

Д.К.Құсбеков

**Әлеуметтік-құқықтық мемлекеттің философиялық алғышарттары**

Мақалада Ертедегі Шығыс ойшылдарының көзқарастарынан бастап Антика мәдениеті ойшылдарының дүниетанымы қарастырылды. Мемлекеттің философиялық мәселелерімен қатар, әлеуметтік және құқықтық сұрақтары кеңінен талқыланды. Заманауи қоғамның болмысы адамзаттың «балалық» шағынан қадам алғандығы және сол дәуірдің дүниетанымы алғышарт ретіндегі бастамасы болғандығы зерттелді. Автор мемлекеттік құрылымның фундаменталдық негізін және қоғамдағы қарым-қатынас реттеу қағидасының дамуын атап өтті. Сонымен қатар әр түрлі кезеңде мемлекет пен адам арақатынасының аспектілерінің өзектілігіне тоқталды.

Д.К.Кусбеков

**Философские предпосылки социально-правового государства**

В статье рассмотрены научные взгляды и мировоззрения мыслителей начиная с Древнего Востока и античной культуры. Наряду с философскими проблемами государства автором подробно проанализированы социальные и правовые вопросы государственности. Отмечено, что истоки бытия современного общества начинаются с мифологического представления, которое отражало первоначальное миропонимание человека, его отношение к миру и обществу. Остановившись на фундаментальных основах государственного строя и принципах регулирования общественного развития, автор подчеркнул актуальность темы в аспекте взаимодействия на разных этапах человека и государства.

UDK 101.1: 316

B.K.Dyusalinova, P.P.Soloshchenko

*E.A.Buketov Karaganda State University (E-mail: dusalinova\_b@mail.ru, p\_soloschenk@mail.ru)***The problem of communication in the context of national consolidation**

The article examines the historical and philosophical approaches to the problem of communication. Its actuality is connected with the Kazakhstan national identity as a defining factor of social status. The idea of open and confidential dialogue constructibility in communication process is being founded as well. The research task of building forms that serve as the language of communication in different social, political and cultural systems is also being actualized in the article.

*Key words:* philosophy, communication, dialogue, mutual understanding, national consensus.

Communication is of special interest for philosophy as forms of thinking and activity, universally valid category and subjective intentions of individuals are concentrated in it. Difficulties in communication are explained by definitions of this phenomenon as direct and indirect, direct and mediate. In direct communication people interact «face to face». The direct collectivity of human activity is carried out within this form. But neither activity is reduced to the direct compatibility nor communication is to the direct contacts.

There are various subject and symbolic means that provide indirect communication between human individuals, relations of various human activities in social evolution process. The problems of social and cultural development are largely determined by its increasing role in people's lives. Taking this fact into consideration prevents the opposition and breaking concepts about activity and communication, communicativeness and productivity, compatibility and separation of people's social life of people. The activity concept focuses attention on the realization of human strength and the communication concept attracts it to the direct and indirect connections of that strength. Both concepts reveal forms of movement, cooperation, translation of human strength and abilities in social space and social time from different sides. The development of domestic social science within dimensional approach in which the principle of labor division prevailed over ideas of social processes have led to the simplified interpretations of communication and activity, i.e., com-

munication was reduced to intersubject interactions and activity was reduced to the person's influence on things. According to said above different forms of communication were reduced to the ideas of direct contacts between people. The objectivity and problematical character interfaced to it were replaced from communication and interdependence of people and social qualities of human subjects were replaced from an activity as well. Although the philosophical and methodological analysis gave every reason to understand the complexity of communication problem, the stereotypical interpretations of communication as a direct human interaction in ordinary and scientific consciousness dominated and continue to operate in fact.

However, the modern reality is that there are social systems that are at different stages of economic and scientific technical development being in a social time and space and in situations of close contacts as well. The situation of communicating naturally becomes wider than direct contacts between human individuals. It brings out the task of building forms that serve as the language of communication in different social, political and cultural systems.

During the XX<sup>th</sup> century problems of communication and social communication have become one of the central and actual philosophical themes in which thinkers of different branches took part, i.e., from transcendental phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and analytic philosophy to existential philosophy, philosophical hermeneutics and contemporary postmodernism. The study of different informative and communicative processes, «practice» symbolic speech, the problems of understanding the «other» forms of social interactions, the methodology of social and historical knowledge, «the theory of communicative action», versions of «discourse ethics», the philosophy of language are just some of many theoretical directions where general tendency of philosophical understanding of communication was realized. It is well-known that the development of communication as an essential and sometimes predominant subject was one of the specific tendencies and getting philosophical thought only in the last century, whereas most of these problems in classical European philosophy either didn't attract attention or were on the periphery of the philosophical research. It was the development of the subject area of communication that has created premises for overcoming «epistemological Robinson Crusoe» natural classical philosophy of learning subject. In the second half of the last century new tendencies were created in social philosophy that actualized a philosophical problem of communication in even bigger degree. The ideas of interpersonal symbolic interaction processes as the fundamental bases of social reality construction formulated earlier by Alfred Schutz have gained a wide recognition and specification [1; 344–351]. In philosophical hermeneutics by Gadamer G.G. the meaning of the word «the other» (as in the previous hermeneutics) got the status of human existence's ontology where social historical reality has been understood as self-interpreted being [2; 11–18]. In the communicative theory of society by Habermas J. the meaning of communicative actions' mechanism in the context of «communicative reason» is presented as a basis for the existence and reproduction of social life. One of the central ideas in the theory of Habermas is that the communication itself and communicative actions are not a means but end of public life in itself [3; 112–124].

Such interest of philosophy to a problem of communication is quite justified. The history of mankind represents history of people's communication with each other. «The very human's being is the deepest communication. To be means to communicate» Bakhtin M. M. claimed [4; 312]. The communication is a part of human culture in any society and in any historical period. The study of philosophical and historical roots and traditions of communication, its forms, means and functions can promote the improvement of people's mutual understanding in all spheres of human activity and can influence on the formation and development of personality as well.

The problem of communication was tried to be analyzed at the earliest stages of human civilization's development starting with doctrines of the ancient East, China, India, Socrat's conversations, Platon's dialogues. The foundations of logic and dialectics were laid in these doctrines which in the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and during the subsequent historical periods have become the subject of further reflection and analysis. Aristotle in his works was one of the first philosophers who attempted to develop a theoretical problem of communication. In Europe the representatives of German classical philosophy of the late XVIII<sup>th</sup> and early XIX<sup>th</sup> centuries Gegel G. and Feuerbach L. gave a new impetus to the development of theoretical problems of communication. Feuerbach L. created the concept of love toward the person accepted by him as the highest form of communication. «The certain person as something isolated doesn't include human existence in himself. The human existence is available only in communication» — he told [5; 203]. Philosophical and ideological ideas and concepts make possible to define the essence of communication, to relate spiritual and moral values and philosophical view of the world from the point of the present which in its turn determines the essence of communication.

Spiritual and material interaction of human activity is reflected in the process of communication and on the dialogue of cultures as well. The characteristic feature of any culture is that it is an element of set of existing cultures and its fall with other elements of the system can lead to degradation of the nation's development. Berdyaev N. A. wrote: «Greek culture, Italian culture during the Renaissance, French and German cultures in the era of prosperity are the ways of world culture of the whole mankind and they are all deeply national, individual and peculiar. All great national cultures are universal in its significance» [6; 298].

One of the first Russian philosophers who dealt with the problem of communication and dialogue between cultures was Chaadaev P.Y. He offered to divide peoples conditionally into original and unoriginal or historical and unhistorical. The thinker related such people to the historical nations who meet the following requirements:

- 1) people's memories, poetry, ideas should be the basis of the society's foundations;
- 2) idea and vocation should be realized by society;
- 3) society has to be in communication with other people and make a contribution to world history;
- 4) getting knowledge must go through thinking rather than borrowing, society must have strong mental skills and accept only the authority of mind and God;
- 5) people's history should have the duration and continuity, go on developing as spiritual interest must prevail over the material and they should draw firmness and confidence in its past;

Chaadaev P.Y. considered nations of Europe historical. He thought unhistorical nations are as follows:

- 1) have no bright memories and therefore have no memory;
- 2) do not know their recognition;
- 3) are isolated from the general humanity, i.e. do not perceive its traditions and ideas, do not communicate with other people, do not give the world anything and take nothing from the world;
- 4) are imitative people;
- 5) are indifferent to the good and evil; live only present and in this present there is only crime and slavery for them.

Chaadaev's division of peoples into historical and unhistorical turns into antithesis of West-East nations. He points out the following features that characterize peoples of East: subordination of spirit to secular beginning, historical dominance of law, life invariance, moral hierarchy.

The need of openness of cultures was obvious for Chaadaev P.Y. It is important for people of a certain culture to interact with other culture, to weaken or strengthen their own culture and as a consequence to have the possibility of their existence [7].

Danilevsky N.Y. introduced the concept of cultural identity of the people. He defined the meanings of the words «cultural historical type», «continuity», «stagnation». Danilevsky N.Y. developed his worldview toward the concept of «cultural historical type». Cultural historical type is formed as a result of interaction of people and their cultures. The more independent and original the elements of cultures' community are, the richer and more varied is the community of cultures. The thinker divided world history into periods in accordance with the cultural historical type of people. The activity of any nation who belongs to a particular cultural and historical type is positive. The development of features of its spiritual nature and life goes independently making contribution to human values. The historical type of all European culture which is characterized by consisting of many different cultures of different peoples may serve as an example. «Right and corresponding to the natural system's laws the group of historical phenomena leads us to the conclusion that the development of humanity came not only through distinctive cultural historical types, corresponding to the great tribes, i.e. through distinctive ethnic groups» [8; 117].

The communication between peoples often led to the merging of cultures while preserving valuable elements of national traditions. It is difficult to compare the culture of one nation with the traditions and customs of another nation. Cultures participate in the dialogue according to their level of development. As the role of culture in the dialogue varies according to the historical evolution, so the problem of understanding and mutual understanding between cultures raises. To solve this problem there have always been two ways: absolute impossibility of understanding foreign culture and a basic possibility of understanding this culture. The first way means locality of cultures, the lack of communication between them because they put an emphasis on originality and uniqueness. The second way which arose as a reaction to the first suggests the possibility of mutual understanding between cultures in their own categories on the basis of community.

Famous Soviet philosopher Batishchev G.S. while analyzing communication writes that people have disadvantages because of the shortage of close communication. He believes that there is a deep disharmony between the spheres of culture because of lack of close communication. Especially it has an influence on the

lowest layer «where culture turns into non-culture, into its self-abnegation and is replaced by its surrogates» [9; 15]. Especially ontological objective process of close communication differs from simple communication that onto communication has poor vocabulary of expressive words and therefore is not for civilization. It can only be met outside symbols in participation of «not giving disobjectification contents. Unlike usual communication with its partiality, a person fully addresses himself in onto communication. Batishchev G.S. points out the following categories of close communication: a) world approval is an acceptance and approval of the universe absolute primacy and priority as a world of all possible worlds; b) co-participation is a participation of everyone for all in the universe and all for everyone; c) there is a priority of an absolutely valuable attitude toward the world; r) there is a dominance on the others; d) there is a preceding dignity of each other in implicit layers of his being; e) there is a creativity as a free meeting; f) there is a co-creation [9; 46].

In order to communicate successfully you need knowledge in communication process, its functions as well as learning of people's interests and needs who take part in communication. The interest in solving problems that arise in communication process and a detailed explanation of certain matters are also necessary, etc. Communication includes not only the giving of information but involves the establishment of favorable interinfluence as well. «The dialogue differs from the monologue in that we not only hear but we listen to the voices of other people getting used to a principally different way of communication in which the main thing is not unambiguous and final truth but considering of all opinions, interested discussion of opposite points of view and finding consensus» — the philosopher Nysanbaev A.N. emphasizes. Our society is opened now for internal discussions, even for discussion of forbidden matters that were prohibited earlier with all interested organizations and wide masses of people [10; 24]. And it is possible only if one refuses the logic of dogmatism. The philosopher considers mutual trust of people, the desire to concede each other essentially important conditions for organizing this kind of discussion when a sincere vision and adoption of common goals and objectives are achieved. There is an acknowledgement of each other thanks to trust, sincerity, mutual interest and respect where the dialogue grows into close and mutually beneficial cooperation in achieving certain common goals.

Citizens with their needs, interests and values in democratic society are able to agree with each other about general laws of the state, its enforcement and penalties for their violation. People are able to be rational trying to follow the nondisjunction their words and actions and are able to take responsibility. You need knowledge of the communication process, its functions as well as study of people's interests and needs involved in communication to make such mutual understanding and mutually organized communication successful. You need an interest in solving problems that arise in the process of communication and a detailed explanation of certain matters, etc. Therefore philosophically understood communication includes not only information transfer but also involves the set of favorable interference. «There is a concept of bidirection, reciprocal communication having reply and responsibility for the reply in dialogue. Unlike the directed linear classical communicative scheme, it includes the equality of each other, the ability to concede a part of his freedom and independence to another, a willingness to give him part of his completeness and self-sufficiency. The dialogue does not help the situation analytically simplify mutual communication but, on the contrary, promotes the situation with mass of meanings and ontological, personalistic, existential, ethical connotations» — said Russian philosopher Nazarchuk A.V. [11; 52].

Philosophical perspectives of understanding communication said above are of particular importance for public awareness of modern Kazakhstan. Such an actual task for the Kazakhstan society as a statement of the Kazakhstan national identity as a main factor of social status requires serious ideological justification. From our point of view, determination of analytical approaches to understanding the national consciousness in terms of social transformation based both on the objectivity existence of a nation and its attributes, and on the fruitful creative activity of people, public institutions on its formation and development as well. In modern Kazakhstan the status of national consciousness is inseparably connected with efforts to strengthen the new community, i.e., the Kazakhstan people and the formation of national identity as a result of cooperation of all citizens. Gradual social and national policies of a strong state, widespread approval and development of democratic principles of self-organization and self-interest, objective study of history and culture of Kazakhstan as time and space interaction of Kazakhstan people with different ethnic communities will afford to achieve national reconciliation step by step. Therefore, it is the approval of the integration model «The unity in variety» which will lead to ever greater unity preserving their ethnic specificity of the peoples of Kazakhstan. Certainly, we shouldn't think that transition to the understanding of the nation by citizens and ethnic movement from policy to the sphere of culture will automatically stop various contradictions. The point is not just to proclaim the multinational people of Kazakhstan as «Kazakhstan nation» but to create fair and

equal conditions for personal development of every citizen improving the system of social welfare in which the natural ethnic differences will not be used as contrast of one nation to another and human rights of any ethnic origin will become an immutable law. It is no doubt that a systematic and balanced view on ethnic relations should be established at the state level to make the design and implementation of state national policy a norm on scientific analysis and prediction taking public opinion and consequences of adopted solutions into account. And this requires a large-scale cultural and educational activities worked out for long-term strategic perspective primarily in the education and formation of young Kazakhstan citizens to change not only the varieties of interethnic intensity, everyday nationalism and tolerance as a norm of social relations available in society but mutual respect and solidarity of Kazakhstan people as well. An important factor of prospects and effectiveness of such policy is, from our point of view, the formation of strong relations of the proposed ideas within usual everyday life of Kazakhstan people, i.e., moral and family values and ideals, public culture of behavior showing the importance and social need of positive interethnic relationship. The aspiration of Kazakhstan citizens to become a civilization with all attributes of the democratic society which originality consists in joint historical memory, various cultural traditions, solidary participation in achieving new social and economic progress in the present and future has to become a spiritual core of the Kazakhstan national identity. High complementarity, freedom of conscience, multiculturalism, susceptibility to all new and advanced, that is, those essential qualities that form the basis of any person's enrichment through the perception of cultural diversity are typical for many citizens of modern Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan declared and implemented in practice the principle that Kazakhstan is a country of equal opportunities for all people which form a united nation. It is necessary to fix in the minds of people a deep belief that the quality of the national area in which they live depends on their knowledge, position, actions in various ways. You can agree with the Russian philosopher Mezhev V.M. who told that «nation unlike ethnic group is what is given not by birth but by their own efforts and personal choice... Nation is a state, social and cultural belongings of the individual but not his ethnic and anthropological belonging» [12; 16].

The historical experience of the majority of states that have undergone social economic and political transformation shows that it is impossible to achieve strategic goals without national unity. It has become a necessary condition to deepen reforms, stabilize the economy and advance forward. The national consolidation which is both the state of society and the process for its unity and consolidation is an essential condition of the sustainable development of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The policy of national consolidation is based on such principles as the Kazakhstan patriotism, an interethnic and religious harmony and civil peace. After all, the logic suggests that the way of creation of new society lies not through opposition but through consent.

#### Список литературы

- 1 Шюц А. Избранное: Мир, светящийся смыслом. — М.: РОССПЭН, 2004. — 1055 с.
- 2 Гадамер Х.Г. Истина и метод: основы философской герменевтики: Пер. с нем. — М.: Прогресс, 1988. — 700 с.
- 3 Хабермас Ю. Демократия. Разум. Нравственность: московские лекции и интервью. — М.: Ками: ACADEMIA, 1995. — 245с.
- 4 Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества. — М.: Искусство, 1979. — 423 с.
- 5 Фейербах Л. Избранные философские произведения: В 2 т. — М.: Госполитиздат, 1955. — Т. 1. — 676 с.
- 6 Бердяев Н.А. Душа России // Бердяев Н.А. Русская идея: Основные проблемы русской мысли XIX века и начала XX века; Судьба России. — М.: Изд-во В.Шевчук, 2000. — 541с.
- 7 Чаадаев П.Я. Сочинения. — М.: Правда, 1989. — 655 с.
- 8 Данилевский Н.Я. Россия и Европа. — М.: Книга, 1991. — 574 с.
- 9 Батищев Г.С. Особенности культуры глубинного общения // Батищев Г.С. Диалектика общения. Гносеологические и мировоззренческие проблемы. — М.: ИФ АН СССР, 1987. — 189 с.
- 10 Нысанбаев А.Н. Философия взаимопонимания. — Алматы: Гл. ред. «Қазақ энциклопедиясы», 2001. — 544 с.
- 11 Назарчук А.В. Философское осмысление диалога через призму коммуникативного подхода // Вестн. МГУ. Сер. 7. Философия. — 2010. — № 1. — С. 51–71.
- 12 Межуев В.М. Идея национального государства в исторической перспективе // Полис. — 1992. — № 5–6. — С. 11–23.

## References

- 1 Schutz A. *Favorites: World glowing sense*, Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004, 1055 p.
- 2 Gadamer H.G. *Truth and Method: The basics of philosophical hermeneutics: translated from german*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1988, 700 p.
- 3 Habermas Yu. *Democracy. Mind. Morality: lectures and interviews in Moscow*, Moscow: Kami: ACADEMIA, 1995, 245 p.
- 4 Bakhtin M.M. *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*, Moscow: Arts, 1979, 423 p.
- 5 Feuerbach L. *Selected Philosophical Works: 2 vol.*, Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1955, 1, 676 p.
- 6 Berdyaev N.A. *Russian idea: The main problems of Russian thought XIX century and early XX century; Russia's fate*, Moscow: Publishing House of V. Shevchuk, 2000, 541 p.
- 7 Chaadaev P.Yu. *Works*, Moscow: Pravda, 1989, 655 p.
- 8 Danilevsky N.Ya. *Russia and Europe*, Moscow: The Book, 1991, 574 p.
- 9 Batishchev G.S. *Dialectics of communication. Epistemological and philosophical problem*, Moscow: IF AN SSSR, 1987, 189 p.
- 10 Nysanbaev A.N. *Philosophy understanding*, Almaty: Home Edition «Kazakh encyclopedia», 2001, 544 p.
- 11 Nazarchuk A.V. *Vestnik MGU, ser. 7 Philosophy*, 2010, 1, p. 51–71.
- 12 Mezhev V.M. *Polis*, 1992, 5–6, p. 11–23.

Б.К.Дюсалинова, П.П.Солощенко

### Ұлттық бірігу контекстіндегі тілдесу мәселесі

Мақалада тілдесу мәселесіне қатысты тарихи-философиялық жағдайлар қарастырылды. Мақаланың өзектілігі адамның әлеуметтік мәртебесін анықтаушы фактор ретіндегі Қазақстанның ұлттық бірегейлігін қалыптастыруымен байланыстырылды. Авторлармен тілдесу барысындағы ашық және сындарлы түсінік негізделді. Әр түрлі әлеуметтік, саяси және мәдени жүйелер үшін тілдесудегі ролін атқаратын формаларды құрастырудың зерттеу міндеті өзекті қырынан сипатталды.

Б.К.Дюсалинова, П.П.Солощенко

### Проблема общения в контексте национальной консолидации

В статье рассмотрены историко-философские подходы к проблеме общения. Их актуальность связана с утверждением казахстанской национальной идентичности в качестве определяющего фактора социального статуса человека. Авторами обосновано представление о конструктивности открытого и доверительного диалога в процессе общения. Актуализирована исследовательская задача выстраивания форм, выполняющих роль языка общения для разных социальных, политических и культурных систем.