Rayev D.S.,
doctor of philosophy,
Tuleubekov A.S.,
candidate of philosophy,
Kazakh University
of the International
Relations and World
Languages named after
Abylay khan,
Kazakhstan

Conference participant

SOCIAL SPACE AND MODELS
OF HUMAN ONTOLOGY

The main aim of the article is to show that the essence of a man consists of such spheres as "clean human", "social", and "subjective". In general, there are two ontological spaces of existence – internal subjective and external objective.

For understanding the meaning of the work, we should consider the epistemological positions in the sphere of interpretation of the social reality of essence.

In general, there are two typologies for dividing society in social philosophy.

According the first of them, we can divide social reality into four models:
1) Naturalistic;
2) Realistic;
3) Through activity;
4) Phenomenological.

The naturalistic understanding of social reality opens its meaning as a degree of nature's meaning in general. This means that, in fact, society is a part of nature and the essence of everyone depends on the laws of his or her biological substance.

A realistic considering of social reality shows the development of society as the development of the social spirit. Social spirit, in fact, exists and expresses itself independently from the individual mind and life.

Social reality understood through activity is the sphere of production, politics and power. Only these three factors determine the essence of society. In this case, society is an abstract space of concrete human activity.

According to phenomenological criteria, the essence of social reality is found in the individual mind as the internal meaning of things, subjective experience, and subjective values. That is why phenomenology considers social reality as a space, which has internal, subjective essence in its base.

The second division of social philosophy considers the essence of social reality to consist of two positions: realistic and nominalistic.

The meaning of this realistic method is the same as in the first division. However, there is also a view of society as a real idea that can influence the individual mind's changing its relation to social surrounding. This idea depends on its internal objective laws.

Over against, nominalistic understanding explains society as a concept having meaning only in intersubjective context. There is no social reality without the individual mind. Social reality exists thanks to the transcendental Me, and everyone knows about his social surroundings because everyone has his own mind and process of cognition.

In our article, we use two models: the realistic and the phenomenological, trying to consider social reality in accordance with these models. In this way society can be understood not only by its specific material character, but through social reality as a specific internal space. In this case, social reality is one of the main sides of the individual mind structure.

As we annotated before, there exists a problem in man's understanding of the synthesis of subjective and intersubjective worlds in my work. The spheres of "clean human" and "social" form man's exhibition about himself as a subject of social cognition. Overall, social cognition is the analysis of social structures and laws of society on different levels of social development. Therefore, social cognition does not represent direct contact with objective surrounding. However, social cognition completes the process of human cognition that lets us see a man not only as a "clean" subject of cognition, but as the real process for connecting with the world. Social cognition constructs social time. Moreover, social time means the time of human existence.

The subject of social cognition in its ontological essence is one of the courses of forming social subjectivity. Subjectivity is founded between individual and external worlds; however, it is not a synthesis of them. Subjectivity as a cognition status just continues the correlation between them. The foundation of subjectivity is transcendental Me. In general, transcendental Me is characterized as the transcendence of a man before his social state. Transcendental Me is independent Me, which has overcome a one-sided individual view for an external world of things.

One of the goals of my research is to demonstrate some of the attributes of human essence depending on social existence. In this specific character, man is an element of social structure but his existence is not defined by it, because he is an active side of relations between him and social surrounding. That is why transcendental Me of man has the power to influence the external social processes more than social surrounding can influence its subjective essence. In social reality, personality is the active side of the correlation between the individual Me and the intersubjective Other and characterizes "human" in the space of the intersubjective world. It is in the sphere of intersubjective relations that particularly "human" ontological projects begin.

The realistic view of social reality assumes the external social spirit is in its active being. No one can understand its essence completely because no one can experience all of the social situations. There is also another problem: man

cannot represent the social reality essence in its complete form because of societal development. Therefore, human transcendental Me is defined by the essence of individual reality more than by outside social surroundings. Nevertheless, in the subjective world man has the possibility of recognizing a personal way to social surrounding. This essentially gives him the possibility of correlating his "human" and his "social", which in turn construct a personal view about his social existence.

The realistic model gives us an interpretation of the substance of a man from above the individual world. This means that the essence of the intersubjective world is more important in understanding the meaning of human existence than the subjective world.

The phenomenological model explains the essence of social reality from inside of a "human". This means that the essence of the subjective world is more important. In this model the meaning of "social" is in the human mind, not outside of it. Introspection assumes that man begins as the essence of social reality. The subject of social cognition has to be understood through the sphere of "human" before the sphere of "social".

Certainly, there is no universal model of social reality in social philosophy. However, their synthesis can wide the research thanks to their best parts.

The problem of "human" supposes the problem of "ontic". Ontic is not ontological. Ontic in its substance is before ontological. Ontology is science about ontic. It is a very important moment when we want to understand being. Being determines surrounding, and being is indefinite. In the philosophy of Hegel, being is indefinite surrounding. In this case, original "human" in a man is an indefinite state, but subjectivity expresses a definite correlation with surrounding. That is why the sphere of "human" is originally the indefinite essence of man. And in social cognition, we should begin with this sphere to understand the meaning of the intersubjective world.

In the philosophy of Heidegger, being is as clear as a dark notion. It expresses our existence, we are in possibility of being, we are existing, and it is clear and linked with Da-sein. Da-sein shows common life of human within society without any personified essence of human. Heidegger writes, "if Da-sein "exists" in such a way that there is absolutely nothing more understanding for it, it has also already thus become no-longer-being-there". [1]

However, determining being cannot be determined by something else because being is the beginning of everything which we want to determine. In social reality, being first means human being because there would not be any society without people. The essence of a man living in different kinds of worlds can be understood through the correlation between "clean" being, "human", and social subjectivity. It is one of the most difficult problems of social philosophy as philosophy in general.

In the case of the correlation between "human" and man, the first one determines the second by the category of "myself". While a man is aspiring outside, his relation with his transcendental Me becomes more defined because his external surrounding express the essence of not-Me, or Other. Connecting with Other a man can understand the aim of his existence more clearly. Sartre writes "I need someone who completely understands all the structures of my being. Being-for-Me directs me to being-for-Someone". It means that it is impossible to know who I am without knowing who I am not. Heidegger's "being-with" expresses being in intersubjective space. It also explains the essence of a man in his completion. So, "myself" helps us to consider man as a phenomenon in contradiction between internal subjective and external intersubjective worlds.

A man recognizes himself when he understands the context of a situation of his concrete existence. It is the space of complete realization of all his instances like "human", and "social", and "subjectivity". That concrete situation is the main ontological factor, which characterizes the necessary causes of human relation to social surrounding.

In general, human nature as its existence in the intersubjective world has a universal specific character. Otherwise, there would not be a relationship among social subjects. Even a single man finds himself as a compound microcosm having the ability to unify different social situations to one big subjective space. That is why man is fundamentally a philosophical category. It is possible experience the problem of man in each philosophical conception. We cannot give him a concrete definition. If we compare him with the world, he is something another than world. If we compare him with the essence of God, he is something another than God, because connection with God assumes moral link of human with divinity in sense of duty. "The duty becomes duty by being traced back to God, but in the duty itself I do not enter into relation to God", wrote Sшren Kierkegaard. [2].

Thus, if we compare human entity with the essence of society, he is something another than society. Therefore, he is as microcosm, as micro Theo, as micro society, because he expresses all of them keeping his own specific character.

References:

1. Basic writings of existentialism. Martin Heidegger. From Being and Time. New York: The Modern Library, 2004. P. 300.
2. Basic writings of existentialism. Sшren Kierkegaard. From Fear and Trembling. New York: The Modern Library, 2004. P. 24.

Idea by - B.Zhytnigor
Illustrator - Y.Simonov

International Academy of Science and Higher Education