

**A. Lazarevich**

*(Belarus)*

## **INFORMATIONAL-COGNITIVE CONCEPT OF KNOWLEDGE AND ITS STATUS IN COMMUNICATIVE CULTURE OF MODERN SOCIETY**

Information and knowledge, technology of their production and socialization become the spheres of the strategic interests of modern society. In their material manifestation, those phenomena determine the new strategies of economic and technological development of modern states. At the level of cognitive and ideological processes, they determine the mobility and creativity of human potential, form innovative qualities of education and culture.

The fact that human progress is based on knowledge can be viewed as a kind of civilizational constant. Consciousness and self-awareness of the human, any social situation, roles and activities, economic, technological and cultural innovations depend on knowledge and mediated by it. First of all, there should be discussed scientific knowledge as an important element in the structure of cognitive-ideological imperatives of the social subject and strategic resource of society. The actualization of this resource in the second half of the XX century led to the situation when knowledge is viewed as not only the power, but also as power, which can create a new society.

One of the definitions of the modern socium as *the society based on knowledge* seems more reasonable. It is not the knowledge as the integral component of the historical cultural-civilizational process, but an “explosive effect” of the integral interaction of knowledge and the newest informational-communicational technologies (technologies of information and knowledge socialization). This objective condition encourages careful and systematic consideration of the knowledge phenomenon from the point of view of relations between classical social-cultural traditions and their neo- and post-interpretations.

Such known definitions of knowledge as Kant's "unity of reason and sensibility" are compatible with recently axiomatic "subjective image of objective world", "reflection of objective reality" or analytical definition of this phenomenon as "justified belief" (A. Ayer), justified by this reality. "Such definitions – according to I.T. Kasavin – are based on ontological postulates, where knowledge is related to reality, or methodological maxims that specify the type of justification. They, in their turn, are the elements of philosophical concepts that determine the normative criteria of differentiation between knowledge and other things" [1, p. 33–34].

Centuries-old traditions of knowledge phenomenon comprehension are not exhausted yet. Moreover, their modern development is associated with detection of the new specifics, formulation of additional problems, domination, and not always a consolatory imbalance of questions and answers. All this is in the mainstream of development of philosophical knowledge and cognitive sciences guiding their cognitive interests in the depth of human nature, psyche and consciousness, their objective ontological essence and subjective individualization.

Cognitive problems have a long tradition. In Plato's works, the central theme is the concept of *knowledge as an idea*. From his point of view, sensory perception does not give a sustainable knowledge, because it induces not belief and assurance, but only unsteady opinion. The concepts are unchangeable if they are right, they give the real knowledge. The concept should have an object to which it is related. This object cannot be identical to sensory perception; it should be a supersensible object which is *an idea*.

Plato dedicated a special dialogue to this concept, where there is the discussion about knowledge between wise Socrates and a young man Theaetetus. Socrates asks: "Tell me honestly and honorably, what knowledge in your opinion is?" Mathematician Theodorus, Theaetetus' teacher is also present at the discussion. Young interlocutor notes that knowledge is the

ability to do something, for example, shoemaker's ability to make shoes. Socrates throws a reproach: the question is not what knowledge is about or how much knowledge exists, but what the knowledge is in itself. One needs to understand the essence of the knowledge concept, not enumerate the kinds of knowledge.

Socrates criticized the reduction of knowledge to feelings. According to Plato, knowledge can be found “not in the feeling, but in that name, which the soul carries when it considers the existing things” [2, p. 245]. In other words, knowledge is not sensory perception, but conclusions and thinking. To think is to discuss; thinking is the process, in which “the soul discusses with itself the things it observes”. [2, p. 249].

In XVI century F. Bacon, the founder of the modern philosophy, outlined the “scientific” method in his “Novum Organum” and considered the basic factors of knowledge of four “idols” that worry the mind, in his opinion – idols of genus, cave, market, theater, that is society, personality, understanding and the way of speaking, philosophical system, environment, and habit. Philosopher supposed “one should seek renewal or at least improvement of connection between thoughts and things”. For him, everything goes through feelings before it comes to mind. Inductive method meant for Bacon “the form of evidence, which looks closely to the feelings, seeks to understand the nature of things, seeks affairs and almost merges with them”. People negotiate with the help of speech, and the words are determined with common understanding. However, bad or wrong choice of words interferes with the mind. “The bad thing is also that human cognition comes from the universally recognized things” [3, p. 353–360].

Not authority, but a powerful force of Knowledge was declared by R. Descartes in his “Rules for the direction of the mind”. Hegel noted that French philosopher started from the demand that the thought should start from itself. Cogito, ergo sum – «I think, therefore I exist» – Descartes postulated.

I. Kant started with the fact that knowledge is largely based on experience, but it comes from experience not entirely. Knowledge is also formed on the base of the so-called a priori (transcendental) ideas, which in the rational form should be understood as axiomatics of inherited experience. According to Hegel, “consciousness is the knowledge itself about any subject... Consciousness is not just knowledge, but a certain attitude to the subject through the knowledge” [4, p. 80].

E. Husserl protected the postulate about objective nature of an object and opposed its subjectivization (new idealistic cognition theories) and widespread psychologism. Philosopher wanted “to clarify epistemologically the logical ideas, concepts and statements”, to enter the understanding of their meaning. But his pupil R. Ingarden wrote to his teacher: “The *problem* of cognition is set when the cognition itself is finished, and they talk about *recognition*. We have a certain idea of the subject, and the question is if this... subject agrees with the “idea””. This was a sketch of a later conventionalism justified by T. Kuhn in his work “The structure of scientific revolutions” [5].

Knowledge phenomenon is still an open problem. In order to define the peculiarities of its solution at the present stage, one has to deal with a separation principle of information and knowledge assessment. Information and knowledge are discussed in the scientific literature in a wide range. However, we talk not about this. It refers to their correlation, interdependence and mutual transitions. Those issues become the most important in consideration of the laws of the society formation based on knowledge, and functioning of knowledge in informational-communicational space of the given society.

There appeared a *cognitive* concept of information. According to it, information is understood as knowledge alienated from the creators themselves and collectivized by verbalization and fixing on a material carrier. In this case, as it was showed by J.A. Schrader, information can be viewed as a turned form of knowledge, in which it is represented [6, p. 21–

24]. According to this concept, information can turn to the new knowledge of a user, a creative act of reconstruction of personal knowledge on the basis of the acquired information. Knowledge is understood here as a personal human phenomenon.

The cognitive concept of information opposes to *cybernetic* one, which comes from the works by C. Shannon. The essence of the latter one is that information about the certain area (system) turns into information about a controlling action (controlling signal). The cybernetic approach, in our opinion, absolutizes the objective side of information, which causes underestimation of its subjective, personal perception. V.M. Glushkov underlined that “on the one side, information can be characterized as a set of data, which circulate in the nature and society, including technical systems created by the human; on the other side, such consideration gives the possibility to describe it as a measure of heterogeneity in distribution of energy (or substance) in the space and time” [7]. It proves that information exists because material systems exist (substance, field and so on), and ideal systems (science, law, moral, art, religion and so on), which are characterized by different types of heterogeneity and their cognition. In other words, objective nature of information is not obligatory connected with the procedures of its comprehension.

We agree with the J.A. Schrader’s comment about the cybernetic concept: “Let’s imagine us in the situation when we need to choose one variant of behavior. Having information that the first variant is prohibited (or excluded on objective circumstances) we are in the position of a controlled system. Finding out that there is one more unexpected variant, we get into a more responsible situation. However, what if we find out those variants differ not only in comparative advantage for us but in risk for others? Then choice becomes a personal action requiring human qualities from us. So, information, which serves for the representation of knowledge, is something qualitatively different from information as controlling signal. But this qualitative difference is created by the presence of the human, who can

extract from the written or encoded information something, which has never taken place neither on paper nor on the computer, that is human knowledge, which helps to implement the freedom of choice” [8, p. 64].

From the analysis of such situations, there can be made a conclusion about the possibility of transformation of information as controlling signal into different information formations with different functional features. In the process of these transformations, the controlling impact is gradually “neutralized” (compensated) by the personal understanding of the coming information. In addition, the proportion of information, which turns into knowledge as a result of personal “assimilation”<sup>2</sup>, is constantly growing. “Alienated” from the direct subject-carrier and objectified with the help of material carriers, things turns into information again. This is the meaning of the cognitive concept. Its advantage in comparison with the cybernetic one is that it takes into account personal (human, subjectively expressed, existential) qualities. Information is information because it can be perceived and assessed. It does not exclude its objective existence but underlines its social and personally important aspects.

Generally, the opposition of cybernetic and cognitive concepts cannot be correct enough. It appeared and exists due to the ambiguous (often jealous) attitude of some researchers to information science and its subject. “Everything, which is connected with knowledge, its nature, features, mechanisms of functioning and development, transformations and so on, according to P. Semenyuk, can be the subject of such area of science as cognitive science or psychology of cognitive activity...

---

<sup>2</sup> In this case there is no reason to absolutize the opposition of cognitive concept of information and its cybernetic interpretation as a controlling signal. In information use there can be situations when there takes place a “mechanical” assimilation of its content, not connected with cognitive-creative acts. In such cases, they say that knowledge owns the human. If we take the opposite situation when the human owns knowledge, that is their knowledge gets a strong individuality and originality, then rejection of some control action is equivalent to acceptance of the fact that human does not act according to their knowledge.

knowledge phenomenon for such a specific discipline is an absolute semantic center, focus of crossing of all directions of its scientific problems. When they talk about information science, it is natural to see such semantic epicenter in the phenomenon of information and the processes connected with it, not in anything else. So, all other moments (including cognitive ones, for example) should make room, in this case, set aside from the subject, giving place to the main defining issues” [9, p. 5].

Supporters of the cognitive concept suppose that specific problems of information science appear in connection with the tasks of information representation of the accumulated knowledge in the form convenient for processing, transfer and creative reconstruction by users. Information science builds bridges between information and knowledge as essences of different nature. It studies not information and information processes themselves, but the processes of mutual transition of information and knowledge. The subject of information science is the sphere of relations between knowledge and information [8, p. 66–67].

E.P. Semenyuk is right saying that the phenomenon of knowledge, its features, laws of formation and development can make a semantic center of cognitive science. Nevertheless, what with those problems of knowledge that appear due to active development of modern processes and tools of informatization of society? It is evident that the latter refers to information science. However, can we use the information here, which is not related to the human and their knowledge that is to get around the problem of interconnection between information and knowledge?

The base of the modern social-informational systems functioning is not information in its traditional interpretation, but in the cognitive one. Today knowledge is the main information resource. At the same time, can we consider the discussions about differentiation of the research subjects in different disciplines to be principal? Several disciplines can study similar issues. Here is some resistance to excessively growing differentiation of

knowledge. By the way, this trend cannot contradict the ideals of information science itself, which is based on the principles of compilation and synthesis of information, possibilities of its concentration in simple forms, sources and so on.

Assessing the prospects of correlation between information and knowledge in conditions of active development of computerization, A.I. Rakitov introduces the concept of information epistemology. “Appearance of “intellectual technology” and passionate interest in nature and possibilities of machinery thinking generated by computer revolution, led to the formation of the new unconventional section – information epistemology. It studies not the kinds of scientific knowledge, but the knowledge in general, but at a particular angle, from the position of processing and transformation of information into its highest form, that is knowledge. Information epistemology studies different ways of presentation and expression of knowledge and possibilities of knowledge building with the help of technical systems. Because of this, the focus of information epistemology transfers to everyday cognition and common sense because they are the initial form of cognitive activity, the universal, comprehensive, encyclopedic, the most difficult, various and rich form” [10, p. 149–150].

According to Rakitov, the main problems of “information epistemology” are the following: What is information? How is it transferred and transformed? What are the functions and relations of signals and codes? What is the epistemological function of computers? Can they think? How to create knowledge from information? How do information, sense, and meaning correlate? What are the ways of the computer representation of knowledge? How are information and language connected? How are computer understanding and mutual understanding of the human and computer carried out? Is it possible to reduce thinking processes to computing functions or introduce others through them? [10, p. 150].



As one can see, there is a wide range of problems. They are complex and they do not involve a hard opposition of information and knowledge. On the contrary, there are emphasized certain aspects of interdisciplinary synthesis of ideas (technical-technological, cognitive, social-cultural, philosophical-ideological), which is a precondition of integral relatedness of information and knowledge in communicative-computer networks of modern society.

Study of modern processes and information trends of society really includes a wide range of issues. Psychological, cultural, economic, social-political and other problems take place here. Information processes and trends have a fundamental importance in this line. The essence of information society becoming is connected with achieving a certain level of information “flow”. The question is about the content and structure of these information processes. Are there some exclusively information components that make their base or already mentioned transformations of information functional properties and its transitions to knowledge and vice versa? In the latter case there is no reason to oppose information and knowledge, because we talk not about the presence of criteria for their differentiation, but about integral trends of formation and functioning of certain information-cognitive “product”, which can be differentiated according to criteria and evaluations presented for information and knowledge as concepts of different nature.

It is clear that not all information is knowledge when knowledge is always informative in its nature and content. By the way, this is the meaning of a comment by E.P. Semenyuk about the cognitive concept. According to him, information is understood as transformed form of knowledge. He writes: “...when information is interpreted as transformed form of knowledge, it is clear that this is not all information, but those types that are connected with human consciousness” [9, p. 4].

This comment proves the information-cognitive concept of knowledge.

The changed conditions of knowledge functioning affect not only its objectified forms that obtained previously unknown technical and technological feasibility. The success of information society isn't connected with it. Objectified knowledge cannot function effectively without certain specific peculiarities of their perception, understanding, and personal comprehension, which in its turn is connected with certain social-cultural phenomena of human existence. In fact, the culturological *principle of complementarity* (by M.A. Rozovy), which indicates incompleteness of K. Popper's knowledge model [11], is reduced to it. Modern information technologies aggravated the problem of the individual ("alive") human knowledge functioning. Today there is a popular point of view connected with the actualization of transfer from the logistic paradigm, which emphasized the role of objectified knowledge, and cognitological one, which claims significance of personal knowledge. [12, p. 4–25].

On the other side, the transformed (objectified) forms of human knowledge let to penetrate into its structure and connection with actual information resources of society. Here the analysis of the latest computer achievements is important, that is expert systems of presentation (objectifying) of knowledge of highly qualified specialists in different spheres.

The essence of knowledge is disclosed in real human connections and relations that are characterized by conditions and peculiarities of social communication. In other words, knowledge is the communicative phenomenon, and procedures of its productive reflection are revealed with possibilities of interactive human practices.

Cognitive experience of the human has a specific historically conditioned status. In the era of early modernity, it was a necessary abstraction of cognitive practices of "atomized" society. However, during formation of the information society,

the cognitive subjects are so involved in the different flow of messages that they lost in many ways their cognitive autonomy and chances for critical reflection. Three factors initiating this situation are the following: mass media influence, the existence of science mainly in the form of the social institute, and finally collective forms of knowledge production (“death of the author”). Here the idea of epistemological reconstruction is not so much the description of the real situation, but a normative requirement of autonomy of thinking: choice, experiments, reflection, and linguistic expression. In this context “today there are three main approaches to the nature of knowledge-message in analytical philosophy: reductionism, dualism, and credulism... The third approach means affirmation of the priority of communicative knowledge: communication is the source and condition of experience, any knowledge in general... one should... combine attention to history and culture taking into account communicative-semiotic nature of knowledge, making the interaction between a creative personality and their environment” [13, p. 48, 50, 53].

Knowledge has a complicated structure, in which there are more than ten types. Here are some of them: peripheral (marginal) knowledge; instrumental knowledge; implicit knowledge in the form of skills and abilities; context knowledge (individual understanding of the problem in the given context); associative knowledge (knowledge-associations that appear in certain connection); unsaid knowledge (which seems evident) and so on.

Manifestation and especially socialization of the named types of knowledge are practically impossible without creation and implementation of basic communicative preconditions that are necessary for understanding and interaction of people in different social-cultural types of environment. For any other type of social-communicative practices, these preconditions (or similar ones) are necessary. They are the main element of the communicative process reflecting the specifics of its rulemaking,

which is justified by the specific nature of the professional activity and its ethical culture.

However, regardless of the type of cognitive methodologies and practices, the procedures of understanding and perception of their own knowledge are possible and practiced. The procedures of the own knowledge perception are connected with cognized phenomena that are not included in the structure of existing knowledge and objectively opposed to it. That is why even in the case when we try to discuss our own knowledge, we talk about the possibility of their indirect manifestation in external systems, towards the procedures of reflection, connections, and relations. The paradox is that knowledge is not revealed at the individual level that is why it needs either individual-object (subject-object) or individual-subject (subject-subject) discursiveness. Discursiveness, in this case, is something, which helps to assess knowledge as knowledge, which can be revealed in the system of certain norms, mutual understanding, standards, social-cultural practices, conventions, symbols and so on, that is in the system of other worlds of knowledge.

M. Heidegger defined such situation as “listening to the thoughts of thinkers”, the result of “dialogue with predecessors” [14, p. 289]. This is close to what N. Elias metaphorically showed at the following example: “Imagine... a group of dancers. Think of court dancing, minuets, and quadrilles, or peasant dancing. All steps and bows, gestures and movements of a separate dancer fully correlate with other dancers. If each dancer is considered by himself it is impossible to understand the meaning and functions of his movements” [15, p. 36].

In other words, communicative nature of knowledge is manifested not only in the fact that it is not thought out of the communicative situation, whether it is a dialogue with external interlocutor or with oneself. It is not acquired and not understood out of interactive relations with re-actualized previous experience and present actual experience.

For modern types of social-communicative relations, it is typical to respect not only individual (collective)-psychological norms but to take into account another component of communicative environment – space and time features that appear today in active-converting function. The latter one claims about itself due to the formation of the global information space, not traditional communication means.

The most spread information-communicative practices are based on verbal techniques of transfer and socialization of knowledge, especially taking into account the definition of knowledge formulated by D. Bell and supported by M. Castells: “It is an ordered set of statements, facts, and ideas representing a reasonable opinion or result of experiment that are transmitted to others through means of communication in certain systematized form” [16, p. CLI]. However, verbal technologies of transfer and assimilation of knowledge are not fully universal and perfect. M. Ilyin wrote: “Did Raphael capture any truth in “Sistine Madonna“, and how it was showed to Dostoyevsky, who stayed in front of this work many times? It can be stated that this inequality and multiplicity, materially objectified faces of the truth was meant by Wittgenstein: “The things that can be showed cannot be said”. Truth or lie can be said not only with verbal means but also they can be showed in other materialized forms. However, the things embodied in plastic (sculpture, paintings) or melody are out of possibilities to be said in a verbal judgment. “Try to say anything logical about Mona Lisa’s smile!” – Weber exclaimed, talking about the beauty phenomenon” [17, p. 156].

Due to the impossibility (or at least difficulty) of full verbal “display” of knowledge, there appeared a complex of other technologies of expert systems, means of communication explication of knowledge. They can be very developed, but M.K. Mamardashvili is right saying that “knowledge cannot be transplanted from one head into another one due to one simple ontological fact: nobody can understand nothing instead of themselves, a person should understand it oneself... And this act

of understanding... should happen or not happen. Knowledge cannot be transferred into another head like liquid into empty container” [18, p. 12].

The act of understanding as the mechanism of personal creative completeness of the human is an important element of any social-communicative system in any structural and situational manifestations. The necessary knowledge and intellectual creativity models are built on this cognitive-psychological and epistemological intention. If we realize even an elementary level of the whole complicated system of social relations out of context of understanding, such system will not have prospects of development, because the objective mechanism of knowledge crystallization in such systems being broken and deformed.

The general context of modern cognitive situation increasingly does not fit the classical limits “object – subject” and even neo-positivist limits of the formula “There is no object without subject”. It is especially evident in the modern information world. Traditionally in information science, it was believed that user (subject) deals with an object (information). Due to reflection (human ability to organize their knowledge), it becomes clear that this interaction has more complicated nature of *inter-subject* relations. Every moment a single subject enters into the communicative relationship with the collective subject (info-sphere). The desire of mutual understanding is at the base of those mutually dependent relationships. User’s communication with info-sphere includes the acquisition of necessary knowledge that is turning information into actualized knowledge and its transfer for public use by turning the knowledge into information. [19, p. 17–18].

Post-nonclassical science assumes that in the mainstream of modern transformations of society the subjects deal more often with not just complicated systems, but with “human-dimension” (V. Stepin) ones. Together with traditional types of such systems (biosphere as global ecosystem, biogeocoenoses, different industrial and social objects), the peculiarity of modern society is

the formation of brand new types of such human-dimension systems as “human – computer”, “computer networks”, “telecommunication networks” and so on. According to V.S. Stepin, “in the strategies with complicated human-dimension systems exists a new type of integration of the truth and morality, goal-efficient, and value-rational action. Scientific knowledge and technological activity with such systems involve taking into account the whole range of possible trajectories of system development in bifurcation points. The real impact on this system with the aim of cognition or technological change always meets the problem of choice of the way of development. And the landmarks here are not only knowledge but also moral principles that ban dangerous methods of experimentation with the system and its transformation” [20, p. 69].

Peculiarities of inclusion of human-dimension objects in the system of modern communication are justified by the fact that traditional structure of such objects is transformed significantly. Usually, it includes the following elements: human – technical mode – natural environment – social-cultural environment. Modern scenarios affect and change almost all elements of complicated self-developing systems.

Social (human, culture) and technical components of those systems are subjected to greater transformation. Unlike bulky technical objects of the industrial age, modern equipment is minimized and becomes more complicated; it is intellectualized taking more algorithmic functions of decision-making and management. The formal-logical context of knowledge functioning in such systems is radically different from versions of its generation and transmission in classical systems of social communication connected with the mentioned above procedures of sense setting and understanding. If we considered current human-computer symbiosis, it would be difficult to differentiate technical and human things.

However, the problem is not just in it, but also in the trend of if not leveling, then at least in “mechanization” of mental and

creative-semantic functions of the human. First, in conditions of intensive growth of information human consciousness cannot assimilate it productively or just adequately. Secondly, the procedures of personal understanding and generation of individual cognitive senses (knowledge) are replaced actively with “mechanical” transmission of information in social communication networks. In other words, modern information technologies greatly influenced the exponential growth of communication networks, the creative component of which transformed significantly.

Let us recall the structural “composition” of communication phenomenon. It can be represented as a message, interpretation (perception, understanding) and transmission. The message is a kind of “thing”, transmitted “product” of information content; interpretation is “thought”, constituted knowledge; transmission is the operation of its transfer based on the corresponding technologies. Contradictory nature of modern communication process is that exactly *transmission* based on technological innovations starts to determine the vector of its transformation.

In the history of human society development, the process of knowledge production and accumulation played a dominant role. The systems of reality explanation, which have survived up to now with little changes and still play the main role in the process of accumulation of objective information about the environment, were created on this base. The principal difference of the modern age is that now there is more communication based on the procedures of information transfer. Duplication, but not the creation of the intellectual product, transfer of information about it through printed publications, telegraph, radio, television, lectures and seminars within the education system, the Internet are typical features of modern society, and it demonstrates the essence of preconditions of the knowledge de-subjectivization (de-personification) phenomenon. The concept “information” hides more often today behind the word “knowledge”, referring to the optionally reflected message, which is transmitted with the



help of social communication technologies. The Baudrillard's paradox comes from it: there are more information and less sense in the world. A more informed person today is not the one who has more knowledge, but the one who participates in a greater number of communications. The peculiarity of those communications is that their information base is not meaningful ("knowledge") and not objective ("product"). Information in the structure of such communications has operational character.

In traditional society, information could not claim to be what it is now. Information can induce new operations only as communication, not as knowledge. People act using information; communication flows like material and energy ones are not absorbed as a resource, and even multiplied and accelerated. It happens, because in modern conditions information is less intellectual knowledge resource, but more a stimulus (motive) of activity [21, p. 96].

Today information is more often associated with communication as information exchange, which is not enough considered. It becomes clear why the main phenomenon of the computer revolution is Internet, but not knowledge bases or artificial intelligence promised by futurologists. It is well known today that a new knowledge is almost not created in the global network, but communication opportunities increase. According to D.V. Kuznetsov, "In the information flow organized like this, transmission of data about features of goods and services (rational denotation of the object) is not at the first place; it is occupied by the creation of its image, which mobilizes affective connotations. It is an exact image, which makes profit in the modern economy and stimulates the development of advertising business. Mass media owners fight for the creation of the beneficial image of the events, not for the monopoly on the data transmission" [21, p. 96]. According to McLuhan's comment in the 60-s of the XX-th century, the real content of the message is the informer oneself [22].

In other words, one of the typical sides of the modern information-communicative process is the trend of devaluation of its traditional creative essence. It looks like the attractiveness of the modern subject of the social action is not in the knowledge but in the creation of attractive images. Analyzing this situation, A. Touraine tries to avoid the terms “information” and “knowledge”. He writes that in modern society social conflicts occur on the “symbolic benefits” [23].

The fact that communication as the images’ creation plays a significant role in modern society is proved by M. Castells’ concept. He begins his analysis from the thesis about network society, in which success depends first of all on the ability to generate, process and use information, based on knowledge, effectively. But analysis of the new forms of economy and culture forces Castells to rely on the concepts “communication system”, “images” [24].

Critical assessment of modern communication practice can be given in the context of analysis of the emerging cognitive turn based on the comparison of the so-called classical (representational) and social-constructivist concepts of knowledge. According to the first one, knowledge is a mental presentation, logical-theoretical representation of the objective world. The second one (new cognitivism) underlines knowledge idea, where it serves as an expression of both the subject and objective world, being the product of their relationship. The meaning of turn is the rejection of the theory of knowledge as representational phenomenon and transition to its understanding within the frame of the theory of social constructionism. One of the consequences of this theory is connected with the fact that the truth stops being a “clean” analogue of reliability. It is constituted in socially and culturally important communication practices. Knowledge, in this case, should be considered as a form of social discourse.

Unlike postmodernity, which replaced studying psychological processes (“death of the author”) with analysis of

discursive practices of linguistic activity participants, new cognitivism (position of famous French psychologist Moscovici) tries to overcome the extremes of representational and post-positivist (language game) concepts of knowledge. This approach admits certain autonomy of social reality and its influence on the individual, but at the same time, there is an emphasis on those processes, through which psychological phenomena produce this reality being its products [25, p. 101]. Moscovici showed that cognitive systems that regulate the world image, are social both from the point of view of their genesis and in terms of content. Their main concepts originate from everyday communication. Therefore, cognitive and communicative aspects are inseparable. The initial idea of the new concept of knowledge is the following thesis: social “dimension” is not added post hoc to cognitive models, but it is organically woven into them.

One of the most important problems of modern epistemology is still the problem of knowledge typology. T. Kasavin writes: “Within the limits of the classical epistemology of the new time, which barely managed to fix the peculiarities of its subject, there were difficulties with the concept “knowledge”. Can we, according to traditional logics, consider the expressed judgments, subjected to binary truth assessment, to be knowledge? Are moral norm, artistic image, religious symbol, and philosophical problem the form of knowledge? Was Aristotle right seeing cognitive content not only in “episteme” (scientific knowledge in modern understanding) but also in such phenomena as faith, opinion, moral judgment, everyday experience? Can we call “knowledge” a disproved scientific theory, which once was considered a delusion? Finally, what to do with the unconscious content of human ideas, with cognitive preconditions, hermeneutic “prejudices”... with thinking skills, with Kant's a priori forms? This problem is sharpened with the opposition of “two cultures” – natural science and social-humanitarian knowledge with countercultural ideas of “scientification of mysticism” and “mystification of science”,

with research of science appearance and the problem of rationality” [1, p. 26].

I.T. Kasavin pays attention to very important and difficult task, which appeared in modern philosophical epistemology, which is separation from demarcation approach. It means the view of knowledge when there is an opposition of science and other forms of cognitive activity. The typological approach to knowledge should be placed at the base of knowledge non-classical theory, according to him. This will be the most reasonable step from the methodological point of view because it eliminates the need of search of general knowledge definition [1, p. 27].

It is true that the development of a universal definition of knowledge, which is often built on its scientific forms, significantly depletes the status of the individual human abilities, because it eliminates other possible types and forms of behavior and actions conditioning in the system of intellectual activity. We should agree that knowledge is a complex phenomenon, coupled with all possible human cognitive practices, the state of the sensual-conscious sphere, and verified by the standards of social acceptability. This approach does not contradict the position of Wittgenstein, who noticed: "There is no strict use of the word "knowledge", but we can formulate several such ones, and each one agrees more or less with the ways of its use in real life” [26, p. 27].

The ways of “knowledge use in real life” and Kasavin’s idea about the necessity of typological approach to the knowledge are close things, but they are not identical. Typological approach removes the task of the search of the knowledge general universal definition due to its unproductiveness in various situations of the spiritual-objective development of the world. This approach is determined by the ideals of knowledge differentiation and lies in the plane of philosophical reflection. Wittgenstein’s comment about the ways of knowledge use in real life is connected with integral ontological procedures of knowledge justification, that is

with the so-called “the ground and the first floors”, according to N.F. Ovchinnikov. At the ground floor, the knowledge faces the external world (nature or social structures). At the first floor, it rises above itself, addresses itself and turns itself into the subject of research. According to Ovchinnikov, “Describing the first steps at the “first floor” of the imagined structure we can say that we meet epistemological darkness... And sometimes we cannot rise so high in epistemological darkness, in other words, not a clear general theory of knowledge, especially scientific knowledge. But in the end we should claim that the structure of knowledge is organized in such way that movements are impossible at the “ground floor” without epistemological light at the “first floor”, that means it is impossible to study the natural world and social relations. The internal need of knowledge makes to collect all intellectual resources in order to “turn on the light” at the “first floor” and highlight the urgent problems of the world understanding” [27, p. 86].

As for reflection on knowledge (“first floor”), it exists, of course, but the German philosopher Höhle’s doubt also makes sense. He analyzes Descartes’ ideas and notices: “he openly disputes the possibility of the situation when the act of thought is the subject of another act of thought that means knowledge about knowledge” [28, p. 19].

During the latest decades, knowledge started to remind an immense information-communicative decentralized archipelago. However, there is a burning issue of management of this priority human heritage. Knowledge management is one of the most discussed issues. There are many theoretical works and practical developments in this sphere. There were created various consortiums, institutes, professional communities; discussions and conferences are conducted. It is justified by the fact that knowledge management is considered by western business owners to be the thing, which influences the profit, creates competitive advantages, and helps to achieve the impossible earlier results. In all big hi-tech companies, there are

corresponding departments, and their activity is controlled by the Chief Knowledge Management. The source of such discipline as knowledge management can be searched in the activity of Swedish accountant Karl Erik Sveiby, who introduced the concept of “intangible assets” of the company. He included brand awareness, reputation, competence of the staff, and organization context, in which that competence could form as integrity, but not as a set of separate knowledge of the staff.

Intangible assets occupied a corresponding place in financial reports and started to be called knowledge. The system of actions that help to use intangible assets for making profit and creation of competitive advantages was named knowledge management.

Intangible assets management became especially important at the end of the XX-th century, which was connected with the increase of competition in the world market and the need of transition from market mechanisms of profit formation to the resource ones. It means that business started to form the profit, first of all, through reduction of costs, more effective organization of work, reduction of time for decision-making, overcoming the stereotypical and outdated schemes by focusing on innovation.

Modern business became innovative less in relation to its products (market orientation), but more in relation to its own activity (resource orientation) – technologies, projects, instruments, strategies, specific organization of business-processes and so on. At this stage, it became clear that key competences should be not only revealed and fixed in the company’s strategy defining competitive advantages but also it is necessary to develop, design and program the future characteristics of key competences.

Generally speaking, the creation of the system of knowledge management is directed, first of all, to the reduction of costs (number of action for goal achievement) and time. Secondly, it is directed to increase of innovations. These goals

can be achieved by the creation of the system of search, production, distribution, use and storage of knowledge. Knowledge management, in this case, is reduced to the organization of infrastructure, which helps to implement the mentioned actions.

A textbook example, which explains the stages of detection and formalization of company knowledge, is the concept of knowledge spiral. It immortalizes a bread maker by Matsusita Electric Industrial Company. Japanese scientists Ikujiro Nonaka and Hirotaka Takeuchi created the concept of knowledge spiral on the base of experience of a bread maker creation. The problem with the bread maker, which baked the dough unevenly, was solved when the expert of the company studied the experience of the best baker Osaka, his way of sheeting the dough, and repeated his main actions in technological solutions of the company. Scientists distinguished the following stages of knowledge creation: socialization, when the expert finds out the baker's secrets and forms her own implicit knowledge through assimilation of the baker's knowledge; externalization, when she converts her implicit knowledge to explicit one, because she has to tell about her work in engineering team; combination, when the team composes documents and catalogs on the base of the acquired knowledge and implements knowledge into products; and finally internalization, which means enrichment of their own implicit knowledge at the expense of experience of the new products creation.

It should be noted that knowledge here is something, which is operated and passed to each other, formalized and revealed by the staff of the company. The process of knowledge acquisition, its usage, development, update, and inclusion of the new knowledge (or exclusion of the old one) into activity started to be named the processes of organization training. The learning organization becomes the organizational shell of knowledge management processes. The manifest of a learning organization is the book by Peter Senge "The Fifth Discipline: The Art and

Practice of the Learning Organization” (1990, new edition of 2007). It included the ideology of teams oriented to continuous solving of organization tasks.

### **Conclusion**

Modern information age can be called the age of domination of de-personalized knowledge, i.e. knowledge-information or information as a transformed form of knowledge. Information-cognitive concept of knowledge is the model of institutionalization and functioning of knowledge in the system of social communications of modern society. This model actualizes and reveals the processes of mutual transition of objectified forms of knowledge (knowledge-information) and personal knowledge of the subject. Within this model, the knowledge stops being just a representational phenomenon, because it is institutionalized in socially and culturally important cognitive and communicative practices of the subject. The procedures of knowledge socialization are determined with effective models and instruments of their management. Information-cognitive model of production and functioning of knowledge gives more opportunities for human self-development and conscious realization of creative skills.

### **REFERENCES**

1. *Касавин И. Т.* Миграция. Креативность. Текст. Проблемы неклассической теории познания / И. Т. Касавин. – СПб. : РХГИ, 1998. – 407 с.
2. *Платон* Собрание сочинений : в 4 т. / Платон. – М. : Мысль, 1993. – Т. 2. – 528 с.
3. *История философии в кратком изложении* / пер. с чеш. И. И. Богута. – М. : Мысль, 1994. – 592 с.
4. *Гегель Г. В. Ф.* Философская пропедевтика / Г. В. Ф. Гегель // Работы разных лет в двух томах. – М. : Мысль, 1971. – Т. 2. – 630 с.



5. *Кун Т.* Структура научных революций : пер. с англ. / Т. Кун. – М. : Прогресс, 1975. – 608 с.

6. *Шрейдер, Ю. А.* О феномене информационного продукта / Ю. А. Шрейдер // Науч.-техн. информация. – Сер. 1. – 1989. – № 11. – С. 21–24.

7. *Глушков В. М.* О гносеологических основах математизации наук / В. М. Глушков // Диалектика и логика научного познания. – М. : Наука, 1966. – С. 406–412.

8. *Шрейдер Ю. А.* Двойной облик современной информатики / Ю. А. Шрейдер // Природа. – 1988. – № 5. – С. 64–71.

9. *Семенюк Э. П.* Информатизация общества и развитие методологических проблем информатики / Э. П. Семенюк // Науч.-техн. информация. Сер. 2. – 1990. – № 12. – С. 2–9.

10. *Ракитов А. И.* Философия компьютерной революции / А. И. Ракитов. – М. : Политиздат, 1991. – 286 с.

11. *Розов М. А.* Информационно-семиотические исследования: процессы-эстафеты и принцип дополнительности / М. А. Розов // Науч.-техн. информация. – Сер. 2. – 1984. – № 2. – С. 1–7.

12. *Героименко В. А.* Знание. Компьютер. Общество / В. А. Героименко, А. А. Лазаревич, Л. Г. Титаренко. – Минск : Наука и техника, 1992. – 151 с.

13. *Касавин И. Т.* Знание и коммуникация: к современным дискуссиям в аналитической философии / И. Т. Касавин // Вопр. философии. – 2013. – № 6. – С. 46–70.

14. *Хайдеггер М.* Время и бытие : ст. и выступления / М. Хайдеггер. – М. : Республика, 1996. – 447 с.

15. *Элиас Н.* Общество индивидов / Н. Элиас. – М. : Праксис, 2001. – 336 с.

16. *Белл Д.* Грядущее постиндустриальное общество. Опыт социального прогнозирования / Д. Белл. – Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. – М. : Academia, 2004. – 788 с.

17. *Ильин М. С.* Две ипостаси слова / М. С. Ильин // Человек. – 2001. – № 5. – С. 149–158.

18. *Мамардашвили М. К.* Классический и неклассический идеалы рациональности / М. К. Мамардашвили. – Тбилиси : Мецниереба, 1984. – 82 с.
19. *Бородина Н. А.* Социально-философский анализ информатизации образования : автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук : 09.00.11 / Н. А. Бородина. – Ростов н/Д, 2012. – 26 с.
20. *Важно, чтоб работа не прекращалась...* Интервью с академиком РАН В. С. Степиным // Вопр. философии. – 2004. – № 9. – С. 16–72.
21. *Кузнецов Д. В.* Роль современных коммуникаций в формировании массового сознания / Д. В. Кузнецов // Философия и общество. – 2004. – № 3. – С. 92–104.
22. *McLuhan M.* The Medium is the Massage : an Inventory of Effects / М. McLuhan. – New York : Bantam Books, 1967. – 159 p.
23. *Touraine A.* The waning sociological image of social life / А. Touraine // International j. of comparative sociology. – 1984. – Vol. 25, N 1. – P. 34–44.
24. *Castells M.* The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture / М. Castells. – Oxford : Blackwell, 1997. – 461 p.
25. *Черникова И. В.* Современная наука и научное познание в зеркале философской рефлексии / И. В. Черникова // Вестн. Моск. ун-та. Сер. 7, Философия. – 2004. – № 6. – С. 94–103.
26. *Wittgenstein L.* The Blue and Brown Books / L. Wittgenstein. – Oxford : Blackwell, 1978. – 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. – 185 p.
27. *Овчинников Н. Ф.* Знание – болевой нерв философской мысли / Н. Ф. Овчинников // Вопр. философии. – 2001. – № 1. – С. 83–113.
28. *Хёсле В.* Гении философии нового времени / В. Хёсле. – М. : Наука, 1992. – 223 с.