to treat people, if we consider them only as carriers of social roles. Therefore, from the point of view of the sociologist Daniel Bell of the US «people need to learn to live with each other» [2; 91].

According to the Russian philosopher T.H.Kerimov «... Architectonic modern society today is seen not one-dimensional, homogeneous, but a multi-dimensional and multi-faceted. Each of its faces is approved in his world, taking into account other possible worlds. The society has always been a heterogeneous, but now his heterogenization was not just a fact, but also an acute problem [3; 3]. In an effort to identify the modern society Umberto Eco discusses our epoch as «a new Middle Ages», Michel Maffesoli takes us into a society

of tribal type Jacques Derrida — in society «coming of democracy», Peter Drucker heralds a «new pluralistic» society». And the American futurist Fukuyama declared the «end of History and the Last Man» (compare with Marx's idea of the beginning of the true history of mankind).

As part of the classical tradition of society understand the basis of an external archetype of order — Space, God, Nature, the idea — which organizes, guarantees the stability, integrity, social functionality, staying out of the social space. Ideal of social searched in union, merger, ordering, goal-setting and expediency. It was the sociality around something in common (the history and evolution of the Company are considered linearly).

And, indeed, the first stages of its inception, the society, social relations, institutions were an attempt to jointly solve the pressing problems of the people in order to survive and improve. Recall virtuous degrees Al-Farabi, which requires a person to compensate for the limited individual human potential creation of collective social organism, promoting the achievement of universal happiness. In other words, society arose to improve human life through the order, harmony, coherence, rationalize it, which corresponded to ideas of homogeneity of society. But the further evolution of society creates a tendency to «snowball», associated with the increasing complexity, acceleration, invariance, relativization of social processes.

It is time to reverse the impact of society on the human tendency of subdual person for themselves, under the soulless machine society, a monster Leviathan. It seems that, like the nature of human society avenged stage of social progress. And as a cry of despair Rousseau sounds the famous slogan «back to nature!».

Hence, the worsening trend of striving for East Indian and Taoist wisdom to their principles of non-action, with the flight of sociality. We think that the path of human development — is the path of the infinite extremes reels from one side to the opposite, the inability to find the «golden mean», measure, moderation, to which called Confucius, Buddha, Solon and other ancient sages.

Apparatus of modern social sciences and humanities is not sufficient for the decision before us now embarked social problems. It turns out that the science used to explain society and human, but in the field of social research that was not enough, so suddenly identify the problems of conformity of the science of society within the meaning of social demands. And then I have a lot of the classical sociology, such as:

- understanding of the human community as an abstraction, driven by the utopian ideal of the projects;
- a linear view of history (hence the idea of the «end of history»);
- focus on the outer man (man in general);
- absolutisation goal-setting ideas and feasibility;
- rigid determinism;
- ignoring the problem of the quality of human life (due to rabid rationalism and constructivism);
- and many others. But this raises a new postmodern frightening trend «of inflation truth» when offset

by the possibility and the importance of social cognition in connection with the discovery of relativistic conception of truth. Hence the special importance in a holistic study of society today by general sociological and philosophical approaches. The sociological approach is largely related to the study of social structure, specific mechanisms of social development, having in the arsenal of empirical research methods, such as questionnaires, surveys, testing, interviewing. The philosophical approach to studying the society of integrity, focusing on such concepts as the goal, the driving forces, the meaning and direction of the historical process. Theoretical background of the «philosophy of society» contained in antiquity, in the «philosophy of history» (a term introduced by Voltaire), in an attempt to comprehend the essence of the early thinkers of society, its ideals and goals. This ancient historians Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Plutarch. Next is Augustine, Leibniz, Vico, Montesquieu, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Spengler, Toynbee, Conte and others.

Fundamental questions of social philosophy is the question of the relationship between objective and subjective factors in the development and emergence of society. On this occasion, there have always been different views. Let's start with the extreme right opposite positions on the issue. It is, above all, on whether the story of a purely objective process, similar to the growth of a living organism, a kind of biological evolution, or whether it was deliberately constructed by people like some mechanism. In other words, the question of what society considered — an independent body, the natural continuation of the development, but at a different stage or mechanism, running man — in other words, dead or alive form.

According to the first point of view, the emergence of human society — a continuation of nature and develop it as a result of the evolution of «codes of conduct» (technological, social, cultural, moral, religious). These «rules of conduct», as a rule, no one consciously invented, but emerged as a result of a very complex process in which each step was accomplished on the basis of all previous history. The future is born past,

history is not on the subjective intentions of man. Just as a new body of an animal does not arise because the animal previously understood its utility and a new social institution more often than not created intentionally to achieve a particular goal. Proponents of this approach to the question of the origin of society and all social formations are historical materialists (historical materialism — a socio-philosophical trend that sees the primacy of objective material processes in the genesis of society, that is, push the materialist conception of history). These include, for example, is Marxist philosophy (founder Karl Marx), who saw in all social phenomena, such as the formation of the society, private property, classes, government and others in the first operation of the objective (independent from persons) material processes.

The second view argues that society is built logically people, as appropriate, on the basis of the decision in advance, based on the arbitrariness of subjective will of man power. Among the supporters of this approach include the British modern philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, the French Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau — the author of contractual social theories, according to which private property, the state emerged on the basis of artificial agreement between people. As part of this approach, there is an idea that is quite possible, and often necessary, to ignore historical trends, popular character, value system worked out for centuries. But the decisive role played by those who possess the necessary knowledge and skills: these are the true creators of history. They must first work out a plan, and then customize the life under these plans. The whole nation is only material in their hands. As a carpenter of wood or concrete engineer, they elevate this material a new design, a scheme which had previously been developing. Obviously, with such a view between «material» and «creators» is a gulf, «creators» can not accept «stuff» as the same people (it would prevent its processing), but it is able to experience him antipathy and irritation if it He refuses to properly understand their role.

Choosing one or the other of these concepts (extreme objectivism and extreme subjectivism) — is not just a heuristic discrepancy. It largely depends on development of the ideology of the state (so now the issues of social philosophy, the problem of the state is a priority in the policy of the States). And besides, it forms two people of different psychological types. Taking the first point of view, the person feels an assistant and collaborator far exceeding his powers. Take the second — an independent creator of history, the demiurge, a little god, and in the end — a rapist. That is something this way and there is a society without freedom, no matter how democratic attributes of such an ideology nor to furnish.

Between these polar positions in solving the relation of objective and subjective produced a huge range of different paradigms in the interpretation of society.

1. The concept of organicism, when there is an identification with the biological organism of society and an attempt to explain social life biological laws (for example, the concept of social Darwinism justifying the law of natural evolution in society: the survival of the fittest.

2. The concept of geographical determinism, when the climate, geographical environment, ethnic, racial differences determine the social processes.

3. The concept of society as a product of an arbitrary agreement of individuals (Social Contract, Rousseau, Jean-Jacques).

4. Consideration of anthropological principle of society and man as part of nature (Spinoza, Diderot et al.). Beginning this principle was laid in ancient philosophy. After all, the space (for the Greek. Cosmos) — this is the whole universe, the whole world, which is opposed to the chaos its order and beauty. Greek municipality offers artists imitate nature. Greek peeping over the nature and studied her harmony, excellence and moderation. The aesthetic ideals of Greek culture: the beauty, the measure, harmony. Beauty was understood primarily as proportionality, certainty, order. The measure — is the principle source of all things, the characteristics of perfection. «Nothing in excess» — recorded on the pediment of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. Worthy acknowledged the existence of a society, the corresponding genuine, high, unchanging human nature. In modern conditions the most comprehensive study of philosophical anthropology given Scheler.

5. The theory of social action that occurred in the 20s of XX century (interpretive sociology). According to this theory, the basis of social relations is the establishment of «meaning» (understanding) intents and purposes of each other. The main thing in the interaction between people — their awareness of common goals and objectives and the action to be adequately understood by other participants in social relations.

6. Functionalist approach (Parsons, Merton). Society is seen as a system of objective and subjective factors.

7. A holistic approach. Society is seen as an integral ring system, logical functions on the basis of both linear state management mechanism using internal energy-information resources and external coordination of certain non-linear structure (conciliar society) with the influx of external energy.

Such social concepts, trying to gain insight into the social system, to understand the mechanisms, trends in the development of society very much. Rich in their diversity suggests that they are directly linked to issues relating to the essence, nature and destiny of man, which is an open problem to this day.

Thus, we come to a very important milestone in the philosophical understanding of society. According to the Russian philosopher V.E.Kemerov, modern «social peace somehow drawn into the interaction requiring a new, multi-dimensional and yet quite specific ideas about the rules of life of the human community, about the rules by which a community can be described, possible understood and prepared for the next stages of their evolution ... one human community ceases to be an abstraction becomes a reality. And this principle to its evolution, shifting it changes the orientation of their communication and cultural, scientific and other subsystems reveals their dependence on the changes taking place with the people» [4; 7]. The scale of this interaction can not be overestimated — we enter a period of inevitable globalization. This is the application of modern times, which could not conceive of classical sociology.

This situation creates a strong incentive for the development of social philosophy. The Society specifically applied to the social philosophy when they do not know how to develop further when the prospects for development are vague when it experiences a vital need for new reforms in its functioning, in the system of social relations caused very extensive and diverse social system as a whole, ie heterogeneity. «Heterogeneous society dramatically increases demands on the philosophy that studies the social processes. Traditional methods of thinking in the face of new challenges are unsatisfactory. There is a need to overcome stereotypes in philosophy. This need is realized by changing and deepening the theoretical and methodological foundations of social and philosophical knowledge» [5; 7].

#### References

- 1 *Добреньков В.И., Кравченко А.И.* История зарубежной социологии. — М.: Инфра, 2004. — 403 с.
- 2 *Белл Д.* Культурные противоречия капитализма. — М.: Этическая мысль, 1990. — 158 с.
- 3 *Керимов Т.Х.* Социальная метеорология. — Екатеринбург: Урал. Наука, 1999. — 160 с.
- 4 *Кемеров В.Е.* Введение в социальную философию. — М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. — 215 с.
- 5 *Керимов Т.Х.* Неразрешимости. — М.: Академ. Проект, 2007. — 215 с.

Б.Ж.Жүсіпова

#### Әлеуметтік тұтастықтың атрибуттары

Мақалада әлеуметтік тұтастықты іздестіру мәселесі қойылды. Қазіргі әлеуметтік философияның көптеген дефинициялары, концепциялары, әдістері бар. Олар тіпті бір-біріне қарама-қарсы болуы мүмкін. «Қоғам», «мемлекет», «тұтастық» және олардың байланысын қарастыру қажет. Әлеуметтік танымның дұрыс әдістемесін анықтау қоғамды зерттеудегі негізгі болып табылады. Бұлар тек когнитивтік қызығушылық емес. Қоғамның тұтастығын іздестіру әлеуметтік мәселелерді шешудің бір амалы болып табылады.

Б.Ж.Жусупова

#### Атрибуты социальной целостности

Автор статьи ставит проблему поиска социальной целостности через адекватное понимание ее. Поэтому в современной социальной философии существует множество дефиниций, концепций, подходов в понимании общества, порой противоречащих друг другу. Необходимо иметь четкое представление о различии таких понятий, как «общество», «общность», «государство» и их тесной взаимосвязи. Определяющим моментом является выбор удачной методологии социального познания, позволяющей отразить многосложность общественной жизни, особенно современной. Все это имеет не только когнитивный интерес, вопрос о поиске целостности общества стал злободневным, как необходимость решения актуальных социальных проблем, грозящих социальными катаклизмами.

### References

- 1 Dobrenkov V.I., Kravchenko A.I. *The history of foreign sociology*, Moscow: INFRA, 2004, 403 p.
- 2 Bell D. *Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, Moscow: Ethicheskaya Mysl, 1990, 158 p.
- 3 Kerimov T.H. *Social geteorologiya*, Yekaterinburg: Uralskaya Nauka, 1999, 160 p.
- 4 Kemerov V.E. *Exordeom to social philosophy*, Moscow: Aspect Press, 1996, 215 p.
- 5 Kerimov T.X. *Undecidability*, Moscow: Academic Project, 2007, 215.

Репозиторий КАРГУ