УДК 009

ИСТИНА КАК СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНОЕ ЯВЛЕНИЕ: СОВРЕМЕННАЯ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ

М. Г. ВОЛНИСТАЯ[1)]***, Е. Д. КОРКИЯ***[2)]***, А. К. МАМЕДОВ***[2)]

[1)]*Белорусский государственный университет, пр. Независимости, 4, 220030, г. Минск, Беларусь*
[2)]*Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова, Ленинские горы, 1, 119991, г. Москва, Россия*

Исследуется новый дискурс об изучении истины в современной науке. Дан краткий ретроспективный анализ основных областей интерпретации истины. Эти направления не просто перечислены, но включены в общую схему современной эпистемологии. Показаны объем и относительная ограниченность таких понятий, как теория соответствия, эволюционная эпистемология, социогуманитарная кибернетика, адаптационизм и неоадаптационизм. Важное место отводится проблеме истины в художественном творчестве. Представлены устойчивые выводы о полифоничности истины и ее мерцающем характере.

Ключевые слова: эпистемология; знание; истина; мезокосм; социализация; творчество; дизайн; адаптация; согласованность; энактивизм; синергия.

TRUTH AS A SOCIOCULTURAL PHENOMENON: MODERN INTERPRETATION

M. G. VOLNISTAYA[a], ***E. D. KORKIYA***[b], ***A. K. MAMEDOV***[b]

[a]*Belarusian State University, 4 Niezaliežnasci Avenue, Minsk 220030, Belarus*
[b]*Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1 Leninskie Gory, Moscow 119991, Russia*

Corresponding author: M. G. Volnistaya (mgv22@mail.ru)

The history of science in any of its transformations and metamorphoses is, in fact, a search for and definition of the truth. As an example, I. Kant's famous four questions start with the question «What can I know?». Thus, the search for truth as a subject of research has been a dominating force throughout human history. Of course, sociology as a social meta-science is also involved in this topic. A simple assertion of the existence of three concepts of truth, namely accordance, agreement and advantage, does not fully answer the prerequisites of contemporary discourse. The present article analyses a new discourse on the study of truth in contemporary science. We give a brief retrospective analysis of the main fields of truth interpretation. At the same time, these directions are not just listed but linked into the general outline of contemporary epistemology.

Образец цитирования:
Волнистая МГ, Коркия ЭД, Мамедов АК. Истина как социокультурное явление: современная интерпретация. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология.* 2020;4:14–22 (на англ.).
https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2020-4-14-22

For citation:
Volnistaya MG, Korkiya ED, Mamedov AK. Truth as a sociocultural phenomenon: modern interpretation. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology.* 2020;4:14–22.
https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2020-4-14-22

Авторы:
Марина Георгиевна Волнистая – кандидат социологических наук, доцент; доцент кафедры социологии факультета философских и социальных наук.
Эка Демуровна Коркия – кандидат социологических наук; доцент кафедры социологии коммуникативных систем социологического факультета.
Агамали Куламович Мамедов – доктор социологических наук, профессор; заведующий кафедрой социологии и социальных коммуникаций социологического факультета.

Authors:
Marina G. Volnistaya, PhD (sociology), docent; head of the department of philosophy and methodology of university education.
mgv22@mail.ru
Eka D. Korkiya, PhD (sociology); associate professor at the department of sociology of communication system, faculty of sociology.
ekakorkiya@mail.ru
Agamali K. Mamedov, doctor of science (sociology), full professor; head of the department of sociology communication systems, faculty of sociology.
akmnauka@yandex.ru

Of course, a greater bias is made towards the sciences of the social and humanitarian profile. That, however, does not exclude the necessary portion of the data of natural science research. In the article these data are not used as demonstrations, but as independent meta-scientific research. We give various examples of the complementarity of different branches of science. In particular, we show the scope and relative limitation of such concepts as correspondence theory, evolutionary epistemology, socio-humanitarian cybernetics, adaptationism and neo-adaptationism. A significant place in the article is occupied by the problem of truth in artistic creation. We also give sustainable conclusions about the polyphonicity of truth and its flickering character.

Keywords: epistemology; knowledge; truth; mesocosm; socialisation; creation; design; adaptation; coherence; enactivism; synergy.

The many faces of history show us non-linearity and unpredictability of social development. Disillusionment becomes more and more common in the very process of cognition, in the rationality of reflection. There has occurred a certain split in man himself. On one hand is our dear physical reality, on the other is our rational understanding of it, which is affected by a number of ever-changing factors. This splitness puts the questions of the accuracy of our knowledge at the forefront, together with questions on the boundaries of delusion and the polyphony of our views. The life of people as a social-tribal being with its vicissitudes and a wide palette of variations is cognition. An individual realises their self through evolutionarily developed abilities to navigate and adapt (individually or collectively) to the environment. The picture of the world, which is constructed inside the mind of a man, the knowledge that he acquires is not and can be neither a homomorphic copy of reality nor the result of an ad libitum conversion. Cognitive skills are involuntarily determined by the three-dimensional world, which people learn and transform using their natural abilities. The truth, paradoxically, is corporeal, because it is framed by the possibilities of human cognition as a mesocosmically real being [1]. At the same time, in the cognitive mechanisms of living beings, there is a vector for the ultimate freedom of the results of perception from the introduced anthropological factors, and for consciousness, this comes from arbitrary or illusory constructs.

In the process of cognition and the corresponding cognitive practices, people deal with themselves, first and foremost, because any information is received through their cultural filters developed in the process of searching and developing as people. The world is comprehended through complex processes of idealisation, abstraction, mortification and coarsening. These models are determined by the boundaries of their knowledge in a given segment of their social life [2]. This thesis is especially relevant for social sciences because here the researcher builds a picture of the world, which is determined, first of all, by its mesocosmic position. It should be recognised that people as a whole, by their non-alternative socialness, are always looking for social guidelines and ways to adapt to the world. The person looks into the world and sees his face: generally speaking, the picture of the world to a certain extent bears the stamp of the personality of the subject creating it [3]. In social cognition, to a great extent (although it's the same in natural sciences), people perceive the world by literally letting it pass through their soul (M. Scheller, F. Jacobi), their cultural capital. J. Ortega y Gasset noted that Cartesian man was antipathetic to history and subjective experience because at the time man did not act «more geometrico».

Existential problems are already by definition eternal, they are pondered time and time again depending on the needs of the cultural space and the personality of the researcher. It is no coincidence that respected thinker of the 20th century B. Rassell marked dialogical substantivity of philosophy, where the acquired answers are not as important as the questions that are generated in the process of pondering, in reflection. Humanitarian reflection is the answer to eternal questions in a historical and cultural context. At the same time, scientific theories, if they wish to remain scientific at their core, are neutral to all kinds of versions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology. Thus, depriving themselves of the general potency of teleology, the value of interpretation, and hermeneutics, the exact sciences (a term the author disagrees with) have substantially constricted their field of influence.

In socialisation or self-creation of personality, people try to: know him or herself, for they are in search of their *I*, their identity, which simultaneously lies in their creative hands and is constantly slipping away from them. Secondly, they seek to understand themselves, to interpret themselves in the *I Am the World* system. Third, they construct their lifeworld and themselves. Every moment of cognition is burdened by the past and fraught with future (G. W. Leibniz).

In literary creation, reality undergoes further metamorphoses. It is multi-layered and discrete, the past, present and future are superimposed on each other, mixing into wonderful metaphorical constructs (M. Proust: «Today is yesterday's tomorrow, or tomorrow's yesterday»). A writer, similarly to M. Chagall's «Blue violinist», offers the reader to travel to polyphonic virtual worlds of characters, where history isn't conventional, but fantasy as seen by the writer. Consequently, a single truth, as it was in the medieval discourse, does not exist, but a multitude of truths are presented. Truth as its product is created and arbitrarily declared by the author (for example, N. V. Gogol's devil in «Christmas eve»). The narrator departs from reality, but all his fantasies are

generated by reality, which means that they are true or may be true (S. Dali, «Premonition of civil war»). They remain just words, an image and a correlative, and not the actual reality. Thus, words are more real than reality itself, because words are expressed, published. Meanwhile, the reality is a moment of being, it mimics, can be interpreted in different ways and in different systems (F. Kafka, «Angels don't fly»).

The assertion that people design themselves and their world inevitably leads to the question about the rules and boundaries of free construction of reality. Even I. Kant in his «Critique of pure reason» (1781) raised the question of the boundaries of the intelligible world and further strictly divided the world of noumena and phenomena [4].

According to the classical – based in antiquity – correspondence theory of truth, the truth is the correspondence (or rather adequacy – authors' note) of knowledge to an object. Knowledge is the cognitive attitude of people to their environment. In the process of active converter (I. G. Fichte, «Wissenschaftslehre») activities, people know the world through transforming it, when processing information coming from the outside (think G. W. Leibniz's marble analogy). Knowledge corresponds, at least it should, to the object, since the subject itself is the result and the actor (one of) the transformation of the world, which lets the subject survive. Acquired human knowledge and experience (religious and artistic as well) have unconditional adaptive value, they form the necessary first social capital and skills in search activity and social orientation. Cultural practices as an element of practical transforming activity also become an integral adaptation segment, through games, imitation, and comprehension [5]. Also, even religious symbolic actions and rituals (prayer, singing, meditation, austerity, etc.) support different systems of self-control; awareness of the sacredness of such practices unites social groups.

Non-adaptationist approach (F. Vuketych, F. Varela and U. Maturana) defines people as an operationally closed system, actively «tasting the world», rather than a «claymation», flexible yet passive or a J. Locke tabula rasa. It is proclaimed that it is wrong to regard truth simply as a form of adaptation, and the result of adaptation practices [6], to it we must add the provisions of constructivism. Whilst being one – absolute and unchanging – the truth, writes J. Ortega y Gasset, cannot be the property of our abilities, perishable and transient [7].

E. Oeser, within his paradigm, advocates that evolutionary epistemology is not as adequate as the coherence theory of truth, defining it as the theory of evolution theory of the truth of coherence, which refers to «diachronic coherence of areas of knowledge, which is based on the logic of successive cognition processes, which precedes the logic of the products of cognition (statements and systems of statements) since it is already rooted in the structures of the human cognitive apparatus as something genetically a priori»[1] [8].

According to this position, the reality is fleeting and discrete. A subject can only cover a small portion of the elusive moment of life, and therefore we are – in the sense of coherence theory of truth – never have clear unbiased access to the truth. Our knowledge is inadequate, it is not a mirror of reality, nor is it isomorphic. Therefore, we rely, as there are no other options, on the knowledge that has been formed throughout the history of man as a species, i.e. on the diachronic coherence of the development of knowledge. For each individual there is an innate metric of the probability of expectations of obtaining a certain knowledge, cognitive optics, which developed in the process of living and acculturation; this is optimal for the real functioning of the cognitive system. Oeser draws on H. Lorentz's fundamental thesis in evolutionary epistemology that ontogenetically a priori knowledge is phylogenetically a posteriori. Evolutionary epistemology can be viewed as an attempt to explain the a priori structures of our knowledge through evolution and «to dynamise» these structures [9].

The classical correspondence theory of truth is based, according to A. F. Oeser, on the concept of empirical realism, which is characteristic of the old paradigms such as the classical mechanics of I. Newton («Hypotheses non fingo / *I* frame no hypotheses»). To a greater extent, hypothetical realism is removed from reality, which presupposes not only the ontological existence of reality but also the problem of its adequate reflection. The following is a position shared by Oeser and it is internal realism with the actualisation of the coherence theory of truth, which is characteristic of theories of nonclassical or post-nonclassical rationality.

In the scientific matrix of a coherent theory of truth and understanding of the conditionality of the results of human cognition by its place in the process of cosmic evolution, evolutionary epistemology reveals the roots of some delusions of the collective human mind. It reveals the mesocosmic roots of erroneous conclusions and ideas, cognitive failures (a certain tolerance of convention) of the science of that time. It is worth noting that even the discarded scientific concepts that no longer have the conductive correlate, in reality, can hardly be called completely false, because the diversity of life (primarily social) provides the researcher with a wide range of interpretations and a field of further scientific research (Feyerabend's principle of proliferation).

G. Vollmer, the author of the evolutionary theory of knowledge, shows that our perceptual illusions, intuitive erroneous judgments, and expectations are programmed mesocosmically. The delusions of the collective

[1] Hereinafter translated by *M. V.*, *E. K.*, *A. M.*

human mind, fundamental in the history of science, have a mesocosmic origin [10].

From the point of view of evolutionary epistemology, the cognitive activity of living beings is determined by the peculiarities of their bodily organization. The fact that the human mind does not mirror the world was shown by F. Bacon in his work «The idols of the four idols of the mind criticism». Idols of the genus are something present in human nature, in each of us as a representative of the species homo sapiens. This is due to our certain bodily organization, evolutionarily developed adaptation to the world, to the so-called mesocosm, as the evolutionary epistemologists of the L. Altenberg school of philosophy say; some aspects have also been highlighted by the General system theory creator, L. von Bertalanffy.

The human eye is adapted to a particular optical window, which is a quite narrow spectrum of electromagnetic waves that can be sensed by the retina of the human eye. Likewise, humans hear only in a strictly defined acoustic window; it lacks the potency to perceive ultrasonic signals that some animals use in the process of communication. A priori knowledge is not arbitrary pre-experience knowledge but is a product of historical development.

In what is now an in-style book, «Head against the wall. Biological limitations of thinking» R. Riedl notes, that our cognitive abilities are framed by dynamic boundaries of preformed cognitive abilities. R. Riedl calls attempts at cognitive leaps Munchausen-esque or metaphysical aspirations of epistemological science.

Completeness and successful learning outcomes are based not only and not so much on linguistic and logical coherence, as on the current functional coherence abilities of the human brain as a self-referential system. That is formed as a result of the evolution of natural functional coherence mechanisms and technologies of cognition.

One of the most influential modern concepts in cognitive science continues to develop the ideas put forward by the founders of the evolutionary epistemology of K. Lorenz's social circle. We are talking about the concept (F. Varela, et al.) of incarnated, or bodily, knowledge.

Knowledge is bodily, it is embodied, directly predetermined by physical human investment, due to the elaborated mesocosm abilities at reflecting reality. The known and the how it is known depend on the body structure and its specific functional features, social orientation and movement in space. There are bodily threads that control the mind.

In the matrix of modern epistemological research, it is postulated that cognition as a complex process is not only the embodiment of the logic of unsurpassed intellectual rigour but also bodily affected and determined by bodily capital.

When defending the unity of body and spirit, M. Merleau-Ponty remarked that the spirit is the other side of the body. It is firmly embedded in the body, anchored in it. People perceive themselves bodily: «I am not in front of my body, I am not in my body, rather I am my body».

F. Nietzsche in 1881 emphasised the «human, all too human» understanding of the truth: «We philosophers… we must constantly give birth to our thoughts out of our pain and maternally endow them with all that we have of blood, heart, fire, pleasure, passion, agony, conscience, fate, and disaster. Life – to us, that means constantly transforming all that we are into light and flame, and also all that wounds us; we simply can do no other» [11].

The corporality of consciousness is closely related to the idea of its situationality. Corporeal means territorialised, located in a certain space of life, which is topologically and temporally structured. The cognitive system is built-in, rooted both internally – in the material neural substrate that provides its activity, and externally – included in the external situational physical and socio-cultural environment. It is impossible to understand the cognitive and creative activity of people, if we abstract from the subject of cognition as a living organism, which is included in a certain situation that has a peculiar configuration, i.e. operating in environmentally defined conditions. Every cognitive act expands into a certain situation with certain topological properties; it is realised here and now.

Body consciousness is not just active, it is enacted: consciousness performs its cognitive functions in action and through action. Through actions, motor activity, the cognitive abilities of a living organism are formed both in ontogenesis and in phylogeny.

The sensorimotor meaning of the bodily *I* is demonstrated by the psychologist D. Legrand – the bodily *I* not only observes actions from the outside and is not just the instigator of actions, it in itself is feeling and action. The body is the point at which action and perception converge… At the bodily level, having pre-reflective self-awareness means experiencing the coherence of action and perception.

Cognitive activity in the world creates the environment itself in relation to the cognising subject – in the sense of selection, picking out and by the cognising subject from the world which corresponds to his cognitive abilities and attitudes. F. Varela connects enaction with the well-known concept of the event by the German thinker M. Heidegger, namely with the double conditioning of the act of birth as being and as historicity. Enaction is an event, i.e. joint and coordinated being of the subject and the object cognizable by him, their coherent and iterative birth and coordinated transformation.

So, it is impossible to understand the work of the human mind, the cognitive abilities of the human intellect, if the human mind is abstracted from the

organism, its corporeality, the ability to perceive in a certain way through the senses, an organism included in a special situation, an environment that has a certain configuration [9]. The mind exists in the body, and the body exists in the world, while the bodily being acts, hunts for something, reproduces itself, dreams, imagines.

The world around us, as F. Varela noted, can be characterised not by means of attributes, but by means of potentials that are revealed, actualised by means of people's involvement in the world, the so-called enaction. One of the decisive arguments in defence of the plurality of truths and, accordingly, the plurality of realities of living beings is based on the idea that every living being, and man to the highest degree, not only reflects the world but also actively builds and constructs it. All this leads us to the problems of constructivism – a very relevant topic for reflection in philosophy, psychology, psychotherapy, and communication theory.

Constructivism began to develop actively in the theoretical reflections of the Modern Age, in the views of G. Vico and G. Berkeley, who have focused on the knowing and the thinking subject in the matter. G. Vico's maxim sounded like this: A person can know only what he knows, i. e. in the process of his knowledge of the world, a person turns only to his own experience and rethinks only this experience. Berkeley, who drew attention to the concept of being, or existence, argued that «to be is to be perceived», that the subject can only access the content of his consciousness, and the world of experience is only the world of knowledge. In this way, the subjects deal in the process of cognition and activity with themselves, they cannot get away from themselves. To a certain extent, this fits in with Voltaire's position «I am a body and I think». The subject is constantly revolving in the circle of his own experience. The German classics I. Kant and J. G. Fichte can also be referred to as constructivists. Reason displays, according to Kant, spontaneous and autonomous activity: it shapes and constructs experience. *The I*, according to Fichte, is busy and active. From *the I*, on the basis of *the I* appears *the non-I*; *I* and *not-I* combine with each other and form each other. *The I* creates the romantic German landscape of forest and mountains that *the I* perceives, but *the not-I* also creates and shapes *the I*.

Representatives of the humanitarian wing (not an oxymoron – authors' note) of cybernetics H. von Foerster, G. Bateson, P. Watzlavik, and the creator of genetic psychology J. Piaget can be seen as successors to the ideas of constructivism.This kind of naturalistically based constructivism thus arose from evolutionary approaches in epistemology and cybernetics, especially from the so-called cybernetics of cybernetics, or second-order cybernetics, i. e. cybernetics as a theory of knowledge. Since people actively build and create the world around them, the idea of truth and its criteria changes radically. Truth is what serves the adaptation and survival of the human body. That which is viable, that which promotes social adaptation and orientation, is the truth.

Constructivism as a theoretical concept finds substantiation in cybernetics, more precisely. The two basic concepts of cybernetics – cyclical causality and structural conjugation of systems – are commonly used in constructing the concept of radical constructivism, in the form, for example, as constructed by E. von Glasersfeld. Cyclic causality is the basis of the concept of homeostasis, i.e. negative feedback, through which the system can return to a state of equilibrium, despite the constantly present internal and external disturbances, and maintain its integrity. Homeostasis mechanisms underlie the self-maintenance of a complex human body and the functioning of automata, as well as many technical systems studied by cybernetics. Meanwhile, synergetics studies different types of connections: not only negative feedbacks that ensure self-maintenance and preservation of integrity, but also nonlinear positive feedbacks that provide a very rapid, avalanche-like development of complex systems.

Cyclic causality determines the property of self-reference. Any self-organising system of inanimate or living nature or society organises itself, being separated from the surrounding world (maintaining its integrity) and built into it, open to it (openness as a condition for self-organisation). A living being (a living organisation) realises itself as a living system through the production of its operations, it, as causa sui, recreates itself (autopoiesis). The subject and the object of cognition are also linked by feedback, the subject is inscribed in the environment, and the environment is inscribed in it. They create, and in the process of this collaboration create each other. Knowledge flows not just from the subject or the object, but from this bundle of subject & object.

The second concept, which has received significant development in the theory of autopoiesis by H. Maturana and F. Varela, is the concept of structural conjugation of the organism and the environment of its activity, the subject and the object of cognition. In the cyclic process of mutual determination, the subject and the object of cognition turn out to be mutually adjusted, adapted to each other, they have undergone the process of co-evolution, otherwise, there would be no survival. The subject is not only open to the environment but also operationally closed, which enables it to maintain its identity [12].

On the basis of these two concepts, the concept of H. von Foerster derives radical conclusions that everyone is in the closed world of their own, because they develop and construct their reality, and thus the concept of truth is the invention of a liar. Therefore, the goal of cognition is not the search for truth, but its very

process, just as dance arises in the process of dancing and is a self-fulfilling goal.

The fundamental idea of cybernetic thinking is the idea of cyclicity, feedback, self-reference, and self-structuring. No system could survive without the ability to maintain and reproduce its behaviour and its organisation. There is always a cyclical moment in self-organisation: it is, in fact, the organisation of the organisation. The consciousness of consciousness is self-awareness, and understanding of understanding is self-understanding. The world around us in the form in which we perceive it is our invention. Instead of worrying about external reality inaccessible to us, it is wiser to focus attention on the world that we build in the process of interaction and communication with other people, on the world of our experience.

According to Heinz von Foerster, everything that is said is said by an observer (because there is no observation without the subject). Descriptions are always self-descriptions. The question that is asked, as a rule, already contains the answer that can be received. Therefore, he recognises as legitimate only those questions that are pure: for him, there is no ready-made answer.

In 1974 this brought H. von Foerster to the development of the original concept of cybernetics of cybernetics, or second-order cybernetics. Indeed, cybernetics is defined by the isolation area of research which, unlike traditional disciplinary areas, acquires the property of self-applicability. Cybernetics itself (a term introduced by the physicist A.-M. Ampère in the first half of the 19th century) is the research subject in cybernetics. «Cybernetics of the first order separates the subject and the object, it points to the supposed independent world out there, outside of us», notes H. von Foerster. «Cybernetics of the second order is in itself cyclical: people learn to understand themselves as a part of the world, of the world that they intend to observe. The whole situation of description shifts to another area in which people are suddenly forced to take responsibility for their observations» [13]. In an effort to develop second-order cybernetics H. von Foerster is, undoubtedly, following the ideas (sometimes quite paradoxical) of G. Pask, whose research goal was on the need to humanise cybernetics, actualising it in arts and everyday life.

«We do not reflect, but invent and design the world», H. von Foerster notes [10]. «We are not able to find out what the reality is. Therefore, we are constantly reinventing and reconstructing our reality and our present being. Since the world is our invention, each of us is cognitively alone, and hopelessly at that. For each of us perceives and comprehends the world to the extent of our own cognitive capabilities. Everyone masters and activates their own world for themselves, constructing their own reality. The concept of truth is a real chameleon in the history of science, which always takes on different colours – in accordance with the position of the one who uses it. Therefore, the goal of cognition is the process of cognition itself» [9]. Buddhists are right when they say that you pave your path while moving along it because the path is not something eternal and predetermined. The path appears at the moment of movement, the road is laid in the course of moving along it. The constructive theory of knowledge is determined by people's curiosity about the world; it is a doctrine of curiosity.

Developing an original cybernetic epistemology, the Anglo-American psychologist Gregory Bateson introduced the phenomenon of looping and loop structures. The researcher, in practice, substantiates the theory of nonlinear cyclical causality, ambiguity and retroactivity of relations that are established between the individual mind and its environment. With regard to the meaning of the message, he spoke about a double bond and a double order. That is about the text and context of messages which can be directly opposite to each other. The subject in this case lives simultaneously in two different worlds, operates with two different, sometimes directly opposite, truths.

The individual mind transcends its bodily certainty and dissolves in its ecological environment, in the networks of the collective mind. The individual mind is immanent, but not only to the body but also to circuits and messages outside the body. There is also a great Intelligence, in which the individual intelligence is only a subsystem. G. Bateson further developed the ideas expressed by another cyberneticist W. Ross Ashby in the 1940s.

P. Watzlawick's basis for constructivism in «The invented reality» (1984) is usually presented in the following quotes. We construct reality while we assume that we perceive it. What we call reality (individual, social, ideological) is an interpretation constructed through communication. The patient is enclosed in a systemic structure that makes up their world. Therefore, therapy should be to destroy this structure. By changing the way the patient sees the world, other people, and themselves, we awaken their strength to overcome the disease: It is impossible not to manipulate. The attending physician also manipulates, destroys the patient's structures, invents a reality that can become a new positive reality for the patient, in which their health condition will improve.

From P. Watzlawick's point of view, there is no single reality. What exists are different versions of reality, which may even contradict each other. The proposed psychotherapeutic method «Be spontaneous!» means a call to play with reality, to soft mutual adjustment to the surrounding world, to create oneself and the world in order to better adapt to it.

P. Watzlawik built his constructivist theory of communication on the following axioms.

1. It is impossible not to communicate. Every behavioural act entails communication.

2. Any communication has two aspects: the content and the ratio (manner, transmission code). Moreover, the second aspect is in a sense metacommunication («the how» of communication is more important than «the what» of communication).

3. The nature of the relationship (approval, opposition, denial) depends on the placement of pauses in the sequence of acts of communication between partners. To establish a harmonious relationship, one should find means to renew the relationship. The most unbearable thing is to be ignored.

4. Human beings use two methods of communication: digital (complex logical syntax with a lack of semantics) and analog (using images, personalised stories, word games, quotations, reformulations with rich semantics).

5. Any communicative exchange is symmetrical or complementary, depending on whether it is based on equality or difference.

The advantage of this position is that constructivism expands the space of the possible. It allows us to play freely with reality and with our experience, which was expressed by I. Kant in his idea of imagination as a productive ability of cognition. Imagination opens up a set of possibilities in any thing or event, as well as shades or perspectives of a different vision. The world appears to us in a free suspended state, we can rebuild it at our discretion, experiment, and wait for a response from it.

Secondly, constructivism emphasises the importance of creating meta-reality in the communication process (which was pointed out by P. Watzlawick), in which the attitude plays a greater role than the content transmitted.

Thirdly, constructivism focuses on the possibility of constant and active creation of reality and oneself, individual emergence, the dissolution of the subject's self in the world around them, in the activity, in the communication networks that they create and which then create them.

The main drawback of the position of constructivism is that the subject of activity, actively creating reality and building themselves in interaction with it, does not meet any resistance from reality, it gets stuck in reality, without noticing the boundaries between own experience and reality as such. It's not just reality that gets stuck, but also the human experience. Facts, as we all know, are stubborn things, but if people question the facts themselves (lat. *Factum* – something is done or made), if facts become hypotheses, then it becomes a «do what you want» situation. People cannot escape from themselves, go beyond the boundaries of their experience, their perceptions and thoughts. They look into the world, and see in it, as in a mirror, themselves, albeit in a different way. Everything is *the I* and everything is *not-I*, everything is a product of my works and imagination.

The criticism of radical constructivism, on the one hand, comes from the position of evolutionary epistemology, and on the other, from the position of nonlinear dynamics and synergetics.

K. Lorenz and his pupils R. Riedl, E. Oeser, G. Vollmer, and F. M. Vuketic showed that knowledge and perception are not the result of an arbitrary construct of the world. This is a form of adaptation of a living organism to the surrounding world, developed by a long evolutionary path. G. Vollmer, being close to the L. Altenberg circle of evolutionary epistemologists, holds the position of hypothetical realism. The window to reality that opens to people (a certain optical window, a certain dormer window) is a mesocosmic window. The mesocosm is a world to which man is evolutively adapted. J. Piaget, too, generally speaking, was not inclined towards radical constructivism and called his position ontological minimal realism.

In the very cognitive mechanisms of living beings, a vector is laid for the maximum possible purity of the results of perception from what is introduced, including concrete bodily factors, and consciousness – from its arbitrary, subjective structures. K. Lorenz calls this important phenomenon objectification. The possibility of objectification is a way out of the endless circle of recursion and mutual subject-object determination. Whenever we manage to explain the origin of any element of our experience through internal, subjective processes or states and exclude it from our consideration of super-subjective reality, we in our knowledge come one small step closer to what exists independently of our knowledge. Our picture of objective reality is built exclusively from such steps. The material world, divided into objects which we perceive, arises only through the fact that we abstract from the subjective and the accidental. Something that allows us to believe in the reality of things is ultimately the constancy with which certain external influences appear at the same time and in the same regular connection with each other in our experience, despite all the changes in the perception of conditions and internal conditions of our selves… Therefore, activities related to abstracting are called objectifying and the act of cognitive activity is called objectivation. K. Lorenz's position can be summarised as follows, objectivation acts on the primary level of physiological mechanisms of perception and it largely formed conceptually thinking (K. Lorenz, «Behind the Mirror»). It is postulated, that the objectified perception of surrounding space peculiar to man is not given a priori, it is formed and determined in the process of acculturation of living space.

K. Lorenz also spoke about deliberate rational objectification, which continues non-reflective physiological objectification, which brings us to the religious aspect of the problem, which has not received significant interest in science. E. Knyazeva notes: «Religious asceticism, in our opinion, is not some kind of whim or

experimentation with one's own body, but a reflection of a deep spiritual and bodily need of people, which fits into the general series of the phenomenon of objectification and deserves serious consideration within this framework. The bodily approach, which has taken the direction (and rightly) of introducing the body into the focus of analysis; thus, we must take into account this need as a significant counterfactor» [9].

Criticism of radical constructivism also comes from the side of synergetics, where H. Haken designated the position as reality-based constructivism or constructivist realism.

According to synergetics, we do have real limitations of our potency, not all of us can do deus ex machina-type feats in this reality and sculpture it as we please. Reality is not infinitely flexible and cannot voluntarily bend under the actions of people, but there are boundaries of both constructivism, and, moreover, voluntarism. The constructive and creative activity of people, in order to be successful, must be guided by natural limitations in the form of their own ways of co-evolution of complex systems, the spectra of their structures-attractors, which are determined by the internal properties of the complex systems themselves, the surrounding world itself. It is possible to realise, design, build, but only what is determined and consistent with internal tendencies.

The synergistic vision of the subject-object connection is such that the subject of cognition with certain attitudes and constructs of consciousness constructs the surrounding natural and social world not at random, but «hits the keys of the possible». Strikes on the keys (according to the established rules) – the carving of new forms, awakening the world to its own new life, a trigger for the beginning of the self-organisation processes.

Using cognition to try to enter into the nature of being, people with their consciousness make irreversible and inevitable changes to it, as shown in non-classical science, in quantum mechanics in early and then late 20th century, and in nonlinear dynamics and synergetics. People become accomplices from the conjugated process of the birth of nature, the process of their development in it.

The possibility of knowing the world in principle, its mesmerizing intelligibility, is connected with the fact that all the elements in the Man and the World System as a complex dynamic structure co-evolve when entering into a complex process of collaboration. Adaptation is multivariant and active: man converts, probes, samples, and experiences the world and waits for a response from it; thus, designing themselves and their mesocosm world. Coevolution at the biological level is associated with the formation of ecological niches, and at the level of human cognition and activity – with the formation of cognitive niches that fit into cognitive landscapes.

I. Kant (and before him, Nicholas of Cusa, and then mathematician É. Galois wrote about the proportionality of knowledge and ignorance) spoke about the impossibility of absolute delusion. All knowledge, our knowledge is always enclosed in ignorance, noted Professor V. Nalimov [14, p. 19]. Ch. Darwin completed his theoretical work by defining the scope of applicability of the theory, denoting, in fact, things-in-themselves, the border of the intelligible world. Theories and concepts rejected in the course of the historical development of science, contain a certain fraction of truth, and were applied in human activities. They were the primary form of human adaptation to the world and its survival in it.

Thinking is nothing other than the adjustable teleological and evolutionarily asserted delusion. It is in this delusion that insight and new viewpoints appear. From dead-end branches of knowledge emerge unorthodox scientific constructs, a symbiosis of new hypotheses (I. Pavlov on the light at the end of the tunnel).

The multivariate process of coevolution, as a result of which a stable mechanism of objectification of the results of cognition has been developed, is subject to constant change, i.e. it evolves and develops in accordance with the challenges of the time. The world has become more complex and vaster before our eyes. We began to suspect that history and life cannot and should not be governed by principles, like books on mathematics, said J. Ortega y Gasset [7].

Библиографические ссылки

1. Мамедов АК. Логика социального познания (Поппер *vs* Маркс). *Социология*. 2016;3:8–19.

2. Ленин ВИ. *Философские тетради.* Москва: Государственное издательство политической литературы; 1947. 469 с.

3. Мамедов АК. *Эпистемология социального познания.* Москва: КАНОН+; 2017. 224 с.

4. Кант И. *Сочинения. Том 3.* Москва: Мысль; 1964. 780 с.

5. Тард Г. *Законы подражания.* Москва: Академический проект; 2011. 302 с.

6. Вукетич Ф. Эволюция и познание: парадигмы, перспективы, проблемы. В: Князева ЕН, редактор. *Эволюционная эпистемология. Антология.* Санкт-Петербург: Центр гуманитарных инициатив; 2012. с. 275–314.

7. Ортега-и-Гассет. Х. *Избранные труды.* Руткевич АМ, составитель, редактор. Москва: Весь мир; 1997. 704 с.

8. Эзер Э. Динамика теорий и фазовые переходы (в связи со схемой научной эволюции по Карлу Попперу). *Вопросы философии.* 1995;10:37–44.

9. Князева ЕН. Понимание истины в эволюционной эпистемологии. В: Касавин ИТ, Князева ЕН, Лекторский ВА, редакторы. *Истина в науке и философии.* Москва: Альфа-М; 2010. с. 357–384.
10. Фоллмер Г. *Эволюционная теория познания. Врожденные структуры познания в контексте биологии, психологии, лингвистики, философии и теории науки*. Москва: Русский Двор; 1998. 256 с.
11. Ницше Ф. Веселая наука. В: Ницше Ф. *Сочинения. Том 1*. Москва: Мысль; 1990. с. 491–719.
12. Матурана У, Варела Ф. *Древо познания: биологические корни человеческого понимания*. *2-е издание*. Москва: УРСС; 2019. 320 с. Совместно с издательством «Ленанд».
13. Foerster H von. *Understanding. Essays on Cybernetics and Cognition.* New York: Springer; 2003. 374 p.
14. Налимов ВВ. *Спонтанность сознания*. Москва: Прометей; 1989. 288 с.

References

1. Mamedov AK. Logic of social knowledge (Popper *vs* Marx). *Sotsiologiya*. 2016;3:8–19. Russian.
2. Lenin VI. *Filosofskie tetradi* [Philosophical notebooks]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury; 1947. 469 p. Russian.
3. Mamedov AK. *Epistemologiya sotsial'nogo poznaniya* [Epistemology of social cognition]. Moscow: KANON+; 2017. 224 p. Russian.
4. Kant I. *Sochineniya. Tom 3* [Works. Volume 3]. Moscow: Mysl'; 1964. 780 p. Russian.
5. Tarde G. *Zakony podrazhaniya* [Laws of imitation]. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt; 2011. 302 p. Russian.
6. Vuketic FM. [Evolution and cognition: paradigms, perspectives, problems]. In: Knyazeva EN, editor. *Evolyutsionnaya epistemologiya. Antologiya* [Evolutionary epistemology. Anthology]. Saint Petersburg: Centre for Humanitarian Initiatives; 2012. p. 275–314. Russian.
7. Ortega y Gasset J. *Izbrannye trudy* [Selected works]. Rutkevich AM, compiler and editor. Moscow: Ves' Mir; 1997. 704 p. Russian.
8. Oeser E. [Dynamics of theories and phase transitions (in connection with the scheme of scientific evolution according to Karl Popper]. *Voprosy filosofii.* 1995;10:37–44. Russian.
9. Knyazeva EN. [Understanding truth in evolutionary epistemology]. In: Kasavin IT, Knyazeva EN, Lektorskii VA, editors. *Istina v nauke i filosofii* [Truth in science and philosophy]. Moscow: Alfa-M; 2010. p. 357–384.
10. Vollmer G. *Evolyutsionnaya teoriya poznaniya. Vrozhdennye struktury poznaniya v kontekste biologii, psikhologii, lingvistiki, filosofii i teorii nauki* [Evolutionary theory of knowledge. Inborn structures of cognition in the context of biology, psychology, linguistics, philosophy and theory of science]. Moscow: Russkii Dvor; 1998. 256 p. Russian.
11. Nietzsche F. [The gay science]. In: Nietzsche F. *Sochineniya. Tom 1* [Works. Volume 1]. Moscow: Mysl'; 1990. p. 491–719. Russian.
12. Maturana U, Varela F. *Drevo poznaniya: biologicheskie korni chelovecheskogo ponimaniya* [The tree of knowledge: biological roots of human understanding]. 2nd edition. Moscow: URSS; 2019. 320 p. Co-published by the «Lenand». Russian.
13. Foerster H von. *Understanding. Essays on Cybernetics and Cognition*. New York: Springer; 2003. 374 p.
14. Nalimov VV. *Spontannost' soznaniya* [Spontaneity of consciousness]. Moscow: Prometei; 1989. 288 p. Russian.

Received by editorial board 23.11.2020.