

S. B. Bulekbayev<sup>1</sup>, K. A. Temirgaliyev<sup>2</sup>, A. S. Lamanova<sup>2</sup>, N. A. Mingisheva<sup>2</sup>, A. N. Raikhanova<sup>2</sup>

### METHODOLOGICAL CRISIS OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCES: THE THEORETICAL ASPECT

<sup>1</sup>Kazakh Ablai Khan University of international relations and world languages (Almaty, Kazakhstan),

<sup>2</sup>Department of history of kazakhstan and social-political disciplines of Karaganda state medical university (Karaganda, Kazakhstan)

---

This article provides the idea that the causes of the contemporary system crisis is that many of the concepts of modern social sciences do not adequately reflect the changed reality, therefore, it is necessary to redefine the existing categorical apparatus. It requires a paradigm shift of modern social sciences which is still based on the Newton-Cartesian metaparadigm. This change has been already occurred in physics and more recently in psychology. Otherwise, methodological inconsistency and weakness of the explanatory potential of social sciences in the explanation and understanding of social processes will be regular phenomenon.

*Key words:* metaparadigm, society, the system crisis, paradigm, transnational companies, systematic, nonlinear development

---

Many scientist analyzed the causes of modern system crisis resulted that presently many contemporary fundamental conceptions on reality, consciousness, human, society and other processes do not reflect this reality adequately. It implies that the modern world have been changed radically for recent decades and resulted that most past conceptions lost their explanatory potential and methodological consistency. Understanding of this fact is widespread. First of all these are «color revolutions» which cannot be explained and understood not only by historical and material imaginations but also by other present social theories and paradigms. It also can be viewed in international relations when some events are impossible to explain by ordinary categories and imaginations. For example, the events of accident or annexation of Crimea by Russia, or evaluation and explanations of events taken place in the south-east of Ukraine. In our view, there is also no any satisfied understanding of nature and essence of global system crisis. In fact, most leading economists cannot anticipate as well as essentially explain intrinsic causes of regular economic crises shaking the world. The explanations of causes of most recent ethnic and religious conflicts are also not persuasive and clear as well as on crisis of culture and spiritual values. In our opinion, all of these facts clearly demonstrate the crisis of modern social sciences and their worldview and methodological bases which is confirmed by many scientists. However, this is paradoxical that scientists mostly are stopped on this acceptance. If crisis is admitted in some science, usually, it is limited with methodological tools of its own science and with avowing of weakness of its explanatory potential. In

our point of view, this problem is out of frameworks of methodological basis of some separate social science. Finally, this problem is connected with more general one – with general metaparadigm of modern sciences which is outdated to the present day and is not proper to requirements of modern sciences. To explain this statement we need to do introductory historical excursus.

From 1970s the academic community starts to realize the fact of pervasive cultural transformation of the European civilization represented by «changing of paradigms» and meant the revision of ideas and values of Western culture dominated in the world for recent centuries. These values include boundless believe in scientific method as the only justified approach to reality; opposition of consciousness and substance; viewing society as competitive fighting for survival; faith in unlimited material progress based on economic and technological growth, egoistic principle about personal happiness, viewing nature as mechanical system.

It is necessary to note that in science the paradigm is generally accepted theories and methods of scientific research. Paradigm is set of assumptions by which different sciences operate. Examples of such paradigms are the Mendeleev's periodical system, quantum theory, mechanics of Newton, chaos theory, the Darwin's theory of evolution or psychoanalytic model of subconscious.

Over the time one paradigm inevitably replace the other. Such radical changes on the world can be viewed mostly in all sciences. Thomas Kuhn in his famous book «The Structure of Scientific Revolutions» discovers structures and mechanism of transition from one paradigm to

another. In his opinion, paradigm shift in sciences happens when generally accepted paradigm encounters some anomaly which is a phenomenon that cannot be explained by existing worldview.

Analyzing the problem of paradigm shift in sciences, the famous English scientist Peter Russell [6] argues that the Kuhn's model of «scientific revolutions» or model of paradigm shift should not be limited by separate disciplines. Moreover, in his view, it is necessary to consider Western scientific worldview on the whole. In the Western worldview all scientific paradigms are based on the following assumptions: reality is physical world; space, time, substance and energy are the fundamental parts of reality.

According to Russell, so as all scientific representations about the world are based on these assumptions, it is not simple paradigm; it is metaparadigm. In the other words, this paradigm is the basis of all paradigms [6].

This metaparadigm explains successfully almost all phenomena of the material world that it hardly ever doubted by anyone. We can find weaknesses in it if we turn to nonmaterial world. It means that it demonstrates its disability in cases of human senses and contemporary global processes in recent decades.

Most probably, the causes of such troubles are in generally accepted scientific model. It is known that elementary particles are joined into atoms which form molecules what is the model of physical objects development. It is also possible to state on living cell. Atoms are in the base of DNA, proteins and aminoacids. This model lets to describe the human brain despite of its incredible complexity. However, on Russell, such model cannot describe consciousness because it is nonmaterial; material does not have consciousness. So this metaparadigm cannot explain what consciousness is. Hence, no one from scientific theories cannot answer the following question based on this model: How nonmaterial consciousness can arise from nonconscious material? As a result, number of unsuccessful attempts to explain phenomenon of consciousness suggests that the science can be under a delusion. All scientific theories of consciousness confirm that this phenomenon is collateral to the physical world described in terms of space, time and substance. This basic assumption is rarely criticized. Hence, the anomaly of consciousness is adapted to standards of material worldview with more complex ways. According to Russell, it is necessary to compose the other metaparadigm instead of explanation of consciousness in categories of materialistic scientific worldview [6]. Unlike Newton-Cartesian met-

aparadigm, this metaparadigm gives more broad perspective to understand phenomenon of consciousness and it has informational nature. If to accept this point of view, consciousness can be explained by terms of quantum mechanics rather than by conceptions of traditional philosophy or psychology. Modern transpersonal psychology considers a human not only as biosocial phenomenon but also as informational one. The latter can explain and understand different phenomena from consciousness ignored by traditional imaginations on consciousness in the past. For example, paranormal and extrasensory phenomena, nature of ideal, etc. According to modern outstanding psychologist S. Grof, there is transition from Newton-Cartesian worldview to new one in these sciences. In his opinion, these discoveries can reverse our representations on human psyche, its pathology and perspectives of treatment. Some of these data are out of psychology and psychiatry and challenge for Newton-Cartesian paradigm based in the Western sciences. They can change extremely our understanding of humanity, culture and history as well as reality itself [4].

Nevertheless, unlike nonclassical physics and transpersonal psychology, the others, particularly, social sciences only now start to realize that they encounter the new more complex level of reality connected with complicated global, informational, communicational processes which formed together new more complex and interconnected world system of modern society. The new system of political, economic and international relations and their new international structure are formed alongside to these processes and relations in present days. As a result, explanatory potential of the old universal paradigms and conceptions is weak and exhausted to explain these new and complex social processes. In the other words, contemporary world is more diverse and complex than the past one described in existing social theories and expertizes.

Simultaneously, in our view, there is no any understanding of necessity of new metaparadigm of science and reflection. It is important to realize that new metaparadigm of all sciences can help to explain and understand new peculiarities and tendencies of world politics and economics development as well as it would be possible to develop new theories and methodologies based on this metaparadigm. In the other words, today scientific society realizes that transformation of social and individual being of contemporary informational society must be accompanied by changes of methodological research strategies of society followed with revision of content and functions of philosophical categories.

In the same time, it is necessary to understand that improvement of categorical apparatus and methodological tools of most sciences is limited by ultimate bases of metaparadigm of modern sciences and its metaparadigm of consciousness. According to Grof, explanatory potential of contemporary social sciences is limited by outdated Newton-Cartesian metaparadigm of science and traditional metaparadigm of consciousness which is still not overcome unlike in nonclassical physics and transpersonal psychology. It means that today unlike simplified vision of the world from position of linear thinking, nonlinearity is the fundamental characteristics of natural and social world as an open self-organized system and assumes continuity of alternatives of its development. The nonlinear system is multidimensional and cannot be described by classical linear methods that generate development of nonlinear methods. Methodology of heuristic problems solving in nonlinear environment represents nonlinear thinking. According to this system of thinking, instability, randomness and disequilibrium play important roles in the world; behavior of nonlinear processes is variable and unpredictable; the order can emerge out of chaos spontaneously; nonlinear thinking denies unambiguous determinism. This alternation in terms of nonlinear thinking such as chaos and order, accident and necessity, differentiation and integration are universal principles of development and self-organization of natural and social world.

The other peculiarity of modern knowledge alongside to traditional objects of inquiry is virtuality representing the most important third type of reality which as special type of reality has certain attributes and parameters of existence, dictates special forms of behavior, communication, activity and, in the end, it has an inverse effect on the person. Additionally, it is necessary to search new methodology and ideological basis of modern processes of unity of three kind of reality.

The above peculiarities of modern cognitive reality emphasize at least two new circumstances. The first are traditional «classical» stereotypes and orientations in explanatory schemes and methods (for example, orientation on complete reflection of the object, linear causality, and exclusion of subject in the process of knowledge, e.g. complete objectivity) which are replaced by new ones (for example, orientation on creation of the complex object as effectively manifested integrity, ensuring its reliable and sustainable functioning, acceptance of different points as allowable, understanding that everything has its own polarity, and viewing of any problem and event

from both opposite sides). The second circumstance presents that the spectrum of hypotheses about what is happening defines contemporary worldview and dominates in contrast to finding of logical explanation of events. It is important to understand diversity and create various complex formations such as production or public associations, unions of states, geopolitical unions and corporations.

The world will impact with serious problems if it will not realize these new realities both in public practices and cognitive activities. It is particularly clear in contemporary global economics and politics where old concepts do not correspond to new processes and realities. Speaking about these transformations, Russian scientist I. V. Sledzevskiy wrote: «The important feature of contemporary international relations to compare with the past is the growth of global players, arising of new interests, increasing of possible actions» [7]. New players of present world politics are global transnational corporations, megapolices, public and cultural movements of different colors and directions, nongovernment organizations, religious-fundamental movements, associations of civic agreement and other members of international relations. It is explained that new actors increased their role in the global system such as transnational economic and financial corporations, international government and nongovernment organizations influenced on foreign and interior politics of independent states, particularly small and weak ones. Transnational actors have already destroyed national independence in its past interpretation. Structures of transnational corporations intervene into economic space of all countries [1].

These fundamental processes of the world economy affect to international processes and build new architecture of the world community which should be analyzed by contemporary social sciences that is extremely important.

### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

- 1 Берентаев К. Б. Экономика Казахстана и вызовы XXI века /Под ред. Б. К.Султанова. – Алматы: КИСИ при Президенте РК, 1999. – С. 168.
- 2 Булекбаев С. Б. Феномен сознания в философии: новый взгляд /С. Б. Булекбаев, В. Х. Хайруллаева. – Алматы, 2012. – С. 63-82.
- 3 Бурханов К. Н. Казахстанский путь в дилемме: восток или запад /К. Н. Бурханов, С. Б. Булекбаев. – Астана, 2010. – С. 7-63.
- 4 Гроф С. За пределами мозга. – М., 1992. – С. 7.
- 5 Митрошенков О. Цивилизационные вызовы и управленческие ответы в начале XXI

века //Свободная мысль. – 2011. – №5. – С. 191-202.

6 Рассел П. От науки к Богу. – М.: Издательский ДОС «София», 2005. – С. 48-49.

7 Селедзевский И. В. Диалог цивилизаций как смысловое поле мировой политики //Общественные науки и современность. – 2011. – №2. – С. 141-156.

8 Сорос Д. Кризис мирового капитализма. Открытое общество в опасности. – М.: ИНФРА-М, 1999. – С. 262.

9 Хайек Ф. А. Пагубная самонадеянность. – М., 1992. – С. 29

### REFERENCES

1 Berentayev K. B. Ekonomika Kazahstana i vyzovu XXI veka /Pod red. B. K. Sultanova. – Almaty: KISI pri Prezidente RK, 1999. – P. 168.

2 Bulekbayev S. B. Fenomen soznaniya v filosofii: novyj vzgljad /S. B. Bulekbayev, V. H. Hajrullaeva. – Almaty, 2012. – P. 63-82.

3 Burhanov K. N. Kazahstanskij put' v dileme: vostok ili zapad /K. N. Burhanov, S. B. Bulekbayev. – Astana, 2010. – P. 7-63.

4 Grof S. Za predelami mozga. – М., 1992. – P. 7.

5 Mitroshenkov O. Civilizacionnye vyzovy i upravlencheskie otvety v nachale XXI veka // Svobodnaja mysl'. – 2011. – №5. – P. 191-202.

6 Rassel P. Ot nauki k Bogu. – М.: Izdatel'skij DOS «Sofija», 2005. – P. 48-49.

7 Seledzevskij I. V. Dialog civilizacij kak smyslovoe pole mirovoj politiki //Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'. – 2011. – №2. – P. 141-156.

8 Soros D. Krizis mirovogo kapitalizma. Otkrytoe obshhestvo v opasnosti. – М.: INFRA-M, 1999. – P. 262.

9 Hajek F. A. Pagubnaja samonadejannost'. – М., 1992. – P. 29

Received 27.03.2017

*С. Б. Булекбаев<sup>1</sup>, К. А. Темиргалиев<sup>2</sup>, А. С. Ламанова<sup>2</sup>, Н. А. Мингишева<sup>2</sup>, А. Н. Райханова<sup>2</sup>*

*МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ КРИЗИС СОВРЕМЕННЫХ СОЦИАЛЬНЫХ НАУК: ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ*

*<sup>1</sup>Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков им. Абылай хана (Алматы, Казахстан),*

*<sup>2</sup>кафедра истории Казахстана и социально-политических дисциплин Карагандинского государственного медицинского университета (Караганда, Казахстан)*

В статье обосновывается мысль о том, что причины современного системного кризиса заключаются в том, что многие понятия современной общественной науки не совсем адекватно отражают изменившуюся реальность, поэтому необходим пересмотр и уточнение существующего категориального аппарата науки. Для этого необходимо смена парадигмы современной общественной науки, которая до сих пор основывается на ньютонокартезианской метапарадигме. Такая смена уже давно произошла в физике и совсем недавно в психологии. В противном случае методологическая несостоятельность и слабость объяснительно потенциала общественных наук в объяснении и понимании социальных процессов будет закономерным явлением.

*Ключевые слова:* метапарадигма, общество, системный кризис, парадигма, транснациональные компании, системность, нелинейное развитие

*С. Б. Бөлекбаев<sup>1</sup>, К. А. Темиргалиев<sup>2</sup>, А. С. Ламанова<sup>2</sup>, Н. А. Мингишева<sup>2</sup>, А. Н. Райханова<sup>2</sup>*

*ҚАЗІРГІ ЗАМАНҒЫ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ҒЫЛЫМНЫҢ ӘДІСТЕМЕЛІК ДАҒДАРЫСЫ: ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ ҚЫРЫ*

*<sup>1</sup>Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынстар және әлемдік тілдер университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан),*

*<sup>2</sup>Қарағанды мемлекеттік медицина университетінің Қазақстан тарихы және әлеуметтік-саяси пәндер кафедрасы (Қарағанды, Қазақстан)*

Мақалада қазіргі уақыттағы жүйелік дағдарыстың себептері қазіргі заманғы қоғамдық ғылым ұғымы өзгерген шынайы болмысты адекватты көрсете алмауына байланысты деген пікір негізделген, сондықтан қазіргі қолданымдағы ғылымның категориалдық аппаратын қайта қарастыру және нақтылау қажет. Ол үшін бүгінгі қоғамдық ғылымның парадигмасын ауыстыру қажет, ол әлі күнге дейін ньютон-картезиандық метапарадигмаға негізделді. Мұндай ауыстыру физикада әлдеқашан жүргізілген және жақында психологияда жүргізілді. Олай болмаған жағдайда қоғамдық ғылымның әдістемелік қауқарсыздығы мен әлсіздігі әлеуметтік үдерістерді түсіндіруде заңды құбылыс болып қала береді.

*Кілт сөздер:* метапарадигма, қоғам, жүйелік дағдарыс, парадигма, трансұлттық компаниялар, жүйелік, линиялық емес даму