

Кемеров В.Е.

Уральский Федеральный Университет,
доктор философских наук,
профессор факультета философии,
руководитель Ведущей научной школы,
Екатеринбург.

ДВОЯЩИЙСЯ ОБРАЗ ОБЩЕСТВА

Kemerov Viacheslav E.

Ural Federal University
Ekaterinburg.
D Sc in Philosophy
professor of department of philosophy,
the Head of leading scientific school.
Ekaterinburg.

THE DUAL IMAGE OF SOCIETY

Abstract. The modern socially-humanitarian knowledge faces to a problem of a division of labour between disciplines. Different representations of a society are as a result formed. Integration between sciences is absent or becomes cleanly formal. In the article consequences of this decomposition and a way of its overcoming are considered. The main things appear ways of representation of a society and the methodological transformations necessary for productive understanding of a modern society.

Key words: models of society, methodology of social-humanitarian knowledge, reductionism & antireductionism, macro- & micro sociality, division society as the object of knowledge, methodological transformation of social-humanitarian knowledge.

There is the tradition of understanding of a society as single whole, as not which constant penetrating varying joint and individual life of people. To it there corresponds also abstract understanding of a society which accompanies different theories and methodologies scientific researches and to ordinary representations.

At the same time the practical and theoretical need of the account of all variety of the social forms, generating methodological pluralism, occurrence of different concepts and typologies which will not be coordinated with each other operates.

There is a set of concepts of social forms, types, steps. The concept of formations of K.Marks is most known. Is less known his concepts of three steps of social development in which steps of personal dependence between people are replaced, dependences social individuals regarding from things, dependences of a society on development of people.

In the second half twentieth centuries Bell's & Toffler concept has been extended. In it the scheme of three steps too is used, but they are allocated by other principles, rather than at K.Marks.

Concepts of steps, as a matter of fact, follow a linear principle of an development of societies from the lowest to the maximum, submitting to which different social systems realize the general logic of development.

The concept of local cultures or civilizations (Danilevsky, Spengler, Toynbee) uses other approaches. In it refusal of the general logic of socio-historical development actually operates. To each culture or civilization the special logic of evolution assuming the specific periods of becoming, a maturity and fading is attributed. This approach can be described as nonlinear.

In the end of the twentieth century models of a modern society as systems of various civilizations and the cultures submitting not to the general logic of construction, and to compositions of contacts, conflicts and interactions are formed [1. Adams J.& Reed I.A.] , [12. Wallerstein] . The Logic of cooperation will transform logic of distinctions.

There is a question: whether it is possible to minimize this methodological pluralism and to consider model or models in which a variety of social forms would keep within the general frameworks of understanding and research.

Further I shall try to present such simple, but the flexible scheme of consideration of a society.

The first model

These models can be treated as the variations of the systematic representations of society. In both aspects, historical and typological, they are coordinated as classical and postclassical ones. In the practical aspect they can be treated as different models of using and developing human resources.

According to the first model society exists as a special form independent of human individuals' being. It is reasonable to think society as a space for people; people occupy their rooms, are separated by its walls, are connected by its stability; all these rate and connect people can be represented and used so as if people don't affect their reproductions and changes. People for society structure servicing, its conservation and renovation are supposed to be used in this conception, of course. But individuals are represented in this conception not in their specific being, diversity, peculiarities, but as raw material and energy necessary for the society, overwhelming and acting behind them.

Such understanding (and application) of society's model inevitably produces the methodology of reductionism. In practice it means that the structures and institutions of society absorb life and activity of this situation produces and the certain treatments of human individuals. In words it is a question of a society and the person. In theory & practice people are not considered as the person reproducing and transforming social communications. They are present at the theory as some kind of the containers loaded by forces and skills, roles and the functions supporting and serving social structures. They operate as the elements providing a society and its institutes.

The second model

The second model represents society as the result of human individuals' interaction. Society doesn't exist separately from individuals, behind their backs and heads, it appears and is reproduced in their mutual and individual life, it is alive until people reproduce it by their interdependent being. People, of course, can be represented in the composition of superindividual subjects, subsystems, subcultures, - the main thing is that society is represented as reproducible result of people's interaction [2. Baumann] , [3. Giddens].

Here we collide with *paradox* of social processes. Its essence - that individuals can keep continual reproduction of the social life only owing to various "bodies" isolated from and the means plying separately from people on social space both social time and *connecting* thus various conditions of a human life and human experience.

Let's emphasize two circumstances. First, discrete things by means of which people support and expand social reproduction of the life, are created by people during evolution of a society. They are separated from functions, operations, the abilities conterminous with direct activity of individuals, allocated from social interactions, accumulate in itself experience of the collective and individualized activity.

Secondly, owing to things isolation and fastening of the experience, people appear capable not only to broadcast it, but also to synthesize experience of different cultures and epoch. Division of human experience, thus, it appears both a condition and result of social evolution. And this division caused joint activity of people.

There is a constant opportunity of new "assembly" of this experience in other forms of development of individuals. We shall note, that here it is a question not only of step-type behaviour of the language means transferring the information, but also on skills, abilities, forces of the people who have fixed in concreteness the social form, and so, special image prepared to "connection" of new social energy.

To told important to add, that people act as carriers of the divided public life. Autonomism of individuals, their branch from direct social dependences creates preconditions for formation of the social organizations in which people cooperate any more on the basis of rigid communications, and by virtue of their interconditionality norms, problems, needs, interests.

In romantic philosophy of XIX century such autonomism was estimated negatively, identified with

mechanical simplification of a public life, accordingly - with partial, unilateral functioning human individuals.

However autonomism at all does not resist to self-realization of the individual: it can be and frequently is the main thing condition of its self-development. An another matter, that autonomism of individuals assumes change of character of external social structures and norms adjusting them and "mechanisms".

Differently, division of the social life, having in the basis of interaction of independent individuals, requires and corresponding forms of jointness, these forms are not natural structures; their people should develop. In these situations just also it is found out, that division a public life between the isolated individuals is not only its partition, but also a condition of synthesizing of new qualities & communications.

If we aspire to interpret complexity social as *process*, as *constant becoming* of a joint life of people, we can find out, how in variations of personal activity of people there is a updating and escalating of a cumulative social life.

The image of social process not simply depends on a position of people, their points of view, sights business, etc. not in subjective orientations, speaking traditional language. Business - in value of individuals as "units" of social communications, accordingly, in opportunities of people to open (or to close) in the behaviour multidimensionality of social process. Business - in the practical ability of people "to open" polyphonic complexity of a sociality to combine and correlate a different forms of development of the society.

The Correlation of two models

The correlation of these models can be considered in various plans. By way of historical is a problem of transition from traditional to a modern society. By way of practical is a question on different ways of realization of human resources of development of a society. By way of sociological is a question on a parity of macrostructures and interactions of social individuals. By way of political is a problem of transition from totalitarian modes to modes democratic.

Within the limits of this article the problem is first of all methodological.

The Second model cannot be realized without change of traditional methods of research and the methods of action connected with them.

The Second model of a society demands revision of classical abstract definitions of life of people and interaction of these abstraction. But it is impossible without revision of classical representations about a determinism, about a parity of the general and especial, structures and process, social and individuals.

From this revision of interaction of philosophy and disciplines of social science [6. Kemerov] follows also.

Barriers

The Twentieth century has appeared the period of overcoming of the developed forms of socially-humanitarian knowledge. Transformation of classical positivism, formation of different concepts of social action, the critic of the structurally functional analysis, approach of social phenomenology and humanistic psychology, social constructivism accrues.

Originally social action was considered in a context of social system as the scheme adaptation of individuals to dominating structures. Then in the sixtieth years of the twentieth century under action of socially-economic changes the approach treating functioning of greater structures in correlation with development of persons [T. Parsons] began to be formed. In wide scales the idea of division of sociology on macrosociology and microsociology extends. The microsociology also is treated as addition of representations about a society as to the big structures. It is focused on interactions of social individuals which support and transform big structures.

In social phenomenology the sight at the social world as result of interaction of human individuals is formed.

The concept structuration of structures [4.Giddens A.] is formed. It shows, that structures generating and vary only when they are incorporated in actions of human individuals. Differently, the society exists, when it is presented in interaction of people. « Change almost always begins on borders and in intervals, but not in the center ». [5.Glenn E. N.,16].

On the foreground in representation and understanding of a society there are not spatial, but time models. As a matter of fact, we deal with a society as special hronotop. It means, that forms of time change social space, its processes, its configurations, its structures. As Z.Bauman writes: “ Time leads to devaluation of space ” [2. Bauman 2000,118].

But it is not abstract time. This is time of activity of people, time of their cooperation, time of devices which they create and use. On a proscenium there are concepts of interaction between people, concepts of practice, representation about influence of people on social institutes. [5.Glenn], [9.Simon].

The tendency is designated clearly enough. But it yet has not won.

Barriers are not overcome. Why?..

The Division of labour between the different disciplines of the social science which have generated in the end nineteenth and in the beginning of the twentieth centuries interferes not only to solve these problems, but also distinctly to put them.

It would seem, the philosophy could help with formation of a new image of a society, but it cannot make it as itself it has appeared is concluded in system of a spontaneous division of labour [6.Kemerov], [7.Kemerov].

The philosophy is compelled to change habitual representations and in private sciences, and in daily experience of people, and in. That forces philosophy to start to such nonconventional and, at first sight, ignoble activity. How the philosophy becomes the cinderella and, thus, eclipses former queen of sciences?

How the philosophy can define the present, including the modern condition?.. The first and enough the direct answer: it is compelled to approach to a situation historically. Further a question (and the

answer) become complicated. What history means? History of philosophy as history of ideas and outstanding characters? No. History - sciences?.. Partly. History of a daily life?.. Too partly. History of a society? The answer correct, but too complex.

The Problem consists in complexity of a question. We can receive answers only on borders of interactions of the philosophy, separate sciences, changes in forms of daily occurrence and shifts of public practice.

The area of *history of interaction* of philosophy and other forms of human experience is formed.

There, where interaction, there - a field of growth of new forms of activity.

Means, new function is assigned to philosophy: historical-methodological. It is possible to argue, how much it new. It is possible to argue, how much the philosophy with it consults. Important main: if the philosophy does not incur this mission, its sense becomes undistinguished or is simply lost.

So, functions of philosophy move aside the historical-methodological analysis of dynamics of human life.

The historical-methodological analysis of the situation is necessary. But it is business of special research.

Bibliography & References

1. Adams J.& Reed I.A. Culture in the transition to modernity: seven pillars of a new research agenda// Theory & Society, 2011,v.40,# 4.
2. Baumann Z. Liquid Modernity.Ch. 3. Polity Press., Cambridge, 2000.
3. Giddens A. Central problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. London: Macmillan,1979.
4. Giddens A. Constitution of Society. Berkley, University of California. Press, 1984 ,pp281-327.
5. Glenn E. N. 2010 Presidential Address: Constructing Citizenship: Exclusion, Subordination, and Resistance // American Sociological Review, V, 76, # 1, February 2011,p.16.
6. Kemerov V.E. Keys to the present – in Shifts of Methodology//Voprosy Filosofii, 2014, pp 3-13.(in russian).
7. Kemerov V E. Crisis, which is always with you. // Voprosy Filosofii, 2018, № 6,pp.21 30, (in russian).
8. Manzo Gianluca. Macrosociology-Microsociology, CNRS and University Paris-Sorbonne, Paris, 2015.
9. Simon B.S. History in times of Unprecedented Change. London. Bloomsberg Academic, 2019.
10. Sztompka P. Society in Action. Cambridge . Un. Chicago Press , 1991.
11. Southerton D. Analysis the temporal organization of daily life // Sociology. Oxford, 2006,v.40,pp.435 – 454
12. Wallerstein. The End of the World as We Know it: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press. 1999.