Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2021, Volume 12, Issue 1Sup1, pages: 215-227 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.1Sup1/280>

Historical Evolution of Knowledge: Interpretation of Truth in Postmodernism

Tetiana KOBERSKA¹,
Tetiana PANFILOVA²,
Olha KRYHINA³,
Jia REN⁴,
Vasyl ZINKEVYCH⁵

¹ National University of Water Management and Nature Resources Use, Rivne, Ukraine, takobe58@yahoo.com

² Lviv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Lviv, Ukraine, kira2007mail@i.ua

³ Mariupol State University, Mariupol, Ukraine, volyav@i.ua

⁴ National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv Ukraine, renia1128@i.ua

⁵ Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine, zinchevych1971@i.ua

Abstract: Changes in society lead to changes in science, changing its fundamental foundations - ideological and value, methodological and instrumental foundations. In turn, a change in the scientific paradigm leads to social change. A situation of this kind is especially evident in the socio-political sciences, since it is they who are more affected by social reality. The nature of postmodern societies is such that its economic component generates a huge number of subcultures, in the scientific world it is called "subcultural explosion." Postmodern societies are societies of permanent changes: consumer standards, moral values, political structure, and so on, repeatedly change during the life of one generation, significantly affect the search for the truth of science and its understanding. In the list of various questions of truth, its character, origin, postmodern departs from objective truth, therefore it becomes contextual and consensus. Theories are replaced by approaches, views, points of view, thoughts. Scientific concepts with their strict certainty change concepts, in which under the same name everyone puts their own meaning and essence. According to this, in postmodernism, not only the scientific paradigm as a model of scientific activity is changing, but the purpose of science, its understanding as a special activity with the search for truth, is changing. This implies a review of the attitude to the "organizational forms" of science, that is, the way in which scientific knowledge is disseminated to the professional scientific community to search for truth, which in its classical understanding no longer exists.

Keywords: *knowledge, truth, postmodernism, historical, postmodern society.*

How to cite: Koberska, T., Panfilova, T., Kryhina, O., Ren, J., & Zinkevych, V. (2021). Historical Evolution of Knowledge: Interpretation of Truth in Postmodernism. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(1Sup1), 215-227. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.1Sup1/280>

1. Introduction

Of the classical theories of understanding truth - the correspondent, authoritarian, empirical, theory of truth as evidence, as well as semantic - in modern scientific discussions, only the latter is taken into account, which is largely due to the introduction of a ban on the definition of the concept of truth within the framework of this theory and the requirement to build a metatheory that would set the initial conditions. In addition to the classical ones, there are also a number of non-classical theories of understanding the truth: conventional, pragmatic and coherent. Despite their “non-classical” status in the methodology of science, they turn out to be more adequate for the modern scientific process.

The search for truth can be carried out both individually and collectively. For example, a scientific conference as a collective way to search for truth, is such a form of development of sciences, when in the process of communication there is an increase in scientific knowledge. The traditional, long delineated, form in postmodernism changes its appearance, is overgrown with new formats, redesigned. The attitude to this form of development of science is also changing, it is becoming ambiguous depending on belonging to a particular scientific subculture.

2. Main research and results

2.1. The essence of truth in postmodernism

There are three different approaches to a scientific conference, reflecting three general epistemological positions, namely:

- skepticism
- agnosticism
- gnosticism

The first concept is designated as conference skepticism, with the help of which a serious doubt is expressed in the use and effectiveness of scientific conferences for science and practice. The second is like conference nihilism, which completely negates the importance of scientific conferences. Third, as conference Gnosticism, which recognizes the importance of scientific conferences as a place for the consolidation of the scientific community, the formation of a professional environment, as a place for the emergence of new knowledge and the birth of truth (Bauman, 2008).

The postmodern situation in sociopolitical science in the organizational forms of the search for truth is ambiguous: next to successful projects there are failures that serve as the basis for a skeptical and nihilistic

attitude that is extrapolated to the truth as such. But since postmodernism is an era of constant changes, continuous revolutions, from here comes the interpretation of the latter as an era of permanent nihilism and skepticism in socio-political science. This is evidenced even by the fact that the problem of truth is not among the fashionable topics and is not the subject of wide scientific discussions (Bilalov, 2019).

Characterizing the specifics of postmodernism due to the lack of a universal language and the procedure of traditional legitimization of knowledge, the problem of the ideal of science and its modern transformations is formed. According to this, specific criteria of the true in postmodernism are determined: socio-operational, socio-political and aesthetic criteria.

The question of the criteria of truth and the concept of truth in the context of postmodernism cause an ambiguous reaction, since on the one hand, this situation is provoked by criticism of postmodernists of the modern history of knowledge of the truth, which they consider to be a big mistake. On the other hand, postmodernism itself is defined as a radically democratic paradigm: it is infinitely pluralistic. And this is due to the number of storeys of the approach or indifference in the assessment, since it is impossible to more correctly say about the need to recognize the mandatory and unconditional value of various concepts and projects. However, there is another side to the coin - a clash with a new danger: any quasi-scientific theories, false concepts without justification and sufficient reasoning can claim equality and significance. This process is especially fast in aesthetics and "science again" - cultural studies, psycholinguistics, communication theory and others: postmodern science is distinguished by the variety of rules of language games, their experimental nature, and anti-didacticism (Berger, 2019).

In closed systems, such as professional communities, the concept of "truth" is, if not conventional, then performative, which means that everything that comes from the concept of "true" is nothing more than performative within the framework of the theory of speech acts.

Deflationary theory finds its development and applied use in postmodern philosophical practice, which demonstrates the redundancy of the concepts of "true" and "true" in any cognitive process. In this case, the concepts of truth establish the rules for using the concept in the research process itself, it changes the essence of the concept of truth, it becomes superfluous: the truth of a sentence is its statement, and its fallacy is a simple negation, and no more. So, truth loses the main thing - its objective status.

Another problem the concept of truth is the leveling of the official status of knowledge in an informatized society. The specificity of the postmodern situation lies in the absence of both a universal metalanguage and a procedure for the traditional legitimization of knowledge. Scientific knowledge is considered as a language - the subject of linguistics, communication theory, cybernetics, machine translation. But it is worth noting that there is no difference between the literary and theoretical text, since the very principle of separation between the language of the "serious text" and the "language of frivolous" is erroneous (Welsh, 1992).

Since the educational environment is an important place in society, scientists often debate about the effectiveness or inefficiency of a particular method or forms of training. So, in discussions about changes in the field of education, the question of the effectiveness of such a form as abstract work has long been open. Representatives of the "old" school believe that this form encourages students to analyze literature and develop students' skills. Educators of the younger generation claim that work as a form of training has outlived itself due to the availability and openness of information flows. However, this problem is not exclusively technical, as it clearly demonstrates the fuzziness of the criteria of scientific nature in modern humanitarian knowledge. In the natural and exact sciences, the situation is much simpler, since there is often the possibility of experimental verification. Of course, inaccuracies and false facts have always occurred in science as a result of incompetence, envy, desire for fame or gain, careerism, and sometimes objective reasons: the right to make mistakes or mistakes, therefore the results of the social and human sciences are often obstructed or assessed as dubious achievements.

The formation of a new ideal of science as opposed to the old implies anti-fundamentalization, especially in axiological terms; pluralization instead of pure truth; externalization and consideration of sociocultural factors; as well as methodological autonomy. But the fuzziness of these postulates creates favorable soil for the spread of quasi-scientific phenomena. The problem of pro-science in the postmodern interpretation takes the form of an absurd question: astrology, ufology, alchemy, which traditionally belong to quasi-science, but differ little from narrative analysis, psychoanalysis, and cultural analysis.

Since the position of the postmodern methodology is post-metaphysical of thinking, which resolutely and clearly refuses the very possibility of constructing a single conceptual system of the world, so far stability, integrity and systematicity as necessary criteria of scientific knowledge are completely discarded. J.F. Lyotard (1998) believes that any

universally accepted opinion or concept should be considered a danger - taking them on faith, a person thereby agrees to the absorption of his consciousness by another system of ancestral views - the "bourgeois system of values". Thus, modern science is becoming a "search for instability."

For postmodernism as a global phenomenon in philosophy and culture, there is a deep protest against everything universal - meta-narratives are harmful, they in every way suppress a person and inhibit any process of development of mankind, science, culture as a whole. Hence, any theory that claims to be a meta-narrative status is assessed as intrusive, limited, one that requires forcible control and streamlining, and therefore is to be denied. The main thing that postmodernism is afraid of is the concept of the norm, and any meta-narrative here is an excuse for power, it establishes this norm.

2.2. The basic strategies of truth in postmodernism

In the discourse of postmodernism there are two main intentions, which means the truth, two different strategies for approaching it:

- the will to truth
- caring for the truth

M. Foucault defines the will to truth as a postulate of a certain type of truth sanctioned by a given culture. In addition, the will to truth is based on institutional support: it is strengthened and at the same time reproduced by a whole layer of practices, such as pedagogy, or such as a system of books, libraries, such as scientific communities in the old days or laboratories today. But, of course, this will is reproduced in a deeper way thanks to the way that knowledge is used in society, by which it is endowed with significance, distributed and placed (Reza, 2016).

Concern for truth categorizes the inner creative nature of discursiveness. Thus, the proclaimed truth ceases to be such at the moment of its adoption as the situation and discourse around change, and it ceases to be relevant. The rejection of the "presence of truth" does not deny the need to search for it, but this line-wise, unpredictable one rejects the phenomenon of an external cause and rethinks the status of chance. That is, if the will to truth cuts off, then concern for truth, on the contrary, takes care of discourse, "pushing" from it power.

The subject of epistemological interest in postmodernism is three contexts of the concept of "games of truth":

1. games of truth in relation to power;
2. games of truth according to the individual in relation to himself;
3. games of truth per se.

This conceptual structure according to Foucault in a concise form contains the basic provisions of the radical postmodern methodological turn and allows you to highlight the key characteristics and criteria of truth in the postmodern scientific paradigm:

- lack of ontological status;
- procedural character and game nature;
- implementation exclusively in the context of linguistic reality

Based on the nature of such a truth, the following criteria can be distinguished:

- socio-operational significance;
- socio-political factor;
- aesthetic factor

Philosopher Lyotard (1998) was the first to introduce the aesthetic criterion for evaluating postclassical knowledge: “Techniques are involved here. First, they serve as a prosthesis of the senses or human physiological systems that have the function of receiving data or reacting depending on the context”.

The reason for the appearance of “aesthetic” on the scene is postmodern sensitivity as a kind of spirit of the time, which permeates human life from everyday rituals in scientific practice. Its essence is to deduce intuitiveness, associativity, inconsistency before the harsh rationality of conclusions. And reality based on sensitivity is constituted “on the other side of the true and false, on the other side of the equivalent, on the other side of rational differences” and makes completely different demands on the “truth” (Deleuze, 1996).

In the process of globalization, postmodern culture has radically revised all the key values of modern culture, including rationality, truth, philosophy, which are of particular importance for modern science and culture. Classic instrumental rationality is considered as a way of fitting a person into the world, determined by the previous work in an ideal, mental plan. It is associated with benefits, reliability, safety and the like. Rationality is an effective means of achieving the goal, the optimal use of opportunities for the most effective solution of theoretical, practical problems of a person with a minimum energy consumption. On the way to the formation of a new, postmodern cognitive culture, the emphasis of cognition is mainly shifted to the axiological and praxeological elements of epistemology (Bilalov, 2019).

The problem of determining the truth actually and historically had a solution, allowing for rational, irrational, or irrational ways of understanding it. As noted, the shift from the target to the value part, rationality transfers

immersion in ontological problems. The epistemological content of rationality is fully penetrated by the awareness of the subjectivity of the norms and rules of cognitive activity, while the subjectivity of the new rationality should not be exaggerated.

For the first time Derrida (2000) approached this issue, who set as his most important task the development of rationality in relation to humanitarian knowledge. Opposing the subjectivist interpretation of the rationality of psychological hermeneutics, having authorized for transcendental value, defining the truth as “the judgment of a transcendental subject based on attribution to common and necessary values”.

Value rationality, which allows one to consider rationality in the filings of other rationalities, gives the right to a value-loaded look at human cultural undertakings: economics, politics, science, religion, philosophy, etc. Being the most integrative component of cognitive culture, variability of rationality allows a variety of types, forms, types of cognitive culture. In particular, in the postmodern type of cognitive culture in such a form as scientific cognitive culture, depending on its types: natural-mathematical, socio-humanitarian cognitive culture, realistic, coherent and symbolic models of understanding the truth are used, respectively. The methodological significance lies in the fact that the search for truth in the cultural space is directed and concretized depending on the sociocultural circumstances recorded in the types of cognitive culture (Kukartseva, 2017).

The changes that occurred with the truth in the twentieth century are a consequence of the transition from strict classical rationality to non-classical and post-non-classical, to a new value rationality. This allows rationality to obtain a new status, and truth to reveal new facets, to continue the life of being in culture and science.

Postmodern ideas about epistemology have sufficient capacity and are characterized by the inclusion of various meaningful values. The epistemological image is formed on the basis of social cognition, with which the sensible living ideals of man are interdependent. This section, both historically and logically, is of great importance for the formation or construction of philosophy. For example, Deleuze (1996), through the creation of his own concepts, introduces knowledge into the field of his own intuition, which in some way has an autonomous existence. A philosopher only then claims to be a scientist if he is able to create concepts. In his opinion: “Philosophy is the art of shaping, inventing, creating concepts”. According to J.F. Lyotard (1998), a concept is an event, not an essence or a thing. “He is a pure event, which is a certain integrity ...”.

According to Lyotard (1998) and his supporters, when metanarratives are unshakable rules and axioms of behavior, they experience delegitimization as a result of constant innovations. Creation of concepts is one of the ways of delegitimization. According to the philosopher, a concept is an event, not an essence and not a thing, therefore philosophy brings together a common plan of universal unity of concepts as fragmentary singularities into a modern environment in which people who are subject to philosophical thoughts and ideas are formed and formed. But is the object of knowledge of these people? J. Deleuze (1996) believes that for them reality appears as production, where all processes are identified with machines. Ale production is not just production in its traditional sense, but "willing production" in which mental and social processes take place. Such a concept, according to Deleuze (1998), allows us to give a symbiosis of Marxism and Freudianism, but in which there are no extremes of these two teachings. This type of production is the work of "willing machines", consisting of their working part - "machine of organs", "body without organs" and a certain level of establishment of authentic relations between them - the subject.

If we understand subjectivity as a person's ability to achieve goals in his own activity, then in modern society everywhere there is a breakdown of subjectivity, its disappearance in social theatricalization. However, in the social space of a consumer society, this process undergoes serious transformations and is significantly problematic. An analysis of the transformation of subjectivity under consumerism leads the authors to disappointing conclusions: an object in a subject-object relationship gravitates to its symbolic explication, to media reality, and the subject to the consumer of information, that is, to the invalid subject (Heisenberg, 1987).

Desiring production allows focusing on the philosophy of multi-level reality, in which philosophical methodology can refuse to identify the subject with the individual, and with society, and with reflective consciousness. The status of the subject becomes dependent on "partial subjectivization", the procedure "establishing truth and falsity, stating the materiality and fundamentality" of concepts is terminated (Kozlovsky, 2015).

The scientist Derrida (2000) separates philosophy from logic, science, and rhetoric, although the general line of postmodernists can be traced through getting rid of the substantialism of traditional philosophy - through the erosion of a clear border between philosophy and even literature. Such innovative impregnations in traditional philosophy allowed a number of postmodernists to declare that "that the end of philosophy has come, as well as the end of much more."

A lot of controversy raises the claim of postmodernists about the purpose and social role of philosophy. So, Derrida (2000) separates philosophy from the public good, blaming the philosopher for cosmopolitanism, the source of his law and freedom. Porus (2016) suggested that this happens on a liberal basis. It is believed that in order to restore the central position of philosophy in the spiritual, cultural and intellectual life, purposeful reforms are needed to transform philosophy into a means of developing people's ability to continue education and to improve a person's personality.

Since postmodernity has become a paradigm non-standard for the whole history of philosophy, it raises a number of questions related to the correlation of the basic ideas of postmodernity and traditional philosophical problems. Today, we can say for sure that over the past decades, postmodern has finally come out of the shadow of marginal philosophical theories, and has become an intellectual tool of our time, reflecting the fundamental constructs generated by human thinking, combining latent and obviously unconscious and rational, which obliges him to formulate theses on epistemological filling of being (Ischenko, 2015).

The history of the epistemological searches of man has a long way. Four successful theories of truth can be distinguished. Classical is the theory of correspondence of knowledge about the object of the object itself, postulates the correspondence of theoretical and empirical. The theory of conventional truth is referred to nonclassical, it implies a kind of local arrangement of scientists on the issue of the basic categories of science (Ilyin, 2018). The last, and most limited, is a pragmatic approach in which truth is determined from the point of view of suitability, it is completely not relevant in the field of fundamental knowledge. Also, in general terms, we can distinguish the philosophical schools of subjectivity and universalism. In postmodern philosophy, there is no need to worry about the relationship of utterances with objective givenness. The question of the truth of the statement can be resolved with the help of its correct interpretation.

It is worth noting that the problem of truth in postmodernism is closely related to the natural need to change the boundaries of traditional academic terminology. Many methodological concepts considered in the postmodern paradigm most organically reflect social transformations. And, if from the axiological point of view the relativity of truth as an individual choice carries a significant number of minuses, then from the point of view of science - relativity can significantly expand the field of epistemological searches, deepen knowledge in the field of information and virtual space,

and, as a result, open new horizons in understanding essence of things (Lazarev, 2015; Markova, 2020).

As the history of scientific knowledge shows, the idea of the truth of knowledge varies depending on immersion in one or another culture: classical representation, non-classical, post-non-classical, postmodernism. The reason for these changes is quite clear if we turn to the historical and social foundations of cognition. Modern culture also puts forward its requirements for the cognitive process, and for knowledge that claims to be true. In this regard, the position of postmodernism in the interpretation of truth deserves attention, in particular, the introduction of such an assessment of it as social significance. As you know, knowledge is born in the process of subject-object interaction, therefore, all changes that occur associated with the interpretation of the connection with this, with an emphasis on the object or subject of knowledge.

Postmodernism fundamentally changes the mindset: absolutizes society and the culture of the subject (Foucault, 2014). The postmodern culture of knowledge developed further the ideas of modernism, but to a certain extent brought them to the point of absurdity from the point of view of the tasks of science and scientific truth. Postpositivism, which expanded the understanding of science by actively introducing the sociocultural conditioning of knowledge, nevertheless limited subjectivity to some extent, making it dependent on the prevailing paradigm. In postmodernism, the emphasis is on the freedom of the subject; therefore, the idea of pluralistic worlds prevails. According to the world, each subject has its own truth. This circumstance is also explained by the fact that both the nature and the task of modern science have changed: it is more occupied with the development and implementation of its results, therefore, it should focus on timeliness and local applicability.

According to a study by Eco (2018), humanity is moving towards a society with a more significant level of freedom, and in it free creativity will exist with an interpretation of the text. In the light of these conclusions, the subject-object relations are rethought in the process of cognition: if the subject is included in the objectivity of the recognizable world, then knowledge carries first of all the content of the subject itself. This can explain the metamorphoses that occurred with the modern understanding of truth. Truth is possible only in context, taking into account the significance of everyday life as a condition of knowledge and practice.

Since in the conditions of the modern world truth loses its fundamental nature and unambiguity, it completely depends on the conditions in which knowledge flows and is intended for them (Pykhtina,

2019; Momjyan, 2020; Dandaron, 2009). The ideas of synergetics that captured postmodernism give it a common orientation: stability and balance. Synergetic methodology largely explains postmodernism. She focuses on communication and interdisciplinary dialogue, in the process of which the selection process is carried out from the possibilities in solving specific problems. Hence, such a characteristic of truth in the modern sense as fertility, success in further research and use is understandable. If we take into account that the subject himself changes, creates himself, then he also understood the loss by the truth of the status of certainty and finiteness.

Famous representative of postmodernism J.F. Lyotard (1998), referring to the problem of affirming local historical truth, gave an example of the connection between science and technology, moreover, in the postmodern spirit, replacing the concepts of “present” with the concepts of “fair”, “effective”, “correct”. He writes: “The state and the enterprise leave an idealistic or humanistic story in order to justify a new goal: in the language of today's managers, only one goal inspires confidence, it is productivity. Scientists, technicians, and equipment are not bought to learn the truth, but to increase productivity. ... A technical criterion is widely introduced into scientific knowledge that influences the criterion of truth”. Then he directly emphasizes the definition of truth through social significance: “The same can be said about the relationship between justice and effectiveness: the likelihood that a certain order will be considered fair increases as certain tasks are performed”. Through these provisions, the author draws a general opinion that modern science is an open system that is included in an open society and an open culture of postmodernism.

3. Conclusions

The wide inclusion of social parameters in the search for truth is a necessary element for the modern cognitive situation in order to organically introduce it into the humanitarian culture, they explain through the peculiarity of modern society: “Modern scientific knowledge is subject to double legitimation. Since this question is asked in full form, namely, as a reversal, which makes it obvious that knowledge and power are two sides of one question: who decides what is knowledge, and who knows what needs to be solved. In the era of computer science, the question of knowledge is more than ever a question of management. ” Thus, the truth of knowledge is determined by a socially significant perspective, creative productivity. Of course, the consciousness and knowledge of the subject depends on the historical conditions as a whole, and more specifically, on the forms of material activity of people, economic ties and relations, interests and goals of

social groups, political leadership, since their interconnection gives rise to different structures, therefore it is really difficult seek a single universal truth.

So, for the successful development of knowledge of society, knowledge is needed that adequately reflects reality. As the world is rapidly changing, society needs a system of self-preservation, an appeal to the ideas of synergetics, can lead a person to the desired public order.

References

- Bauman, Z. (2008). *Tekushchaya sovremennost'* [Flowing modernity] (Vol. 20). Peter.
- Berger, P. (2013). *Sotsial'noye konstruirovaniye real'nosti* [Social construction of reality] (Vol. 16). Medium. 323 p.
- Bilalov, M. (2019). Zavisimost' kognitivnoy kul'tury ot istiny [The dependence of cognitive culture on the interpretation of truth]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 2, 3-8.
<http://www.spsl.nsc.ru/FullText/konfe/%D0%9B%D0%9C%D0%9D-20191.pdf>
- Dandaron, M. (2009). The discursive content of postmodernism. *Vestn. Buryat. state un-that. Ulan-Ude. Issue. 6a: Philosophy, sociology, political science, cultural science*, 5(2), 109-113.
- Deleuze, G. (1996). *What Is Philosophy?* (Revised edition). Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, J. (1998). *Logika smysla* [The logic of meaning]. Rarity; Business Book. 480 p.
- Derrida, J. (2000). *O grammatologii* [About grammatology]. *Ad Marginem*. 512 p.
- Eco, U. (2018). From the Internet to Gutenberg: text and hypertext. *New literary review*, 32, 5-14.
- Foucault, M. (2014). *Slova i veshchi* [Words and things]. A-cad. 408 p.
- Heisenberg, V. (1987). *Shagi za gorizont* [Steps over the horizon]. Progress. 368 p.
- Ilyin, I. (2018). *Postmodernizm ot yego istokov do kontsa veka: evolyutsiya nauchnogo mifa* [Postmodernism from its origins to the end of the century: the evolution of scientific myth]. *Intrada*. 255 p.
- Ischenko E. (2015) Problema real'nosti v filosofsko-gumanitarnom diskurse [The problem of reality in philosophical and humanitarian discourse]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 2, 3-20.
<http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/hyman/2003/02/ischenko.pdf>
- Kozlovsky, T. (2015). *Postmodern Modernity. Questions of philosophy*. No. 10. 85-95.
- Kukartseva, M. (2017). Epistemologiya i ontologiya istorii [Epistemology and ontology of history]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 1, 24-35.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/epistemologiya-i-ontologiya-istorii>

- Lazarev, F. (2015). The problem of truth in the social sciences and humanities: an interval approach. *Questions of philosophy*, 10, 95-113.
- Lyotard, J. (1998). *Sostoyaniye postmodernizma* [The state of postmodernism]. Aletheia. 360 p.
- Markova, L. (2020). Science and the logic of the meaning of J. Deleuze. *Philosophical sciences*, 6, 254-281.
- Momjyan, K. (2020). Progressiruyet li sovremennaya sotsial'naya filosofiya [Is modern social philosophy progressing?] *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 4, 97-123.
- Porus, V. (2016). Is science a self-organizing system? *Questions of philosophy*, 9, 95-108.
- Pykhtina, T. (2019). On the issue of systemic science in the light of postmodernism. *Ideas and ideals*. 2(12, T.2), 35-40.
- Reza, D. (2016). Filosofiya i budushcheye [Philosophy and the future]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 4, 93-98.
https://www.lihachev.ru/pic/site/files/lihcht/2015_Sbornik/2015_Dokladi/2015_plen_004.pdf
- Welsh, V. (1992). Postmodern. Genealogy and the meaning of one controversial concept. *Way*, 1, 16-136.