

B.Zh. Zhussupova<sup>1\*</sup>, T.Kh. Kerimov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;

<sup>2</sup>Ural Federal University named after B.N. Yeltsin, Yekaterinburg, Russian Federation  
(E-mail: zhussupova2013@mail.ru, kerimov@mail.ru)

## In the flow of sociems

The article reveals the creative spirit of modern sociality, transforming it into a flow of sociems as the continuous formation of social singularities. Modernist worldview guidelines with faith in holistic, metaphysical ideals are being persistently replaced by fundamentally new cognitive attitudes that represent the latest civilizational challenges. The current course of social development has changed the usual rational social schemes, opposing, destroying, and deconstructing them. In social processes, increasing factors of pan-mythologization of all areas of social activity, the relativity of spiritual values, subjectivism, irrationalism, randomness, unpredictability, and uncertainty have been revealed. The image of contemporary society is one of flows of independent processes and human manifestations of will, fracturing, splitting, multifarious, varied, ludicrous, and individualistic. Modern cognitive thinking and a radically new epistemology are needed since the social environment has changed. Post-classical socio-philosophical discourse is a result of the metaphysical project's crises of conventional systematicity, reductionist scientific explanation of reality, and classical spiritual precepts. Instead of contemplating the clash between social paradigms, we must consider their coexistence poly-paradigmality, and how they mutually complement each other in examining different facets of social reality and addressing specific problematics across different scales.

*Keywords:* heterology, modern sociality, paradigm, post-non-classical, classical, sociema, singularity, uncertainty, co-existence, discursivity.

### Introduction

Modern social reality is composed and represented by sociems, denoting the continuous formation of social singularities. Furthermore, this is not a tribute to the postmodern tradition of baselessness, narrative, discursiveness, and uncertainty. This is something that is urgently emphasized and eloquently evident.

Classic images of integrity and wholeness, stability, and certainty have long and inexorably faded and have outlived their usefulness in all spheres of social reality, proclaiming its creative spirit and nature in the sense of unpredictability in self-organizing constructs.

Modern society has moved far away from the classical prose standards, turning to poetry of social events. However, this is not a romantic message but causes constant anxiety and social tension.

What is driving this modern social shift? The ascent of liberalism, separatism, individualism, and the inclination toward breaking traditional bonds and connections, along with the diminishing need for an all-encompassing view of the social landscape, was facilitated by civilizational prerequisites. These prerequisites include significant advancements in the realms of science and technology, notably within the information domain. The problem is that this happens less at the local and state levels. After all, the state (contrary to metaphysical intentions) is formed by humans, actors, and societies and does not play the same consolidating, organizing, patriarchal role as the classical sages saw it.

Modern thinkers emphasize the enormous range of social variability. Zh.-L. Nansi, in his work [1–10], depicts diversity in contemporary society as ensnared in the perceived meaninglessness of human existence. He characterizes it as a complex and futile arrangement, portraying civilization as an artificial construct devoid of vitality, estranged from individual lives. Emphasizing a shared coexistence among all humans, Nansi suggests that the fundamental essence of human life lies in the interconnected essence shared by each individual — a co-essence that defines their existence [1; 55]. Every entity is designed to be with other beings; there is no such thing as a generic being. J.R. Searle believes that social education is a structurally organized whole, existing and reproduced as such in the minds of individuals [2]. According to B. Latur, society is made up of a variety of elements that are all interconnected in a network and lack a distinct identity. Latur uses behavior and cognition to try to comprehend individuals in society. He wishes to accompany them so he might see life from their viewpoint [3]. Manuel De Landa, when contemplating society, mentions the con-

\* Corresponding authors. E-mail: zhussupova2013@mail.ru

cepts of “assembly”, “multiplicity”, and “complexity”. He delves into the genuine interactions among individuals in the real world, interactions that prove challenging to capture through theories due to their tendency to revolve around idealized notions and connections.

The functioning of society is carried out in the actions of multiple parts in an “assembly”. Several self-organizing systems arise through a process called “assembly”, which changes rival modes of existence to create new forms. When an item is assembled, its form changes to match its surroundings [4; 83]. The result is that the thing takes on a new form.

Contemporary socio-philosophical discussions highlight individualism and humanism, evident in the increased focus on examining daily human existence. Daily life unfolds visibly, yet it's also influenced by events preceding one's awareness. In essence, while traditional views positioned everyday human experience as a backdrop for individual growth, post-non-classical socio-philosophical perspectives elevate daily living to the forefront of social life.

Philosophers across various schools such as Marxism, Phenomenological Sociology, Phenomenology, Existentialism, and Analytical Philosophy, including L. Wittgenstein, J. Austin, A. Lefebvre, K. Kosik, A. Heller, and M. Foucault, have directed their focus towards the examination of everyday processes. The hypothesis proposed by Michel de Certeau, a French philosopher, is particularly significant and merits special consideration in this regard.

Contemporary social theory aims to humanize society by recognizing its construction through the everyday actions of its constituents. Understanding ordinary human existence becomes vital in grasping how these behaviors impact social interactions, sometimes causing perplexity in social dialogues. Conversely, ancient philosophy leaned heavily on theoretical constructs, shaping the behaviors of particular individuals.

M. de Certeau's book, “The Practice of Everyday Life”, encapsulates his anticipation of a significant shift in the relationship between social theory and practice through the analysis of daily existence. This perspective didn't immediately resonate with the philosopher; it emerged from socio-philosophical movements in the latter 20th century. These movements questioned whether individuals actively construct social structures or if these structures are molded by human agency.

As such, a closer understanding of practical problems is necessary for modern social ontology as well as a new analysis of socio-philosophical obstacles.

This is also relevant for the conditions of modern Kazakh society, which is facing new global severe challenges of our time, as stated in the program documents of the Republic of Kazakhstan. President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev spoke about the need to search for a new paradigm of social action in his Address to the People of Kazakhstan (September 1, 2020).

Such a social paradigm can be heterological, turned into a living social process (contrary to metaphysics) to get closer to modern human understanding. The first reason such awareness is important to prevent oneself from reverting to totalitarian ideologies, which are present in “utopian social engineering” initiatives that aim to change society in accordance with a predetermined blueprint. As per Zh.M. Abdildin, J.S. Mill's concept maintains relevance in the current context. Abdildin posits that governments or entities aiming to devalue individuals, even under seemingly noble intentions, will realize the limitations of ordinary individuals in achieving exceptional accomplishments. Additionally, a flawless system that sacrifices everything lacks the essential vitality, stifled to expedite the system's operations, rendering it unsuitable for any purpose [5; 96-97].

### *Research methods*

Many approaches, including social heterology, fractal analysis, theoretical and philosophical generalization, heuristic synthesis, and social synergy, have been used to examine modern social dynamics.

### *Results and discussion*

The knowledge of a living individual living in the creative processuality of a particular human life is addressed by the heterological paradigm of cognition and comprehension of modern social processes, including those taking place in Kazakh society. It is founded on:

- extensive social distribution;
- heightened nonlinearity in social progress;
- amplifying decentralization within social life;
- escalating mediation through social media platforms;
- rising liberalization of society's spiritual underpinnings;

- strengthening the factor of panmythologization of consciousness;
- increasing the degree of virtualization of social space and many others.

A vision of society “from below”, the heterological social paradigm rejects any attempts to idealize social education or to bind it to a single, absolute, system-forming foundation that is mostly subjectively generated or wishful thinking. Given the enormous rise in the importance of seemingly trivial, meaningless occurrences, this is an inexcusable error in the strain of modern society, which is brought on by turbulence and uncertainty.

In this heterological-methodological perspective of thought, the cognitive gambit represents the over-socialization of social life, which has nothing to do with metaphysics, consisting of the social virtualization of real life and an exaggerated dissolution of social illusions in the game. This comes precisely from “from below”, from “living” self-organizing social processes. The primary tool of “over-socialization” is information. In the period of “developed postmodernity”, the information environment dominates social reality, dictating to society as a whole and its constituent parts of methods, forms, and images of social behavior, according to E.V. Piliugina. J. Baudrillard characterizes the images representing the equivalence between information and the social environment during the shift from modernity to postmodernity as simulacra [6].

Our reality is filled with specters, simulacra, artificial constructs, and manufactured values driven by trends and a quest for status. We are mired and stuck in the space of social shows (English “show” — display, performance), which illusorily socializes us in isolation from reality. This is precisely what Slavoj Žižek means when he writes that today's social reality is torn apart due to its transformation into a virtual one. But the problem is not with virtuality. On the other hand, the problem lies in the virtual itself: “Virtuality is very concrete”. However, when everything is taken into account, it is insignificant. This could be regarded as a specific effect of the actual, if one so chooses. Moreover, this is the real origin of the problem [7; 173]. To put it another way, social space is “the most acute, problematic aspect of virtuality”, or genuine virtuality. This is the location of rupture's ontology. The chasm between the thing and the real is what matters [7; 117]. This is a statement of the times that no one has ever thought about. This happened in a string of social events. Alternatively, humanity has always dreamed of needing information to help a person master the world, especially since the Enlightenment era. Nevertheless, the fact that we would find ourselves captivated by it, having lost the demarcation line between the real and the virtual, the classical paradigms of cognition could not conceptually foresee. Via social heterology, the essence undergoes transformation into an event during the process of becoming, achieved by shifting one's perspective on thought and transcending prior cognitive paradigms. The process of being is, therefore, where the essence of being happens. Any event has this level of eventfulness.

Nietzsche was incensed by this, observing how common morality disconnects force from its manifestations. It's akin to separating lightning from its flash and mistaking the latter as an action attributed to a specific entity named lightning [8; 137]. Living together is a part of a heterological matrix.

Because of its heteronomous nature, the event is linguistic. An event occurs when a being presents itself in the external world. Being, not being a recognized entity, cannot be identified as a noun. Action constitutes a part of being. Hegel construed the activity of what exists before as the process of becoming, where the fulfillment of preconceived intentions culminates in an outcome. In contrast, the genuine process of evolving through diversity and difference is termed heterogeneous becoming. This is precisely what F. Nietzsche had in mind when he challenged the philosophical attitude toward the subject and its predicate [9; 302]. Heidegger's ontological revolution holds that the mystery of mankind is not objective, but rather exists in the “background” that makes it possible to see this essence of being [10; 408]. “Man is in the lumen of being”.

Existence and Being share an inseparable and ambiguous link. They do not exist independently, yet they are not mutually exclusive. Existence and being are essentially distinct from one another. A being “takes place something, and not nothing, to bring existence into existence” [8; 138]. Existence is an activity, a process of unfolding, a becoming of existence. It is also the detachment from being that makes being possible. The misconception originates from the long-held belief that existence is a word that can be an object, substance, idea, or essence. Because of this, there is an onto-hetero-genetic relationship between the virtual and the actual: through internal difference, the virtual generates the actual. Furthermore, in the process of actualization — which involves drawing new distinctions — multiplicity is actualized because ontogeny equals heterogeneity [8; 150]. The precise question of how and when the virtual becomes actual is at the heart of the current socio-philosophical conversation. “Difference is behind everything, but behind difference, there is nothing”, observes R. Rorty [11].

The traditional, ontological framework halted rational thought and demanded blind acceptance of the definitively established. It left out alternative explanations for the many life paths people take. The priority should be given to “another possibility” instead of adhering to this form of onto-theological thinking [8; 208]. A “possibility-reality” represents an alternative potentiality different from the currently acknowledged one. Another contributing factor is the temporal variability: the past could have unfolded differently, there might be various non-linear developmental models in the present, and the future may introduce unknowns. Coherent virtuality is an additional alternative. In virtual content, distinct contents blend into one another until they are indistinguishable and the object and subject planes are not clearly separated in comprehension [12, 216].

In “Difference and Repetition”, Delez clarifies the difference between the virtual and the possible:

1) “The potential” is more important than “the existing”: How can the nonexistent be separated from what already exists if it is already a potentiality included in the idea before any characteristics make it conceivable? Though it is a notion, existence is apart from conceptions. Though it exists in both time and space, it does so as an impartial environment; it is not intrinsically formed inside either [12; 217];

2) There could be a virtual identity relationship that resembles a difference. The possibility and the virtual are distinct from one another since the latter refer to the idea's pure multiplicity, which drastically rejects identification as a prerequisite [12; 217], and the former deals with the concept's essential shape;

3) The relationship between the virtual and the actual eliminates any similarity. Social phenomena are unique.

As a result, there are two models, two perspectives on being, and two kinds of contrasts between conventional and new ontologies:

– Identification holds dominance over difference in the realm of onto-theology, much like existence bows to being as the foundation of identity. Identity serves as the genesis of difference, its progression, culminating in stark opposition and resolution. Differentiations are suppressed, combined, and reconciled within Hegel's framework into a fundamental unity that is devoid of differences and is firmly based on logic.

– According to the theory, heterological difference goes beyond just defining pre-existing components. Rather, it is the basis of existence, enabling being to produce its own essence. After constant development, this substance takes the shape of an occurrence and becomes a phenomena in phenomenology. There is no previous, complete identity of being that serves as a foundation; identification is not what causes difference. It turns out that being itself is what makes creatures different from one another, not the differences between identical beings.

J. Delez explores the symbolic depiction of these dual differences in his book “Nietzsche and Philosophy”, employing F. Nietzsche's insights as an illustration. Nietzsche postulates the existence of two conflicting forces within every individual: the active and the reactive. An active force is flexible; it asserts its individuality, subdues, pushes the limits of its power, and turns it into a source of satisfaction and approval [13, 130]. Without a doubt, the active force is the creative force. Unlike active parties, reactive forces take action. Put differently, reactive forces impede the emergence of creativity by opposing it and linking it to previous events. Nietzsche is notable for taking this position against conventional religions, viewing them as reactive structures that view variety as a threat to a person's identity.

Adopting Nietzschean ideas is necessary to go from the evaluative stance of the well-known German cultural rebel to the ontology of today's social environment. This world has become dynamic, unpredictable, uncertain, and heterogeneous, emerging from the confines of a homogeneous group united by shared values. A challenge to civilization is what makes things different from one another. It has to do with different from different.

This implies that the only things left to do are to disassemble, try new things, and produce. Embracing diversity entails having an open mind. Delez suggests the following method: dive into the layer, investigate its potentials, identify a suitable position, consider potential shifts away from established territories, explore possible paths, occasionally establish links between streams, gradually evaluate the degree of intensity while maintaining a modest region of innovation [8; 214].

As a result, we declare that procedural principles form the basis of reality. Actualization entails creating new distinctions, thus giving rise to multiplicity, with heterogeneity symbolizing the origin of existence [8; 150]. Being is discursive and different. Being is verbal; it does not belong to the subject but generates it. Being an event is continuously self-established.

Turning from the philosophical and methodological intentions of the heterological social paradigm to actual social practice, we note the explicit contradictory complication of post-modern social life, including in

Kazakh society. These, for instance, are the fundamental paradoxes of every contemporary state, including Kazakhstan. “First, the relationship between the people and the government is unclear. Next, there's an increasing disconnect between the state and society, leading to the rising prominence of “micro-power” within governance institutions compared to political power. Additionally, the “network form” of global authority severs the connection between accountability and decision-making. This results in politically irresponsible managerial choices at the global level, leading to the erosion of one of democracy's fundamental principles—the notion of the “common good” [14].

Social heterology suggests starting from living processes, following them, and legitimizing uncertainty as an inevitable attribute. A profound socio-philosophical concept is required to reflect the picture of modern society more accurately.

### Conclusion

Hence, the post-modern society exhibits explicit heterogeneity, evident through its primary characteristics:

- Sociems, representing the ongoing formation of social singularities.
- Complex differentiation.
- Escalating complexity in proliferation.
- The explicit multi-directional nature of events and processes.
- Polycentration of social space;
- Hidden connections of social processes due to the increasing degree of their mediation;
- Pluralism of worldviews and others.

The traditional tenets of social philosophy are no longer applicable in this context. The social processes of today are becoming more unpredictable. This social shift can be attributed to the high achievements of science and technology, especially the information process, which made it possible for liberalism, separatism, individualism, and dynamism toward the breaking of traditional ties and relationships to flourish. It also resulted in the loss of the need for a comprehensive view of the social landscape.

Prominent modern thinkers emphatically identify a vast range of social variability in society, which indicates the birth of a new social ontology, *a new formulation of socio-philosophical problems relating to the practical life of a person, including everyday modern life.*

This is also relevant for the conditions of modern Kazakh society, which is facing new global severe challenges of our time. The heterological paradigm allows us to get closer to the objective process of social life, to an understanding of the fundamental interests of a person, which the classical social cognitive paradigm did not consider, looking at a person “from above”, smoothing out the social picture towards a single basis. In this context, we're not addressing conflicting social paradigms; rather, we're exploring how they synergize to address specific problems and investigate diverse facets of social reality. Therefore, if determining the general, global pattern of social evolution is the aim, then applying the classical paradigm makes sense. To comprehend the distinct aspects of human existence in today's fast-changing, highly dynamic world marked by societal upheavals, we need cognitive tools that encompass the human dimension within social processes — the vital fabric crucial for understanding.

In the tension of modern sociality caused by turbulence and uncertainty, it would be an unforgivable mistake to ignore seemingly small, insignificant events, which, as practice demonstrates, play a monumental role in social processes, leading to tragic consequences.

Modern society, including Kazakhstan's, is in the complex, contradictory dynamics of social processes uncharacteristic of classical cultures. These are the contradictions of the information society, the problems and contradictions of modern states, and many others that can only be solved from the position of the heterological paradigm.

The heterological approach rejects the search for a single internal or external basis in post-classical social viewpoints, characterizing social action as pluralistic and rejecting a complete ontology. This viewpoint examines society's inner workings in great detail, emphasizing its variety, individuality, plurality, heterogeneity, and cohabitation. It follows their tendencies with a self-developmental framework. Within this heterological framework, techniques such as fractality, synergetics, and rhizomorphism function. Rather than focusing just on institutionalized aspects of social history, we believe that this heterological approach is the most helpful for accurately recognizing and defining the complex modern social processes and making them simpler to grasp [15; 283].

In order to fully comprehend contemporary social processes — which are shaped by unique characteristics and traits — post-classical social perspectives need to go deeper. This knowledge is essential for developing humane and caring plans and strategies that will be further the advancement of mankind in the future.

*The article was prepared as part of a scientific project under the grant AP13268777 “Heterological paradigm of social research under the conditions of uncertainties in the development of modern Kazakhstani society” (2022–2024) (Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan).*

## References

- 1 Нанси Ж.-Л. Бытие единичное множественное / Ж.-Л. Нанси; пер. В.В. Фурса. — Минск: И. Логинов, 2004. — 272 с.
- 2 Медведев В.А. Методологический анализ когнитивной модели Дж. Серля / В.А. Медведев // Сумма философии. — 2006. — Вып. 5. — С. 91–105. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://elar.urfu.ru/bitstream/10995/4367/2/sf-05-18.pdf>. 11.06.2020.
- 3 Латур Б. Пересборка социального: введение в акторно-сетевую теорию / Б. Латур; пер. С. Гавриленко. — М.: Изд. дом Высш. шк. экон., 2014. — 384 с.
- 4 Керимов Т.Х. Современная социальная философия: учеб. пос. для вузов / Т.Х. Керимов. — Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2015. — 156 с.
- 5 Абдильдин Ж.М. Логика теории современной демократии и проблемы ее реализации / Ж.М. Абдильдин, Р.Ж. Абдильдина. — Астана: Фолиант, 2014. — 344 с.
- 6 Пилюгина Е.В. Состояние постмодерна: сингулярность бытия, транспарентность сознания и панмифологизация реальности / Е.В. Пилюгина // Гуманит. науч. журн. — 2014. — №1. — С. 30–36. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sostoyanie-postmoderna-singulyarnost-bytiya-transparentnost-soznaniya-i-panmifologizatsiya-realnosti>
- 7 Зброжек Е.А. Онтология разрыва как ключ к пониманию философии С. Жижека / Е.А. Зброжек // Вестн. Воронеж гос. ун-та. — 2012. — № 2. — С. 115–120.
- 8 Керимов Т.Х. Бытие и различие: генеалогия и гетерология / Т.Х. Керимов. — М.: Академический проспект, 2011. — 256 с.
- 9 Ницше Ф. Воля к власти: опыт переоценки всех ценностей / Ф. Ницше; пер. Е. Герцык. — М.: Культурная революция, 2005. — 880 с.
- 10 Жусупова Б.Ж. Фрактальность. Турбулентность. Социальность / Б.Ж. Жусупова // Global science and innovations: mater. of the internat. scient. conf. — Gdansk, 2019. — С. 406–410.
- 11 Рорти Р. Философия и Зеркало Природы, Гуманитарный портал / Р. Рорти. — 1979. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/5141>.
- 12 Гермашова В.А. Понятие «виртуальная реальность» в философском знании / В.А. Гермашова // Наука. Инновации. Технологии. — 2009. — № 5. — С. 215–221.
- 13 Делез Ж. Ницше и философия / Ж. Делез. — М.: Ад Маргинем, 2003. — 392 с.
- 14 Мальцев К.Г. Кризис государства-нации как проблема социально-политической философии / К.Г. Мальцев, Л.Л. Ломако // Вестн. ЛГУ им. А.С. Пушкина. — 2020. — № 1. — С. 55–64. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/krizis-gosudarstva-natsii-kak-problema-sotsialno-politicheskoy-filosofii>
- 15 Жусупова Б.Ж. К вопросу о социальной онтологии / Б.Ж. Жусупова // Вестн. Караганд. ун-та. Сер. История. Философия. — 2022. — № 3. — С. 280–287.

Б.Ж. Жусупова, Т.Х. Керимов

## Социум ағынында

Мақалада әлеуметтік ерекшеліктердің үздіксіз қалыптасуы ретінде оны қоғам ағымына айналдыратын қазіргі әлеуметтіліктің шығармашылық рухы ашылған. Біртұтас, метафизикалық идеалдарға сенетін модернистік дүниетанымның нұсқаулары ең соңғы өркениеттік сын-кәтерлерді білдіретін түбегейлі жаңа когнитивтік көзқарастармен тұрақты түрде ауыстырылуда. Қоғамдық дамудың қазіргі бағыты кәдімгі ұтымды әлеуметтік схемаларды өзгертіп, оларға қарсы тұрды және жойды, оларды деконструкциялады. Әлеуметтік процестерде әлеуметтік қызметтің барлық салаларын панмифологизациялау факторларының күшеюі, рухани құндылықтардың салыстырмалылығы, субъективизм, иррационализм, кездейсоқтық, болжамсыздық және белгісіздік анықталды. Қазіргі қоғамның көрінісі шашыраңқы, таланған, алуан жүзді, әр түрлі, абсурдты, автономды процестердің ағыны және адамның ерік білдіруімен ерекшеленген. Әлеуметтік әлем жаңа танымдық ойлауды, түбегейлі жаңа гносеологияны қажет ететін басқаша болды. Постклассикалық емес әлеуметтік-философиялық дискурс дәстүрлі жүйелілік дағдарысынан, классикалық рухани нұсқаулардан, метафизикалық жобадағы шындықты ре-

дукционистік ғылыми ілімнен туындайды. Алайда, бұл әлеуметтік парадигмалардың қарама-қайшылықтары туралы емес, яғни полипарадигмалық туралы, олардың әлеуметтік шындықтың әртүрлі бөлімдерін зерттеудегі, белгілі бір типтегі мәселелер мен масштабтарды шешудегі өзара толықтырулары туралы айтылған.

*Кілт сөздер:* гетерология, қазіргі әлеуметтілік, парадигма, постклассикалық емес, классикалық, социум, сингулярлық, белгісіздік, бірге өмір сүру, дискурсивтілік.

Б.Ж. Жусупова, Т.Х. Керимов

## В потоке социем

В статье выявлен творческий дух современной социальности, который трансформирует ее в поток социем как непрерывного становления социальных сингулярностей. На смену модернистским мировоззренческим ориентирам с верой в холистические, метафизические идеалы настойчиво приходят принципиально новые когнитивные установки, которые репрезентируют новейшие цивилизационные вызовы. Современный ход общественного развития изменил привычным рациональным социальным схемам, противостоя, разрушая и деконструируя их. В социальных процессах обнаружились усиливающиеся факторы панмифологизации всех областей социальной деятельности, релятивности духовных ценностей, субъективизма, иррационализма, случайности, непредсказуемости и неопределенности. Картина современного социума разрознена, разорвана, многолика, разнообразна, абсурдна, индивидуализирована потоками автономных процессов и человеческих волеизъявлений. Социальный мир стал другим, требующим новейшего когнитивного мышления, принципиально новой эпистемологии. Постнеклассический социально-философский дискурс вызван кризисом традиционной системности, классических духовных ориентиров, редукционистского онаучивания действительности в метафизическом проекте. Однако речь идет не о противопоставлении социальных парадигм, а о полипарадигмальности, их взаимном дополнении в исследовании различных срезов социальной реальности, в решении определенных типов задач, масштабов.

*Ключевые слова:* гетерология, современная социальность, парадигма, постнеклассический, классический, социема, сингулярность, неопределенность, со-бытие, дискурсивность.

## References

- 1 Nansi, Zh.-L. (2004). Bytie edinichnoe mnozhestvennoe [Being singular multiple]. Minsk: I. Loginov [in Russian].
- 2 Medvedev, V.A. (2006). Metodologicheskii analiz kognitivnoi modeli Dzh. Serlia [Methodological analysis of J. Searle's cognitive model]. *Summa filosofii — Sum of Philosophy*, 5, 91–105. Retrieved from <http://elar.ufru.ru/bitstream/10995/4367/2/sf-05-18.pdf>. 11.06.2020. [in Russian].
- 3 Latur, B. (2014). Peresborka sotsialnogo: vvedenie v aktorno-setevuiu teoriiu [Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network theory]. Moscow: Izdatelskii dom Vysshei shkoly ekonomiki [in Russian].
- 4 Kerimov, T.Kh. (2015). Sovremennaiia sotsialnaia filosofiiia: uchebnoe posobie dlia vuzov [Modern Social Philosophy: textbook for universities]. Yekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo Uralskogo universiteta [in Russian].
- 5 Abdildin, Zh.M., & Abdildina, R.Zh. (2014). Logika teorii sovremennoi demokratii i problemy ee realizatsii [The logic of the theory of modern democracy and the problems of its implementation]. Astana: Foliant [in Russian].
- 6 Piliugina, E.V. (2014). Sostoianie postmoderna: singuliarnost bytiia, transparentnost soznaniia i panmyfologizatsiia realnosti [The state of postmodernity: the singularity of being, transparency of consciousness and panmythologization of reality]. *Gumanitarnyi nauchnyi zhurnal — Humanitarian Scientific Journal*, 1, 30–36. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sostoianie-postmoderna-singulyarnost-bytiya-transparentnost-soznaniya-i-panmyfologizatsiya-realnosti> [in Russian].
- 7 Zbrozhek, E.A. (2012). Ontologiiia razryva kak kliuch k ponimaniuu filosofii S. Zhizheka [The ontology of rupture as the key to understanding the philosophy of S. Zizek]. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriiia Filosofiiia — Proceedings of Voronezh State University. Series: Philosophy*, 2, 115–120 [in Russian].
- 8 Kerimov, T.Kh. (2011). Bytie i razlichie: genealogiiia i geterologiiia [Being and difference: genealogy and heterology]. Moscow: Akademicheskii prospekt [in Russian].
- 9 Niczsche, F. (2005). Volia k vlasti: opyt pereotsenki vsekh tsennostei [The will to power: the experience of revaluing all values]. Moscow: Kulturnaia revoliutsiia [in Russian].
- 10 Zhussupova, B.Zh. (2019). Fraktalnost. Turbulentnost. Sotsialnost [Fractality. Turbulence. Sociality]. *Global science and innovations: materials of the international scientific conference*. Gdansk, 406–410 [in Russian].
- 11 Rorti, R. (1979). Filosofiiia i Zerkalo Prirody. Gumanitarnyi portal [Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. Humanitarian portal]. Retrieved from <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/5141> [in Russian].
- 12 Germashova, V.A. (2009). Poniatie «virtualnaia realnost» v filosofskom znanii [The concept of “virtual reality” in philosophical knowledge]. *Nauka. Innovatsii. Tekhnologii — Science. Innovations. Technologies*, 5, 215–221 [in Russian].
- 13 Delez, Zh. (2003). Nitszshe i filosofiiia [Nietzsche and philosophy]. Moscow: Ad Marginem [in Russian].

14 Maltsev, K.G., & Lomako, L.L. (2020). Krizis gosudarstva-natsii kak problema sotsialno-politicheskoi filosofii [The crisis of the nation-state as a problem of socio-political philosophy]. *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A.S. Pushkina — A.S. Pushkin Leningrad State University Bulletin*, 1, 55–64. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/krizis-gosudarstva-natsii-kak-problema-sotsialno-politicheskoy-filosofii> [in Russian].

15 Zhussupova, B.Zh. (2022). K voprosu o sotsialnoi ontologii [On the issue of social ontology]. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya Istoria. Filosofiiā — Bulletin of the Karaganda University, History. Philosophy Series*, 3, 280–287 [in Russian].

#### Information about the authors

**Zhussupova, B.Zh.** — PhD, Assistant Professor of the Department of philosophy and theory of culture, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;

**Kerimov T.Kh.** — Professor, Doctor of Philosophy, Ural Federal University named after the First President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Yekaterinburg, Russia.

Buketov University