The Tuareg as social and cultural phenomenon is analyzed in the article. Features of the Tuareg life, their culture, history and contemporary struggle for their own state are being researched. The Tuareg problems in the entering to the modern world are determined.

T.I. BUTCHENKO

PHILOSOPHICAL GROUNDS OF PROJECTIVE MIND

In condition of increasing dynamic diversity of modern society it becomes more difficult to rely on the experience of the past, but instead the need for fundamentally new solutions arises. At the same time the role of mass everyday practices of planning for the future is reduced. Based on common sense and the method of "trial and error" they increasingly are found to be ineffective and even dangerous. The matter is that in the context of growing scope and complexity of the human's actions, the price of erroneous decision is unacceptable high. Accordingly, there is a problem in forming projective mind as volitional and cognitive ability to construct new models socially important artificial objects on the grounds of collecting, saving and processing information about the future state of the space-time part of the world in the situation of uncertainty (or risk).

Outstanding feature of our time is the active elaboration of the wide scale projects aims to change the environment and the climate, to improve great urban infrastructures and complicated industrial systems, to develop global transports and communicative networks. The projective activity in the field of genetic engineering, designing forms of life, and even a human becomes the subject of intense debate. In the scientific and technical spheres social-technological, applied, projective aspects begin so prevail over fundamental, academic ones, it gives the base for some philosophical and scientific currents and schools (foremost it concerns radical constructivism) to identify research and projective activities as the same [5]. In the cultural area, in the field of philosophical, humanitarian and socio-political knowledge this or that concept, theoretical approach or cultural and spiritual tradition are becoming increasingly regarded as a special kind of projecting, planning or programming individual and society, their values and spiritual aspirations [7]. Demonstrating considerable achievements, the process of activating the projective capacity of people at the same time faces the significant difficulties. The reverse aspect of the extraordinary spreading of the "projective" terminology is a dangerous increasing of the elements of utopianism and technicism in public mind, which are ideologically serve the consumer attitudes, manipulative-instrumental relations to another person, the nature, spiritual and cultural heritage and the Universe as a whole as means of satisfying selfish needs of a particular individual or social group.

One of the important reasons for the possible distortion of the projective activity is the failure of its modern conceptual assumptions, which are given popular metaphysical hypostatization of mind and its intentional self-sufficiency (in the terminology by Gilbert Ryle: dogma of "ghost in the machine") [9]. First of all, we are talking about the dichotomous opposition between such concepts as "subject" and "object", "internal" and "external", "theory" and "practice", "project" ("plan") and "spontaneity". Thus, the culture of modernity widely replicates different patterns of projecting thinking as a private matter of a separate subject, the inner silent activity of which is derived from its own mysterious, incomprehensible self. In turn, introspective illusion of "isolation", "independence" of mind stimulates a wave of utopian fantasies (for instance, in the way (inspired existentialistic projective interpretation of human being byJ.P. Sartre [11]) the motto of French students: "Be realistic – demand the impossible!") was expressed during the riots in Paris in 1968. Also, it does not exclude the various excesses of consumer selfishness of individual planners (for example, in the case of disappointment and mental frustration as natural consequences of the utopian projective optimism).

Inability to overcome these dangerous trends, using (proceeding) philosophical, conceptual foundations of modern culture, determines an acute problematic situation, seeking the solution of which, the philosophers all around the world are involved nowadays. The atmosphere of becoming "risk-society" (concept by U. Beck [2]) creates a favorable environment for doubting

the possibility of socially meaningful projecting (planning). What is more there is a basis for the radical nihilistic objections of traditional cultural patterns, the world outlook concepts which recognize and reinforce the person's right to be the subject of constructive activity. One of the common points of view is represented in early writings by postmodernists (R. Barthes, G. Deleuze, J. Derrida, F. Guattari etc.). They express the rejection of the presumption of the subject in all versions of its articulation in particular through the development of concepts of "The Death of the Subject", "The Death of the Author" and others [1; 4]. Nevertheless we should accept that the postmodern destruction is controversial: intentional aimed on simplifying irresponsible consumer activism at same time it leaves unanswered questions about the mechanism of the responsibility in the culture, which is devoid of the concept of "subject".

Perhaps more productive position is related with the attempts to analytical unlocking of technocratic "subject-object" monologism using the external clarification of dispositional relation between mind and reality represented in such cases as "Twin Earth Experiment" (H.W. Putnam) and "Arthritis Thought Experiment" (T. Burge) [3; 8]. In this aspect mind can be defined as a complex of subject-object and subject-subject dispositional relations, in which the interaction between subject and object is mediated differentiated and hierarchical social and communicative bonds between individual and group subjects. Some arguments in support of this statement may be found through to Hilary Putnam's hypothesis of the universality of the division of linguistic labor [8, p. 145-146]. Likewise it would not be useless to consider some points by Tyler Burge who believes that traditional metaphors make the mistake of treating intentional mental phenomena individualistic. In a contra way he states: "New approaches must do better. The sense in which man is a social animal runs deeper than much mainstream philosophy of mind has acknowledged"[3, p. 117].

Based on the external conceptions of mind it is possible to say that the main feature of mind is the dispositional openness (transparency) to the world in its natural and social dimensions. The concept of "disposition" refers to the measure of mutual relation "subject – object" as mutual transitions, where the subject objectifies, revealing itself in the object and the object subjectifies, revealing itself in the subject. Thus the dialog-referent meditation of "subject-object" relationship is provided. At the same time this conceptual point departs from dangerous technocratic position that attributes mind the special status of sufficient substance. It is also important that the analytical operation preserves a human as a subject, which is responsible for his/her initiatives and actions.

We should note here that the most complete dispositional nature of mind is manifested at the projective level. The project of creating a new object is impossible without sufficient a precision grasp, a sense of the dynamics of real self-organization opportunities in a certain context of natural and social reality. Achieving this result supposes a delicate filigree analytic work in which the typology of projective transforming parameters has to be complemented by individual approach which aimed to leave a space for unique self-organization of the transforming object. Furthermore, one should not forget to keep a self-organization space for all people who participate in social projective communications and interactions. That should be possible backlash of the social and individual elements of transformation models, without which their integrity and completeness is under doubt, bumping into resistance of natural and social reality.

In this way the considerable arsenal of special conceptual and perceptional means has already accumulated. In conceptual dimension we can observe the transition from hypostatized constructs of mythology and religion to analytical openness of philosophical and scientific thoughts, and it's latest achievement is the establishment neoclassical nonlinear rationality oriented on the coordination of regulation and self-regulation in natural and social systems. In perceptual dimension the relevant progress occurs in correlation with the analytical search of measure of projective language formalization. According to this heuristic movement projective language differentiated to the language by philosophers and scientists and the language by practitioners, managers (engineers, financiers, politicians, lawyers, administrators) who are proximate organizers and performers of various projective implementations. Theoretical language is used in the conceptual elaboration of projective transformation then it is conversed into the

language of legal documents – laws, regulations, statutes, programs and plans demanding a high degree of specificity and accuracy to carry out the regulatory mission of projects.

It should be emphasized that the final (in the way of positivistic attempt to create "meta-language") deciding the problem of formalizing the projective language is impossible. Despite the risk of distortion the initial projective idea to incorrect interpretation of the ambiguous meanings of natural language systems, at the same time they meet the needs to keep the transparency of the projective model, providing mobility, flexibility of its components in response to changes in the natural and social reality. As the example, we can remind about the phenomenon of "Italian strike" or "Obstruction" ("Work-to-rule") that is a form of civil protest, with the matter in how you can maximize the exact effectuation by employees of their official duties and rules and as a result the failure of normal functioning of the organization, which can't work all on the established norms, as they certainly are lagging behind the dynamics of the natural environment and are unable to cover all various forms and specific features of social communicative situations. All in all, to ensure the conceptual and perceptual projective transparency it's necessary to ensure the development of special institutional infrastructure and proper conceptual interpretational tools.

In this context, the special projective constructive mission of philosophy of mind becomes clear. Implementing analytical reflection of conceptual foundations of the projective activity, it contributes its update, thus participating in programming practical social and projective changes. The need for this functional purpose increases in times of crisis, breaking the traditional conceptual connections when linguistic and regulatory guidelines of the past begin to contradict the needs of the future. Starting from the criticism of everyday ideas and then turning to the analysis of complex theoretical concepts, philosophical analysis determines the rationalization of the semantic root of projective mind, the generation of the system of conceptually new model-conceptual values, thereby contributing to the replacement of social and cultural frame of the projective activity.

In fact, in such way the connective analysis is realized, and its purpose is to track the conceptual links rather than reduce complicated concepts to simple ones. By Strawson P.F., the description of the basic structures of mind made according to this attitude should be focused on three dimensions: the theory of being (ontology), the theory of cognition (epistemology) and the theory of propositions that may be true or false (logic) [12]. In our opinion, the proposed algorithm of analysis should be supplemented by the theory of values (axiology), which enables the incorporation for more full explanation of the mechanism of social communicative mediation of subject-object relations.

As a consequence, a systematic analysis of the most common categorical dispositions: "Being – Mind", "Space – Time", "Truth – Reality", "Harmony – Chaos" and others is provided. Combining and synthesizing in various (often uncritical) methods in modern culture, they may form numerous stable conceptual systems of projective behavior (analytical and dogmatic, idealistic and materialistic, rational and irrational, conservative and reform, anarchistic and etatistic etc). Meanwhile, of course, this list indicates only the typical, the most common ways of philosophical explication of projective ideas.

In real life all the possible philosophical clues are much more sophisticated, various, related with the endless modifications. In their being they are all in their own way are directed to the creation of the possible worlds – all of the possible states of being, alternative to the available ones. In this case, the development of projective ideas throw analytical philosophical level can be considered as a peculiar way of spiritual experimentation. Using it the projects of various transformations are verified on dispositional openness to natural and social reality. Thus their utopianism and technocratic sidedness can be overcome to a certain extent.

Concurrently, being on the borders between knowledge and ignorance, beliefs and doubts, philosophical concepts are potential sources of utopias. Moreover, such a possibility can apply not only to opposite aspects, so to speak, only the expenditure side of philosophical thought movement. In fact, a certain degree of utopianism is a necessary component of the projective aim of analytic philosophy. The fact is that the philosophical conceptual generalization has taken

separately as net self-sufficient conceptual types can serve as utopian constructs or "utopia of culture" like a kind of transcendental illusion that integrates perspective of the world as a whole.

So, the investigations of the great utopias of the past disclose the significant elements of direct extrapolation of philosophical conceptual schemes of the reality in their conceptual and ideological foundations: the absolute "world of ideas" preceded "the Republic" and the "Laws" by Plato, the exaggerated collectivistic constructivism preceded "Utopia" by T. More etc. Generally all utopists did not have enough recognition of hypothetical specificity of philosophical constructs, the probable nature of their basic prognostic potential, projective-constructive implementation of which required their development on the scientific-theoretical level, where they had to receive the specific content and status of verified statements. Not meeting this requirement, they fell into utopian creation of conceptual, abstract schemas which did not correspond to the actual diversity of life, and therefore, could be realized by means of instrumental violence against nature and a human.

Removing the threat of philosophical fundamentalism is happening by restoring the union of analytic philosophy and science. According to the "union's agreement" the precariousness of philosophical thought, equilibrating between knowledge and ignorance, between faith and conviction, is balanced by the fundamentality and the probability of a scientific theory which is a form of synthesis and interpretation of the data of observations and experiments. Providing the entire, logically coordinated reference of a certain fragment of the reality (phenomena, processes, relations, characteristics, attitudes, laws (the law of nature, etc.), it has a large heuristic power, systematically explaining facts which have already known and predicting still unknown facts and phenomena. In this aspect a scientific theory outlines the space feasible projective dispositions, reducing the degree of uncertainty and risk. In turn, the projective activity as a form of creation (or better to say subjectivation) of new artificial objects provides technologically-constructive trial for a scientific theory, revealing false claims and limitations in it. All in all, the well-known idea by R. Harre that a realistic model of science is more adequately described in terms of creating new things, than in terms of the opening new truths found its projective continuation here [6].

A scientific theory that is opened to new facts and reality in general is the source of the projects. However the implementation of this openness is problematic, bumping into several obstacles. Firstly the intellectual power of a scientific theory can contribute to its uncritical self-exaltation, spreading claims of self-sufficiency. It is linked to attitudes of scientism on the purification of the scientific knowledge from metaphysical statements. In other words, it is the refusal to renovate the most general meaning root of scientific theory. However it is impossible to refuse conceptual basis, it is possible only to refuse to ask the question on the necessity of its analytical philosophical reflection, thus simply conserving the available the most general principles of scientific knowledge. Falling behind the dynamics of natural and social reality they thereby will transform into the precondition of "scientific" fundamentalism that is the source of a variety of technocratic utopias (for example, in the way of utopia "Walden two" by Skinner B. F.) [10].

It should be noted that the danger of "fundamentalist-scientific" distortion of projective mind is determined by deeper processes beyond the desires and aspirations of individual theorists. Outside a certain fragment of objective reality, the integrity of which is reproduced by the theoretical knowledge that reveals the inherent regular correlations of the world, there is always something that has no scientific explanation. Realizing the contradiction between the known and the unknown pushes the researcher to find some intermediate logical level that eliminates the problem. The role of this level is often made by special ideological concepts that can receive some mythical features: direct sensuality, imagery, hypostatizations.

In addition, we should consider the immanent to the science the measure of inertia, that is conditioned by the objective need of the scientific verifying any theoretical innovations on their validity. In pursuit of a reality, that supposedly escapes from the eyes of researchers, they certainly can speed up their work, but thus the scientific status of the knowledge obtained in a rapid way become problematic. In the changing environment of modernity scientific theory also faces with other problems. In particular, trying to grasp the nature of the object deeper and to

response on constantly varying social needs, science naturally differentiated. Accompanied by increasing specific knowledge at the some time this process does not preserve coordination bond between the different branches of science. All this, of course, reduces its adaptive capacity, making it vulnerable to mythologizing process, making the attempts to "solder" the dissociation of scientific knowledge using different mythological constructs.

One cannot deny that mythological concepts take an ambiguous role in the cognitive-projective activities. They stimulate researcher's and planner's imaginations, provide an opportunity to synthesize certain information to move from random ideas about something to orderly knowledge that often gets conspicuous scientific value. Myths "lock" incompleteness and relativity of scientific and rational ideas, serve as starting points of many research programs. One should, however, not forget that mythical conceptual images can divert from reality, creating only the illusion of solving real problems. After all the exceeding their "critical mass" causes loss of the projective capacities by a human.

Therefore in conclusion we can say that to generate of projective mind and to realize its general social meaning the conceptual core of scientific theory should be reconstructed in the philosophical way. As a result a new degree of mutual correspondence of analytic philosophy and science should be achieved. Ultimately, such symbiosis is beneficial for both scientific theories and philosophical ones: if philosophical explication of projective concepts, teetering on the edge between faith and knowledge, is not supported by scientific knowledge, it becomes a source of utopias, and, vice versa, the scientific elaboration of projective ideas becomes mythological and produces utopian technocratic projects when it "forgets" about its own philosophical background, the reflection of their original logical ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions.

THE LIST OF LITERATURE

1. Barthes R. The Death of the Author // www.DeathoftheAuthor.com
2. Beck U. Risk Society, Towards a New Modernity. – London: Sage Publication, 1992. – 272 p.
3. Burge T. Individualism and the mental. Midwest studies in Philosophy, 4:123-121 // http://www.uwyo.edu/philosophy/_files/colloquium-series/individualism-and-mental.pdf
4. DeleuzeG., Guattari F. What is Philosophy? – New-York: Columbia University Press. – 1994. – 256 p.
5. Glasersfeld E. An Introduction to Radical Constructivism // http://www.vonglasersfeld.com/070.1
6. Harre R. Varieties of Realism: A Rationale for the Natural Sciences. – Oxford [Oxfordshire] ; New York : Blackwell, 1986. – 375 p.
7. Koslowski P. The Myth of Modernity. The Poetic Philosophy of Ernst Jünger. – Moskow, Resbulika. – 2002. – 239 p. (Russian translation).
8. Putnam H. The Meaning of "Meaning" // http://mcps.umn.edu/assets/pdf/7.3_Putnam.pdf
9. Ryle G. The Concept of Mind. – New York: Barnes & Noble, 1949. – 334 p.
10. Skinner B. F. Walden Two [with a new preface by the author]. – Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2005. – 302 p.
11. Sartre J.P. Being and Nothingness: An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology. – New York: Citadel Press, 2001. – 553 p.
12. Strawson P.F. Analysis and Metaphysics. An Introduction to Philosophy. – Oxford University Press, 1992. – 144 p.

ФИЛОСОФСКИЕ ОСНОВАНИЯ ПРОЕКТНОГО СОЗНАНИЯ

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье раскрывается особое проектное предназначение философии.   Как форма аналитической рефлексии концептуальных оснований проектировочной деятельности, она обеспечивает обновление ее содержания, тем самым принимая участие в программировании социально-практических изменений. Обосновывается, что необходимость этого функционального предназначения возрастает во времена кризисов, ломки традиционных концептуальных связей, когда понятийно-нормативные конструкции

прошлого начинают противоречить потребностям нарождающегося будущего. Отталкиваясь от критики обыденных представлений и далее переходя к анализу сложных теоретических концептов, философский анализ обусловливает рационализацию смыслового ядра проектного сознания, генерацию в нем системы новых концептуальных смыслов и понятийных значений, таким образом, содействуя замене социокультурного каркаса проектирования.

С этих позиций анализируется взаимосвязь философских и научных оснований проектировочной деятельности. Показывается, что его нарушение снижает проектный потенциал человека: если аналитико-философская развертка проектной идеи, балансирующей на грани между верой и знаниями, не подкрепляется научным познанием, то она превращается в источник утопий; и, наоборот, научная разработка проектных идей догматизируется и мифологизируется, когда она «забывает» о собственном философском основании, о рефлексии исходных логико-гносеологических, аксеологических и праксеологических предпосылок.

Как вывод, обосновывается диалогическая стратегия аналитической актуализации проектного сознания на путях восстановления единства ее философских и научных концептуальных истоков.

В. И. ПАЛАГУТА
ДИСКУРС ВЛАСТИ И ВЛАСТЬ ДИСКУРСА

Как уже говорилось в предыдущей нашей статье настоящего издания (см. «Культурологічний вісник» - №29 за 2012 год) форма вопрошания субъекта о самом себе сигнализирует о непрерывно совершаемом онтологическом по своей сути акте субъективного самоудостоверения. Напомним, что данный акт указывает на один из основных методологических принципов разрабатываемой автором теории самоидентификации социального субъекта, который наглядно демонстрирует роль дискурса как *базисной структуры отношений*. Поэтому, дискурс как особого рода речевая структура имеет власть над субъектами благодаря неотъемлемой потребности человека к самоименованию и, тем самым, установлению им своего места или позиции в том или ином поле социальной реальности. Ряд онтологических характеристик дискурсивного пространства наглядно иллюстрируют данное положение [1, С.348-373]. Так, характеристика *силового воздействия дискурса* априорно предполагает *непрерывную, подчас скрытое навязывание «производящих» дискурсы субъектов,* что предполагает социальные отношения доминирования, манипуляции и подчинения субъектов социальной группе или её номинальному представителю в дискурсивном пространстве. Известный представитель критического дискурс-анализа (КДИ) Тён ван Дейк в одной из последих своих работ замечает, что «властвовать означает сегодня обладать не столько аппаратом принуждения, сколько возможностью определять (описывать, объяснять, прогнозировать, конструировать) текущую ситуацию в обществе, формулируя критерии объктивности, непредвзятости, авторитетности, правдивости и истинности» [2, с.8]. Ещё одна онтологическая характеристика - *позиционность дискурса* задаёт структуру социального пространства через распределение (перераспределение) относительных (реляционных) позиций и, тем самым, конкретизирует социальное отношение как отношение устанавливаемого порядка и предписанных или оговоренных правил следования ему.

Характеристика *диспозиции* акцентирует внимание на занятии субъектом определенного места или позиции, которые проявляются через антагонистические и гегемонические взаимодействия в дискурсивных пространствах, что, в конечном счете, и является одной из подоснов всей системы структурирующихся и подвергающихся рефлексии со стороны субъектов силовых или властных отношений. Уже упоминаемый нами ранее голландский учёный замечает, что «мы не поймём, как социальные ситуации или социальные структуры вторгаются в текст и речь, если не поймём, как люди интерпретируют и репрезентируют эти социальные условия в рамках особых ментальных моделей – *контекстных моделей*. То же справедливо в ортношении «эффектов» дискурса,