

B.Zh. Zhussupova

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

### **Cognitive angle of «another sociality»**

The article raises the problem of the study of modern society, explicitly represented by heterogeneous sociality. The power of the dynamics of modern life breaks the usual human connections, but, most importantly, the basic human landmarks. The main attributes of a heterogeneous society - the difference, the multiplicity of singularities, decentration. Decentration of the human community occurs. This is another nature, «another sociality», «another humanity». The modern course of social development demonstrates dissonance with the reductionist classical attitudes of social philosophy to the monotony and integrity of social being and proves their inconsistency, lifelessness and even inhumanity due to ignoring the quality of human life. What became important was the humanitarian character of thinking, which is designed to overcome the classical subject-object mindset and get closer to subject-subject, to self-knowledge.

*Keywords:* heterogeneous society, post-nonclassical discourse, post-nonclassical methods, epistemological potential, cognitive interest, heterological paradigm, plurality of singularities, nonlinear structure, dynamics of self-development, human-like tactics.

The power of the dynamics of modern life breaks the usual human ties, but, most importantly, the basic human landmarks. Decentration of the human community occurs. Society ceases to be monotonous, homogeneous. It becomes non-equilibrium, heterogeneous. This is a completely different world compared to the near past, the factor of its uncertainty has increased, and the principle of uncertainty has become even more obvious.

The society of today involuntarily casts doubt on the assertion about the necessity and possibility of joint stable human coexistence. Under the influence of powerful civilization factors, despite the processes of world globalization, modern society is scattered, torn by irreconcilable contradictions, not orderly, not «combed» under the basic provisions of classical social paradigms, sharpened on the search for a single system-forming principle of social life, on total metaphysics that defines everything social processes by a certain single supreme, superhuman principle of existence and development. T.Kh.Kerimov, referring to Heidegger, calls such metaphysics as onto-theology: classical (including social) «metaphysics solves the issue of general theology. From the very beginning of metaphysics, the ontological search for the general, i.e. that things exist in general is associated with the search for the highest being. Theology in this, in fact, is: it explores the existence as a whole, or in general, reducing this whole to the highest being» [1; 110].

Contrary to traditional metaphysics, modern society is heterogeneous, it is decentralized and multidimensional. This is another nature, «another sociality», «another humanity». Modern society is torn apart, decomposed into many parts that can hardly be called composite. And this separation has reached a high degree. The increased factor of the mediation of social processes plays an exceptional role in this. In his studies, T.Kh. Kerimov notes that the architectonics of modern social life today is no longer seen as one-dimensional, homogeneous, but multidimensional and multifaceted. Each of these faces is affirmed in the sphere of its own world, taking into account other possible worlds. «Society has always been heterogeneous, but now heterogenization has become not just a fact, but also an acute problem» [2, 3].

Social philosophy is in the same heterogeneous state as social reality itself. According to M. Mamardashvili, «the most difficult thing in modern thinking is to get used to seeing the world not as ready, given for understanding ... The evolution of philosophy occurs when something is really broken in this conquered bliss, in this ontological rootedness of a person ... And the question arises (in any case, this question is being rethought): does there exist a ready world of laws and betrayed entities?» [3; 59].

The linguistic turn as a part of the ontological one, thus, ambivalently implies the onto-anthropological and the onto-social, the inevitable necessity of which was stated by Martin Heidegger. According to T.Kh. Kerimov, «with Heidegger's transformation of the meaning of ontology, the latter turns out to be a study not of «being as being», but being in its relation to... human being» [1; 107]. In this context, according to V.E. Kemerov, the traditional philosophy absolutized the transcendental method, going beyond the limits of man and becoming supra-historical, supra-human. As a result, it turned out to be incapable of understanding the human component of social being, the essence of human life. It was unable to teach people to live

like human beings [4; 14]. Traditional philosophy looked at human existence as if from above, from a bird's-eye view, which, undoubtedly, allows us to outline the contours of human life, but, alas, only contours.

The contour of human life was also blurred due to the increase in the level of mediation of man by the conquests of civilization, one of the manifestations of which is language in the broad sense of the word. It is in this vein that methodologically the idea of the «death of the author» R. Barth should be heeded when, in his essay of the same name, he spoke about the author's narrative tyranny in understanding the meaning of a literary work (read: social action), depriving a person of a deep creative understanding. In the same direction, Michel Foucault proposes a new methodology of humanitarian knowledge - the archeology of knowledge about a person. The «archeology of knowledge» is a deep analysis of discourse associated with the «excavations» of powerful layers of the dead human language (culture), under which a living person is buried and his activity. Discourse analysis is not based on referring to the source of discourse, but on a systematic study of discourse as a practice, forming discourse objects. In this sense, according to the philosopher, that there is no progress or meaning in human history. Hence, the ideas of deconstruction of Jacques Derrida, meaning the understanding of the text through the destruction of the stereotype or inclusion in the new context.

Modern society explicitly demonstrates mosaicism, heterogeneity, and this heterogeneity has reached a high degree. Modern society is heterogeneous. Research into a heterogeneous society needs social heterologous paradigms, or social heterology. A serious attempt to develop social heterology as a new theory and a new methodology of modern social research was undertaken by T.Kh. Kerimov. Before him, the philosophical reflection that had prepared a similar paradigmatic shift was attended by the famous works of the Russian philosophers V.S. Bibler, V.E. Kemerov, M.K. Mamardashvili, V.S. Shvyrev, M.M. Bakhtin, G.S. S. Batishchev and others. Western thinkers J. Bataille, J. Derrida, J. Delez, E. Levinas, J.-L. Nancy, S. Zizek, A. Badiu and others have prepared a deep ground for understanding the realities of modern sociality. The main focus of these studies is on society from the inside, in terms of the diversity of its shades, reflected in human activity, in the actions of people.

Thus, the problem of human action is viewed in a new way in the philosophy of M. Bakhtin as acutely relevant, as the thinker sees a person's action in the person's action, focusing on another person, representing a dialogue in which the primary structure of individuality, uniqueness of the person's being, is born the transition from this, which is present, has arisen in the past, formed, to create, creatively creative in the present, and then to the future.

According to M.M. Bakhtin, dialogue with another is the field on which genuine creative human activity takes place, which is present in completely different areas of social being. And in this matter there is a serious study of the subtly revealed and clearly articulated differences between creative creative activity and activity, on the contrary, destructive, opposite, destructive. In the situation of the modern world, in which there are complex, non-one-dimensional, difficult-to-define processes, as if guaranteed by moral and moral positions, but not guaranteed in the sense of destructive results, a deep philosophical analysis of the blurred line between good and evil is more urgent than ever.

According to M. Bakhtin, a human act seems to be nothing more than a microcosm of creative activity taking place in a world that is fundamentally incomplete, in which the future is not guaranteed by nothing and no one, is not predictable, even if it is possible to turn to ultra-precise scientific theories. Moreover, each perfect act forms the world and is realized for the person as actual and responsible. Being a creative act, the deed is not derived entirely from past experience, already generalized by the sciences. Any act is always directed at another person, in which his duty is expressed, and at the same time his unique true originality in relation to the future. But, according to the thinker, as much as creativity and creation are present in the act, it contains destructiveness and destruction, since the presence of a priori knowledge in a human act is necessarily combined with the individuality of his initiative, the subjectivity of the will, coming from the complex depths of the soul.

M. Bakhtin sees the main indispensable condition for creativity in the diversity and diversity of social connections, their polyphonism, in dialogue and polylogical interhuman relations. As the philosopher emphasizes, a specific human act already includes many prerequisites for creativity and meaning formation [5; 82].

The Russian philosopher and cultural scientist V. Bibler in his social reflections does not focus on the relations between subject and object, as was customary in classical philosophy, but on inter-subject relations. Moreover, each and every object of the world that the philosopher understands «as if he were a work» is an embodiment of the author's subjective and subject characteristics. This subject is of much greater interest than as a targeted subject of knowledge. But at the same time, subject-object relations are not leveled, since

any thinking continues to be objective. However, as V. Bibler emphasizes, the more polylogical the dialogue is, the more infinitely possible the world can be reduced to this or that logic, the more bun of being dense, non-absorbing, mysterious, pushing out of thought [6; 312].

Thus, in the history of social-philosophical thought, beginning with M. Heidegger, there is an onto-anthropological and an onto-social turn, which resulted in two main models, two main approaches in explaining social being: ontological and heterologous. The ontological approach is connected with the obligatory correlation of the social being with a certain transcendental, ideal foundation. The heterologous approach, on the contrary, seeks not to look for an absolute source, a guiding principle and center, which is beyond the essence of things. This approach is associated with such a view on society, in which it is differences, and not identity, that are its main attributes, linear development and organization of society are questioned, and multidimensional connections bring relativism to the fore.

But today there is no serious socio-philosophical theory reflecting the picture of heterogeneous society. As T. Kerimov writes: «Our society has not yet established the limits within which it would be possible to invent life strategies of human behavior and the limits of their implementation in social practice. Moreover, in a heterogeneous society, the very principles of society are open to criticism and any new theory or concept, any new life strategy is rejected under these conditions as inadequate» [2; 7]. But such a concept is necessary in order to escape from the captivity of a certain metaphysical foundation. This foundation must be sought within society.

According to the heterologous paradigm, social being is considered as the basis of things in the sense of belonging to them, and not in the sense of possession, mastering. This means that being is the being of singular existence. Being is the difference of being. Being is co-being. The way of being of existence is co-existence.

Thus, for modern philosophy, the idea of becoming a distinction, which means a transition to a new concept of being, not tied to any traditional foundation, becomes very important. And then, according to T.Kh. Kerimov, heterology becomes ontology as a teaching about difference.

In traditional metaphysical discourse, the relationship between being and the real is thought of as a relationship of one and many. The obvious difference between being and being is that being is singular (singular), while being is multiple. For social heterology, the real (many) is not everything, it is not a multitude of separate objects, but a multitude in the making. Becoming as a becoming essence of unity. But this is not a metaphysical unity - it is the unity of the becoming. This is a different idea of sociality, it is a different sociality.

If we make an excursion into the history of social sciences, they developed in the framework of the interaction of classical metaphysics and natural science. Therefore, sociality was scientifically reduced, was tied to a certain higher organized and organizing order (Cosmos, God, Nature). The ideal of sociality was association. Happiness in the union - the state as a family in Confucius, the state as a city in Plato, the state as an organism in Al-Farabi, etc. This is a kind of sociality that says we and always sets up around the third member of the relationship, serving as an intermediary between the subjects. It is a sociality around something in common.

It is known that classical social philosophy was based on the cognitive explanatory guidelines of the natural sciences, which in the 19th century led to the emergence of positivism. T.Kh. Kerimov identifies two reasons for this:

- 1) highlighting the natural causes of sociality;
- 2) objectivity of the natural sciences.

Therefore, in sociology, a type of theoretical consciousness arises, based not on tradition or faith, but on research results that are not foreign to criticality. True, this criticality in the sociology of Comte, Durkheim, Weber is within the cognitive procedure and does not affect the characteristics of the subject of knowledge. After all, the main principle of sociology of O.Kont is to know society as it is in itself, naturalistically, objectively.

On the one hand, such a gnoseological approach allowed one to free oneself from metaphysical distortions and simplifications, but, on the other hand, the philosopher emphasizes, this ambivalent gives rise to even more restriction caused by excessive objectification of society. Kont uses the expression «the natural laws of society», Simmel speaks of «social forms», and Durkheim speaks of «social facts».

According to T.Kh. Kerimov: «In a strange way, precisely when sociology stands out as a private and autonomous (from metaphysics) discipline with its subject (with its truth and essence of this subject) and corresponding methods, it turns out to be in the power of metaphysics» [2; 10]. True, now sociology refers

not to the higher transcendental order, but to the social Cosmos, to the order that is invisibly present in society itself (by the way, the word «cosmos» in Greek means «Order»). And all variants of being of a man with society are only particular cases of social cosmos.

In this connection, a person is located in the system of social coordinates. It is a mobile aggregate of social roles, functions, rights, duties, subordinate to the institution of total sociality. The individual shares all his social functions in social time and space with others. Social time and space are determined by social change. Thus, we are talking about the self-sufficiency of the social, as, indeed, in the metaphysical (ontological) concept it was about the self-sufficiency of metaphysics. Therefore, writes T.Kh. Kerimov: «Two discourses are mirror images of each other, and each justifies its legitimacy by discrediting the other» [2; 11].

And therefore, according to T.Kh.Kerimov, we must find those who do not reconcile these two discourses, the so-called median, or the third, which reconciles these two, «since this third discourse will always strive for transcendentalism or social realism in accordance with different versions of metaphysical or social humanism» [2; 11]. We have to talk about the «other sociality», not on a single basis and the identity of the abiding, but about the sociality of the multiple, discrete, heterogeneous. We should not talk about a homogeneous society, but about a heterogeneous, a society of differences. It is necessary to overcome metaphysics.

The society of the XXI century is characterized by heterogeneity composed of:

- differences as a structure-forming factor;
- obvious nonlinearity (lack of a single center).

Modern sociality, according to T.Kh. Kerimov, no longer an object or idea, it is a co-being of various existences, singularities. Representatives of the philosophy of life, existentialists, postmodernists, personalists, and others also spoke of this.

There is no common being among singularities, they are united only by the escape of being, supporters of the heterologous concept believe. Sociality is not a common spatial and temporal reality. Sociality is being-together. Individual being is separation. Individual being is co-being, for which a heterology is necessary to describe, which is based on the difference in the being of the individual (in contrast to classical metaphysics, which is capable of describing a homogeneous society). Consequently, the heterogeneity of modern society has become a necessary problem for social research.

It is like M. Heidegger, being is always his own being. But the singularity, according to T.Kh. Kerimov, is not a projection of the subjective I onto the surrounding me, but, on the contrary, what defines «motility» every time. The singularity of time is «escaping from substance». Being is in the discreteness of singularities. Being together is a division of the being of society. Hence tolerance is a measure of the belonging of an individual existence to being together. Hence, being together equals equality. But equality is not unconditional, not categorical, but concerning ourselves. Equality is not a criterion or measure. Equality is the equality of unequal. Equality in difference.

According to the heterologous concept, history is «timelessness», «intertemporality», on the basis of which history and historical time arise. In any historical event, time seems to be stopping, hanging, «spreading». Between the moments of time there is an event.

The heterologous concept, in our opinion, indeed, offers a completely new paradigm of social research, changing the cognitive perspective, trying to overcome the nomotical attitudes of epistemology. It is aimed, indeed, not at describing and explaining complex social processes (although it would be another mistake to dismiss them from sociology accounts), but at a more or less deep understanding of the motives and actions of living people, rather than formalized subjects of human history.

Thus, the society of the XXI century is characterized by an explicit heterogeneity composed of:

- differences as a structure-forming factor;
- obvious nonlinearity, decentration of social processes and the person himself;
- high degree of mediation of social processes, hiding their complex interactions.

In this connection, the classical attitudes of social philosophy no longer work. The uncertainty factor of modern social life increases, which leads to the concept of the «uncertainty principle» in socio-philosophical knowledge. But, as it turns out, the principle of uncertainty was first derived in natural science knowledge, and is fully consistent with the concept of «scientific paradigm» both in the study of nature and in the study of society.

There is a plurality of post-non-classical paradigms of social cognition, aimed at discovering laws — tendencies of social development and not allowing the idea of «inflation of truth» in the field of social philosophy. The main concept of post-non-classical paradigms of socio-philosophical knowledge should be het-

erologous, able to understand the complex, mediated social processes and relationships that have a self-organizing developmental algorithm.

The heterologous concept of post-non-classical social paradigms rejects ontology as onto-theology, which is associated with the search for the omnipresent single foundation (external or internal) of social life, presenting it as homogeneous. This aspect offers the study of society from the inside, in terms of differences, singularities, multiplicity, heterogeneity, co-existence, following the logic of self-development, identifying its tendencies. It is in the heterologous manner that the methods of synergetics, rhizomorphy, and fractality work.

The heterologous concept recognizes the principle of uncertainty of social cognition, but does not absolutize it, but in a complex hierarchy of mediations reveals their correlation with each other in order to feel for real connections.

Post-non-classical social paradigms are needed in order to come closer to an understanding of modern social processes, the main carriers of which are people driven by unique features and qualities, and develop humanistic, humanistic tactics and strategies for the future development of mankind.

### References

- 1 Керимов Т.Х. Онтология как онто-теология и ориентиры ее преодоления / Т.Х. Керимов // Известия Иркутского гос. ун-та. — 2015. — Т. 14. — С. 106–113.
- 2 Керимов Т.Х. Социальная гетерология / Т.Х. Керимов. — Екатеринбург: Наука Урала, 1999. — 160 с.
- 3 Мамардашвили М.К. Философские чтения / М.К. Мамардашвили. — СПб.: Азбука-классика, 2002. — 832 с.
- 4 Кемеров В.Е. Введение в социальную философию / В.В. Кемеров. — М.: Аспект-пресс, 1996. — 215 с.
- 5 Бахтин М.М. К философии поступка / М.М. Бахтин // Философия и социология науки и техники. Ежегодник 1984–1985. — М.: Наука, 1986. — С. 80–160.
- 6 Библер В.С. От наукоучения – к логике культуры / В.С. Библер. — М.: Изд-во полит. лит., 1991. — 413 с.

Б.Ж. Жүсіпова

### «Басқа әлеуметтіктің» когнитивті ракурсы

Мақалада гетерогенді әлеуметтілікпен айқын көрінетін қазіргі заманғы қоғамды зерттеудің мәселесі қарастырылды. Қазіргі өмірдің күшті дамуы әдетте адами байланыстарды ғана жойып қоймай, негізгі адами бағыттарды да әлсіретуде. Адамзат қоғамдастығының децентрациясы жүрде. Гетерогенді қоғамның негізгі белгілері — айырмашылық, ерекшеліктердің көптігі, децентрациялық. Бұл басқа табиғаттылық, басқа «әлеуметтілік», басқа «адамзаттылық». Қоғамдық дамудың қазіргі заманғы үрдісі адам өмірінің сапалылығын елемеуге байланысты әлеуметтік болмыстың біртектілігі мен тұтастығын және олардың арасындағы келіспеушілік пен адамгершілікке сыймайтын әлеуметтік философияның классикалық ұстанымдарының редуционистік диссонансын көрсетеді. Ойлаудың гуманитарлық сипаты негізгі болып табылғандықтан, бұл ойды қабылдаудың классикалық пәндік субъект-объект, субъект-субъектіге, яғни метаойлауға, ал одан өзін-өзі тануға бір қадам жақындайды.

*Кілт сөздер:* гетерогенді қоғам, постклассикалық емес дискурс, постклассикалық емес әдістер, эпистемологиялық әлеует, когнитивті қызығушылық, гетерологиялық парадигма, сингулярлықтың көптігі, сызқтық емес құрылым, өзін-өзі дамыту динамикасы, адамиөлшемдік тактикалар.

Б.Ж. Жусупова

### Когнитивный ракурс «другой социальности»

В статье поднимается проблема исследования современного общества, эксплицитно представленного гетерогенной социальностью. Мощь динамики современной жизни разрывает привычные человеческие связи, но самое главное — основные человеческие ориентиры. Происходит децентрация человеческого сообщества. Главные атрибуты гетерогенного общества — различие, множественность сингулярностей, децентрированность. Это уже другая природность, «другая социальность», другая «человечность». Современный ход общественного развития демонстрирует диссонанс с редуционистскими классическими установками социальной философии на однообразность и целостность социального бытия и доказывает их несостоятельность, безжизненность и даже бесчеловечность в связи с игнорированием качества человеческой жизни. Важным стал именно гуманитарный

характер мышления, который предназначен преодолевать классический субъект-объектный прием мысли и все более приближаться к субъект-субъектному, к метамышлению, а в итоге — к самопознанию.

*Ключевые слова:* гетерогенное общество, постнеклассический дискурс, постнеклассические методы, эпистемологический потенциал, когнитивный интерес, гетерологическая парадигма, множественность сингулярностей, нелинейная структура, динамика саморазвития, человекомерные тактики.

## References

- 1 Kerimov, T.Kh. (2015). Ontolohiia kak onto-teolohiia i orientiry ee preodoleniia [Ontology as landmarksontology and the landmarks of its vercoming]. *Izvestiia Irkutskoho hosudarstvennoho universiteta – Bulletin of Irkutsk State University*, 14, 106–113 [in Russian].
- 2 Kerimov, T. Kh. (1999). *Sotsialnaia heterolohiia [Social heterology]*. Ekaterinburg: Nauka Urala [in Russian].
- 3 Mamardashvili, M.K. (2002). *Filosofskie chteniia [Philosophical reading]*. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka-Klassika [in Russian].
- 4 Kemerov, V.E. (1996). *Vvedenie v sotsialnuu filosofiiU [Introduction to social philosophy]*. Moscow: Aspekt Press [in Russian].
- 5 Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). K filosofii postupka [To the philosophy of the act]. *Filosofia i sotsiolohua nauki i tekhniki. Ezhehodnik – Philosophy and sociology of science and technology. Yearbook, 1984–1985*, 80–160. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 6 Bibler, V.S. (1991). *Ot naukoucheniia – k lohike kultury [From science of Knowledge to the logic of culture]*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo politicheskoi literatury [in Russian].