Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, volume 81
1st International Scientific Conference "Modern Management Trends and the Digital Economy: from Regional Development to Global Economic Growth" (MTDE 2019)

Postmodern identity crisis in the context of the communications informatization development

Korotkevich E.R.
Moscow Vitte University
Moscow, Russia
korotkevich@mail.ru

Tsurkan M.V.
Tver State University
Tver, Russia
080783@list.ru

Dokukina I.A.
Central Russian institute of Management, Branch of RANEPA
Orel, Russia
Dokukina.orags@mail.ru

***Abstract* — The article is devoted to the crisis of identity analysis in the postmodern culture highlights the system of identity state causes and associated with the globalization processes of modern society and its transformation as in general. It also examines the influence of these causes on the personality formation. The proprietary attempt to draw attention to the similarities between the Epicurean, Stoic and Skeptical trends of the Hellenistic era was made and it became significant in a historical perspective. An interesting interchange between the epochs could be considered and separated by approximately two millennia, the ancient skepticism localized in the Perron and his followers' studies as some kind of relativism and agnosticism.**

If we proceed from the fact that the ancient world is the birthplace of modern European humanity, the modern society roots, among other things built on the postmodern demonopolization of truth, in many respects go back to the Hellenistic era. The attitude of thinking towards reality of the nature and criteria of true knowledge is to be considered as an indubitable philosophical merit. The Hellenistic philosophy characterized by "internal emigration"; not anthropological, but "existential" plot twist of philosophical ideas, an individualistic orientation, in many respects anticipated modern epistemological, ethical and socio-philosophical ideas, and its representatives considered in a broad historical context turn into not the "marginal" thinkers of their era, but real prophets in the world philosophical ideas.

Keywords* — *hellenistic era, identity crisis, skepticism, postmodernism, globalization, information society.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays there are no places left unreached by the information field (television, Internet, mobile network). This leads to an identity change under the influence of technological progress. The postmodernist worldview formation is treated as a long, controversial, diverse process that began in the late sixties of the last century and has not been completed for today.

The assertion that antique skepticism in the person of the Perron School's philosophers to a certain extent predicted not only postmodernism, but also postmodern society.

The purpose of the article is to identify and describe the reasons related to identity crisis in the information society. Postmodernism is a reaction to the crisis of the identity of the Western culture as a result of the technological revolution associated with the computer technology invention of communication and management, which started the world society reorganization into a global information society. Information transfer social life into a virtual mode and became the direct creator of society, largely shifting social activity from the real sector to the virtual sector. An "information society" already exists in scientific literature and in life; also - the economy, which is called "informational", "virtual", "electronic", and - management, called "electronic government".

In fact, the transfer of social life from the real sector to the virtual sector is a direct postmodern challenge to the truth, which is no longer real, but a virtual, information construct, something arbitrary, conditional, insignificant. The virtual procedure itself acquires undoubted significance, virtual activity that does not "serve" to reality, but directly aligns it in real time. This social embodiment of the main idea of the Perron's followers is that there is no truth, but there is a social activity, which is carried out "according to custom and law" and does not need truth. It can do without it.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodological basis of the research is the unity of the etymological, logical and historical approaches as well as the consistency principle and some hermeneutical methods of interpretation and understanding. The historical and philosophical reconstruction method is also used, which includes primary methods (when considering resources) and secondary (when attracting various kinds of literature on the topic). The research in selecting the necessary material, methods of immanent interpretive analysis (in analyzing the philosophical constructions of ancient skeptics) and comparative analysis (when comparing the epistemological ideas of the Hellenistic, or late anti-classical philosophy with modern concepts in the philosophy science field) and the Inteza method interpreted as the compound material in a new way.

III. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Traditionally, it is believed that ancient skepticism is one of the Hellenistic philosophy school along with other philosophical Hellenism areas - Stoicism and Epicureanism. The differences between these areas are usually considered in the history of philosophy. However, one can draw attention to the similarities

between them, which perhaps not being fundamental for their period of time. It become significant from a historical perspective and make it possible to consider an interesting dialogue between eras separated by approximately two thousand years. Hellenistic philosophy, characterized primarily by "internal emigration", a peculiar not anthropological, but "existential" turn of philosophical thought, an individualistic orientation, in many respects anticipated modern epistemological, ethical and social-philosophical ideas. Antique skepticism can be localized not only in pyroneism, but also in the general intellectual orientation of Hellenistic philosophy, which was expressed in skepticism and protest attitudes of representatives of various philosophical trends back then. Thus, the ancient skepticism can be viewed as a historical milestone starting from which theoretical thoughts were divided into old, philosophical and new scientific (epistemological) thoughts. As a result, the scientific picture of the world began to take shape (not in the sense of becoming scientific, according to T. Kuhn, paradigm, but in the sense of theoretical knowledge reflection), along with his philosophical picture [2]. In this case, the connection of ancient skepticism with the modern philosophy of science is traced: the most significant directions in it - positivist, historical and postmodern - united like Hellenistic philosophical schools, around the position that verity in science is largely a convention. Scientific rationality gains knowledge and not the truth in its classical sense. It is not excluded that the ideological and historical Hellenistic skepticism mission expressed not only by Perronism, but also by other philosophical Hellenism directions, was precisely in the phenomenon of new theoretical thinking preparation - scientific thinking.

It can be argued that ancient skepticism implicitly expressed the ideas of "undirected", "turbulent", "precedent" social dynamics that do not need truth. The latter turns out to be unnecessary, since it is associated precisely with direction, stability, and predictability. Antique skepticism diminishing the meaning of truth (in the schools of the Epicureans and the Stoics), or even denying it altogether (in Perron), thus spoke in favor of the "undirected" character of social dynamics. A skeptic cannot strive for asserting the falsity of any idea since the basic methodological principle of skepticism is to avoid or deny anything in order to avoid dogmatism.

For example, the American researcher W. Parker puts forward a number of ideas that echo the ancient skepticism because he analyzes the strategies identified by A. Franklin, which according to the latter, scientists use to build a system of confidence in the experimental results. W. Parker shows that these strategies are similar to what could be called the practice of "computer simulation" or the strategy of "Sherlock Holmes."

According to A. Franklin, says W. Parker, experimental results in physical science usually become generally accepted only on the rational evidence basis and not in the "social" procedure of the agreement on their acceptance / rejection as some theorists and philosophers believe. Protecting this thesis and defensing his own analysis of numerous experimental checks carried out by scientists. A. Franklin declares his claim to create an epistemology of the experiment.

Meanwhile, W. Parker notes such researchers as T. Weissart and E. Winsberg pay attention to the analogy of lots of scientists discovered by Frank Frankin's strategies for scientists to obtain convincing experimental results with the "computer simulation" strategy. Each person has his own interests, which encourage him to do something. A scientist is a man and therefore also has his own interests, which impel him to pursue in science not only and not so much "objective", as "interesting" results. In essence, a natural scientist, mathematically, that is, extremely rational, making out the course of the experiment and the experimental results, unfolds the "equations of his interest." This is similar to some kind of problem-solving simulation, although problems, of course, are solved. However, problems are solved something like this - this is the simulation, - as their computer solves, which, simulating a seemingly objective, previously unknown result, executes its program, that is, lays down its "interest" in obtaining the result.

A physicist conducting "objective" experiments cannot get rid of his interest in programming the result. "Computer simulation" in science is well-known and consists in the fact that scientists' program experimental results with certain theoretical ideas about the subject under study; that is, the intellect is always "biased" acting not inductively - from single facts to their generalization, but in a deductive manner, predicting the single manifestations of a certain object from a general idea about it. In the philosophy of science, an entire school is known that has fixed this feature of the intellect, which substantiates the hypothetical-deductive method as the basic scientific method.

Due to the fact that scientific experimentation is programmed by the intellect, solving the problem posed by the idea of the subject of experimentation, it is important as an operation of the intellect - the movement from idea to experimental results. This procedure builds a system of trust in science, turning the original idea into experimental results. Thus, the question of confidence in scientific results is a procedural question. If the procedure in science is sustained, including the experiment procedure, confidence in the results is ensured. This is the social factor of scientific development - in the confidence of scientists in the procedure as a fundamental context for substantiating scientific results. The procedure itself is something external and social in relation to the theories developed in science. If this "external" is so important then it turns out that scientists are engaged in a kind of "simulation" - they conduct experiments, formulate theories as if for the sake of a procedure and observing it guarantees success. If it is neglected so failure comes. Sherlock Holmes was also engaged in such a "simulation," who brilliantly uncovered the crimes, strictly following the procedure - applying the purely logical key of the deductive method to the next riddle. Sherlock Holmes with his "deductive procedure" acted in much the same way as science works, where the procedure requires:

1) to draw up according to the available data, however fragmentary and scanty they may be, a general idea about the subject;

2) to derive the expected manifestations from the general idea about the subject;

3) to carry out experiments to confirm / refute these expectations that is to confirm / refute the general idea of the subject;

4) correct, if necessary, according to experimental results, the general idea of the subject and repeat paragraphs (2) and (3), returning to paragraph (1) and subsequent paragraphs until the experimental results show that you no longer need to return to paragraph (1).

As W. Parker notes, “science ultimately produces results that do not cause mistrust.” Although the entire scientific procedure is carried out within theoretical thinking and cannot be “on the other side” to it that is it cannot be an independent criterion of scientific truth. Consequently, there is a general “default” agreement that the credibility of scientific results is not a problem, since it is ensured, one can say automatically by the procedure itself. However, that is not a problem for the representatives of science themselves or for society is made a problem by those who theorize about science, trying to find for our intellect an “independent” justification of its reliability as a tool for gaining knowledge that deserves trust. So, A. Franklin is looking for special strategies in science, which scientists allegedly develop precisely in the experiment in order field to increase confidence in experimental results. It has five such strategies. One of them is the strategy of using such an experimental toolkit, which has already established itself as a “manufacturer of accurate results”. The next strategy is the experimenter's expected behavior of the experimental toolkit. The third strategy is the experimental tools reliance, which is based on a well-proven theory. The fourth strategy is independent verification of results. The fifth strategy is “eliminating possible sources of errors and alternative explanations for the results” [1].

Meanwhile, the A. Franklin strategies analysis were consciously used by scientists in order to increase confidence in scientific (experimental) results. These “strategies” are part of the scientific work procedure; and the researcher, conducting the experiments, simply follows the procedure of “the Sherlock Holmes’s strategy,” and not “seeks to increase the credibility of the experimental results.” Such a desire would be absurd since it meant the scientists distrust. If Sherlock Holmes did not trust his method, he would not be Sherlock Holmes. In the same way, science exists and proves its strength through its procedure, its method, and it does not need to look for any additional evidence that its results are credible [3].

The W. Parker notes in conclusion, that his method sounds paradoxical, but scientific knowledge is valuable not because of truth establishment but because of it solves riddles. Truth itself does not lead to anything. The puzzle leads to overcome problems and motivates development. Science is immersed in the solving riddles procedure and it is not important whether the solved riddles are “objective truths”, but it is important that the next solved riddle is an accomplished development and a new level of society development. If there were no science, not as an objective truth supplier, the society would not have developed, by the Sherlock Holmes theory. The more indifferent a person is to riddles the more confident he is that he knows everything objectively remaining ignorant, inert, undeveloped. One of the science procedure missions is to ensure the social development.

William Parker takes a completely postmodern position with respect to science arguing that what is needed is not the truth but the correct “solving riddles” procedure (solving problems). The picture of "undirected" science - not having a goal in the form of truth. The science moves from problem to problem and within the limits of each problem, from knowledge of the problem to knowledge of the solved problem. Thus, knowledge grows. However, this growth does not puts us closer to the truth and does not distance it since it is impossible to prove that the next solved problem is the absolute truth that achieved. The latter turns out to be an empty concept or conditional term. Science is the embodiment of human rationality, and one can say that a person “programs” science as he programs a computer. Therefore, a person who asks science what is truth will not receive an answer as he asks himself. Representatives of ancient skepticism understood this, putting forward the idea of a “sage”, who knows that it is meaningless to ask what the truth is - the answer does not exist in principle, since it is not present in the “sage” (clan person) himself.

Another thing is that a person cannot but ask such a question - simply because he possesses thinking. But the “sage” understands the futility of such a question, but the “fool” does not; and both behave differently in real life. The “sage” lives without being seduced by the truth, the “fool” is seduced and therefore is ready to accept as truth what he thinks is the truth, either “authoritatively” prompted or imposed. “The Fool” is a shameful, conditional characteristic of a “mass (average) person,” that is, a characteristic of the overwhelming majority of society members. “Sage” is also a conditional characteristic of a clear minority of its members. According to such a “sociology”, implicitly contained in ancient skepticism and especially readable by the followers of Perron. The society not only does not pursue truth in reality but in general (excluding “wise men”) it is seduced by a fetish of truth, its various substitutions, which only increases disorientation and confusion of the individual in society, which is "non-directional." This is a reflection of the postmodern society; society, natural to man, because it (like science) is programmed by a man who does not know what truth is. The society as a whole as well as science (and any human activity), lives according to the laws of "computer simulation" - when the existential goal that gives meaning to everything is the procedure itself, the process of producing all sorts of "products". This is the existential truth, and “products” is its simple function. The skeptical-oriented Hellenism philosophers saw this existential truth - let us recall the same Stoics, where the thinking procedure braced out their product (agreement of thinking with itself is the truth), achieved automatically; not to mention the followers of Perron, who directly denied the very possibility of attaining truth itself.

It is possible to assert that man has always built a postmodern society - a society without truths itself but based on the truth. However, a person stubbornly seeks truths due to his nature, but it never found since he searches for it developing the “computer simulation” procedures and not realizing that it is in the truth lies. Therefore, the computer technologies of communication and management invention unfolded the processes of information and economic globalization It was a kind of historical necessity, as a result of which postmodern society became an entity.

Why do people even come to the concept of truth? In many respects because of our everyday experience. It seems that there are certain “absolutes” that is insurmountable factor (a kind of absolute truths). One of this "absolute" everyday consciousness is the time factor. Since the everyday consciousness has become historical, the passage of time has seemed as immutable and irreversible and directed towards the future [5]. This “absolute truth” opened to the historical consciousness led to the discovery of another “absolute truth” - death. Antique non-historical consciousness did not draw a distinction between mortal people and immortal gods, thus, considering not death, but immortality

as truth but timelessness. This is one of the reasons for the emergence of ancient skepticism: it appeared at the turn of eras, the turn of paradigms. Antique skeptics, who were still in the coordinates of non-historical consciousness, but wondering what is truth did not make much of a skeptical look at it. In these old coordinates it was not a significant mental support. Much more difficult, skepticism regarding truth was given to a developed historical consciousness (in the philosophy of science), accustomed to rely on the concept of truth.

Thus, the main historical merit of all of Hellenistic skeptical-oriented philosophy (Perronism, Stoicism, Epicureanism and Kinism) is in the discovery of a method of thinking that was realized for them in the distant future in the scientific method and the corresponding model of society, "society founded on science." The idea of a "society based on science" has been modified in modern times into postmodern society, which is called a global information society, a "non-directed" society, a post-non-classical society. The essence of the method of thinking (scientific thinking) discovered by antique skepticism is that thinking is tuned to achieve empirically adequate knowledge and is not intended to answer the question of what things are "in reality". It is able to answer such a question (about truth) only when it "investigates" real events that happened at a certain time and place, for example, by restoring a picture of a crime or some real historical event. Such positivities meant the same positivism, denying the very possibility of theoretical truths and, therefore, prohibiting theoretical thinking from breaking away from empirical data. Thus, positivism, even if straightforward and sometimes even reaching primitivism, was defended in science, a skeptical with respect to truth, method of achieving empirically adequate theories.

As already mentioned, this method of thinking was fairly accurately described by the Stoics, the Epicureans anticipated the positivists and the Perron school indirectly pointed to the empirical thought boundaries offering to judgments formulate the truth in the form of "it seems to me that ...", "in my opinion ...".

The proposed categorical form of the judgment "this is so" by the "explanatory" introducing additional reflection proposed by the followers of Perron, the form "I think (I am convinced) that this is so" has a very deep sense of penetrating the secret of human rationality. This is not skepticism for the sake of skepticism, but skepticism as a result of understanding, albeit an intuitive, inherent human method of thinking. Suffice it to say that the psychologists of the 20th century were seriously engaged in the analysis of the "cautious" form of judgments defended by the perroneists. The form "I think that ..." introduces into the judgment not so much subjectivity. "I" as indication of the judgment basis "this is so". The form "I think that ..." is always contained in discourse showing a person's desire to explain himself to find an excuse for his judgments, but at the same time he understands that there is no such excuse outside of thinking, since the reference goes to "I think…". A person speaking out on different occasions unconsciously follows the inherent way of thinking, achieving not the truth, but "agreement with oneself." This method is described by ancient skepticism in terms of the idea of a "sage" who finds peace of mind, equanimity (Stoics, Epicureans), and even insensitivity (Perron and his followers), due to the abandonment of a truth pursuit. The method of thinking that does not attain truth but "agreement with oneself" performs the most important social task - it gives a person psychological comfort, which is much more important than knowledge of the truth; and in this discovery is a significant achievement of ancient skepticism. Therefore, it is not surprising that science does not aspire to true, but to "empirically adequate" theories. This is how human rationality protects the psychological comfort of the individual in science. A person may "forget", for example, in disputes expressing himself categorically, but still in the depths of his clan consciousness. He fulfills a program to protect his own psychological comfort and, "cooled down" he loses interest in "upholding the truth" in everyday conversations. This ordinary situation of "rational behavior" of the individual has been made the subject of its analysis by modern psychological science, focusing on the so-called "ordinary psychological explanations", which comply with the requirement of the Perron philosophers to refrain from asserting the truth - the categorical form "this is so".

This ancient skepticism gave a general idea of the thinking method found in modern studies the problem of justification, in which researchers come to the idea of ancient skeptical philosophers that the most reliable substantiating resource is the system itself, the method of our thinking.

Modern scholars actualize ancient skepticism showing that the underlying strategy of thinking is not confrontational, rejecting alternatives, the concept of "truth", but reconciling the concept of "legitimacy". They show that legitimacy is synonymous with justice, and justice, unlike "truth," is really capable of bringing people together. People will say: this is fair and, therefore, right - it should be so, thereby fixing the justification that took place.

The implicit idea of ancient skepticism, according to which man does not need a fetish of truth, but mutual understanding is needed, the deficit of which is only aggravated by false consciousness, as if individual (or group) holders of truth are possible, is developed, for example, in a joint article by Brazilian scientist M. Monteiro and American researcher E .Kitting, who demonstrate that this idea of ancient skepticism is embodied in modern science, which in turn simulates human communication. So, M. Monteiro and E.Kiting consider that the interdisciplinary and global nature of the factor that forms a qualitatively new face of modern science becomes a factor that highlights the problem of mutual understanding and team unity of researchers representing not only different areas of knowledge, but also different cultures. They emphasize that such a science clearly demonstrates its constructivist nature. The results in it are directly determined by the procedure, the procedure for establishing working communication, working understanding between members of the research team [6].

The practice of science, these researchers note, is dramatically changing due to the increasing interdisciplinarity of the topics being developed, so that researchers from different disciplines do not have a common research background, and their work in the interdisciplinary field is accompanied by a certain lack of understanding. In an attempt to create a common research background - to integrate different areas of knowledge - the formation of so-called "cyber infrastructure" takes place in science, when information sciences and computer technologies become part of physics, chemistry, and medicine. It becomes relevant to study such a new phenomenon in modern science as

an interdisciplinary research team - a new type of scientific community in which the problem of mutual understanding comes forward. This actual problem of communication in science can be studied, for example, sociologically - by making it an object to study, meetings of an interdisciplinary research team, in which team members present each other a part of a common research project and discuss the problems of its implementation. Such meetings contribute to a better definition of team goals and a better understanding of project participants, and the study of such meetings would help to understand what modern science is like interdisciplinary cooperation.

Communication is a language and if communication in modern science due to the transformation of the scientific community into an interdisciplinary scientific community becomes an urgent problem then the increasing importance becomes the role of language in science. Science with its interdisciplinary collaboration trend models the global information society and this similarity is only enhanced by the emergence and cyber infrastructure growth in science. The center of the global information society is also communication in the form of computer communication - computer language. Computer communication has already influenced national languages and are involved in the global information society acquire speed, conciseness and new tonality forming the phenomenon of the global computer community, where a certain new understanding is developing [5]. Similarly, in modern science there is an interdisciplinary community that develops its own language - a new language of scientific communication - in overcoming the deficiencies in mutual understanding of participants in interdisciplinary cooperation. These deficiencies are: a different understanding of the legitimacy of knowledge - when participants demonstrate a different approach to substantiating the connection between theoretical results and empirical data of a study; the lack of a common understanding, which is due to the use by different research strategies participants. The collision can lead to the common understanding emergence. The problem of mutual understanding of participants at the mutual expertise level of the research work considered to be done when mutual understanding depends on “how to see” and “what to hear”, and when therefore participants try to use clear visual representations and computer modeling of research results.

In regards of the modern processes of informational globalization the fundamentally positive communication should lead to an increase in mutual understanding - an intersubjective semantic field on a global scale, creating an unprecedented impulse for development. The Institute of Science is not just a part but a model of society subject to all structural reorganizations of society including the structural adjustment associated with the information globalization processes. The interdisciplinary communication in the modern science is an adequate response to information globalization, the answer in the form of professional communication, based on computer simulation of research procedures. Moreover, communication in the social system science has always played the same fundamentally important role as in the system "society" - just before computer technology, the interdisciplinary research field was created by mathematics, which served communication in science in general and interdisciplinary communication in particular. Science - at least since the period when it became an institution - has always been promoted by communication and global communication. Real science has always been the world science. Scientific results are recognized by the world scientific community and are examined by the world communication scientists. Such a common examination in science is facilitated by the fact that as a rule expert represent the area of knowledge in which the results to be examined are obtained and all the experts sharing a single background of knowledge do not find it difficult to understand the evaluated research project. It is a different matter when expert communication takes place in an interdisciplinary field, then each communication participant has only partial knowledge in the course of the research, knowledge of his own part of the work. In this situation, direct and systematic communication is required in order to directly exchange information for the intersubjective semantic field, which is built in working order, which is not present. Intersubjective semantic field is built anew each time for a specific project. It is an emergent and therefore creative. Its development is a simultaneous growth of mutual understanding and new knowledge [4].

Thus, interdisciplinary communication in science is a qualitatively new science in which communication moves to a fundamentally new level of team brainstorming for a specific research task. In the “old science”, where interdisciplinary cooperation was not only not developed but in general was not welcomed. The communication was divided being within the boundaries of different areas of knowledge and had a monodisciplinary character. The development was rather sluggish, precisely because of limited communication. In the modern society the informational globalization has freed communication making it “fast” and creative. At the same time, the risks have increased, but there are no risks where there is no movement.

Informatization of communications develops not only between individuals, but also between structures and communities [9]. Modern conditions make it impossible for the authorities and the public to interact, business structures without the use of information technology. In particular, one of the implementation areas of the federal projects “Digital Economy of the Russian Federation” is the improvement of the public sector, mainly in the field of public administration through a number of measures, such as:

- ensuring digital transformation of the state (municipal) service through the introduction of digital technologies and platform solutions;
- ensuring the improvement of mechanisms for the functioning of interdepartmental electronic document circulation in the interests of the efficiency interaction between state institutions and the business and civil society”.

The “new society" is being formed [10]. In the “old science” as in the “old society” communication was restrained and restrained communication means repetition of what has been passed, restraining in it the potential of creativity, unexpectedness, novelty means communication aimed at preserving the status quo, which in itself makes its unnecessary.

Meanwhile, we need a kind of dictionary that would give the same thing a single meaning for all of us. Such a dictionary can be born only in free communication. People are able to understand each other partially. They discover one another’s knowledge and come to a new knowledge together.

Interdisciplinary communication in science as well as communication in the conditions of informational globalization show an independent value for the individual and society of the procedure, process, development. This intrinsic dynamic is designed to ensure its main result - the growth of people's mutual understanding. The main thing is for this growth to occur, which is the true meaning of social progress.

Ancient skeptical philosophers were doubtful of the truth result, which takes the form of completion becoming traversed and achieved. Achieved and passed immediately lose its value demanding the resumption of movement. And that is why, Perron and his followers insisted on preserving perpetual motion by refuting the “stop” in the form of any truth statement. In this respect, Epicurus’s argument about death is indicative is a typical argument of a skeptical-oriented philosopher. Death is the truth of the life cessation movement. It has no meaning for a person, it is a meaningless truth, like any truth result that stops movement. All Hellenistic schools developed a deep idea of skepticism about the fundamental disposition of human rationality in motion, process, procedure - as such, dynamics, and not on the statics of truth-results.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

It is quite possible to see the detailed development of this ancient idea in modern (devoted to the philosophy of science) studies and can be called the method of thinking. The conclusion is that for our rationality to achieve mutual understanding, human unity and this is what is treated as truth and justice. The objectivist truth leaves a person indifferent, since it is alienated from him and is interesting to him only in the process of his creation. This process is socialy carried out as human communication. The mutual understanding benefit is inherent a person. The Perron’s followers said that there could not be individual holders of truth. The idea was personified by the “sage” figure in all skeptically oriented Hellenistic philosophy schools. “Sage” in ancient skepticism is an absolute criterion in the form of generic human thinking, a collective (no single) human mind. Ancient skeptics understood that truth was not objective. Otherwise, it would have been given to the "separate mind" who had acquired the right to teach someone and had a power over them. They understood or guessed that truth being an intersubjective can be born only in free and equal human communication being a definite “construct” of human mutual understanding. In this case, a deeply democratic more precisely humanistic sense of ancient skepticism becomes well-known and long before the modern era was able to demonstrate the following: a sage is a person who understands that all people are equal before their individual (and group) ignorance of what is truth. However, the thing is though there are few wise men and for the most part people are ready to be enslaved by those who declare themselves to be the truth holders and use its banner as an instrument of power over others. A due process approach the sages are forced to go into internal emigration and to be content with agreeing with themselves as the Stoics, and the Epicureans, and especially the Perron’s followers taught.

References

[1] Gusev D.A. Philosophical and historical background of ancient skepticism // Bulletin of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Philosophy. 2008. № 2. S. 54-62.
[2] Lucky R.A. Parallelism of Consciousness in the Phenomenology of E. Husserl // Teacher XXI Century. 2010. No. 1. P. 305-310.
[3] Prokhorov M.M. Truth and Reality // Philosophical Thought. 2013. No. 6. P. 293-387.
[4] Lucky R.A. Reduction and epoch in the phenomenology of E. Husserl // Teacher XXI century. 2014. V. 2. No. 1. P. 249-257.5. Atkinson M. Cognitive science and philosophy of mind // Understanding cognitive science. N.Y. etc., 1988. P. 46-68.
[5] Ronzoni M., Valentini L. On the meta-ethical status of constructivism: reflections on G.A.Cohen «Facts and principles» // Politics, Philosophy & Economics. L. 2008. Vol. 7. № 4. P. 403-423.
[6] Tsurkan M.V. Project Management in the format of intersectoral partnership: studies. allowance. - Tver: Tver. state Univ., 2017. - 208 p.
[7] Kolesnikova E.Yu. Virtual society as a new space for constructing gender identity. South Russian Forum: economics, sociology, political science, social and economic geography. 2013. № 1 (6). pp. 076-081.