

PHILOSOPHY

Social Knowledge in Constituting the Axiosphere of the Society

S. Chmykhun*, O. Protsenko

The National Aerospace University KhAI, Kharkiv, Ukraine

*Corresponding authors. E-mail: s4myh@mail.ru

Paper received 04.04.2016; Accepted for publication 15.04.2016.

Abstract. The article is devoted to the study of the modern social knowledge in the process of establishing the axiosphere of the society. It demonstrates that values being the coordinates of the human world foster its stability and arrange the purposeful human activity.

Keywords: axiosphere, social knowledge, culture, value system, society.

The **topicality** of the socio-philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of the social axiosphere under the current conditions of the social knowledge functioning is determined by the following factors.

Globalization processes observed in the modern world actualize the axiological potential of the society as a whole and its separate representatives. Humanistic thrust of the value orientation is able to harmonize the relationships within the frames of various cultures, foster surmounting of the crisis in the spiritual life, which suffers from the predominance of the present-day individual's materialistic sights as well as outlines the perspectives of exiting from the conflict situation. Axiological problematics directs the social object's attention at the risk factors, which spell disasters of various scopes. These are, above all, the positive values, which co-exist with negative values, disvalues as well as ecological, political and other public life processes. The issue of value differentiation according to their impact on the individual and the society as a whole require critical thinking and value judgement, the veracity of which provides the modern social knowledge. The axiological universum has always been the integral part of the object field of the philosophic knowledge. Nowadays, this knowledge encompasses various provisions, interpretations and conclusions.

The following most well-known scholars tackling the axiological problematics, which are worth mentioning, are the German philosopher R. H. Lotze, who determined the existence of values as insights of the special kind. H. Rickert offered value classification. N. Hartmann became a representative of the phenomenological school, which gives the analysis of values and amenities. It is worthwhile mentioning the sociological thought of T. Parsons, which is aimed at the search of the determinants of social interaction harmonization via forming the axiological consensus. A notable contribution into the development of ideas connected with the moral and ethical value continuum was made by the scholars E. S. Fromm and Yo. F. Fukuyama, K. Apel and Jü. Habermas. Russian scholars A. Guseynov, V. Inozemtsev, O. Drobnitskiy and N. Rozov played an important part in establishing the modern interpretation of the axiological potential of the social knowledge. Among the Ukrainian specialists tackling the problem of values were S. Krymskiy, A. Tolsoukhov and I. Parapan.

The notion of axiosphere in the given research refers to the relatively independent social reality, represented by a

value hierarchy and value structures, the unity and interrelation of the phenomena of the social knowledge and conscience (public and individual) transpierced by some certain values. The social knowledge holds the information about the axiological properties of the subjects and objects to be studied in line with the main problems of various spheres of the philosophic knowledge. The above-mentioned defines **the purpose of the article** – to demonstrate the role of the social knowledge in amplifying the potential of the society axiosphere. "Ethics distinguishes moral values, aesthetics defines artistic values, social psychology addresses individual value orientation problems, political economics predominantly deals with economic values as public commodity values etc. However, the fruitful solution of certain problems is impossible without the socio-philosophic analysis of these values". [1, c.78] The social knowledge is the factor that is the embodiment of true and ostensible values and the basis for defining some values wreck dynamics, identification and emergence of other values, transition of values to disvalues. This "ephemerality" of values in connection with life and culture has been noted by H. Rickert: "Are there any dormant autotelic values?... the person who realized that the values to which independent meaning is assigned are not autotelic values in their essence, they will be more eager to seek values, the meaning of which will be immune to critics. We will never be able to stop wondering about the "sense" of our life, and this sense may be revealed on the basis of meaningful values. Thus, due to the depreciation of "life values" widely accepted without critics under the influence of fashion the drive to true life values must emerge..." [2, c. 421]

In the social knowledge the so-called dominant values can be distinguished. One of their manifestations is the life purpose of the subject of the social knowledge (personality, culture type). The absence of the explicit life purpose hints that the subject is in the course of its formation, crisis or decay. You can imagine the individuals whose life purpose is union with God, artistic work as a way of self-expression, artistic work as the perfection of the reality, wealth, power and pleasure ("modes of social significance" – Wealth, Mastery, Holiness) etc. Sets of dominant values for various types of cultures and personalities can be represented in the same way. Value is the notion which characterizes "ultimate" categorical grounds for human existence. This notion characterizes the meaning of certain objects, phenomena and processes for an individual, social groups and the society as a

whole. These two above-mentioned notions of “value” often differ and are sometimes controversial in every-day life: what is regarded as a value in philosophy – freedom, kindness, truth – may not be of any interest for an individual. In their turn, certain objects valuable for an individual in the philosophic sense are not valuable. The notion of value can be compared with the notion of the essence of man, which does not always coincide with the individual human existence.

The socio-philosophic analysis of the social knowledge structure and functions presupposes the axiological analysis of the aspect of the living activity problem for the subject being a knowledge carrier. With regard to this, above all, the notion of “value” and the way it is used in the knowledge of the society need to be clarified. The social knowledge refers to the values via determining the essential characteristics of the man, via the axiological potential of the correspondence of the due to the things in existence as well as the ideal to the real, via defining the goal-setting activity of the man. A value corresponds to an estimate. Goals shaped on the basis of values are always large-scale life-purpose goals. Values being the coordinates of the human world promote its stability and arrange purposeful human activity. In the common sense a value refers to the “ultimate goals” of an individual and the society, acting as a criterion for evaluation of any cultural phenomenon.

Values in the history of the mankind act as some spiritual constants, which help people to withstand difficult life circumstances. Values order the reality and introduce evaluation coordinates to its understanding. They correspond to the insights into the ideal, the perfect and the essential. Values add to the sense of the human life.

Values in their aggregate in the social knowledge are presented as the sui generis information. Values serve as a specific form of human orientation in the environment, which does not uncover its subject content, but it “encodes” this content in the form of predefined judgements. These are the public attitudes and judgements, imperatives and prohibitions, goals and projects, expressed in the form of axiological vision of the good and the bad, justice, life purpose and destiny of the man. With relation to this vision objects and events (natural, historical, cultural) surrounding the individual are identified. According to the scholar O. Drobnitsky, “values are, on the one hand, characteristics of objects (phenomena) in which the individual is interested somehow and which are evaluated positively or negatively, and, on the other hand these are the forms of cognition, which express the normative axiological attitude of the individual to the reality”. [3, c.292]

It is worth noting that the axiological vision of the object differs from the scientific one. This is a vision of the object being beneficial or harmful, good or bad, kind or evil. This vision is unobtainable for the natural science because it cannot enable expressing the real terror of atomic bombing during World War II or present-day terrorist acts. The science is only able to document the history of certain physical and chemical processes. Evaluation of these processes with regard to their implications for the individual is not a natural-science but an axiological stance on the object, its different dimension. This is the exclusive power of the social science

over any other knowledge. This is the value of the object for us as opposed to its very existence without us in accordance with its own development laws. This is also the vision of what exactly the object should be (a process, an event) in accordance with our activities, needs and interests.

Axiological vision of the world is inherent to the social nature of the individual. At all times and époques people have allotted sense to various natural and social phenomena and processes. And the more important these phenomena become for the individual, the more they affect them, the more intensively it is done.

The individual is a sentient, emotional as well as cognoscitive being. Their cognitive activity occurs in the emotional environment of desires and actions aimed at the practical attainment of the goals. Cognition is an aspect of the existence of their spirit. Their conscience is a holistic composition encompassing the sphere of demonstrating passions – hatred, love. The whole world is initially believed to be living in accordance with its own norms. Making sense of the surrounding things, construing historical world processes as the victory of the good or of the bad is the fundamental feature of the social knowledge – its generic characteristics.

The world around us is initially tinted with value (for the subject). Our human “ego” is always in the center of this world full of positive and negative values. This means that the individual perceives the world around with regard to the values in terms of its importance for themselves and for the others. Values are inherently primary, i.e. the individual always perceives the environment as to the categories of the good and the bad, justice etc. The ego is always the center of the situation being an indivisible property of the self. This fact has been studied by experiment by S. Grof, M. Wertheimer.

Human life is a correlation of the due and the existent. F. H. Kessidis has repeatedly expressed the idea that it brings into compliance the real and the ideal as well as the real and the possible, makes emphasis either on the way life is indeed, or the way life should be with regard to its sense and value. [4] Since the individual lives simultaneously in the real and in the due, the element of the due penetrated all spheres of the activity and the whole world.

Values are crucial for the formation and functioning of the social knowledge. The life of the individual as the a social object is largely distinguished by value orientation, which enables defining this aspect of the social knowledge as axiological (axioshere of the social knowledge).

Axioshere educes the potential of the social knowledge, which can be characterized as the axiological knowledge. It encompasses a wider information space than the axiological one. The axiological knowledge is the knowledge which defines value criteria and serves to represent benefits for the individual and the humanity as well as ways to attain these benefits.

This can be observed in the analysis of the culture as a social phenomenon. In the modern philosophical comprehension of the culture its axiological nature and is actualized and cultural phenomena are present in the social knowledge as the carrier of values.

It is evident that values represent the cultural dimension for the individual, embodies the attitude to the forms of human existence. It brings spiritual diversity to the individual’s reason affections and will. Therefore, the

value is not only the “conscious”, but also lifelike, existentially perceived existence. It characterizes human evaluation of social knowledge because it is put through the personality, through the inner world. If the idea is a breakthrough to the perception of certain aspects of existence, of private and social life, then the value is the personified attitude to the world arising not only on the basis of knowledge and information, but also based on the individual’s own life experience.

Acquisition of cultural values and, consequently, various levels of the social knowledge relative to them, which were found in the previous époques and new levels in the formation process, is a separate and a complicated problem, being both theoretical and practical. Even understanding of what is a cultural value and what is a pseudo-value or a disvalue does not come off immediately. There is no conformity in various representations of what is a value as a whole and in particular. The axiosphere of the social knowledge comprises the notion of values as well as axiological relations.

Values dictate a certain nature of relationships, the specificity of which lies in the fact that they comprise the desired on the basis of the individual’s voluntary, free choice. Values do not disunite or alienate the individual from other people, however, they consolidate, unite, bring people together into communities of any level: a family, a collective, an ethnic group, a nation, a state, the society as a whole. Moreover, value relationships are not external or compulsory, they are inner and nonviolent. And, finally, true values, e.g. conscience, love or courage, cannot be seized by force, deception or money, or taken away like power or wealth.

Social values relate to the significance, applicability and practicality being expressed and perpetuated in values and judgements, which in the aggregate are the social knowledge. Only positive significance becomes a value and the object, the carrier of the value, may be useless (a simple stone as a mascot). In line with this the value is not limited to significance. Axiological relation encompasses the due (the norm) and the desired (the ideal). An the demand to display kindness (the moral norm) even being met does not mean its full realization of the good as a value. According to V. Solovyov, the good is due, however, it can only be the good of we desire it, if there is experience of the good as the ideal, as my goal and as my aspiration to the good. M. Mamardashvili in his polemic with I. Kant, put forward this concept as a question that every person must ask him/herself: will you be more moral with regard to the more efforts you make to implement them [5, c.14].

Axiological relation in essence is the embodiment of the ideals experienced by people. Thus, axiological relations cannot be external and compulsory. They cannot be rammed through (you cannot force someone to love or to be happy), they cannot be taken possession of like power or wealth. Absence or presence of values and their necessity cannot be proved by logic. For the person who believes or is in love, there exist God and Love, but there is no God and no Love for those who do not have faith or have never been in love. And the latter does not stay within the consistent abstract logical construction.

There are three basic interrelated elements in the value structure: significance, norm and ideal. All these elements

are present in the axiosphere of the social knowledge. Culture is defined by the degree to which these values are realized and axiological relations are implemented in all spheres of the human activity. Values can function as significances, norms and ideals in the social knowledge.

The specificity of values, their place in the axiosphere of the social knowledge and functioning in the society are not defined by the inter-subject rather than the subject-object relations, and they are realized, in their turn, in these relations. The relationship of the subject to the object from the point of view of its significance defines the specificity of the valuation, not the value. This enables to distinguish the notions of valuation as the subject-object relationship and value which establish the most general types of relations between the objects of any level from an individual to the society as a whole, which plays the reverse normative and regulatory role in the society. In line with this we refer to the relationships not only between the individual and the society, but all the possible variants of interpersonal relationships.

Breach of value inter-subject relations is the source and the basis of the individual’s alienation from other people, from himself, from the society and the nature. The concepts of natural and artificial value relations are diverse. The first type of relations brings good to the individual (welfare, health) while the others bring evil (sicknesses). The philosopher N. Lossky writes that the source of the good and the bad in the value system is the morality. Moral evil lies in breaching the range of values by the agent, i.e. in self-love and selfishness, deeper love to oneself than to the God or other beings whereas the correct balance of values demands a deeper love to The God than to oneself, and the equally deep love to other beings and to oneself [6, c. 62].

Conclusions. Hence, modern social knowledge aims to distinguish true values from the ostensible ones. There are many cultural regulations as to the reason and the way one should live and this displays the real pluralism of the modern culture. Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish at least two real solutions of the global task: the first lies in the fact that the creative activity of specialists in axiology to develop the conceptually new system of philosophic grounding with regard to the modern value priority must enable universal consideration and qualitative evaluation of the existing value orientation; the second presupposes creation of the conditions under which the individual can realize his/her priorities based on his/her deep inner reaction that must foster creation of a system of criteria to help reveal the true values and distinguish them from the ostensible ones.

Social knowledge is included in the process of constructing the axiology of the society, producing meaningful components, which influence the advent of new values corresponding to the real social life conditions. This social knowledge is the basis on which rational and emotional utilization of the axiological meaning of the social reality is formed. In this respect, social knowledge directs the value potential for the benefit of the individual and his/her culture thus humanizing the entire communication space of the society. Social knowledge comprises knowledge of the important. This is the knowledge that determines evaluation criteria and serves as the concept of the benefit for the individual

and the mankind as well as ways to attain these benefits. It encompasses a wider information space than axiology.

The social knowledge is not the study of values. According to its information potential it is wider than the

latter resulting in the analysis and the place of values in the process of culture formation and social subject establishment on the part of its intellectual and practical activity as well as creative, utilitarian and pragmatic activity.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Ценности познания и гуманизм науки / Отв. ред. В.М. Найдыш, В.А. Федоров. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 1992. – 240 с.
2. Риккерт Г. Философия жизни: Пер. с нем. // Г. Риккерт. Философия жизни. – К.: Ника-Центр, Вист-С, 1998. – С. 269–443.
3. Дробницкий О.Г. Мир оживших предметов: Проблема ценностей в марксистской философии. – М.: Политиздат, 1967. – 351 с.
4. Кессиди Ф.Х. Философские и этические проблемы генетики человека. – М.: ТОО «Мартис», 1994. – 107 с.
5. Мамардашвили М.К. Сознание как философская проблема // Вопросы философии. – 1990. – № 3. – С. 3–18.
6. Лосский Н. О. Условия абсолютного добра: Основы этики: Характер русского народа. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 368 с.

REFERENCES

1. Tsennosti poznaniya i gumanizm nauki [Knowledge Values and Humanism of Science] / Отв. ред. V.M. Naydysh, V.A. Fedorov. – Moscow: Izd-vo RUDN, 1992. – 240 p.
2. Rickert H. Filosofiya zhizni [The Philosophy of Life]: Translated from German // H. Rickert. Filosofiya zhizni [The Philosophy of Life]. – Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, Vist-S, 1998. – P. 269–443.
3. Drobniyskiy O.G. Mir ozhivshikh predmetov: Problema tsennostey v marksistskoy filosofii [The World of Resurgent Objects: The Problem of Values in Marxist Theory]. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1967. – 351 p.
4. Kessidis F.Kh. Filosofskie i eticheskie problemy genetiki cheloveka [Philosophical and Ethical Problems of the Human Genetics]. – Moscow: LLP «Martis», 1994. – 107 p.
5. Mamardashvili M.K. Soznanie kak filosofskaya problema [Conscience as a Philosophical Problem] // Voprosy filosofii [Questions of Philosophy]. – 1990. – vol. 3. – P. 3–18.
6. Losskiy N. O. Usloviya absol'yutnogo dobra: Osnovy etiki: Kharakter russkogo naroda [Conditions of Absolute Good: Basics of Ethics: The Character of the Russian Nation]. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. – 368 p.

Социальное знание в конституировании аксиосферы общества

С. Чмыхун, О. Проценко

Аннотация. Статья посвящена рассмотрению роли современного социального знания в процессе становления аксиосферы общества. Показано, что ценности, как координаты человеческого мира, способствуют его устойчивости, организуют целенаправленную человеческую деятельность. Именно социальное знание воплощает в себе критерии различения ценностей истинных и мнимых, включает в себя основу для выявления динамики крушения одних ценностей, обозначения и возникновения других, переход ценностей в „антиценность”. Социальное знание обозначает ценности через выявление существенных характеристик человека как социального субъекта.

Ключевые слова: аксиосфера, социальное знание, культура, система ценностей, общество.