

B.J. Zhusupova

*Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University
(E-mail: zhusupova2013@mail.ru)***Truth in the middle****To a question of methods of social knowledge**

The author of article puts a problem of search of new methodology of social knowledge. The classical paradigm in research of society in the 20–21st centuries began to lose the relevance in many provisions. She found in many respects metaphysical nature, straightforwardness, idealization and even lifelessness as absorbed in itself strictly rational installations in knowledge of society and the world in general. While the world of society which carriers are the people movable not only objective laws of life, but also free wills, including the psychological plan is subjectively diverse, многосложен, and is often unpredictable. It is illegal to dump all variety of social paradigms of research from the account. It is known that truth somewhere in the middle. And it does possible to pass to essentially new methods of social knowledge.

Key words: society, rationalism, paradigm, truth, reductionism, factuality, synergetic, psychoanalysis, knowledge, method.

The question of knowledge of the world the person belongs to number of fundamental philosophical questions from the moment of emergence of philosophical outlook, undoubtedly. Criterion of fundamental nature in philosophy, besides special complexity of a question, is its cornerstone that means basic importance of its decision defining all following philosophical designs and discourses.

Not casually, within the German classics Immanuel Kant declared this gnoseological question the main question of philosophy, more important, than ontological, having made at the same time Copernican revolution in to Kant dogmatic philosophy which before skepticism emergence he called even «despotic» [1; 74]. What can I know? From here: what do I have to do? And already as a result: what I can hope for? And by and large: what is the person? And these Kant asking — as return to great Socrates: «Learn yourself!»

In the Preface to the well-known work of «The critic of pure reason» Kant writes: «I understand under it not criticism of books and systems, but criticism of ability of reason in general concerning all knowledge for which he can strive irrespective of any experience, so, the solution of a question of an opportunity or impossibility of a metaphysics in general and definition of sources, and also volume and borders of a metaphysics on the basis of the principles» [1; 76]. Thus, it turns out that in a dilemma an ontology gnoseology of the concept «ontological» and «gnoseological», on the one hand, show ambivalence, but, with another, however, the primacy gnoseological, probably, exists. And in this regard not less important aspect in a gnoseological perspective — development of cognitive methology appears.

It is known that methodology — the necessary tool of human knowledge, set of ways of knowledge consisting of the categorical device and the developed technology of knowledge, and such technology which will be conformed with the decision as it was told above, a corner question of essence of human knowledge in general. Without sitting over this problem, we will note that despite a variety and variety of methods and methodologies of knowledge, there are two main: methodology of scientific and humanitarian knowledge.

The question of methodology of scientific knowledge rose sharply during Modern times when the person the activist spirit of management of the nature, spirit of the Creator, mister, spirit of the free will seized. It is known that Francis Bacon, John Locke, René Descartes, Benedict Spinoza, Gottfried Leibnitz stood at the origins of development of methodology of scientific knowledge and it is a lot of other representatives who became axiomatic characters of secularization Europe of 17–18 centuries. The classical paradigm of scientific knowledge which attributes were rigid rationalism, a linearity, one linearity, a determinism, idealization, homogeneity, editorial which safely and resolutely extended as in natural sciences, and humanitarian fields of research was so formed. And there is no wonder in connection with mechanics of reductionism installation of the physics of Newton Laplace dominating in the Western world up to a boundary of XIX — the XX centuries when its claims for absoluteness, adequacy of reflection natural, social and humanitarian (if it is possible to tear off them from each other) processes began to be called in question. Especially it affected the social and humanitarian sphere of research.

Many provisions of classical sociology began to change. These are such as:

- understanding of human community as abstractions movable by utopian projects of the ideal states;
- linear understanding of history (from here idea of «end of history»);
- orientation to the external person (person in general);
- absolutization of ideas of a goal-setting and expediency;
- rigid determinism;
- conjuncture;
- ignoring of a problem of quality of human life (in connection with extreme rationalism and constructivism);
- and many others.

In general, the social knowledge differs from natural-science in a number of provisions radically:

1) in natural sciences idealization of the studied object, a certain metaphysical nature is allowed that is followed by an ejection of phenomena of the objective world, it's from general communication. The social knowledge where the system of difficult relationship of objects which at the same time carries out functions and subjects of knowledge is very important, is impossible out of communications with the objective and subjective world;

2) natural sciences deal with invariable laws in the same conditions. In social life which carriers are people there are a lot of uncertainty, variability that is reflected not in laws, and tendencies of social development;

3) development of society in general is more dynamic, historically, periodically, than natural objects;

4) the social phenomena not completely coincide with their essence, than the phenomena natural;

5) at natural sciences there is a rigid epistemological tool that in social knowledge is limited, and sometimes owing to existence in many respects the factor of unpredictability, freedom of will is impossible at all. In this sense the natural-science knowledge is «dry». The scientist is interested in the world in itself, without person, and the knowledge of the person of the world is characteristic of social knowledge;

6) society is ambivalent no presented by subject and object of knowledge. Therefore the social knowledge is process of self-knowledge;

7) in social knowledge there is no objective research. The researcher anyway, even without volition, states the opinion of events, dependent on its own understanding, perception, feelings, beliefs, etc. (remember «idols of a cave» of F. Bacon, in social knowledge they are inevitable).

Before humanists there was sharply a question of search of the specific methodology. About a basic difference of natural-science and humanitarian knowledge it became clear in XVIII — the beginning of the 19th centuries. Still earlier to it in the work «The bases of new science about the general nature of the nations» were pointed by the Italian philosopher, the founder of philosophy of history and ethnic psychology Giambattista Vico, foreseeing disputes of the subsequent philosophers on distinctions and features natural and the humanities. And at the beginning of the 19th century the representative of «life philosophy» Wilhelm Diltey, designating this dilemma, suggested to divide sciences about the nature and sciences about spirit as the natural sciences for that period leaning on classical mechanics were not able to understand complexity of social life. He understood that neither reductionism nor extrapolation largely are inapplicable to the study of society, and therefore called for a new, particularly suitable for the analysis of society methodology of the human sciences, oriented on the *understanding* of social processes, while the natural sciences are based on the method of their *explanation*.

Even deeper the problem of methodology of humanitarian knowledge in the mid-19th century and early twentieth centuries was raised by the brightest representatives of neo-philosophers such as Baden (Freiburg) school, the main of which were influential figures Vildenband Wilhelm and Heinrich Rickert. Being committed to the transcendental method of Kant, they continued the idea of the founder of German classical philosophy, that is, the subject leaned on the content of consciousness in the process of understanding the world that must be reflected in the development of cognitive methodology. Taking as a starting point for their research the fundamental principle, neokantians — badents have seenaxiological determinant in any cognitive process, thus determine its interest in its humanitarian area. However V.Vindelband was opposed to the traditionally accepted classification of scientific knowledge who separates sciences on natural and human because of their differences in their subject areas. He suggested in the basis of classification of sciences to nominate not the subject of study, but the methods that are specific to these types of sciences, as well as their purposes. According to the classification of V.Vindelbanda, there are two types of sciences:

1. The type of science that seeks to find general laws of phenomena, using nomothetic (basic) study method;
2. The type of science that seeks to find the unique, unrepeatable phenomena using ideographic (fixing the special) research method.

Moreover, the division between these two types of sciences does not duplicate their distinction on the science of nature and spirit, as these two methods are used in its arsenal as a natural science, and social studies. In this sense, these two methods are equivalent. For example, the historical sciences of nature are ideographic, and the social sciences by their definitions, can not be nomothetic (otherwise social or humanitarian science would be impossible, otherwise it would be equivalent to the art, where the main value and purpose — individualization). G. Rickert, developing the position of his teacher further, and nominating in the base of the classification of advancing scientific knowledge the methodological approach and research interest, believed that nature as an individual and a special subject for science, as containing common laws does not exist — exactly does not exist the objective history of the subject. These two methods are not determined by the subject content, and depends on your interest researchers who may be interested in one case the general laws, in other case — a unique phenomenon. Hence Rickert brings two main epistemological methods: generalizing and individualizing that are opposite only to logical interest or to a private or a general. In fact, natural science and social science are closely connected among themselves and differ only in the concept of the researchers, the results of which are comparable with the conventional lines, «which a geographer thinks to orient on the globe with lines, which just does not correspond to anything real» [2; 36].

Thus, neokantians make a significant contribution to the development of the methodology of social cognition, indicating the complexity of the problem, her scruples, ambiguity, dialectical, the synergies. And through the prism of neokantism the sociology of Karl Marx reveals his vulnerable sides. On the one hand, Marx was among the first in *sotsiosophia* understands the society as a single organism, a special system, which is a unit of the person, the individual as the bearer of social relations. This is not a simple sum of individuals, and the sum of relations, ties between people in an objective manner and form in the course of primarily labor, economic activity. Hence, Marx brought the concept of socio-economic system, which is based on the mode of production of material goods, named by a philosopher the basis of any society. A method of production, in its turn, divided into productive forces and the relations of production with the decisive role of the productive forces of society, in structure of which Marx distinguishes personal (human) and real (technical) factors. However, at the same time, we understand that the personal factor again is understood by the philosophy impersonally, that is, as a person — «cog» of material production, the individual essence of which is leveled completely. Next German thinker still «paints» the social image, depicting «superstructure» of society, to which he attributes all the other spheres of public life, including the spiritual, and even (the irony — BZ) mental.

Thus, we see rigidly deterministic, straightforward approach to the study of society and social development, what is undoubtedly has a place and can be justified, if we set a historic task. But as for the futures of social forecasts, this methodology is unacceptable, which is confirmed by the sad experience of our former Soviet countries. The main reason for the error of Marx's approach to the society is ignoring the importance of mental side of human nature (despite the fact that he was still singled out the concept of «social psychology», but then again putting it at the mercy of the base of the economy) that in all religions is understood as the soul and the human spirit, and in psychoanalysis theories — subconscious or unconscious, from the point of view of the latter reflecting the biological in man (Freud), or even mystical (Carl Jung).

Such a mistake in social cognition rather overcomes the other social thinker, not less popular in the western world, Max Weber, who leans in a social life not on an abstract social individual, but on an intelligent action, sharpened on its own spirit, manifested in social activities. Therefore, not society defines individuals, but rather the individual and his effect creates the society. Social actions — meaningful, actions motivated people to achieve certain goals. Weber tries to classify social actions, distinguishing:

- Purpose-rational, i.e. directed on achieving solid-defined goals;
- Value-rational, i.e., carried out in a mode of spiritual values;
- Affective, i.e. based on feelings, emotions, affections;
- Traditional, i.e. actions by habit, according to the settled traditions.

According to the opinion of sociologist-philosopher, in social development grows tendency of the purpose-rational action, a vivid example of which is the emergence in the 16–17 centuries in Europe the capitalist society with its panrationalism in all spheres of public life, both economic and spiritual, including religious (Protestantism — rational religion). Weber stresses that it is the spirit of rationalism generates new so-

cio-economic relations. Philosopher creates a so-called interpretive sociology aimed at the study of society by their actions focused on other people. This means that society does not exist as an abstraction, it is always concrete. And this concreteness concerns including their soul-spirit-mental states, that is presented in the philosophy of existentialism explicitly.

Highlighting the diversity of the social organism, versatility and the subtlety of human existence, the French sociologist Emile Durkheim spoke thus: «Society — is the most powerful focus of physical and moral strength, which only exists in the world. Nowhere in nature does not occur such a wealth of different materials that are concentrated in such a degree. Not surprisingly, therefore, that from societies distinguished the peculiar kind of life which responds to the elements, its components, converts them and rises to the higher forms of existence» [3; 234, 235].

In connection with the foresaid, the picture of social life should be drawn in different colors and shades that reflect all the nuances and aspects of society, including the theory of psychoanalysis. It is no accident that there is a Freudian-Marxism or neo-Freudianism as another paradigm of social studies. Moreover, such paradigms in the social philosophy are of many. Among them there are no error, there are one-sided. They all have a right to exist, and each brings its own aspect of the study of social life. As you know, the truth is always somewhere in the middle, in the middle of many social constructs and paradigms of research, what makes the social philosophers not to connect with the classical paradigm and leads to a completely new, such as synergy or fractal paradigm.

The etymology of the concept «fractal» comes from the Latin word «frangere» or fractus — to break, to break into pieces; fractional, broken, and the literal meaning — broken geometrical form, or a geometric shape composed of several parts, each of which is similar to the whole figure as a whole. That is, consisting of their small copies — thus, having the property self-similarity. In this way, the fractal is self-similar, i.e. is composed of small copies, likes to himself and presents the great scientific and philosophical interest.

Trying to divide the fractal into pieces (any size), we will get a smaller copy of the original form. For example, the cloud consists of many small clouds, sea — of many drops, like the sea. The Russian philosopher Mikhail Epstein wrote about this: «As modern science shows, fractal rugged coastline, mountain range, oscillating flame, sea waves, a cloud, a snowflake, a colony of mold... Fractal is self-similarity of the dynamics, which is reproduced at different levels of his division or multiplication. And this is not a mathematical fantasy, this is the only accurate way to describe the complex phenomenon of our world which is rough, winding, harsh and devoid of the perfect smoothness, which they attribute to them prefractal science».

The principle of fractality didn't become an exception and for humanitarian knowledge as all world surrounding us consists of a large number of small, tiny worlds, the reduced similarity whole that once again obviously confirms ideas of unity of variety, ideas of a microcosm for the first time offered by ancient philosophers. In the philosophical knowledge called by postmodernists a philosophical discourse, the idea of fractality has received the greatest relevance and viability. Occurs the geometric metaphor of the pyramid of life, cast them to a variety of small pyramids. There is a geometrical metaphor of a pyramid of the life composed their sets of small pyramids. In social philosophy quite often society was offered to be considered as a big family (Confucius), a live organism (Al-Farabi), the mechanical car (Lametri), a tree, roots, that is by analogy with those multiple elements which expressively or explicitly by all means are present at him.

During the STC world society has changed in many ways — a quantitative change such as the acceleration of social time together with the expansion of social space with dialectic inevitably led to major, qualitative changes, contradictions, and uncertainties. We are on the threshold of a completely new, unknown reality, which attracts, simultaneously triggering the alarm.

Nature also socialites, becoming the object of social activities, and has already been humanized, far removed from the original state, becoming a monument of culture. It has radically changed its relationship to society. An objective confrontation of nature and society is mediated by the man, his influence on her. Nature is thus humanized by the material, anthropomorphic, unlike myth, is an obvious reality. On the one hand, nature is actively involved in human space, expanding, thus, the social reality. On the other, under the pressure of the person it acquires its own history. And now, already modified, it's completely new, unknown to us, affects the society. The most striking example of human measurement of the nature are grandiose discoveries of the 20–21st centuries as cloning, surrogacy, plastic surgery, creation of the gene modify organisms (GMO), creation of synthetic materials and others which, on the one hand, help with the solution of many social problems and with another represent an active interference in natural processes, creation «the humanized nature which consequences aren't defined at all.

We live in a period of acceleration of social time, closely associated with the new social space. Changing the usual ratio between them due to the high level of development of research and information technology (being here and now, we can chat over a huge area, including past and future). The XX and the XXI century has acquired many epithets — «the information society», «postindustrial society, postmodern society, post-modern society» — and represents a qualitatively and quantitatively new education compared to all the known in the history of mankind. In particular, the term «postmodern society» has entered the French post-structuralist (J. Derrida, J.-F. Liotard, Gilles Deleuze, Roland Barthes, etc.) as a symbol of the spiritual condition of social life, due to the fact that break down the meta-narratives in the culture (the rules of the game») that justify, regulate the life of society and man. «Postindustrial society» — the term suggested by D. bell. This confirms the complexity of social life, the study of which is possible only when you use fractal thinking.

Any concept bears the stamp of fractality. For example, in the conjunction of the concepts «heart» and «mind» every single concept contains an element other — smart heart and heart mind — because the only way they represent the system. About this is very well written in Abai «Words of edification».

A particular striking example of fractality is the man. Human life is a nonlinear system, the nonlinear system. And this is due to the presence of the spirit of liberty, freedom and the unpredictability of the choice of thoughts, desires and actions. What is the degree of this freedom, what is the degree of the ability to use it — and to date, the acute, open, burning in the philosophy of existentialism, philosophical anthropology, and postmodernism. By the way, Aristotle identified such a human oddity that possessing from birth the ability to move, think and speak, all these people cannot use such a priori and skills forced to develop, making the need for physical education, logic and rhetoric.

Between the age of the human soul and biological age there is no direct linear correspondence. It is bright and is certainly reflected in the structure ages. In every moment of life man is made up of all their ages, just as each age is also goes through all the other ages, contains them in itself. «This is the fractal structure of the personality, which responds to the fractal structure of the universe itself is crucial and can respond to it...old age, too, there are the childhood...the old age is maturity... And old age is old age».

Moreover, a person who fully meets the standards of one age and devoid of signs of other ages, non-humane. «He wears his age like a well-fitting suit, under which there is not a living body, and a plastic doll. Even-aged man is hoax, who exposed in the imaginary Museum of human age» [4; 28]. People interesting and natural, when it is the bearer of all ages at the same time: in childhood, adolescence, youth discernible signs of maturity, of wisdom, and in adulthood not lost childishness, spontaneity, openness.

It is no coincidence that in social cognition has emerged the concept of «ontogeny» and «phylogeny», which mutually penetrate each other, representing inseparable, ambivalent unity. So, the evolutionary development of humanity is considered by analogy with the evolution of one organism (hence, the ancient world often referred to as the childhood of humanity), and individual development of the organism is likened to the process of development of all mankind.

Fractal cannot be a linear development. The dynamics of self-similarity of the fractal science explains and otherwise cannot explain how the principles of self-organization. So the fractal is a complex self-organizing system. In this sense, the fractal transitional, quasistable, potential as becoming the new system, which is characterized by randomness, instability, which gradually passes evolve to sustainable, orderly whole. Hence the concept of a fractal is central in synergetics — the science of chaos and order, on transients, the evolution of complex open nonequilibrium systems, to which, doubtless, relate a social system.

References

- 1 *Кант И.* Критика чистого разума. Предисловие к первому изданию // Собр. соч.: В 3 т. — М.: Мысль, 1966. — 742 с.
- 2 *Риккерт Г.* Науки о природе и науки о культуре. — М.: Республика, 1998. — 329 с.
- 3 *Дюркгейм Э.* Социология и теория познания. Хрестоматия по истории психологии. — М.: МГУ, 1980. — 386 с.
- 4 *Эшттейн М.* К философии возраста // Звезда. — 2006. — № 4. — С. 25–28.

Б.Ж. Жүсіпова

Аралық ақиқат

Әлеуметтік танымның әдістері туралы

Мақала авторы әлеуметтік танымның жаңа әдістемесін іздестіру мәселесін қойып отыр. XX–XXI ғғ. қоғамды зерттеу барысындағы классикалық парадигма өзінің өзектілігін көптеген жағдайларда жоғалтып отыр. Ол қоғамды және әлемді тану жолында рационалды болғандықтан, метафизикалық, біржақтылық, идеалдылығын әрі жансыздығын байқатады. Ал әлеуметтік әлемді білдіретін адамдар тек объективті заңдарға ғана емес, сонымен қатар психологиялық, субъективті, жан-жақты, күрделі бола отырып, болжауға келмейді. Зерттеудің барлық парадигмаларын жоққа шығаруға болмайды. Ақиқат белгілі ортада болуы мүмкін. Сондықтан әлеуметтік танымның жаңа әдістеріне бет бұруға жағдай жасайды.

Б.Ж. Жусупова

Истина посередине

К вопросу о методах социального познания

Автором статьи поставлена проблема поиска новой методологии социального познания. Отмечено, что классическая парадигма в исследовании социума в XX–XXI вв. стала терять свою актуальность во многих своих положениях. Она обнаружила во многом метафизичность, прямолинейность, идеализацию и даже безжизненность, подчеркнуто автором, так как «впитала в себя строго рациональные установки в познании общества и мира в целом, в то время как мир социума, носителями которого являются люди, движимые не только объективными законами бытия, но и свободными волеизъявлениями, в том числе психологического плана, субъективно многообразен, многосложен, а зачастую непредсказуем. Все многообразие социальных парадигм исследования, выделено в статье, сбрасывать со счетов неправомерно. Как известно, истина где-то посередине. Это делает возможным переход к принципиально новым методам социального познания.

References

- 1 Kant I. *Sobr. soch.*: The 3 V., Moscow: Mysl, 1966, 742 p.
- 2 Rickert G. *Science of nature and the science of culture*, Moscow: Respublika, 1998, 329 p.
- 3 Durkheim E. *Sociology and the theory of knowledge. Readings on the history of psychology*, Moscow: MGU, 1980, 386 p.
- 4 Epshteyn M.K. *Star*, 2006, 4, p. 25–28.