

Center for Humanities Education of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

01001, Kyiv–1, 4 Tryohsvyatitelska St.,
tel . (044) 278–30–13, fax 278–87–20

**USE OF METHODOLOGY
HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES
IN THE RESEARCH OF SOCIAL PROCESSES**

ANALYTICAL REPORT

based on the results of work on a research topic

"Sociocultural and cognitive factors of transformations and integrations

"methodology of humanities and natural sciences"

(2018–2020)

Kyiv — 2020

FROM THE CONTENT

Introductory part

Section I

Trends in the development of philosophical anthropology as a sphere of integration of humanitarian and natural science methodologies .

Chapter II

The influence of synergetics on the formation of modern philosophical anthropology.

Chapter III

Methodological hybridization of the study of social processes and its impact on the culture of thinking of a scientist.

Conclusions and recommendations

INTRODUCTORY PART

In recent decades, Ukrainian society, which is experiencing the powerful influence of global globalization processes, has seen a rapid strengthening of the role of the humanities as channels for integrating various branches of scientific knowledge. This situation makes it ***urgent*** to isolate and specifically study the changes that occur within the methodologies humanities and natural sciences. Today, more than ever before, the need to investigate *the principles and factors* that determine the mutual countertrends of the humanities and natural sciences is becoming more urgent. Such research will allow us to choose appropriate *strategies*, ways and means of forming scientific and ideological meanings, which will make it possible to influence social relations in many ways in a new way and to predict the prospects for their development.

In view of this, ***the purpose of the study*** is to analyze the conditions for the transformation of the corpus of anthropological knowledge, to outline the trends in their functioning, primarily in the context of methodological hybridity (theoretical-methodological aspect); analysis of the features of philosophical thinking in modern socio-cultural conditions (culturological aspect).

Achieving the goal requires solving a number of ***research problems*** :

- Identifying the reasons for the formation of the so-called "worldview vacuum", as a result of which intellectual thinkers, including domestic ones, in the first quarter of the 21st century actually continue to remain captive to worldview stereotypes formed by the postmodernist paradigm of the last decades of the last century.

- A radical revision and rethinking of the basic philosophical concepts of postmodernism and substantiation of a fundamentally new basis for the formation of philosophical paradigms of the 21st century, which will allow, while preserving and multiplying the positive intellectual achievements of the past, to reach a qualitatively new level of philosophizing in accordance with the needs and challenges of today.

- Analysis of the false consequences of an overly broad interpretation of the conceptual apparatus of philosophical anthropology.

- Consideration of manifestations of methodological hybridization as risk tendencies: the excess of integratism methodologies and knowledge, amateurism, adaptability, clarity, simplification of interpretations, etc.

- Identifying the limits of integrating natural science and humanitarian methodologies .

- Research into the scientific and ethical concepts of the culture of modern philosophical thinking and the definition of the criteria of the methodological culture of a scientist.

Novelty The study is formulated in a number of theses:

- In the context of the ideas of “fundamental ontology”, it is substantiated that the methodological sphere of science is currently impossible outside the concept of universal meaning-making . It is shown why none of the sciences is able to ignore the problem of human existence, to comprehend all its complexity and completeness.

- In the stream of postmodernist ideas, the contradiction of the concept of integrity, which in the field of anthropological knowledge acts as one of its basic provisions, has been revealed. It is argued that philosophical anthropology (from the standpoint of methodological expertise) warns against giving final and unambiguous answers to questions about the essence of human life.

- Analysis of research in the field of philosophical anthropology in Ukraine (in the context of the risks of methodological hybridity tendencies) shows that the project of complementary cognition plays a decisive role for the newest methodologies of human sciences. For Ukrainian philosophical anthropology, this means reintegration with classical and non-classical epistemological traditions to substantiate new principles of the integrity of human existence.

- The basis of the methodological culture of a modern scientist is knowledge about the problematic nature of the existence of the world and man. The philosophical basis of this culture is the basic provisions of modern philosophy in their correlation with the provisions of postmodern philosophy. The features of the formation of the methodological culture of scientists largely depend on the transformation processes that take place in the spheres of humanitarian and natural knowledge. The insufficient

attention of philosophy and science to issues of methodology is obvious. We can state the crisis state of the latter.

– One of the reasons for the crisis of methodological knowledge is the difficult situation in the modern perception by specialists of the intellectual cultures and social practices (including their methodological components), which were quite widespread until recently, which are commonly called modern and postmodern . There is a powerful criticism of the culture of modernity, especially the style of thinking characteristic of it with the use of the corresponding categorical apparatus. It is argued that the worldview and methodological attitudes proposed by modernity allegedly unambiguously opened the way to ideological totalitarianism, utopian projects of reforming societies, repressive social practices, etc. In fact, as it turned out in the process of scientific research, the logic of the “modern” tradition ended in the “degeneration” of the culture of *problematic* thinking, formed to a large extent precisely by the modern intellectual tradition. Postmodernism became a powerful "negation" of the previous (modern) culture in general and the style of thinking promoted by it in particular, a "program" of resistance of the singular to the general, a "cult" of the plural, a "distributor" of individual rights to the special, independent, unique, personal. At the same time, it did not create a "social" instrument of harmonizing these principles in the social whole. Thus, it involuntarily replaced "general" thinking with uncritical mythological thinking.

Field of application : the results obtained can be used in scientific research (social sciences and humanities), educational, and social and management spheres.

Keywords : society, globalization, science, philosophical anthropology, modern, postmodernism, methodology, culture, thinking, basis/foundation, synergetics , crisis.

CHAPTERS

Trends in the development of philosophical anthropology as areas of integration of humanitarian and natural science methodologies

Man, as a special kind of being, "lives" (is present) in three realities - natural, social, transcendent. Accordingly, the numerous approaches to him in modern literature can be reduced to three main ones:

- 1) a person in his biological (natural) manifestation;
- 2) man is a social being;
- 3) man as the result of divine creation.

The naturalness of man reveals his uniqueness as a biological organism. Sociality reveals collective forms of existence in time and space. Transcendence finally tears man out of the animal world and connects him with God.

Today, as before, the approach is still popular, according to which only biological sciences are able to describe the main features and achievements of man. It is clear that without a deep study of the natural malt of human existence it is difficult to understand the mechanisms of biological heredity, the formation of predispositions, the peculiarities of races, etc. The project of the so-called new naturalism proceeds from the fact that, standing out from the natural kingdom, man still does not become a special kind of being. The achievements of natural sciences not only constantly enrich, but also transform knowledge about human nature and the essence of this being. As a result, it is the natural component of human existence that is being intensively studied. At the same time, criticism of introspective methods of self-justification of the spirit is increasing in science.

The turn to a naturalistic understanding of consciousness, language, and culture took place with all its might in the 1980s. Natural science began to assert itself as a human science to a large extent. Particular attention in this regard was paid to biology and physiology of higher nervous activity. Gradually, the idea was formed that as a result of the development of these and other sciences, humanitarian knowledge (especially philosophy, psychology, and economic theory) would be displaced from the sphere of argumentation of propositions about the causes of human behavior.

Trying to understand the nature of consciousness, the specificity of the reflexivity of this phenomenon and the diversity of its manifestations, a number of specialists a priori assume (and this is their methodological basis) that the secrets of the brain can be discovered purely empirically, by studying different areas of brain tissue and their activity. Thus, the English researcher S. Greenfield (specializing in the field of brain physiology) considers it fundamentally important to know how exactly nerve tissues produce consciousness. In the modern world, no one denies the connection of consciousness with brain neurons. But are they capable of directly bringing consciousness to life in all its diversity? According to S. Greenfield, there is no single problem of consciousness; this phenomenon is multifaceted. One thing is “self-consciousness”, that is, the ability of the subject to analyze his own mental states, desires, thoughts, and other processes that underlie the unconscious. Important for her is also the question of the nature of the relationship between the most general characteristics of consciousness and its content, which always has a specific content.

Indeed, some researchers are convinced that the interpretation of consciousness and culture is possible only through knowledge of the human brain. At the same time, another approach is also actively asserting itself: “Whatever the real successes of empirical neuroscience, we still have the right to assert that the understanding we seek of such an object as a person is fundamentally and irreducibly connected with meanings, values, social rules and the ability to express ourselves, which is provided by language” (*Smith R. Being a human: historical knowledge and the creation of human nature. - M., 2014. - P. 154*). The position of the English researcher R. Smith, like many other scientists, is that “human” cannot be defined and described only in terms of anatomy and physiology. It is not the brain that feels and thinks, but the person, immersing himself in the surrounding world.

These questions have a long historical and philosophical tradition. Not always knowing this, some experts in the field of neuroscience claim that they do not yet have enough knowledge about the internal processes in the "matter" of the brain to explain in detail how consciousness arises from the electrical and chemical activity of neurons. They are sure: the answer can be found by increasing the volume of research, constantly accumulating new empirical material. The same S. Greenfield is convinced: the

moment is not far off when scientists will have at their disposal enough necessary information to draw final conclusions about the nature of consciousness and the mechanisms of its functioning. This confidence is justified by brain research, which is based on computer modeling and cognitive psychology. There is no doubt that the neurons of brain tissue have their own "specialization". At the same time, there is no confidence that the most accurate cartography of neurons will allow us to deepen our understanding of consciousness. Unfortunately, many researchers of this complex problem purposefully ignore philosophical ideas about consciousness. It is not uncommon for not only representatives of specific sciences, but also individual philosophers to conclude: "Mental processes are nothing more than brain processes that differ in a special way" (*Greenfield S. Journey to the Centers of the Mind: Toward a Science of Consciousness.* — NY, 1995. — P. 12).

And yet, the idea that neurons generate various mental processes that underlie consciousness is gradually becoming a thing of the past. In philosophical literature, the question of the possibility of abandoning the term "psyche" in the long term is occasionally discussed. This approach is sharply criticized by representatives of evolutionary psychology, in particular, by the Canadian scientist S. Pinker.

Another trend that is relevant today connects the interpretation of human nature with the achievements of structural anthropology and linguistics. Within its framework, it is believed that the "specifically human" cannot be understood using only knowledge of the natural sciences. It is revealed in the social manifestations of the individual and the supra-individual, including in the context of various symbols. This variant of anthropological research includes the legacy of the French scientist and philosopher J. Lacan. He went far beyond the boundaries of classical structuralism and orthodox Freudianism, outlined new perspectives for research, and headed an influential scientific school that did not disintegrate even after his death. J. Lacan proceeds from the fact that the unconscious is structured as language. The task of structural psychoanalysis is to restore the status of libido as the embodiment of the creative principle in human life, a source of fruitful conflicts, and an engine of human progress. Developing the traditional neo- and post-Freudian tendencies of desexualization of the unconscious, the scientist builds an original concept of its denaturation,

debiologization. Justifies a new approach to the interpretation of unconscious desire as a structurally ordered pulsation. This idea is actively developed by his followers. The term "pulsation" is one of the key ones in post-Freudian aesthetics. Losing its chaotic nature, the unconscious becomes cultured, which allows us to transform pulsations into works of art and other cultural phenomena.

However, the paradigm within which a person is considered as a social being is also subject to criticism. Even the French theorist J. Baudrillard pointed to the "resistance" to sociality, which has been clearly present in modern society for some time, to the spread of phenomena of escapism, political indifference, destructiveness, etc. Nowadays, sociality as an indisputable privilege of the individual raises serious doubts among a number of scientists.

Today, it is often said and written that the existence of people and their activities cannot fully explain the existence of society, but at the same time they do not find sufficient grounds for other arguments. The main problem here is seen in the fact that individual individuals and various social associations cannot be considered as a special "building material" of this sphere of objective reality. The statement is becoming increasingly popular, according to which society, even if it uses democratic mechanisms of governance, has enormous coercive power, which impoverishes individuals, largely deprives them of their humanistic potential, and thereby has an internally destructive effect on its own functioning. According to the convictions of thinkers of the past, the power of society increases with the power of the individuals who live and create in it. However, the real picture turned out to be much more complicated. The legitimate fundamental nature of society is the averaging, equalization of subjects. After all, it cannot a priori adapt to all its members. Individuals, by their potential, often exceed the capabilities of society and therefore "chaoticize" it. Society, in turn, calls on them to banal ranking. As a result, the huge unused potential of people is neutralized, or even forcibly "extinguished" altogether. That is why the state is increasingly thought of today as a Leviathan.

The tendency associated with the phenomenon of transcendence deserves special attention. It is deeply rooted in domestic philosophical thought. According to M. O. Berdyaev, the spiritual principle in man has a transcendental basis. In other words, it is

not derived from nature, from the surrounding world. Man's dissatisfaction with finitude, his tendency towards the infinite reveals the divine in him. According to this theorist, man cannot be self-sufficient, this would mean that he does not exist. "This is the secret of human existence - it proves the existence of something higher than man, and this is the dignity of man. Man is a being who overcomes his limitations, transcending himself to something higher" (*Berdyaev N. A. On Man, His Freedom and Spirituality // Berdyaev N. A. Selected Works. - M., 1999. - P. 40*).

It is no coincidence that many consider the transcendental feeling to be the most precious acquisition of man. It determines the parameters of spirituality, the search for ideal entities, and divine faith. In this context, the individual belongs to two worlds at the same time — earthly and heavenly. Such duality, according to some researchers, lies at the heart of the essence of man. A descendant of Adam can transform, transform his own nature, become a cyborg, a cybernaut, etc. But ignoring the transcendental, its conscious removal from the sphere of human existence is the limit beyond which man himself disappears. Only his various distorted manifestations — works — remain.

What is happening now in the field of philosophical understanding of man? How can one assess the current state of philosophical anthropology? The answers to these questions are not distinguished by common agreement. On the contrary, a wide range of different positions is revealed. Researchers speculate about the undeniable collapse of classical anthropological discourse. However, often with the most radical distancing from the classics, many leading representatives of this branch of philosophy retain a strong interest in its individual subjects. A number of signs of an anthropological crisis are fixed and at the same time an anthropological turn in philosophy is asserted. On the one hand, we are talking about the decline of philosophical anthropology, and on the other, about the promotion of anthropological topics to the center not only of philosophical, but also of all humanitarian knowledge. Works are written about the transformation of anthropology into *anti-* anthropology and at the same time eliminate it as a kind of fiction.

The crisis of modern philosophical anthropology is, most likely, a pause before its new renaissance, the essence of which is in the steady mutual penetration and complementarity of humanitarian and natural knowledge and methods of cognition.

Only in this way can the difficult situation that has developed in this area be overcome. The nearest and distant horizons of human comprehension are directly related to the integration of all sciences and forms of knowledge that are directly or indirectly involved in the study of this phenomenon.

In the contaminations of the above-mentioned ideas, the general theoretical position of Ukrainian anthropological thought took shape and exists today. It was formed over decades against the backdrop of discussions on the problems of identity (V. I. Shynkaruk, M. V. Popovych, V. G. Tabachkovsky, S. B. Krymsky, V. S. Gorsky, I. V. Bychko, O. M. Tkachenko, I. Ya. Lysy, etc.), the integrative connection of natural sciences, social sciences and humanities (V. A. Ryzhko, Yu. A. Ishchenko, I. Z. Tsekhmistro, M. M. Kyselev, I. S. Dobronravova, etc.), the mutual influence of philosophical-anthropological and theological thought (V. P. Petrov, V. M. Nichyk, M. V. Kashuba, G. Ye. Alyaev), philosophical and artistic reflection (L. T. Levchuk, A. S. Kanarsky, S. D. Pavlychko, I. A. Bondarevska), the study of cultural artifacts (Yu. I. Lypa, A. Bila, O. S. Kyrylyuk and others).

Ukrainian anthropological visions have always been and are still distinguished by the orientation towards the retransmission of a universal meaning through the comprehension of ethnocultural forms, the ability to combine the natural knowledge tradition about man with modern ideas about humanity, humanity, understanding of the complexity of knowledge (as a product of subjects of different cultures of all mankind) and methodological difficulties. Ukrainian philosophical anthropology does not deny classical rationality either, but sets limits for it, emphasizes the equivalence of different methods, forms and types of cognition. In other words, classical (modern) science should be “balanced” by a non-classical (post-classical) interpretation of anthropological problems. In this case, attention should be paid, among other things, to the uncertainty, relativity and complementarity of knowledge.

The most characteristic features of the cognitive tradition about man in Ukrainian philosophy of recent decades are the growth of epistemological possibilities for interpreting the idea of the continuity of human existence; understanding anthropological problems in the context of the relationship between the individual and the social; focusing on the importance of practical conclusions regarding the features

of man's presence in the social environment; a tendency to develop specific anthropological problems and topics; and the lack of ambition to substantiate a general philosophical theory of man (the latter was the main one for theorists of European philosophical anthropology).

P AT WITH D AND L AND AND
The impact of synergy
on the formation of modern philosophical anthropology

Since the end of the 20th century, philosophy and science have been witnessing a transformation of the main worldview categories and methodologies. Its basis has been changes in society that are difficult to analyze, let alone define, in the traditions of classical and non-classical rationality. In particular, we are talking about the use of various destructive social practices, starting from the undisguised propaganda of the ideology of fascism, the spread of terrorism, dubious experiments of modern teenagers with aggressive drugs and synthetic medicines that purposefully destroy the body and intellect, ending with a purposeful influence on peoples and states through the policy of "controlled chaos". In such cases, the semantic, and therefore objective, exhaustion and unproductiveness of traditional, proven theories of social development, including existing anthropological attitudes and formulations, is usually recognized. It is clear that there is a need to develop new concepts and methodologies.

Since the central category of philosophical and scientific humanities is the category of development, semantic transformation has affected it more than other semantic formations. The subjective basis for such changes and at the same time the formation of new methodologies was the emergence in the middle of the twentieth century. (as a response to the search for new methods of describing non-traditional social phenomena and processes) of the theory of self-developing systems - synergetics. It is synergetics that many see today as a real alternative to dialectics as a theory of development and the most reliable way to substantiate the essence and mechanisms of phenomena and processes in society that do not fit into the usual,

traditional picture of development (see the works of V. S. Stepin, I. S. Dobronravova, L. D. Bevzenko). Such a transformation is probably not groundless. The phenomenon of development since the time of G. Hegel has always been considered in the context of the existence of systemic objects . Therefore, the theory of self-organized systems could not remain indifferent to it. Since synergetics studies self-organized formations, development for it a priori is self-development. It is worth emphasizing that G. Hegel considered self-development to be the essence of development. Nature for him is devoid of this characteristic, although its inanimate component is in a state of motion. The latter occurs under the influence of external causes. The living sphere, however, the philosopher endowed with the ability to self-development, which has an internal cause. According to G. Hegel, society, which has separated from nature and opposes it, not only moves, but also constantly self-develops. Having made development the object of special and deep research, the German thinker actualized the question of the relationship between the natural and human sciences, their connection and demarcation.

The main goal of synergetics is to overcome the contradictions between the natural sciences and the humanities. In self-organized systems, the meanings of "development" and "self-development" have little in common with the classical (Hegelian) version of understanding these processes and the corresponding categories. The nature of the connections between structures, components that self-organize is also not the same as in formations that are not capable of self-organization. The laws in self-organized systems also "work" differently . If in dialectics the emphasis is on connections that have a necessary character and the obligatory knowledge of the necessary (the accidental here is secondary), then in synergetics the principle of chance can rise to the level of the principle of necessity. In certain situations, it "gives" necessity the status of chance. This means that the synergetic model of the world and man inevitably changes the meaning and content of *the axiological* parameters of development. Value characteristics rapidly lose their humanistic character. They are no longer correlated with individual, collective and community ideals, but take on the abstract form of formulations and attitudes that relate not only (often not so much) to humans, but also to various cybernetic programs, virtual reality, biological processes

in organisms, etc. All this is reflected in the latest philosophical and scientific definitions of development (See: for example: *Grushin B. A. Development // New Philosophical Encyclopedia. In 4 vols. - Vol. 3. - M.: Mysl, 2001. - P. 397*).

This means that the exclusion of the moment of awareness, the personal attitude of the subject to the development process by synergetics produces a situation where a multitude of autonomous, self-contained systems with their own laws of functioning remain outside the cognitive and value capabilities of a person. And even if we have an approximate (external) idea of the nature of their existence, we are unlikely to be able to seriously influence these formations, because the system (by definition) is self-organized and cannot allow interference with it. Moreover, it itself is capable of interfering in the functioning of other structures that are not considered systems or objectively are not them. Provided that people are considered in the status of such non-systemic objects, they will become too vulnerable to external interference. This is quite possible if society or its individual structures in the context of the discourse of synergetics do not correspond to the principle of systemicity according to certain parameters.

The methodology of synergetics, which many still perceive through force, or do not perceive at all, nevertheless reflects the historical regularity of transformations of relations between the world and man. This is especially true of the influence of synergetics on the sphere of the humanities and social sciences. It is meant that not only the study of changes in collective systems (society as a whole or individual social groups), but also individual systems, leads to interesting conclusions that are diverse and at the same time generalized in nature. An individual person in isolation from society is able to progress, sometimes even outpace its development, even when aggregate social conditions prevent this. Conversely, he can regress, despite the fact that favorable conditions have been created in society for his development. In turn, a certain (specific) collective system can also be considered as a "aggregate individual". With the indicated approach, randomness will also be related to changes in both an individual person and the entire society. The reason is that society and an individual are not only independent in their social existence, but at the same time completely dependent on specific circumstances - global changes in nature, the rapid development

of high technologies, the spread of various diseases, etc. Therefore, depending on the goals of philosophical or scientific research, the relationship between man and society can be considered as an equal or hierarchical relationship of autonomous systems. Man, like society, manifests and realizes himself in various manifestations: "system in the system", "system outside the system", "system of systems".

The above gives grounds for the conclusion: a new theory of development is currently being formed, based on the synthesis of humanitarian and natural science knowledge. Accordingly, a semantic transformation of the categories "development", "self-development", "evolution" is taking place.

Since the second half of the twentieth century, the concept of "evolution" is used not only to denote transformational processes in nature, changes in the biological structure of human ancestors, its movement on the path from biological to social. The term "human evolution" today is not a metaphor. It has become normative in the study of various aspects of individual and social life. At the same time, supporters of the synthetic theory of evolution perceive the fact of its widespread use in the field of humanitarian knowledge with great caution.

One of the reasons that significantly complicates the situation regarding the unequivocal approval by representatives of various sciences of the thesis about evolution as a process of human formation is a somewhat arbitrary interpretation of the concept of "evolution" itself. Unfortunately, there are still no clear criteria for the difference in its application in relation to animals and humans. In the last two or three decades, the conscious and purposeful adaptation of a person's own self to the surrounding conditions, primarily social, has become a way of active self-realization. There is a change in the proportions of the human body (increased so-called asthenization). The principles of perception and assimilation of knowledge are also changing. Relations between generations of people are becoming somewhat different. All this is unlikely to be a confirmation of the evolution of man, because evolution concerns changes not in individual organisms, but in species. The fact that only one human species currently lives on Earth confirms the impossibility of evolution, at least in its traditional understanding: "Two species occupying the same ecological niche cannot coexist within the same territory — a well-known ecological rule. So the

absence of other species of people on Earth can only be regretted, but there is no reason to be surprised” (*Rubtsov A. Charles Darwin and the Theory of Evolution // Science and Life. — 2009. — No. 1 // [Electronic resource]: [http://www.nkj.ru / archive / articles / 15252](http://www.nkj.ru/archive/articles/15252)*). And if there are problems associated with changes in the maturation of man into the world, then they are all from the sphere of economics, sociology, psychology, pedagogy, but not biological anthropology.

One can give many specific examples of human evolutionary progress (changes in the proportions of the human body, hair color, life expectancy, etc.), but none of them is capable of serving as a criterion for evolution. The life paths of specific individuals and the life path of “intelligent man” as a species are fundamentally different things. For the same reason, changes in the principles of perception and assimilation of knowledge, the nature of relations between generations cannot be criteria for evolution. In addition, if the evolution of our ancestors is a process of formation and transformation of social features under the influence of natural factors, then in modern times the reverse process is taking place: a changing social reality leads to various mutations, migrations, transgenicity, etc. And therefore a natural question arises: is evolution in the traditional sense something that has already been formed on social principles?

So, the question of the criteria of evolution is not only too complex. It is contradictory in its essence. This is clearly visible in the plane of concrete scientific knowledge. The situation with the term "evolution" is also difficult in philosophical anthropology. Academician V. S. Stepin, for example, believes that man can be considered as "another line of evolution", which is not a manifestation of the evolution of nature. He was able to appear and can exist only within the framework of this "other evolution". At the same time, the existence of development as a special way of human self-realization is not denied.

It is no coincidence that experts argue that the current level of science does not allow the use of traditional ideas about development in relation to humans. Evolution and development merge into each other, which gives reason to speak of evolutionary development as a unity of mutually conditioned social and natural changes in human

life. In view of this, the main features of "evolutionary development" can be distinguished:

1. If human development is possible only as self-development, then human evolution is also a consequence of a conscious attitude towards nature — that is, self-evolution. And this affects the formation not only of individual characters of people, but also of social relations in general.

2. Since development and evolution in relation to man cannot be considered apart from the connection of one with the other, it is logical to assume that this connection is of a self-organized nature, appearing in some situations as dialectical, in others as non-contradictory. Quite often, individuals pay increased attention to the processes taking place in society, as a result of which the evolutionary side of their own lives seems to them not so important. If they worry too much about their own evolution, this negatively affects the functioning of society. For example, when a person begins to consciously fetishize the results of scientific and technological progress, considers the process of improving comfort items as the ultimate goal of society's development, and declares his own strength and power in nature, he immediately experiences the downside of progress in the form of economic crises, wars, nuclear and environmental disasters, "diseases of the century," etc. Conversely, attempts to convince the community to lead a "healthy lifestyle," live honestly and fairly, and care about nature (for example, to reduce the volume of harmful emissions into the atmosphere by at least 5% annually) often result in a decline in production rates, a decrease in gross domestic product, an increase in unemployment, etc.

3. If development is truly evolutionary, and evolution is developing, then along with general laws and principles, there are also random coincidences of circumstances. When it comes to evolution and development as such, we are dealing with the laws of nature or society. But when a person "merges" with nature, when evolution and development collide, "laws of chance" come into play, which can be called "laws of absolute ignorance". They reveal the complete arbitrariness of the course of events and their very low predictability. This, accordingly, leads to changes in the theoretical requirements for understanding evolution and development.

4. Speaking about the evolutionary process, it is necessary to recognize the different nature of its implementation in time. Man, as a developing system, always has a perspective, he never considers himself as a completed, final being. His time is a time of endless multifaceted self-improvement. And the longer this time, the stronger a person's confidence in himself.

S T A P T I O N A N D

Methodological hybridization of social process research and its influence on the culture of scientific thinking

In the current situation of methodological chaos, associated with the crisis of the classical type of methodology, the philosophical understanding of such a specific phenomenon as methodological culture becomes a necessary and extremely important task. The pace of development and prospects of science, technology, and culture as a whole depend to a large extent on this phenomenon. The above is directly related to the methodological achievements of each specific scientist and researcher.

Modern science experiences not only a lack of theories capable of providing solid answers to life's challenges, but also the growing influence of globalization processes, as a result of which it is forced from time to time to review the content of its provisions and especially conclusions. It is with globalization in philosophy that the decline of spirituality in society, the primitivization of many human needs and interests, and the emergence of a number of destructive phenomena are largely associated. At the same time, relying on the ideas of both domestic (M. V. Popovich, S. B. Krymsky, V. G. Tabachkovsky , A. M. Ermolenko, M. M. Kiselyov, V. A. Ryzhko , A. Ye. Konversky) and foreign (Z. Brzezinski , E. Giddens , D. Goldblatt , S. Huntington , A. Tsingyan , M. Emar) thinkers, we can still speak of the normality of globalization as a trend of civilizational development, since it is clearly endowed with social characteristics and seeks to adjust the individual to unity with other representatives of the human race, despite cultural, economic, political and other obstacles.

The above-mentioned questions provoke discussions in the fields of domestic philosophical science. They are a confirmation of the necessity and at the same time a kind of call to urgent changes in this spiritual sphere, especially in the context of guidelines on the practical orientation of philosophical research and the integration of multidisciplinary knowledge (See: *Practical Philosophy: Reality and Possibility* (*A. Loy (moderator), E. Bystrytsky, M. Boychenko, A. Yermolenko*) // *Philosophical Thought*. — 2017. — No. 3. — pp. 6–23), and also encourage the understanding of an important philosophical problem — the phenomenon of methodological hybridization, in particular the complex and ambiguous processes of transformation of philosophical and anthropological methodology.

The risks of methodological hybridization were emphasized by M. Heidegger in his time. Today it is completely clear that modern anthropology has expanded disciplinary (and subject-wise) so much that now this is seen as a risk of its philosophical “suicide”. According to M. M. Boychenko, “scientists carry out not always necessary unification, expansion or replacement of traditional philosophical disciplines by creating non-philosophical in methodology and formulation of questions middle-level theories - from various versions of applied epistemology and borderline concepts to the newest pseudo- philosophical directions, in which the word “philosophy” is used without reason” (Ibid. - P. 10). Prof. A. M. Loy also warns against amateurism in the process of integrating diverse knowledge and methodologies . The material of scientific research cannot be “something amorphous and eclectic”.

Modern science has taken a course towards hybridization of knowledge, ideas, and methodologies in order to create highly productive forms of collective activity of researchers and obtain knowledge of a qualitatively new level. And this cannot but cause concern. We must not forget that knowledge and methodological hybridity are in agreement with the everyday human reason , even encouraging it. After all, being confident in the diversity of truths of experience, scientific research, faith, artistic representations, etc., a person resists any doubt. So, despite all the positive things that are in complementary experience, it can be a manifestation of amateurism, and then a person receives something amorphous and eclectic for cognition instead of comprehensive material. If we assume that the exhaustiveness of knowledge is possible

only within the framework of a method that has a discursive -pragmatic character (since only then "truth" and "truthfulness" fit with "correctness" and "understandability"), then it becomes obvious: the ability to organize the subject of research according to a certain core conceptual framework, which will slowly grow into a complex of different knowledge, can protect against errors in complex-integrative discourse. This is also directly related to philosophical -anthropological knowledge.

Today, anthropology is a network-like branching of knowledge composed of "temporary truths " that are justified only within a certain system. Philosophical anthropology has abandoned the metaphysical interpretation of truth as the mutual correspondence of thought and thing (= has refused to think about essence). Instead, it is inclined to understand truth as the agreement of what is thought in an expression with the thing. At the same time, the diversity of methodologies , concepts, and "temporary truths " is "welcomed" in every possible way. Truth as freedom slips into subjectivity over and over again. Hence the skeptical assessment of the results of anthropological knowledge: the concept of "man" is increasingly characterized as "empty", a replacement is sought for it; anthropological knowledge is considered incomplete, and the attempt to create a general anthropology is considered futile. The risks of methodological hybridization are one of the arguments against excessive integration of natural sciences and socio-humanitarian sciences. Ultimately, any science about man somehow turns its back on the "living man", because the content is "distorted" through "objectification" and " dehumanization ", each science establishes (determines) for itself specific principles and methods of cognition. At the same time, this means: man himself is always something greater than how he understands himself.

The question concerning the criteria for distinguishing science from "other" knowledge is one of those that cannot be left unanswered. And not only because today the signs of a "religious revival" and an "occult renaissance" are clearly manifesting themselves. Other factors can also be put at the basis of such a need - they concern changes associated with a radical shift towards a descriptive type of scientific consciousness. This is the absence of a single methodological norm, the loss of unified methodological guidelines by science, defects in the methodological consciousness of practicing scientists, the destruction of the foundations of traditional scientific criticism

of pseudoknowledge . Pseudoscience today appears primarily as a special socio-humanitarian phenomenon and a form of solving socio-humanitarian problems that uses the cultural, moral, social, psychological, and not epistemological authority of evidential knowledge . It feels especially comfortable in the territory of applied science. In the current weakness of scientific methodological criticism, with the actual loss of unified methodological guidelines by science, and other devaluations in this area, the scientific mind involuntarily falls into a special "risk zone", gradually moving to the periphery of culture.

It is obvious that many aspects of human existence cannot be considered through the prism of classical science, but this should not deprive confidence in the possibility of their rational study. Otherwise, one would have to agree with the well-known thesis rooted in positivist and scientist models of cognition: everything that cannot be analyzed by science and goes beyond the limits of comprehensive rationalization must be attributed to the sphere of emotions and irrationality, to non-rational forms of culture and mentality. But it is impossible to “bracket” all existential true and value judgments and express in terms of discursive reason the mystery, for example, the essence of human consciousness. The search for the foundations of the synthesis of anthropocentrism and cosmocentrism as worldview principles of research, carried out in post-nonclassical science, opens up the possibility of considering the transformation of the worldview paradigm in the broadest aspects: synergetics , virtualism , globalism , cognitivism, post-nonclassical education, medicine, social psychology , etc.

Nowadays, the future of fundamental science is often associated with quite popular, even fashionable ideas of *finalism* . It is difficult to deny that in the conditions of the crisis of modern culture and the growth of various problems in society, including those of a global nature, we have witnessed all sorts of “predictions of the end” — of the human race, human history, human culture. Moreover, scientific controversies are accompanied by mutual arguments, which concern both the idea of the “end of science” and the denial of its possible “ finalism ” (according to the latter, scientific activity will cease only with the suspension of the existence of civilization). In substantiating the finalist position, cognitive argumentation, based mainly on linear extrapolations into

the future of modern negative trends in the dynamics of social life and fundamental sciences, usually dominates.

It is stated that during the 20th century no new fundamental physical theories were created, and the number of outstanding discoveries is decreasing. A decline in the "return" from scientific research is also recorded. At the same time, opinions are expressed that over time a single physical theory of the main types of interactions ("Theory of Everything") may be formulated, which will become "final" and "complete" not only physics, but also science in general; on the basis of a reductionist approach, knowledge about the general laws of life and the functioning of consciousness will be derived from it. The opposition to this approach claims: the future development of society is possible only on the basis of fundamental science, which is aimed at increasingly complicated and at the same time adequate to reality ideals of scientific rationalism. They will continue to make a significant contribution to the scientific picture of the world, worldview and human life world in the future.

Obviously, behind the arguments about the “end of fundamental science” lie the difficulties of the transition from the stage with already mastered and therefore familiar research methods to a new, painfully unusual and directed by different principles of the scientific research process. This gives grounds to speak not about the “end of science”, but about a certain transitional period to a new stage of the search and disclosure by science of its own internal potential opportunities, hidden reserves. One cannot but agree with the famous theorist of science of the 80s M. K. Petrov that without effective control over the additions of knowledge, without prompt resolution of global problems, humanity risks ending badly; today the prospect of the collapse of the Universe is too close and real for the position of indifference to the finite earthly existence to retain for us the attractiveness or at least the external attributes of dignity (See: *Petrov IN. The modern image of the world . The crisis of the classical Physics // Petrov V. Intelligence . — Vol. 2. — K.: Tempora , 2013. — P. 946 – 958) .*

The need to form special platforms for the implementation of transscientific discourse encourages the creation of appropriate administrative and scientific structures. One of them is a network of very influential Bioethical Committees with their inherent inter- and transdisciplinary orientation (For details, see: *Kashkanova N.*

G. Activities of bioethical committees: aspects of Ukraine's integration into the European scientific space // Journal of the Kyiv University of Law. — 2014. — No. 4. — P. 146–151) In many ways, the mission of this organization is to concentrate the efforts of scientists and statesmen to develop optimal bioethical solutions, possible on the basis of a certain transitional integrative -pluralistic methodology, acceptable for different types of scientific rationality. On the one hand, bioethical committees today are the maximum possible way for modern culture to approach the tasks and demands of bioethical problems at the junction of science and other spheres of human activity. On the other hand, these research platforms cannot always adequately fulfill their important and necessary mission. The current crisis uncertainty regarding the methodological component of scientists' consciousness gives grounds for the conclusion: appeals to any unified "norming", "standardization" of knowledge are not productive. They do not justify themselves epistemologically in the current cognitive situation.

In view of this, it would be reasonable to turn to the search for a qualitatively new level of "objectivity" and "content" of a number of basic epistemological categories, to recognize the legitimacy of their new, non-classical meanings, interpretations and connotations. That is, to talk about their other dimensions, compared to those that have developed in the course of the evolution of science. In today's conditions of the crisis of classical methodology, a specific example of such an approach can be seen in the situation with the concepts of "scientific norm", "limits of science", even "knowledge". On the one hand, the well-known difficulties surrounding the universal methodological norm nullify the traditional scientific criticism of destructive forms of knowledge (primarily false science, parascience), produce inadequate images of science and further exacerbate the problem of demarcation of different forms of knowledge. On the other hand, appeals to the fact of convention and pluralism of scientific norms should not acquire the meaning of an "important methodological right" (as, for example, happens within parascience, which refuses to recognize the requirement of a single and mandatory universal cognitive norm for research activity. Of course, taking into account the above, some other approaches and solutions are needed here, which are not associated with a complete rejection of the

methodological norm, but with the formation of its new philosophical and methodological understanding, which would adequately meet the needs of today's epistemological field, the boundaries of which are expanding. The realities of society and its culture have set priorities in favor of more flexible, synthetic models of thinking. A special role in this process should be played by the methodological culture of the researcher, whose creativity, one way or another, is axiologically “loaded” and therefore to a greater or lesser extent directed at Man.

CONCLUSIONS AND R E C O M E N D A T I O N

The methodology of the humanities, especially the social sciences, in modern conditions is undergoing significant changes, which are associated, first of all, with socio-cultural transformations of civilization, generated by powerful global processes that determine not only the movement of financial and human flows within the entire planet, but also the socio-economic and spiritual-cultural development of specific societies. Therefore, critical reflection and rethinking of the ideological, including ideological, foundations of the existence of the system of social relations itself is becoming very relevant. The methodology must carry knowledge that provides an understanding of what is *really* happening in the socio-cultural environment. After all, a proper understanding of reality, a real assessment of the state of social life are a prerequisite for the accumulation of accumulated knowledge into techniques, approaches, principles, methods, analytical discourse , etc.

The hope that the "classical" *monologue* of idealistic transcendentalism would be replaced by a "non-classical" *dialogue was not fulfilled*. interpretative , reasoned, consensus thinking and practice. Ideologies, the basis of which was “general” ideas (in fact, universalist thinking), were replaced by other ideologies, oriented more not on “rational ”, criticism of the existing state of affairs and at the same time the search for a theoretically reasoned way out of existing negative social circumstances, but on such a “general” as *social myth* , of course, in its new, “ideological” coloring.

Based on the above, it is argued that the consequence of this was the replacement of categorical-conceptual, conceptual-theoretical (problematic) thinking, argumentation by logical means of understanding reality with sensory-figurative representations of it, characteristic of mythology. That is, the "accumulation" of experiences that lead not to solving problems, but to the accumulation and unpredictable release into the environment of negative political "energy" - dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs. The dominance of such "thinking in images", the attraction of the human spirit to the emotional perception of reality, beyond its explicit theoretical awareness, cannot but lead to the accumulation of socio-cultural problems, but does not guarantee their solution.

The above-mentioned reasons for the crisis of methodological consciousness converge in one thing: one of the foundations of modern socio-cultural development and, at the same time, people's thinking is increasingly represented by social mythology. It is shown that this is precisely what is connected with the discussion in public discourse of such phenomena as fakes, social illusions, political (social) myths, pseudo-realities, false "truths", mysticism, etc. As a result, these phenomena become an integral part of people's real life, and even its "norm". It is substantiated that in modern society the function of myth, albeit with significant reservations, can be performed not only by literature and art, but even by science, which is also not alien to the temptation to interpret the named phenomena in its own way. It is no coincidence, for example, in historical, political, sociological, economic, philosophical discourses, researchers have recently increasingly appealed to mythologically interpreted reality.

The conclusions formulated by our research team can be used for methodological substantiation of a set of tasks and topics in various fields of knowledge - social philosophy, philosophy of science and technology, sociology of culture, psychology, ethics and in any field of social work. The main results are a rethinking of the essence of scientific and philosophical-anthropological methodologies in view of general worldview and epistemological -cognitive changes in the conditions of growing globalization. From a practical point of view, this is important for increasing the effectiveness of philosophical and scientific research, finding productive methods of

cognitive and practical activity, formulating strategies for understanding social processes, and determining ways to optimize its vital activity.

The results of the scientific research are presented in 38 publications (total volume 45.7 d.a.) in Ukraine and abroad, including three collective monographs: “The Great Kyivan” Mykola Berdyaev / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. — Kyiv: Dmytro Buraga Publishing House , 2018. — 532 p. (26.3 d.a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Taranov , etc.); Philosophical Self-Determination of Gustav Shpet / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. — Kyiv: Dmytro Buraga Publishing House , 2019. — 462 p. (19.2 d.a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , etc.); Stages of Life of Yakov Golosovker / Central Public Organization of the National Academy of Sciences. — Kyiv: Dmytro Buraga Publishing House , 2020. — 520 p. (22.5 d. a.) (authors: M. Yu. Savelyeva, T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Taranov , etc.).

Sociocultural Prerequisites for the Transformation of Scientific Methodology” (13 d. a.) has been submitted for publication (authors: M. Yu. Savelieva, T. D. Sukhodub , S. V. Vilchynska , etc.).

The results of scientific research work were tested by the performers at 34 scientific conferences and round tables.

Scientific supervisor of the topic
Doctor of Philosophy , Professor, Senior Researcher
Central Scientific Committee of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
Savelieva M.Yu.