

SOCIAL SPACE OF IDENTITY

Рассматриваются элементы конституирования социального пространства идентичности. Показана связь понятий структуры социального пространства, информации, познания, деятельности и коммуникации. Утверждается необходимость сбалансированного перехода от эссенциалистской к конструктивистской парадигме социальной категоризации.

Ключевые слова: социальное пространство, идентичность.

Розглянуто елементи конструювання соціального простору ідентичності. Показаний зв'язок понять структури соціального простору, інформації, пізнання, діяльності та комунікації. Стверджено необхідність збалансованого переходу від есенціалістської до конструктивістської парадигми соціальної категоризації.

Ключові слова: соціальний простір, ідентичність.

Constituting elements of social space of identity are considered. The connection between the concepts of the structure of social space, information, knowledge, activities and communication are shown. The need for a balanced transition from essentialist to constructivist paradigm of social categorization.

The keywords: social space, identity.

Problem formulation. «Identity» was not a problem as long as the philosophy expressed a doubt that what is called «the unity of the self». However, in the socio-analytical sphere this term was used much later. And when we meet in the philosophy and culture of the twentieth century a metaphor «death of the subject», then we must remember that we are talking about the subject of classical thinking as self-sufficient in terms of continuity and integrity of its «cogito, ergo sum». But at the same time we are talking about the formation of a historically new subjectivity in all its various manifestations. There is quite we can see the main reason for addressing the problem of identity and its diversity. Researchers have tried to explicate the ways of formation of identities in social interaction and conceptualize the options of self-determination of the subject in different social contexts. Since then, the ideas of individuality and identity no longer rely on the premise of the original existence of some kind of «essence» or «givens» of the subject. In the foreground there is the concept of socially constructed identity. That is why the question of how the identity discourse conceptually forms, is not purely scientific and is associated with a broad socio-cultural context.

The extent of the problem. Philosophical and methodological principles of constructivism and essentialism are faced in the problem field of the theory of identity. Essentialism comes out the thesis that identity is the product of objective social and biological structures. Constructivism assumes the identity is the result of ideological interaction between individuals and groups. Essentialism is stable in everyday discourse in

all cultures. Considering the essentialism is reaction, social theorists develop conditions of emancipation from his clutches.

The main group of works on issues of identity is works of modern scholars [1] operating in various theoretical and methodological directions, and made a significant contribution to the development of problems of the identity of social subject. The base, on which the first identity theories were built, was motivational and affective sphere that most fully expressed in the psychoanalytic direction (Z. Freud, E. Erickson, J. Marcia, H. Grotevant, H. Marcuse, G. Adams, A. Waterman, P. Weinreich, M. Foucault, J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, F. Mollon). The theory of social representations (S. Moscovichi, W. Doyce) complements the main idea of psychoanalysis with the idea of social communication and social identity theory (G. Tayfel) – with the idea of cognitive processes. New basic ideas (without absolute motivational and affective sphere) were found in the theory of symbolic interactionism (J. Mead, J. Habermas, R. Jenkins) and the theory of self-categorization (J. Turner, P. Oaks). Thus, the symbolic interactionism is based on the idea of interactions, the theory of self-categorization absolutes cognitive sphere. Try to compare different approaches to integration made possible in discourse analysis (T. van Dijk, F. Nelson, C. Hardy, L. Phillips, M. Jorgensen, E. Laclau, C. Mouffe).

The space-time concepts have a particular importance in understanding of the reproduction of human identity. «Space» and «time» are the fundamental ontological categories, which are developed by different areas of knowledge. The social space-time is the object of study of the humanities. Social subjects inherent understanding of social space, firstly, in unity with the category of time, as the chronotope (formal and substantive category of narrative genres, semantic linking social subjects), and secondly, as reality, that encloses and structures human and society. The moment of change is an absolute defining moment in relation to the rest moment in the existence of social phenomena. Apparently, the «structuring» is more important for the characterization of social space than the «length». Social from these (structuralist) positions disclosed primarily through the structure. Structure and space in a certain sense there is sameness. Time is represented by change of spatial structures, therefore, there is a reason to consider the social from position of «space».

The development of the category «social space» engaged G. Simmel («Sociology of space», 1903), P. Sorokin («Social mobility», 1927), M. Weber («The city. – Economy and society», 1922), M. Heidegger («Art and space», 1969), E. Giddens («The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration», 1984), P. Bourdieu («Sociology of social space», 2005), P. Berger and T. Lukman («The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge», 1966). To these scientists, the concept of social space is the most effective tool of categorical synthesis of social theory primarily in structuralist (constructivist) interpretations. And we are convinced that constructivism, seems more in keeping with the modern pathos of «change» in the world.

The aim of the article is to comprehend the constituting elements of the social space of the identity of social subject.

The main theses of the article. For our study, it is important that the statement of identity (individuality, integrity) is the statement by which the complex of ideological

(illusory, imaginary) quality becomes «individual», i.e. proclaims itself the reality (verity, truth).

Identity (shape of our sociality) is experienced by the human individual primarily as a sense of identity. But sensory knowledge (cognition) from the very beginning has social and historical character. The unity of sense (sensations, perceptions, ideas, emotions) and rational (concepts, judgments, reasoning, methods, methodology, theory, etc.) knowledge are found here. Most of the sensory experience includes images learned from descriptions, narratives (stories), and the like, made by others. Therefore, the universally significant discourse about identity is possible.

Identity, speaking from our sensibility, is a category of aesthetic expression of the social world. Aesthetic (aesthetic activity) satisfies the most important human need – need for «*spacing*» – to see, perceive, experience the world (and oneself) as a «specific living whole» where the whole (completeness) is the starting point of perception and imagination. Here, identity is defined by the «mimesis» and «catharsis» as direct identification with «its» community and as a «joy of recognition». «Mimesis and catharsis» in our opinion, is an elementary form of social communication, which allows to recognize themselves in a certain «history», identify with it, to experience the joy of its recognition (primarily the recognition of survival unit: family, tribe, state, humanity). Mimesis is the «imitation», which precedes and even contrary to a «realistic» representation.

Indeed, identity is a representation of yourself, as we think about ourselves and who we want to be, what kind we like ourselves (tested: no one likes to imagine himself ugly, poor and sick). After all, significance of identity is determined by three basic human needs: affiliation to the community, positive self-esteem and safety. Everyone tries to find "their" group, where the sense of belonging is attack and defense, benefit and harm, sadness and joy. It is correct to believe that any decor takes its grounds in magical (praxeological) amulets of ancient man. Our distant ancestor reassured and pleased view of these amulets, and from here, from this joy a sense of beauty was born.

Praxiologic (economic) distinction of course dominates as a base. So, in economic era images of «I-identity» and «We-identity» recognized as «right» («beautiful»), depend on the interest ideologues. The potential economic value of identity always impacts on «their» assessment, i.e. «their» «beauty» is converted into «their» «benefit». The narratives of the «correct» beauty told by such «art experts» create the conditions of cultivation of new «totalizing fictions» of identity (really, our sexual instinct, which has long been freed from heterosexual genital and, therefore, is a natural attribute in finding yourself, your identity, your subjectivity and your place and role in society, artificate our lives without efforts of «art experts», causing us to be «king of the hill», catch an envious glances on yourself). «The trick» of successful social categorization is that the artistic narrative is closer to man than purely political or purely academic narratives.

Human need for spacing or artification of Social (social activity) leads to deception and self-deception: «it is not difficult to deceive me, I am deceived by myself with pleasure»; «fool me, but fool me beautiful». Even playing kids demonstrate the model of «ratification» – creation of sociality, social space by human.

Physical characteristics of the space can not determine the specifics of the social space,

but great importance for social phenomena are informative, cognitive, activity, communicative processes. Obviously, the analysis of this aspect of social phenomena will reveal certain aspects (elements) of the essence of social space. Moreover, the space, relation, information, cognition, activities, communication interact with each other very closely.

The difference, diversity are necessary conditions of information. Understanding the information as a measure of diversity is closely connected with ideas about the motion as a change. In turn, the change is a kind of difference. Social arises where they able to distinguish and differentiate primarily statuses and roles. But here it is appropriate to talk about the knowledge (cognition): all knowledge is information, but not all information is knowledge.

The key concept, providing justification of social existence as a distinction (knowledge), is the concept of activity. Already in classical German philosophy this concept has acquired the status of a fundamental principle of the explanation of human existence. Principle of activity was further, besides crucial, developed in philosophy of modern materialism (Marxism) and in its socioeconomic theory. If in German idealism an explanatory load of concept of activity was directed to the fact that to reveal active nature of the spirit, then in Marxism activity itself becomes the true substance of culture, of the whole human world. The activity becomes an explanatory principle, an essential methodological condition for building a theoretical picture of the world in general and social and historical nature of man in particular, therefore, the activity must be assumed also heuristic principle.

Actions deliberately oriented on their semantic perception, called communicative. Communication (lat. *communicatio* – message, transmission) is the sense and ideal-substantial aspect of social interaction [2, p. 322]. The main function of communication is to achieve a social community, while preserving the individuality of each of its elements. If the language used to rely only means of communication, but now communication itself is immersed in the structure of the language, it becomes a space where deploy certain linguistic forms. Such «communicative» turn has opened the horizons for artificially and technical relation with the organization of communication. Due to the mass construction of the linguistic and semantic-semiotic resources, communication became articulated, acquiring various organized forms.

Relationship of structure concepts of social space, information, cognition, activity and communication activities, considered by us, is necessary for further disclosure of the concept of social subject, which places itself as an object in its social, symbolic environment.

As you can see, the universal signs of space (structural, dimension, objectivity) is certainly applicable to the social space, but appear here in a special way. The concretization of the general features of social space should be carried out taking into account the specifics of the social form of the motion. Manifestations of this movement are the social distance and social mobility. The social distance is a distance between classes, social groups and individuals in the social structure of society. Social mobility is the agility of social groups and individuals in the social structure.

Thus, under the social space we will be understood, first of all, a space that is formed

by social processes and interactions, in which these processes and interactions are realized. Further, the social space can be understood as a form of existence of social life. Therefore it is necessary to talk about the concept of social space as a socio-philosophical category, reflecting the form of the existence of higher structural level of the organization of being, i.e. society. Here we are dealing with a dialectical interaction of content and form.

Another note. The social space is not limited to the physical space of the society and is determined by human subjectivity. Being of social subject has a spatial structure. First, the man is preset to feel the ordering effect of the social space by the fact he was born in a society, namely the person's position in the social space determines, to a certain extent, the being of man. Secondly, the man creates new spatial relations caused variation and creativity of his subjectivity, i.e. structures social life in a new way. Therefore, as the social space creates man as the ensemble of social relations, as man tend to create social space he desired. The social and philosophical thought is developing these two directions and its synthesis in the justification of the phenomenon of social subject.

Thus, in the framework of the social theories about space as structuring and defining beginning the concept of the social space gained in the implementation of E. Giddens, who claimed [3, p. 42] that the structural organization is an indispensable condition for the stability of the processes of social interaction. Society is created as a result of space-time structuration of these interactions.

The category of the social space gained the most «structuralist» elaboration in the work of P. Bourdieu, who believed [4, pp. 56-57], that social world can be represented in the form of multidimensional space, built on the principles of differentiation and distribution, formed by set of operating properties in this universe, i.e. properties that can give their owner the power and authority in the universe. So individual subjects and groups are defined by its relative position in this space.

Even so subjective everyday reality becomes the main content of sociospatial relations. Indeed, regarding the legality of the structural and objectivist judgment in the interpretation of the social space, we can conclude that the whole society gets the spatial dimension as the formation of the human person. Moreover, the laws of development of physical space only to a certain extent determine the process of constructing of social spaces. The world of man in the early stages of social anthropogenesis was a world of objects, whose integrity was more «given» by mutual position and relationships of objects, not «preassigned», not conceived. However, this reality, objectivity is conditional as to the extent to which an object at all can be given to the subject-observer, it is given, conceived, designed. Therefore, social space is given condition of social interaction of social subjects.

Once created, the social space begins to live by its own laws and to make a person with very specific characteristics of social and spatial predestination. So N.L. Vinogradova believes [5, p. 41] that space of the church, produced by human, creates a well-defined social reaction in this person when he applies to it or he is fitted in it: no noise, remove the cap, downcast eyes. This is an example of transformation of physical space in social, but the feature of the social space is that it can not have a physical location.

However, the social subject can not be simply «turned» in space, «fitted» in the social field: the subject is a valid factor, which problematizes the social space by its creative

energy. Then, social space integrates subject and is integrated by it. This is a continuous process of dialogic interaction of subjects. Here, according to V.E. Kemerov [6, p. 100] chronotope sociality of the space and time can be truly understood on the level of the human individual.

A man from the very beginning of his personal development becomes involved in the metaphysical developing of reality. Entering the purely physical, it would seem contacts with the things he has to learn human ways of interacting with them (substantiation of production as a one process of objectification and disobjectification sets the scientific understanding of the creation of subject-object collision). Thus, even L. Feuerbach reinterprets the concept of «object» in the theory of developing of the world. According to Feuerbach, the concept of the object is formed originally in the experience of human communication, and therefore the first object to every becoming human is the other human («subject», «You»). This «Other» is recognized as external, objective reality, and thus the existence of the external things at all, the objective world is recognized.

The problem of the formation by human the social space of interaction is decided by researchers, in general, similar «mediator» approach. Social space occurs in the interaction of subjects on «common area» (B. Vandenfels). Martin Buber simulates the situation thus: «The area, established by the existence of man as a man, but is not determined terminology, I call the area "Between". It is the original categories of human reality, even if it is implemented in very different degrees. Hence it should come the true third..."Between" is located on the other side of the subjective, on the other side of the objective, on the narrow ridge where I meet You» [7, pp. 92-94]. The concept of «third» as a kind of «knowing» area is introduced by M. M. Bakhtin: «Every dialogue is as if in the background of response understanding of the invisibly present third, standing above all the participants in the dialogue (partners)» [8, p. 323].

The social space is determined by dialogical relations of «near and far contexts», namely, universally valid systems of symbols-meanings. The ability of the symbolic (social) creates society. Conscious behavior of the individual is formed during developing of the social space, alleged manipulation of the symbols that represent the subject itself and various aspects of its environment. However, meanings fill the social space, do function of mediator of sociality, only if they can be interpreted by subjects. The sign bearing the meaning becomes useless if the one to whom it is intended, is not able to understand it. There is simply not the general social space.

A typical example of the problems associated with a different vision of the nature of the structuring of social space is the two main interpretations of the concept of identity, namely, objectivist and subjectivist methodology. «Objectivism» in the explanation of social processes based on the premise of the existence of objective specifics of the group causes the identification of the individual with their own kind. «Subjectivism» does not call into question the very fact of existence of objective differences, however, wonders why some factors (e.g., nationality, language) determine collective actions, while others (such as color preferences, growth) do not. This view leads to the nomination of the thesis that the unity of a group of people is in *their opinion* about the existence of the group and their

belonging to it no less (if not more) important than the objective specifics of the group. This in turn highlights the issue of the regularity of the formation and support of the identity, which can not be inferred from the objective group of specifics.

Social space exists, being expressed in certain forms, one of which is a text or word. The social space is seen in the word as a mediator between subjects. Word is the supreme sign of sociality. Social appears in senses contained in the words; senses, the nature of which is in the requirement of understanding, interpretation.

Speaking of language as a mediator in the formation of social space, we emphasize its importance for the reproduction of the practice. Deepening problems of the social space as a space of understanding, V. Frankl marked: «I would say that the dialogue without logos, a dialogue in which there is no focus on intentional refrain is actually a mutual monologue, only mutual expression... To be human is to be in relation to something and to be aimed at something other than himself» [9, pp. 322-323]. According to Frankl, the social space is the set of meanings, or «logos» as a kind of «intentional refrain».

But we know the huge role the non-rational aspects of social interaction (L. Wittgenstein: «language does not express the fact that it expresses»). The limitations of the logic («logos») consist in non-uniqueness of the language as a mediator in a broad semiotic sense, like any sign system. Social space of meanings is filled not only with rational components, but also with experiences.

We guess the meaning of words, we guess the meaning of activity. Most theories of understanding do not account the expressive character of world developing by man. E. Cassirer has fully developed the idea of mind and sensuality connection in his conception of «symbolic concept» called to strengthen the thesis that any realizable perception is always the product of collaboration of sensual perception and spiritual apperception. Giving to any sensual perception of meaning is a fundamental ability of man as homo symbolicus.

Cassirer's thesis on the necessary connection between reason and sensibility developed Bakhtin in his reasoning about the dialogue. According to Bakhtin, to be a man means to be in a dialogic relationship with others. As Bakhtin said, «the world unity of the aesthetic vision is not a notional systematic, but concrete architectonic unity, it is situated around a specific value center, which is thought of and seen and liked by. This center is the man, everything in this world get the meaning, sense and value only by reference to the human, as a humanly» [10, p. 509].

K. Marx has already said about the dialogue as a method of adapting of social man and mediator in the formation of the social space in his conception of reproduction of the social. This reproduction is the universal form of the human «amateur». Namely, Marx was the first who to consider work as the reproduction of human relations, as the creation of the man by himself.

Thus, we believe the social space is created by social subjects, by the interaction of their internal worlds. The social space is not a neutral background against which social interactions take place, not a repository of interaction of the subjects, but the co-existence of these subjects. Social interactions are not just being in a certain fixed social space as a passive medium as in the substrate, vise versa, social interactions define the topology of the space, i.e. cosmology, the structure of social being. In the ability to interact in the social

space the subject increasingly manifests itself as its creator, and it affects himself.

Conclusion. The reduction of the subject to the function («things») of the social system prevents the understanding of the processes in modern transforming societies as reifies thinking about social categorizations has not only theoretical, but also political aftermaths. The main thing in modern social philosophy is considered the formation of dereification of thinking about social differences, therefore, the «return of the subject» in social theory. A change of bases of social theory is needed on the positions of the subject-oriented approach, namely, a balanced transition from essentialist to the constructivist paradigm. Arguments, in which social reality is *preassigned* as contextually-labile discursive space, become relevant. Overcoming of essentialist paradigm is possible in the way of formation of the subject, self-determining with competence in symbolic constructs of the social space.

References:

1. Van Dijk T. A. To the definition of discourse (1998). Available at: <http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm> (rus); Deleuze J., Guattari F. Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and schizophrenia (trans. from fr. D. Kralachkina, scient. ed. V. Kuznetsov). Ekaterinburg: U-Factoria, 2007. 672 p. (rus); Deleuze J. Michel Tournier and the world without the other. Logic of Sense. Moscow: Raritet; Ekaterinburg: Business Book, 1998. 480 p. (rus); Discourse analysis. Available at: <http://slovari-online.ru/word/социологический-словарь/анализ-дискурса-дискурс-анализ> (rus); Makarov M.L. Fundamentals of the theory of discourse. Moscow: Gnosis, 2003. 280 p. (rus); Marcuse H. Eros and civilization. One-dimensional man: a study of ideology of developed industrial society (trans. from engl., afterword., notes A.A. Yudin; ed., foreword V.Yu. Kuznetsova). Moscow: AST, 2002. 526 p. (rus); Mollon F. Unconscious. Moscow: Prospekt, 2002. 79 p. (rus); Nelson F., Hardy C. What is the discourse analysis? Modern Discourse Analysis: Electronic journal [electronic resource], 2009. Issue 1. Volume 1. Access at: http://www.discourseanalysis.org/ada1_1.pdf (rus); Phillips L., Jorgensen M. Discourse analysis. Theory and method (trans. from engl.). Kh.: Humanities Center, 2004. 336 p. (rus); Freud Z. Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the «I». Access at: <http://www.klex.ru/1as> (rus); Foucault M. The will to truth: the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality. Moscow: Kastal, 1996. 448 p. (rus); Habermas J. Moral consciousness and communicative action (trans. from germ. ed. D.V. Sklyadneva). St. Petersburg: Science, 2006. 380 p. (rus); Erikson E. Identity: youth and crisis (ed., foreword A.V. Tolstoy). 2nd ed. Moscow: Flint, MPSI, Progress, 2006. 352 p. (rus); Doise W., Worchel S., Morales J. F., Paez D., Deschamps J. Social representations in personal identity. Social identity: international perspective. N.Y.: Sage Publications, 1998. Pp. 13-25; Grotevant H. Assigned and chosen identity components: a process perspective on their integration. Adolescent Identity Formation: Sage Publications. Inc., 1992. Pp. 73–90; Grotevant H., Adams G. Development of an objective measure to assess ego identity in adolescence: validation and replication. Journal of youth and adolescence, 1984. V. 13. № 5. Pp. 419–438; Jenkins R. Social identity. London: Routledge, 1996. 235 p.; Laclau E., Mouffe C. Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics. London: Verso, 1985; Marcia J. E. Identity in adolescence. Handbook of Adolescent Psychology (ed. by J. Adelson). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980. Pp. 159–187; Mead G. From Gesture to Symbol. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago, 1934. Pp. 65, 66-76, 78.; Moscovici S. Notes towards a description of social representation. European journal of social psychology. 1988. № 18. Pp. 211–250; Tajfel H. Social identity & intergroup relations. Cambridge, Paris, 1982. 234 p.; Turner J. C., Hogg M. A., Oakes P. J., Reicher S. D., Wetherell M. S. A self-categorization theory. Rediscovering the social group: a self-categorization theory. Oxford, NY., 1987. Pp. 42–67; Waterman A. Identity as an aspect of optimal psychological functioning. Adolescent identity formation. Sage Publications, Inc., 1992. Pp. 50–72; Weinreich P. The Operationalization of ethnic identity. Ethnic psychology: research and

practice with immigrants, refugees, native peoples, ethnic groups and sojourners. Amsterdam, Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1988. Pp. 149–168.

2. Communication. Newest philosophical dictionary (comp. A. A. Gritsanov). Minsk: ed. V. M. Skakun, 1998. 896 p. (rus)

3. Modern social theory: Bourdieu, Giddens, Habermas. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University, 1995. 120 p. (rus)

4. *Bourdieu P.* Sociology of politics. Moscow: Socio-Logos, 1993. 336 p. (rus)

5. *Vinogradova N. L.* Social space and social interaction. Herald of the Voronezh State University. Ser. Humanities, 2005. No 2. Pp. 39-54. (rus)

6. *Kemerov V. E.* Introduction to social philosophy. Moscow: Aspect Press, 1996. 215 p. (rus)

7. *Buber M.* Problem of man (trans. from germ.). Kiev: Nika Center, Vist-C, 1998. 96 p. (rus)

8. *Bakhtin M. M.* Aesthetics of verbal creativity. Moscow: Art, 1986. 445 p. (rus)

9. *Frankl V.* Man in search for meaning (trans. from engl.). Moscow: Progress, 1990. 368 p. (rus)

10. *Bakhtin M. M.* Notes (1920). Literary-critical articles. Moscow: Artistic literature, 1986. Pp. 509–531. (rus)

Рецензенти:

Доктор філософських наук, професор, завідувач кафедри соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін Харківського інституту фінансів Українського державного університету фінансів та міжнародної торгівлі Панфілов О.Ю.

Доктор філософських наук, професор, професор кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого Калиновський Ю.Ю.