

NORMATIVE CONDITIONING OF THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE SOCIETY SUBJECT: SOCIOCULTURAL APPROACH

© **Yulia A. Burlova, Olga A. Baklanova**

*Krasnodar University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation
(Stavropol Branch); North Caucasus Federal University,
Stavropol, Russian Federation
science-almanac@mail.ru*

The study of normalization of the consciousness of a social subject, the process of forming a normative consciousness from the point of view of a sociocultural approach, is being carried out. External determinants, combinations of three regulatory systems are religion, morality and law. They create conditions for the unification of regulatory components in a conditional complex, conditionally called "normative consciousness," based on personal attitudes of morality. Social norms do not seek mobility or variability, they are characterized by traditionalism and continuity. The socio-cultural connection between the processes of rationing and humanizing the life of a subject of modern society is manifested in the fact that these processes must go in parallel with each other, and the strengthening of the regulatory component should not be ahead of humanization. The sociocultural approach helps to understand not only how the development of normative consciousness is determined, but also how its regression occurs, that is, the formation of "deviant" consciousness.

Key words: society, norm, normative consciousness, subject of society, sociocultural approach, normative conditionality, interiorization.

[Ю.А. Бурлова, О.А. Бакланова Нормативная обусловленность сознания субъекта общества: социокультурный подход]

Проводится исследование нормирования сознания социального субъекта, процесса формирования нормативного сознания с точки зрения социокультурного подхода. Внешние детерминанты – сочетания трех нормативных систем: религии, морали и права, создают условия для унификации нормативных компонентов в кондициональном комплексе, условно называемом «нормативное сознание», основанном на личностных установках нравственности. Социальные нормы не стремятся к подвижности или изменчивости, для них характерны традиционность и преемственность. Социокультурная связь между процессами нормирования и гуманизации жизни субъекта современного общества проявляется в том, что данные процессы должны идти параллельно друг с другом, причем усиление нормативной составляющей не должно опережать гуманизацию. Социокультурный подход помогает понять не только, как детерминируется развитие нормативного сознания, но и как происходит его регресс, то есть образование «девиантного» сознания.

Ключевые слова: общество, норма, нормативное сознание, субъект общества, социокультурный подход, нормативная обусловленность, интериоризация.

Yulia A. Burlova – Ph.D. in Law, Professor, Krasnodar University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation (Stavropol Branch), Stavropol, Russian Federation.

Olga A. Baklanova – Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, North Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russian Federation.

Бурлова Юлия Александровна – кандидат юридических наук, профессор, Краснодарский университет Министерства внутренних дел Российской Федерации (Ставропольский филиал), г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация.

Бакланова Ольга Александровна – кандидат философских наук, доцент, Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация.

Introduction

The everyday existence and activity of a modern person is due to a whole range of factors, the totality of which is transmitted in the concept of "systemic conditionality" or "systemic determination." This includes not only causal determinism, but also functional factors of conditional (complex, combined) and other forms of conditionality and determination.

However, a social subject (individual or collective) is not a programmed machine; taking into account all the wealth of determining factors, it is not devoid of free will. Sociocultural and especially value determination show that the individual is not fully determined by external factors, but that it is conducting some kind of anthropological dialogue with them. This can be described as a peculiar "circular determinism," meaning that the sociocultural determination of the subject's actions forms a normative consciousness and at the same time modifies it, depends on it and affects it [3, pp. 29-36].

Results and discussion

The normative determination of a social subject's life is carried out, for the most part, through the language practices. Language plays a significant role in the vast majority of spheres of public life, in the formation and development of normative consciousness.

Deontic modality is formed and realized in a language that becomes the ontological "home" of social norms. In general, if we look at social norms from the standpoint of social ontology, then the norm is a kind of sociocultural code. In essence, this is information about behaviour, the carrier of which is, of course, a language. It is a transmitter from the field of public consciousness, public memory, to the area of a social subject's consciousness. Language helps to transport norms from the social field to the anthropological one. This process is ambivalent and allows individual norms to be transmitted into the social domain as feedback or social inquiry [5, p. 67].

In general, this rationing process cannot be called spontaneous. By themselves, social norms do not seek mobility or variability, they are characterized by traditionalism and continuity. So, if we look at the norm from the point of socio-synergistic view, then the norm will appear as an element of social order, stagnation or stability in contrast to deviation, which is characterized as manifestations of chaos and risks of socio-cultural dynamics.

The very process of normative consciousness formation is not spontaneous and uncontrolled. On the contrary, it is organized by regulatory institutions and those who support social order, that is, government institutions. It is clear that society is stratified, and a state with personified power in its person is conditionally at the intersection of the interests of social groups (what is beneficial to the military may not be beneficial to the intellectual class or the working class). In this regard, of course, some interests are pursued more than others, and there can be a destabilizing situation. Historical practice, including Russian, shows that external influences in such conditions are quite capable of changing traditional, even canonical archetypic norms to the opposite, to set new canons. But there are always forces of social inertia that are able to return societies to their previous states even with the most radical, revolutionary changes (it can even be emphasized that especially with them) [1, pp. 206-209].

These inertial forces are embedded in the values of society, in its spiritual (cultural) sphere, the dynamics of which, unlike the economic or political sphere, are extremely low. The study of the spiritual sphere, its dynamics and the ability to "guarantee" society a return to the previous conditionally stable states during the systemic crisis of all other spheres is carried out by a sociocultural approach, which, combined with a structural and functional approach, shows how the social norm can turn into deviation and be dismantled.

In the sociocultural perspective, normative consciousness is considered not as a constant, inflexible phenomenon, but, on the contrary, as a phenomenon undergoing

constant transformation, constantly changing according to the logic of a changing social space. Moreover, these phenomena change not synchronously, but diachronously, even polychronously. Each trajectory of social spheres has its own speed of development and change, forming together a whole connected system, in which the public is combined not only with the public (at different levels), but also with the anthropological. The sociocultural approach helps to find bonds between anthropological and social in human life, to understand the processes of mutual agreement of these two most important, and in many respects opposite directed vectors [10, p. 7].

The sociocultural approach helps to understand not only how the development of normative consciousness is determined, but also how its regression occurs, that is, the formation of "deviant" consciousness. Deviant consciousness is the antipode of normative consciousness. This is an abnormal, non-normative perception of socio-cultural reality by the subject. Moreover, the phrase "abnormal" in this case has no negative connotation. It only states the inconsistency of norms, the loss of connection with formal norms, movement along a different trajectory. This means that the subject stopped using formal norms and began to reproduce some other, informal ones. They also exist in the sociocultural space, but something caused the subjects to move from one trajectory to another [6].

For example, Protestantism at one time was considered the same as terrorism is now considered, it was persecuted for it. However, there was a massive transition from one religious norm to another, and today Protestantism has firmly taken its place as one of the branches of Christianity. There is one more example, once women wore trousers, and it was considered abnormal and unacceptable. Today it is a familiar form of clothing, a practical version of the norm in many countries of the world. These examples show that deviations themselves are not constant, and over time they can acquire the character of social norms, replace old norms with new ones [9, pp. 262-265].

It should also be noted that deviations, especially in the creative aspect, are a necessary condition for development, since they help to avoid the stagnation of old norms. Otherwise, the entire social system as a whole would be destroyed. Even tradition, no matter how conservative it seems, always has a reserve inside itself for updating outdated meanings, dismantling old ones. First of all, these changes follow an anthropological line, relate to new ideas about what exactly is considered humanism. That is, to paraphrase Hegel, meanings follow the expansion of what is understood as freedom.

This is the sociocultural connection between the processes of rationing and humanizing the life of a person of modern society, "its ethical and humane component" [12, pp. 3426-3429]. It seems that these processes should go in parallel with each other, and the strengthening of the regulatory component should not be ahead of humanization. These two processes are linked as means and goals. The means of achieving social order should not diminish the goals of the highest value of human freedom. Humanism suggests that man is an end in himself. In this regard, rationing is necessary to minimize destructive processes for the subject or society. But at the same time, rationing must be excluded from creative activity, it should not be in science, in philosophy, rationing should not take the form of fighting dissent. Otherwise, a person is deprived of his freedom (the main bond of anthropological and social), because it is impossible to normalize emotions, external feelings, creativity.

On the other hand, the goals do not justify the means. The freedom of one should not violate the freedom of the other. Therefore, rationing and humanization should dialectically limit each other and coexist as a unity and struggle of opposites.

Moreover, all three elements of social rationing: religious norms, moral norms, legal norms are mobile, changeable, relative. All of them exist diachronously. Only the consciousness of the social subject and personality can stabilize them [2]. That is, in some

attitudes of individual morality, connecting these elements of a complex mosaic into a single picture of normative consciousness, where there is a mutual addition of all three regulatory systems.

In modern society, the above is even more difficult due to global external challenges. Globalization destroys the integrity of ethnocultural borders, produces cultural diffusion, randomly creating "transit" states in rationing processes. This cannot but affect the minds of social subjects. On the one hand, subjects in these processes are often doomed to a sense of marginalization, rejection, loss of transparency and predictability of what is happening. The external symptom of this is often transit nationalism as an attempt to urgently restore national integrity, as a fear of losing macro-identity. On the other hand, national self-awareness compensates for its damage by expanding and tightening religious normalization, which is often given the status of hyper-value (focusing on religious foundation as the universal foundation of all life).

The internal manifestation of this state can be called a situation of existential choice, which a person gets into, forced in one way or another to choose a system of values that becomes basic for him [7, pp. 210-213]. In particular, this applies to those systems that contradict each other. Conflict can await a social subject even when the legal system is rebuilt in its mind, legal consciousness is formed, but the religious or moral system remains unchanged. They inevitably find themselves in conflict, and the legal consciousness is most often deformed, because it cannot withstand rivalry with sacred religious norms (dogmas).

Globalization or the import of regulatory systems is very complex because regulations cannot change one at a time, consistently, all regulatory systems are then subject to rational revision, which makes the process of changing regulations extremely difficult and dangerous. The crisis of any part of normative consciousness often leads to the fact that the consciousness of the subject falls into the opposite extreme, that is, reaction, recovery, conservative isolation [11, pp. 559-564].

It is this tendency that is developing in Russian society, in which, after two decades of active reformation and import of Western regulatory (legal) culture, the ideas of Russian conservatism turned out to be extremely strong today (the works of the classics of Russian conservatism of the 19th century became very popular in the public consciousness).

Such an interest is quite consistent with the essence of conservatism itself, which, according to K. Mannheim, can be interpreted as "reflected traditionalism" [4, p. 597], which replaces the systemic crisis of regulatory systems.

However, if the Western European version of conservatism has undergone significant changes since its inception from the first half of the 18th century (found resources to overcome newly emerging contradictions), then in the Russian version we are faced with a constant declaration (as among both conservatives of the turn of the 19th-20th centuries, and modern) of a number of fundamental provisions that, in their opinion, determine the traditional socio-cultural identity of Russian society. We are speaking about stable stereotypical statements calling on Russia to look for its own path under the decisive influence of a religious norm (religious sacralization of power), "community" and collectivism, allegedly capable of ensuring traditional order and stability [8, pp. 173-181].

In our opinion, such a stable repeatability of ideas is associated not so much with real awareness and understanding that there is Russia, especially at the moment of its development, but with a persistent desire to overcome the constant gaps in the cultural tradition that have continued over the course of more than 350 years of the history of Russian society [13, pp. 82-89]. Russian conservatism is often not so much nostalgia for the past, for certain values that actually exist and are rooted in the consciousness of the people, but for ideals and archetypes and mythologists functioning at the unconscious level, which leads to their constant "failure" both in socio-political practice and in attempts

in socio-philosophical reflection.

Unfortunately, this nostalgia is unable to keep the erosion of the Russian public consciousness, including the normative one, its disintegration into a circle of narrow-private interests, overcoming the lack of feeling and understanding what I am, as a person, including as part of society, as a certain unit of collective identity. Reasoning about the need for strong supreme power and its moral authority among citizens, the justification of imperial ideas, at the moment are not able to overcome, the developed in the Russian consciousness stereotype of the state and government officials as some kind of "inevitable evil." As a result, on the one hand, a person is not ready to take an active life position (hence there is a steady expectation of actions and a miracle from power), and on the other hand, there is sometimes total distrust and unwillingness to deal with this very power.

Conclusion

As a conclusion, it can be noted that the normative conditioning of the consciousness of a social subject does not yet mean the normative behaviour of this subject. Awareness of norms does not yet lead to their execution in the process of action, perception differs from action, in different situations they can exist in different ways. This emphasizes the practical significance of this work and can largely explain why the norm does not become a guide to action, and how exactly it is necessary to form a normative consciousness so that this happens in reality.

Литература

1. *Ерышов Д.В.* Детерминация нормативного сознания // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2014. № 2. С. 206-209.
2. *Ерышов Д.В.* Социокультурные детерминанты нормативного сознания и деятельности социального субъекта // Автореферат дис. ... кандидата философских наук / Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет. Ставрополь, 2015. 22 с.
3. *Калмыков Р.Б.* Целесообразность в свете теории кольцевого детерминизма // Новые идеи в философии. 2014. Т. 2. № 1 (22). С. 29-36.
4. *Манхейм К.* Диагноз нашего времени / Пер. с нем. и англ.; Отв. ред. и сост. Я.М. Бергер. М.: Юрист, 1994. 700 с.
5. *Маринычев Д.А.* Мировоззренческая идея и нормативное сознание индивида // Инновационная наука. 2019. № 10. С. 65-69.
6. *Пеклова А.Г.* Социокультурные метаморфозы правового сознания // автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата философских наук / Ростовский государственный университет. Ростов-на-Дону, 2004. 25 с.
7. *Стабровский Е.И.* Нормативные и личностные правовые ценности в правовом сознании человека // Вестник Академии МВД Республики Беларусь. 2020. № 1 (39). С. 210-213.
8. *Стародубцева К.А.* Роль православия в становлении и формировании российского права // Забайкальские рождественские образовательные чтения «Князь Владимир. Цивилизационный выбор Руси» (региональный этап Международных Рождественских образовательных чтений). Чита, 2014. С. 173-181.
9. *Таранова А.Е.* Механизмы легитимации девиантного поведения в молодежном сознании // Вестник Белгородского университета потребительской кооперации. 2006. № 2 (16). С. 262-265.

10. *Тедеева Т.О.* Абсолютное и относительное в нормативном сознании (социально-философский анализ) // автореферат дис.... кандидата философских наук / Московский государственный областной университет. Москва, 2016. 22 с.
11. *Халаева А.А.* Социальные элементы, влияющие на формирование нормативного сознания // Миссия конфессий. 2019. Т. 8. № 5 (40). С. 559-564.
12. *Gazgireeva L.K., Goverdovskaya E.V., Vetrov Y.P., Goncharov V.N., Erokhin A.M., Kolosova O.Y.* Pedagogical conditions for the professional competence formation of medical universities students in the course of studying bioethics conceptual fundamentals // Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2018. Т. 10. №12. С. 3426-3429.
13. *Sklyarova E., Kamalova O.* Crimean war: medical and social characteristics and consequences // Научный альманах стран Причерноморья. 2020. №4 (24). С. 82-89.

References

1. *Yeryshov D.V.* Determinatsiia normativnogo soznaniia. Gumanitarnye i sotsialnye nauki [Determination of normative consciousness. Humanitarian and social sciences]. 2014. No. 2. pp. 206-209 (in Russian).
2. *Yeryshov D.V.* Sotsiokulturnye determinanty normativnogo soznaniia i deiatelnosti sotsialnogo subekta [Sociocultural determinants of normative consciousness and activity of a social subject]. Extended abstract of dissertation of Ph.D. in Philosophy. North Caucasus Federal University. Stavropol. 2015. 22 p. (in Russian).
3. *Kalmykov R.B.* Tselesoobraznost v svete teorii koltseвого determinizma. Novye idei v filosofii. [Expediency in the light of the theory of circular determinism. New ideas in philosophy]. 2014. V. 2. No. 1 (22). pp. 29-36 (in Russian).
4. *Manheim K.* Diagnost nashego vremeni. [Diagnosis of our time]. Translated from German and English; Executive editor Ya.M. Berger. Moscow. Yurist. 1994. 700 p. (in Russian).
5. *Marinychev D.A.* Mirovozzrencheskaia ideia i normativnoe soznanie individa. Innovatsionnaia nauka [Worldview idea and normative consciousness of the individual. Innovative science]. 2019. No.10. pp. 65-69 (in Russian).
6. *Peklova A.G.* Sotsiokulturnye metamorfozy pravovogo soznaniia [Sociocultural metamorphoses of legal consciousness]. Extended abstract of dissertation of Ph.D. in Philosophy. Rostov State University. Rostov-on-Don. 2004. 25 p. (in Russian).
7. *Stabrovsky E.I.* Normativnye i lichnostnye pravovye tsennosti v pravovom soznanii cheloveka [Regulatory and personal legal values in the legal consciousness of a person]. Bulletin of the Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Belarus. 2020. No. 1 (39). pp. 210-213 (in Russian).
8. *Starodubtseva K.A.* Rol pravoslaviia v stanovlenii i formirovanii rossiiskogo prava [The role of Orthodoxy in the formation of Russian law]. Trans-Baikal Christmas Educational Readings "Prince Vladimir. Civilizational choice of Russia" (regional stage of International Christmas educational readings). Chita. 2014. pp. 173-181 (in Russian).
9. *Taranova A.E.* Mekhanizmy legitimatsii deviantnogo povedeniia v molodezhnom soznanii [Mechanisms of legitimization of deviant behaviour in the youth consciousness]. Bulletin of the Belgorod University of Consumer Cooperation. 2006. No. 2 (16). pp. 262-265 (in Russian).

10. *Tedeeva T.O.* Absolutnoe i otnositelnoe v normativnom soznanii (sotsialno-filosofskii analiz) [Absolute and relative in normative consciousness (socio-philosophical analysis)]. Extended abstract of dissertation of Ph.D. in Philosophy. Moscow State Regional University. Moscow. 2016. 22 p. (in Russian).
11. *Hapaeva A.A.* Sotsialnye elementy, vliiaiushchie na formirovanie normativnogo soznaniia. Missiia konfessii. [Social elements affecting the formation of normative consciousness. Mission of confessions]. 2019. V. 8. No. 5 (40). pp. 559-564 (in Russian).
12. *Gazgireeva L.K., Goverdovskaya E.V., Vetrov Y.P., Goncharov V.N., Erokhin A.M., Kolosova O.Y.* Pedagogical conditions for the professional competence formation of medical universities students in the course of studying bioethics conceptual fundamentals. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2018. V. 10. No. 12. pp. 3426-3429.
13. *Sklyarova E., Kamalova O.* Criminal war: medical and social characteristics and consequences. Science Almanac of Black Sea Region Countries. 2020. No. 4 (24). pp. 82-89.

16 October, 2022