"Anthropological Turn" in Social Theory

Guzel K. Saykina and Anton S. Krasnov

Kazan Federal University Tatarstan, Kremlevskaya Street 18, 420008 Kazan, Russia

Abstract: The purpose of the study is to show the role of philosophical principle of anthropologism, constituted in the situation of "anthropological turn" during the first half of the 20th century, in cognitive and institutional organization of modern social-humanitarian knowledge. It was proved that, despite the fact that substantively and methodologically anthropologism is positioned today only in a negative way. It discovers certain points of growth and reveals its positive resource, especially outside the philosophical spiritual and practical space. The importance of anthropologism principle as the factor of differentiation and integration of social and humanitarian knowledge is shown. It is proved that modern anthropologism is capable of a theoretical situation production, on the other side of social and human opposition. Anthropologism is an important principle in view of the fact that modern social nature reveals its anthropic character. All this allows us to put forward the idea that an "anthropological turn" was noted in social theory during the last two or three decades which may be able to overcome an extreme old anthropologism.

Key words: "Anthropological turn", anthropologism, sociocentrism, social and human sciences, social and human nature

INTRODUCTION

The principle of anthropologism was criticized by poststructuralist critique of mind repression, ontology and the principle of identity (Derrida, 1982; Foucault, 1994). Designed to expand the thought and the action for a person, it is the power which suppresses a man's nature. However, even Heidegger (1993, 2003) criticized the "metaphysics of the subject", announced a human being as a subject and led eventually to a global catastrophe. At the same time, "the philosopher marked a negative way of communication between metaphysics and anthropology:" metaphysics of the subject "turned the science of the world into anthropology. We know his sentence: "having become anthropology, philosophy itself perishes of metaphysics" (Saykina, 2014a).

Anthropologism is characterized by the recognition of a man not only as the initial start of philosophizing but as a kind of the world origin, a special genus of things. Its advantage is the study of a man from the perspective of a metaphysical essence, wholeness and fullness of life; his shortcomings the absolutisation of priority rights in the world and as a consequence, the disappearance of other entity self. In extreme forms anthropology operates in accordance with the principles of the "School of origin" and not the "School of Existence" (school data were revealed by Saykina (2014b). Nevertheless, putting himself in the Origin, the man opposes the world (or the worlds: natural, transcendental, social), breaks with the history. He acts as if there were no other origins. One may not state that he is torn away from the Other: he becomes the Other for the whole world.

The following question was the starting point of the study: is it possible to talk about an exhaustion of the philosophical principle of anthropologism? To do this, the analysis of the cognitive and institutional organization of modern social theory was performed.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The object of study is the principle of anthropologism and its internal resources. The critical-reflective method and the method of historical reconstruction allowed to reveal the trends of its development in contemporary social theory. The comparative method helped to identify the specificity of modern anthropologism action. The study was carried out by the hermeneutical analysis of a social and human reality.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the situation of "anthropological turn" anthropologism was constituted in the scientific criticism of anthropological knowledge. The philosophers (for example, M. Sheler, N.A. Berdyaev, K. Jaspers, Nesmelov V.I.) considered the following as its major

Corresponding Author: Guzel K. Saykina, Kazan Federal University Tatarstan, Kremlevskaya Street 18, 420008 Kazan, Russia

drawback: a man as a holistic being, is not percieved from the aspect of essence in it, its spiritual characteristics are removed, a person is objectified (Scheler, 2009).

However, in the last two or three decades an interesting situation is observed: in each of social sciences and humanities an appropriate anthropology is constituted a subsidiary discipline (historical anthropology is added to history, social anthropology is added to sociology and legal anthropology is added to jurisprudence, etc.). Ome may explain the emergence of regional anthropologies as follows. Social and human sciences, since the beginning of the institutionalization experienced a complex fate: they were often accused of being unscientific. They could claim a scientific status only to prove the adherence to the principle of knowledge objectivity (its independence from a person).

The positive role in it was played by sociocentrism which came from Marxism. But in the race for the title of science, they robbed themselves and their subject: social mechanism at all levels (base and superstructure ones) was operated like by itself (objectively) without a man's effort. The society turned into a meta-reality in relation to a man and the man was out of sight.

At the same time, a nature centric social reduction program was dominated in respect to the material form and constants which manifest itself with the necessity of natural law. The method of explanation was at its base and the transcendental subject of cognition, an abstract and an impersonal one corresponded to it. In solidarity with Kemerov (2012), the authors of "society, social nature and polysubjectivity, their reviewers Tereshchenko and Shatunova (2013) noted: the classic social science is in fact is a non-classical discourse, the emerging of nonclassical rationality ideas which take place under the conditions of some curing of residues, relics concerning principles of classical science, mastered in the space of a social theory". We believe that such a relic acting in a classical social science was the contribution mechanism to the substantial model of society. As the result, the public relations lost their carriers the living people. This bias could not be unnoticed.

It was necessary to make the reverse step: to show that there is no society or culture without a man. The emergence of the regional types of anthropology demonstrates that a person cannot factor out social and humanitarian studies. The thing is not about finding a particular object in the basic science the material started to be considered from a different angle. The development of approaches and understanding of cultural centric programs is in the center of new paradigms, without which a man as the crreature with meaning is not percieved. So, in a modern social-humanitarian knowledge the point of view of a man on society becomes the main one. The

appearance of the variety of anthropologies demonstrates that "anthropological turn" is made today in a scientific field and anthropologism is qualified as a general scientific principle.

We came to the conclusion that anthropologism destroys substantive determination in a disciplinary structure of the social and humanitarian sphere as a person is equally the subject of both social sciences and humanities. The process of budding from the basic anthropological doctrine, from the basic science is also the factor of social sciences and humanities integration. This is a rather unusual way of integration, on the basis of the internal fragmentation of a particular science. And, it is quite a strange way of differentiation based on common sciences. Thus, anthropology may become a fertile ground for interdisciplinary dialogue and "paradigmatic vaccinations". Therefore, anthropologism changes institutionally the structure of the scientific community.

Substantially philosophical anthropologism, acting on the territory of the socio-humanitarian cognition, could rid itself pf its own shortcomings: not to generate reductionism but rather to "save" from the split inherent to science, partial nature, a linear way in understanding of a man. Due to the fact that anthropology does not change a parent science, we should talk about complementarity of two approaches: anthropologism and sociocentrism. They begin to "balance" each other, to get rid of absolute extremes. Therefore, the "anthropological turn" in the social and humanitarian knowledge creates the situation where a researcher begins to look at the reality from the point which is on the "other side" of the social and human opposition. By this it differs from the "anthropological turn" in the philosophy of the early twentieth century. In principle, this conclusion may be extrapolated to a social philosophy situation.

The opposition of social and human is most clearly crystallized in the existentialist philosophy in which the social aspect effect due to the leveling of a person appeared as his antipode as the factor of his killing. Unlike Marxism, the idea of a hard substantial presence of social contrnt is not observed in it, hence one may overcome the social characteristics in "border situations". At that it is important that Marx as Krasnov (2013) notes was the first one "who definitely noticed that in a capitalist society where social relations are constituted by the logic of capital, any human activity is alienating, eliminating its generic essence".

So, in the era of the "anthropological turn" social and human aspect became mutually exclusive realities and it could hardly contribute to the development of social and philosophical thought. We believe that before it the "anthropological turn" could also be fully cognized just now.

The change of paradigms and research programs in contemporary social theory was due to the fact that modern society in a certain sense is the apotheosis of the difference erasure between a social and a human aspect.

The differentiation of society as an "objective reality" and as a "subjective reality" by Berger and Luckmann (1966) is methodologically important for us. The understanding of society as an "interpretive reality" is a productive model. In this case, society as such is not given to a person, it is presented in the form "treated" by people in the form of interpretation. Indeed, the social reality cannot be experienced as a subjective phenomenon. Thus, the boundaries of objective and subjective are blurred, they pass into each other and are fused. The comprehension of social aspect via intersubjectivity leads to the fact that the social fabric may be defined as the form of transformation process by a man's subjectivity. "Intersubjectivity occurs as the result of individual "meeting" with their unique subjectivity, the peculiarities of life experience perception. At that the "mood" of subjectivities within an intersubjective context gives rise to new meanings and the acquisition of the latter leads to the restructuring of subjectivity" (Gizatova and Ivanova, 2013). In our opinion, a significant theoretical consequence of this approach is the development of a new image of sociality as a semantic compatibility.

The social world is identified with the life world and therefore, appears as a sphere in which a person is included directly (at least in view of the fact that the events are ranked by him according to their value hierarchy). Even the power structures are more personalized: a person has an opportunity to meet personally with a president or any other politician, to ask a question via the internet (this, "international structure of humanity" according to Nurullin (2014)). Thus, society creates a kind of close, horizontal, social relationships without mediation, i.e., communications. They take the form of "anthropic" and "individualized" as the influence a person from his individual identity. And vice versa. Thus, a person, as Shatunova (2015) shows "undergoes an additional creation and a recreation by the views of others" that may be the reason of a curious phenomenon revealed by the researcher: "The face of a modern man is so self-sufficient in the metaphysical sense that it is able to exist independently of an individual. The downside of this situation is the independence of a man from his empirical person, the ability to create your own face in the metaphysical work from a given empirical state". It can be concluded that the influx of a social and a personal in each other in the trend could produce metaphysical effects in human life and society is the acquiring of a "human face of society", the development of a man's integrity and the achievement of a genuine event compatibility on the basis of the "School of Being".

In order to reflect the horizontal form of social relations, the social theory increasingly uses anthropological categories in its nature: "I" and "Other", "I" and "You", creating the illusion of metaphysical reciprocity relationship domination. Thus, the social hierarchy, with its hierarchical and repressive character is no longer visible and the social differences are seen as the products not the objective factor action but as the products of anthropological factors an individual level of education, success, luck, communication skills (and sometimes because of "beautiful eyes, legs", etc.) or opposite qualities, respectively. In the limit it seems that differences disappear, because the very concepts of "I" and "Other" are thought as mutually transitional, but the main thing "Other" may be rooted inside me. Naturally, the social atomism will dominate in the understanding of a society, the concept of "individualized society" (Bauman, 2001) and the society will be losing its ontology.

Logically, the reverse side of the communicative and dialogical relations of I and others may be narcissism, self-sufficiency of monads and the extreme limit of the ratio I and other become the relations between different aspects of a man's inner world. As the result today, according to Gizatova *et al.* (2014), "we can state dissonance narratives about themselves and others" generating "an ideology of opposition" with a relevant social discourse, "the consequences of which in the multicultural world is an inevitable social and cultural disintegration".

This does not mean that that there is no exploitation and violence in a modern society. Today, social reality with all the richness of differences is on a global mega-level, on the level of world capital transactions. Besides exploitation is present not in the traditional sphere of production but in the field of consumption. However, due to the fact that consumption affects every member of society, we do not feel an explicit violence. In the area of consumption actually "at the same time there goes an operation of our metaphysical need for dignity, happiness, freedom, love" (Saykina, 2014c) but we do not perceive this in terms of exploitation. Bauman noted purposefully that the current problems of society emerge as the problem of a biographical nature.

Thus, anthropologism is a successful platform for a modern model of society that has an anthropological character.

Summary: The study revealed the advantages and disadvantages of anthropologism principle. It was found that the philosophical anthropologism is not exhausted in primordial times of "anthropological turn". Its internal reserves are safely mastered today, in the content and institutional form of a philosophical thought in the bosom of social and humanitarian scientific knowledge. This shows that anthropologism constitutes itself today as a general scientific principle.

Therefore, it was concluded that the modern "anthropological boom", formally manifests itself in the form of appearance of many regional kinds of anthropology, changing the cognitive and institutional structure of the social sciences and the humanities, may be qualified as an "anthropological turn". As the result, the theoretical reconstruction of the "anthropological turn" formation revealed its reasons which can be summarized as the reaction to the dominance of sociocentrism, the substantial model of society. The series of its distinctive features is revealed compared to the philosophical one (the ability to get rid from reductionism, one-dimensional perception of a man and the ability to balance sociocentrism).

It is proved that an objective basis of possible extension of anthropologism in modern socio-humanitarian and socio-philosophical knowledge is a blurring of an objective and a subjective aspect in the functioning of modern society, the illusion of social relations horizontal form dominance, an individualized nature of social relations. In modern society, an open repressive nature and violence was changed by to the temptation techniques and impersonal, subject mediated public relations communication, contact. Social differences appear not as an act of objective social factors but are determined by the anthropological differences.

CONCLUSION

"Funeral processes" in philosophy did not allow the philosophical principle of anthropologism to develop fully in a mother's womb. However, the anthropological capacity could not disappear without a trace. It begins to "grow roots" well in the social sciences and humanities. Anthropologism is able to introduce the ideas of wholeness and a metaphysical essence of a man in the social theory and, given the fact that the concepts of social theory one way or another are involved in the development of reality, a society may produce metaphysical effects of event compatibility, reciprocity

and a man may produce the mood of taking over responsibility for the very method of communication between people.

Thus, the theoretical interest of this work authors was aimed at the identification of philosophical principle of anthropologism transformations during the past two or three decades. This study will expand the theory of social and humanitarian knowledge philosophy, correct the epistemological views. The analysis of the current social model is able to push to the critical specification of its parts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Bauman, Z., 2001. The Individualized Society. Polity press, pp: 272.

Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T., 1966. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, pp: 328.

Derrida, J., 1982. Margins of Philosophy. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp: 330.

Foucault, M., 1994. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sci.. Vintage Books, NewYork, USA, pp: 387.

Gizatova, G. and O. Ivanova, 2013. The transformation of subjectivity in modern multicultural society. The Bulletin of the Russian nation, 5: 117.

Gizatova, G.K., O.G Ivanova and G.N Stepanenko, 2014. National ideology in a multicultural world. Life Science J., 11(10): 703-704.

Heidegger, M., 1993. Time picture of the world. Time and Being. Moscow: Republic, pp: 41-62.

Heidegger, M., 2003. The End of Philosophy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp: 124.

Kemerov, V.E., 2012. Society, social, polysubjectivity. M.: Academic Project; Foundation "Peace", pp: 252.

Krasnov, A.S., 2013. The dyad "identity-alienation" in K. Marx syntagma: history and modernity. The Bulletin of Sarat. Univ. New Ser. Ser. Philosophy. Psychology, Pedagog, 13: 26-29.

Nurullin, R.A., 2014. Personality Formation and Education in Multicultural Field of Soc. Life. Middle-East J. of Sci. Res., 21(1): 39.

Saykina, G.K., 2014a. Situation in the area of human metaphysics: struggle of "School of Origin" and "School of Being". J. of Language and Literature, 5(3): 24.

Saykina, G.K., 2014b. Transformation of human transcendence in a consumer society (hermeneutic analysis). J. of Language and Literature, 5(4): 419.

Saykina, G.K., 2014c. The Metaphysics of Man as an Area of "Purified" Humanity. Asian Social Science; 10(21): 122.

Scheler, M., 2009. The Human Place in the Cosmos. Translated by Manfred Frings. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp: 79.

Shatunova, T.M., 2015. Aesthetic metaphysics of a person. Modern problems of science and edu. No. 2; http://www.science-education.ru/129-21560

Tereshchenko, N.A. T.M. and Shatunova, 2013. V.E. Kemerov. Society, social nature, polysubjectivity. Problems of Philosophy, 5: 188.