

УДК 17.023.36

*Vira Dodonova, Roman Dodonov***POSTNONCLASIC HORIZONS OF SOCIAL RATIONALITY**

*The article is devoted to the analysis of postnonclassical social rationality. In her authors vision of newest discourse of social rationality is given as a synthesis of various positions. The general discourse-positions are considered: social action, refusing from grand narratives, axiological priorities, social synergy, communicative rationality and set.*

**Key words:** *discourse, discourse-position, social rationality, postnonclassical rationality.*

*Віра Додінова, Роман Додінов***ПОСТНЕКЛАСИЧНІ ГОРИЗОНТИ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ РАЦІОНАЛЬНОСТІ**

*Стаття присвячена аналізу постнекласичної соціальної раціональності. Авторське бачення новітнього дискурсу соціальної раціональності подається як синтез різноманітних дискурс-позицій. Основні дискурс-позиції такі: соціальна дія, відмова від гранднарративів, ціннісні пріоритети, соціальна синергетика, комунікативна раціональність тощо.*

**Ключові слова:** *дискурс, дискурс-позиції, соціальна раціональність, постнекласична раціональність.*

*Вера Додінова, Роман Додінов***ПОСТНЕКЛАСИЧЕСКИЕ ГОРИЗОНТЫ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ РАЦИОНАЛЬНОСТИ**

*Статья посвящена анализу постнеклассической социальной рациональности. Авторское видение новейшего дискурса социальной рациональности представлено как синтез различных дискурс-позиций. Основные дискурс-позиции следующие: социальное действие, отказ от гранднарративов, ценностные приоритеты, социальная синергетика, коммуникативная рациональность и проч.*

**Ключевые слова:** *дискурс, дискурс-позиции, социальная рациональность, постнеклассическая рациональность.*

The problems of content, genesis and trends of postnonclassical rationality may be the most actively discussed in philosophical literature. The postnonclassical rationality is not entire, so it consists of many types of rationality, and social rationality is very important. Its analysis is associated primarily with the place and significance in social practices, awareness of the subject in social life, and interaction with other types of rationality. Social rationality of postnonclassical type turns in the form of discourse that integrates a scientific and non-scientific, philosophical and political, religious and ethical views. The discourse is objective, verbal-symbolic construction that accompanies the process of meaningful social interaction of people, so it always characterizes as interaction, dialogue. Any discourse generally involves a contradiction, a collision of different attitudes, opinions, points of view, its inconsistency and fragmentation.

Postnonclassical discourse resembles a stormy flow, that can't be stopped or ordered. However, it can always be extended, supplemented with new aspects, and this extension is happening while understanding of information, that already exists. In other words, when the discourse is happening, we are its contemporaries and participants. In modern literature there is no single point of view about how the discourse analysis should be drawn up. Some people think that this analysis should consist of deconstructing of the basic concepts of the discourse. Others insist on chronological fixing of events with interpretation of statements that the participants are expressing. We think, that any opinion shouldn't be ignored. But we'll try to describe the «topic of discourse», outlining the range of problems of postnonclassical «discursive scope» of social rationality.

If discourse is a «view of many in one direction», the discourse-position is a particular point in space (physical and social-cultural) from which the one of those many views. Analysis of discourse in this context involves relatively holistic spectrum of discourse positions that can be imagined as a «fan», where a variety of ideas focused in one point – on the subject of the discourse.

Of course, the most qualified and interested among the discourse participants are professional sociologists, who focus on the concept of social action. So first of discourse-positions is associated with determining of the place of rationality in the structure of social action.

1. *Discourse-position «social action».* Social action as the basis of social practices is the primary function of social rationality. Describing postnonclassical rationality, scientists often use the term of social practice, which outlines the problems of postnonclassical transformations. So, that is the question: what does reveal

the social rationality more – social action or social practice? Surely, social practice has more wide meaning and contains a variety of social activities. All the social variety, including rationally organized institutions of social order, is spinning around a single act of social action, like around the nucleus. The theories of social action are trying to answer the question about determination of social rationality. What is more important for rational behavior – free choice of the person or external for him social norms and rules? How to combine individual creativity and social principles, that constrain it? How much the social action is free, and how much is caused? The analysis of social action can pick out the objective and subjective components of individual behavior (micro level), social structure (macro level) and social theory. Numerous attempts of sociologists to combine objective and subjective component of social practices within the theory of rational choice, symbolic interactionism, the concept of habitus, phenomenological sociology, ethnomethodologic, didn't reach the goal.

In postnonclassics the determining of degree of rationality of person's specific actions is possible providing that their formalization is in form of completed behavioral cycles, which can be considered as stable structures. Sociologists abstracts from unique and special conditions of behavioral act to be able to compare, evaluate, measure behavior. Instead of understanding the nature, content and even context of human action, they investigate such formal features as necessity, motive, interest, purpose, incentive, etc.

Considering the general trends of postnonclassical rationality, such as the exaltation and the actualization of role of the subject in natural and social systems that historically developing, special significance acquires constructivist interpretation of social processes [1], increasing attention to investigation of everyday spheres of human existence, which is focusing on routine interactions and plurality of vision of social reality. Constructivism is absolutisation of subjectivity, the most consistent and strict «anti objective position». All theories of social action in the focus of their theoretical problems had solutions and overcoming opposition of subject-object relationship, so postnonclassical tradition has the same problem in the form of habitual rationality. But the solution of the problem of removing the subject-object opposition occurs mainly by the influence of postmodern guidelines – specifically «decentration» of subject and object and creating a multilayer model of society (the distinction between system and social integration) and person (separation of different components of subjectivity).

2. Discourse-position «refusing from grand narratives». The second component of postnonclassical discourse of social rationality is a deliberate denial of the holistic picture of the social world, represented in non-classical rationality by science and pervasive ideologies. Fragmentation, relativity, plurality of ideological orientations of the person and society became the prerogative of thinking of postnonclassic age. The most active opponents of the holistic view of the world were philosophers postmodernists with their project «non grand narratives». Whereas postmodernism and postnonclassic coincides chronologically in general, and they are not antagonists in social theories area, the position of postmodernism about grand narratives can be considered as postnonclassical intentions.

The grand narrative is the stories of the world history in a special «format», usually about the history «with a happy-end». Postmodernists notice the fact that grand narratives integrate scientific knowledge with politics, ethics, law, etc. Precisely in grand narratives occurs «the relation of knowledge with society and the state, which essentially is a relation between facility and purpose» [2]. Not accidental, J.F.Liotar notes the affinity of science language and language of ethics and politics in western culture.

In grand narratives occurred legitimation of the subject, truth and power. From the position of power legitimation is a process that gives to lawmaker the right to declare the law as the norm. And vice versa – from a position of knowledge lawmaker is a process according to which the legislator that interprets social discourse is allowed to create specified conditions in order to make some statements part of this discourse so, that society could take it into account. Due to this total subject occurs the interaction between denotative statements oriented on truth and prescriptive statements oriented on justice, that implement in grand narratives. Question about the state is bound with the question of scientific knowledge. In a postmodern question about legitimacy of knowledge raises differently than in classical science: there is no universal metalanguage and traditional legitimation of knowledge.

From methodological point of view, grand narratives are trying to build a single system of social norms, practicability and order, truth and justice. Summing ideological orientations of previous culture we should focus on the following positions: priority of general and social over the individual and separate, building a single system of cultural norms, understanding of science as the leading sector of cultural awareness, awareness of existence (being) as a clear and solid foundation of reality. As a consequence, all human knowledge have been developing into a holistic, hierarchically organized system, subordinated by unified principle. Content of this principle can be historically variable, but its function, which lies in the centered beginning of the system remains unchanged. Cosmocentrism, geocentrism, anthropocentrism changed each other, but always remained «centrism». From the view of postmodernism claims of any text on the status grandnarrativs today seem unfounded.

Postmodernism insists on deconstructing of grand narratives, advancing irony as a tool to overcome it. Age when occurs the devaluation of confidence grand narratives, J.F. Liotar called, in fact, the postmodern

era. «We paid a lot, – he writes, – for nostalgia of general and single, of reconciliation of concept and sensual, of a transparent and communicative experience. In universal wish to relax and calm down, we hear a hoarse voice to restart terror, to finish fanaticism, dream about reaching and hugging reality into his arms. That is the answer: war to entire, we will testify about unimagined, intensify discord and save the honor of the name» [3].

Considering that grand narratives in the public mind are associated with total ideologies, the top target of civil-political charge of postmodernists was leading monoideologies. Criticizing grand narratives, postmodernists tried to prepare the society to denial of monoideology for plurality of ideological positions, emphasizing the negative consequences of total ideologies were in history.

3. *Discourse-position «axiological priorities»*. Rational relation to the world doesn't deny the need to realize that person's activities are meaningful, necessary, such that its content has not only utilitarian and pragmatic aspects, but tymotycal (from Plato's «tymos»), evaluative content component. The evaluative aspect of social rationality, pointed out by Max Weber when he opposed the evaluative rationality goal rationality. In his view, evaluative rationality is more inherent to traditional society, while goal rationality is required transfer to modern society. Therefore, the evaluative rationality Weber considered as underdeveloped, low form, which should be replaced by higher, more sophisticated and effective.

In postnonclassics, when subject is responsible for the consequences of his actions upon himself, society, the universe, disregard for evaluative rationality is reversed. This is facilitated by displacement of spotlight from «values-goals» to «value-means», which is now regarded as self-sufficient. It turns out that even the highest achievements of world science and technology, despite the presence of very powerful tools, are not able to achieve the main goal: to solve global problems, including offer something effective to inhibit the rate of intensification of ecological catastrophe.

Consequently, in postnonclassics we can see increased attention to evaluative rationality as a form of combination, for example, programs of political parties with philosophy, science with ethics, technology with responsibility. «Merging» theoretical and practical philosophy led to formation of another type of rationality, called ethical. That radical turn that ripened in our eyes in evaluative consciousness indicates about intuitive dissatisfaction of excessive rationalization of public relations where the subject «dissolves» and loses his own identity. The meaning of this rotation in reproduction of old certified universal values and including them into the postmodern social-cultural paradigm. According to opinion of many local researchers, its most important feature will be moving from relative to absolute, from pluralism to monism, from avant-garde and «revolutionary spirit» to the spirit of tradition, the «cultural revolution» to the ecology of culture, from progressivism to conservatism.

4. *Discourse-position «social synergy»*. If we talk about scientific postnonclassical rationality, it must be noted that the most significant component of it is the synergy that delineates the contours, directs trends, indicates features of rationality in late XX – early XXI centuries. Synergetics emphasizes the nonlinearity of development, the complexity of the processes occurring in natural area. Nonlinear, increasingly unpredictable processes taking place in the social area. The social synergetic with its own methods draws unique portrait of modern sociality, proceeding that the universe is understood not as a passive substance that was typical for the mechanistic view of the world in modern times. In postnonclassical rationality «spontaneous activity» is inherent to substance (I. Pryhozhin, I. Stinhers). From «spontaneous activity» implies that the social worlds unfolding based not on certain laws of historical development, but on the random realization of alternative variants that automatically cut off the others, sometimes even more desirable and optimal opportunities of development. The process of social development is conceived as unpredictable changing conditions of society and its structures, in contrast to the classical vision of development from one stage to another. It doesn't provide neither clear detection of reasons nor specific social agents of new states. The factor of chance is very important in synergetic tradition. Extrapolating these problems on the development of society, it should be noted that social synergetic focuses on the importance of risk as a factor of social postnonclassical age developing.

Due to synergetic thinking in social practices actively implemented the principles of non-linearity, heuristic elements that allow individuals to fulfill social and professional roles rather effectively, to adapt to disequilibrium of fields, to different effects of emergency. «Precisely because of fundamental changes not only in scientific world picture, but in global characteristics of modern culture, synergistic style of thinking acts as a way of thinking of postnonclassical science» [4]. We accustomed to extrapolate processes, predict further development proceeding the previous stages, and synergy proves that one stage (phase) of self organization is qualitatively different from the other; epistemological model that is suitable for one tempoworld, inadequate for describing of adjacent with it tempoworld. Combining of different epistemological models in a single picture, which is rather complex organized integrity – such postnonclassical type of rationality that manifests by social synergetic.

5. *Discourse-position «communicative rationality»*. Important discourse position, which can not be ignored, is communicative rationality, i.e. productive, creative interaction of people, upon which bases all social life. This position is represented by names of Y. Habermas, K.O. Apel, V. Kulman, D. Boler, V. Hesle, P. Ulrich and others. Representatives of communicative considered that the mind is the last regulatory authority, and

sought to remove it from the communication philosophy – in contrast to the classical philosophy of mind. Therefore, the content of the «communicative turn» in the social philosophy is considered in the plane of speculative modeling of ideal (transcendental) communication, so it's a base for discursive agreement about basic moral norms and values. The concept of communicative rationality designed to understand a fundamental way of human existence, which implies the projective relation to reality, which directs, encourages actors to active social action.

Analyzing the various forms of communication, J. Habermas highlights «communicative action» (interaction) on the one hand, and discourse – on the other. Within the interaction assumed significance and meaning to exchange information (necessary for the operation of experience); within discourse problematic claims on the meaning become the theme and no exchange of information takes place. In discourse using justifications we are trying to restore agree that became problematic in communicative action [5]. Communication can serve as a procedural-creative form of communication in which is important the trend preparing of new purposes, primarily social, as well as finding the most effective methods of achieving them. «In this case, – writes I.P. Farman, – communication is creative, potentially heuristic and can cause some synergistic effect – to produce new knowledge. With this form of communication Habermas associates the concept of communicative rationality, which is understood as the process of developing of holistic cultural meanings (in the unity of cognitive, moral and esthetic assessments), which could serve as a moral guide in the development of society and the individual, and the search of their practical implementation» [6].

J. Habermas considers that the most productive methods are the active functioning of the individual in «free associations», activities of social groups to implement the communicative practice of education, forming of ideas, motivations, freedom; culture assimilation of various texts, especially textual phenomena associated with creative work; using of alternative for the classical rational methodology: hermeneutic methods, psychoanalysis, ordinary language and experience of direct communication, that bases on everyday knowledge and awareness, and active reference to the scope of the imagination, artistic, esthetic and even utopian consciousness. Preceding such methods the crisis of motivations can be overcome, qualitative social-cultural changes by reorienting the existing values become possible.

In general, the gist of the concept of communicative rationality and the theory of communicative action is not in designing any social processes, but in stimulating direct social acts on the base of organized communication links designed to facilitate personal development, improve rational social order, humanize international relations.

6. Discourse-position «social management». Postnonclassical discourse of social rationality adjacent to many actual problems of post modernity, but the quintessence of its manifestations, in our opinion, is social management. Rationality of social management is in recognizing of the ideal which moves society and which is historically specific and variable. Secondly. specified movement itself must meet the attributes of rationality, i.e., to be effective, optimal, predictable etc.

Under conditions of postnonclassic the emphasis in social management significantly change: the rejection from meta narratives, plurality of ideologies in society actualizes the problem of goals, methods and management techniques in civil society, social and individual consciousness and behavior. Specificity of public relations management is that the impact on social behavior can be both direct and indirect. In modern theory of social management there are two different models of making management decisions: rational and discursive. The «discourse model» corresponds postnonclassical rationality. Reference of social managers to discourses, texts, semantics and symbolism is caused not only by general linguistic turn in philosophy, but also the specific practice of pluralistic democracy. The real world in postnonclassic no longer considered to be developed independently of the concepts with which it explained.

Discursive management is based on deep correction of language-world of individual and society. Discourse is a tool of influencing on axiological sphere of social life, and therefore it's tool for constructing social reality. Excessively disproportionate and active intervention in discourse of a participant of polylogue can impose their own beliefs and attitudes, manipulating consciousness of opponents and gradually changing their values.

Manipulating the discourse may construct a model for depiction of types of nonlinear environment such as consciousness, unconsciousness, culture, society and history. That's why the discursive model of social management is a priority in conditions of plurality, uncertainty, risks, randomness, nonlinearity of social development.

An important feature of manipulation is incompatible of finite interests and objectives of manipulator with relevant existing needs and desires of manipulation object. Manipulation is a type of fraud of political leaders, social institutions, government agencies, using the media, political events, all sorts of scams. These actions are associated with attempts to create a false impression, secret compulsion, illusion of solving. Manipulation as a secret management and proceeding of people carried out by sufficiently sophisticated methods of influence, which requires some skills. Another sign of manipulation is its latency, hidden its true aims not only from the recipient, but also from society in general. Manipulation can be defined as a way to domination through spiritual influence on people by programming their behavior. This effect is aimed on psychical structure of the

person, performed in secret and aims to change thoughts, beliefs and goals of people in the desired direction. Using manipulation technologies by modern social control is not only discursive practices associated with verbal reflection of social events and processes, but also the deeper layers of the collective psyche, the unconscious – in particular. So discursive and manipulative practices are the most important tools of social control in postnonclassical age of development and functioning of social rationality.

Concluding the overview of discourse positions that describe postnonclassical social rationality, it should be noted that modern social theory usually don't pretend to be exhaustive and definitive answer on the questions, which are actualize to society and need immediate solution, but each act of philosophical reflection with definite problem brings us one step closer to understanding of investigated phenomena. The author's point of view is not exception in this regard. Of course, fixing of discourse position doesn't guarantee the completeness of the analysis, which is peculiar to rigorous scientific methods, we can only identify some trends that logically follow from the previous stages of social development and to outline the problem field of major players determining postnonclassical horizon of social rationality.

#### **ЛІТЕРАТУРА:**

1. Бергер П. Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания / П. Бергер, Т. Лукман. – М.: МФФ; «Academia-Центр», «Медиум», 1995. – 323 с.
2. Lyotard J. F. The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge / Transl. Bennington G & Massumi B. Foreword by Jameson F. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis & University of Manchester Press, Manchester, 1984, p.69.
3. Lyotard J. F. «Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism»? // The Postmodern Condition, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis & University of Manchester Press, Manchester, 1984, pp.71–82.
4. Режабек Е.Я. В поисках рациональности (статьи разных лет): [научное издание] / Е.Я. Режабек. – М.: Академический проект, 2007. – 383 с.
5. J. Habermas, N. Luhmann. Theorie der Gesellschaft oder Sozialtechnologie: Was leistet die Systemforschung? Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a. M., 1971, s. 114–121.
6. Фарман И.П. Модель коммуникативной рациональности (на основе социально-культурной концепции Юргена Хабермаса) / И.П. Фарман // Рациональность на перепутье: в 2 кн. / Кн. 1. – М.: РОСПЭН, 1999. – С. 264–292.