



INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE REVIEWS



No. 1 (1) 2020

Social Sciences series

www.aiu.kz

INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE REVIEWS

Social Sciences series

Has been published since 2020

№1 (1) 2020

Nur-Sultan

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor
Shaikhutdinov M.Y.

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Doctor of Jurisprudence, Professor
Amandykova S.K.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Irsaliyev S. A. | - Candidate of Agricultural Sciences, President AIU, (Kazakhstan) |
| Sarsenbay N. A. | - Candidate of Economic Sciences, (Kazakhstan) |
| Somzhurek B.Zh. | - Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan) |
| Amandykova S.K. | - Doctor of Jurisprudence, Professor (Kazakhstan) |
| Kazhyken M. Z. | - Doctor of Economic Sciences, (Kazakhstan) |
| Toxanova A.N. | - Doctor of Economic Sciences, (Kazakhstan) |
| Akhmadiyeva Zh.K. | - Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate professor (Kazakhstan) |
| Laumulin M. T. | - Doctor of Political Sciences, (Kazakhstan) |
| Orlova O.S. | - Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor (Russia) |
| Yatsek Zalesnyiy | - Doctor of Jurisprudence, Professor (Poland) |
| Francisco Javier Diaz | - Dr. hab., Professor (Spain) |
| Revorio | |
| László Károly Marác | - PhD (The Netherlands) |
| Verbitskiy A.A. | - Doctor of Pedagogy, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education (Russia) |

Editorial address: 8, Kabanbay Batyr avenue, of.316, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, 010000
Tel.: (7172) 24-18-52 (ext. 316)
E-mail: social-sciences@aiu.kz

International Science Reviews**Social Sciences series**

Owner: Astana International University

Periodicity: quarterly

Circulation: 500 copies

The cover design is Salikhitdin Aitbayev's "The woman in blue" replica

CONTENT

<u>Evgenii Alisov, Dmitry Kalinchenko</u> ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF YOUNGER STUDENTS WITH INFORMATION PRESENTED BY VISUAL MEANS OF DIFFERENT DEGREES OF ABSTRACTION	4
<u>Anar Mukasheva, Kamal Sabirov, Alisher Ibrayev</u> ANALYSIS OF LAND OWNERSHIP IN FOREIGN LAW: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN	11
<u>S.K. Amandykova, N.I. Khairmukhanmedov</u> LEGAL ASPECTS OF PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES: PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE KAZAKH DIASPORA ABROAD	17
<u>Maliutin Nikita Sergeevich</u> TRENDS IN THE MODERNIZATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROL IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION	23
<u>Lazzat Yerkinbayeva Daniya Nurmukhankyzy, Indira Nesipbayeva</u> LEGAL PROBLEMS OF REGULATING AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN	30
<u>Aigul Bokayeva</u> DEFINING THE POST-MODERN	41
<u>A.K. Kurmashev</u> RESOURCE NATIONALISM AS A KEASTONE FACTOR IN KAZAKHSTANI FOREIGN POLICY	50
<u>Aigerim Ibrayeva</u> CASPIAN REGION ENERGY RESOURCES AND THEIR IMPACT ON ..	55

DEFINING THE POST-MODERN

Aigul Bokayeva

Astana International University,
Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The article is devoted to a historical review of various understandings and interpretations of the term “postmodernism”, and analysis of its philosophical foundation, laid down by post structuralism and deconstructivism.

Today the word "postmodernism" has become so fashionable and widespread that it is applied to almost each area of human life. And at the same time, we are faced with a paradoxical situation where the clear definition of this term is more or less absent.

Indeed, the multifaceted nature of postmodernism has gone from trying to go beyond modernity, criticizing its foundations to the proclamation of a new historical state and its awareness. A huge number of interpretations of the essence, meaning, and also definitions of post-modernism have been caused by its nature.

Obviously, on the one hand, postmodernism is a multifaceted intellectual movement expressing a special view of the world, a special mentality reflecting the profound changes that have occurred in cultural and social life in the second half of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries. On the other hand, postmodernism does not represent a single theory or a single concept but rather a variety of different approaches and visions related to different theoretical directions, as well as the new methods of studying the reality.

Today, a large number of researchers around the world continue to address to the topic of postmodernism. They attract continuous interest to the raised issues, criticism and various declared new ideals and projects for their implementation both in the present and in the future.

Keywords Modern modernism/modernity, post-modern, post-modernism, post-modern, industrial society, post-industrial society, post-structuralism, deconstructivism

Introduction. Now, it is more interesting and relevant to reflect back to the last century's comprehension concepts of their time that it has ever been before. A number of these concepts described culture as “post-modern”, and the society as “post-industrial”.

At the end of the last century, Dick Hebdige wrote that “the success of the term postmodernism ... has generated its own problems. It becomes more and more difficult as the 1980s wear on to specify exactly what it is that “postmodernism” is supposed to refer to as the term gets stretched in all directions across different debates, different disciplinary and discursive boundaries, as different factions seek to make it their own, using it to designate a plethora of incommensurable objects, tendencies, emergencies». (Dick Hebdige, 1988)

Postmodernism arose as an intellectual movement. It was not called in order to comprehend only economic but also political and cultural problems. Although, the elements of a new ideology have been developed in various areas of European culture since the beginning of the 20th century, postmodernism emerged as a notable social phenomenon, when the sphere of culture claimed to be not only a special but also a dominant position among other social spheres.

The main distinguishing feature of postmodernism is the initial orientation, where any general theories that claim to be the only true knowledge of reality cannot describe the world as a whole. Postmodernism is not a separate movement in literature, architecture, visual arts, theater, philosophy, science, sociology, etc. It is a general expression of the spirit of the times, the intellectual pulse of an era that is called postmodern. Usually researchers tend to distinguish between the two concepts. “Postmodern” refers to the period of time that comes after modern. The historical framework of this period is determined by different thinkers either from the 20s or from the 60s of the last century. Sometimes it goes into the second half of the 19th century. “Postmodernism” means self-awareness of culture at a historical stage.

It is common to find another widely used term “postmodernity”, which means a certain period in social evolution or a doctrine aimed to study social differences. This is the difference between “postmodernity” and “postmodernism”. The last term focuses on cultural issues while the former one focuses on social contradictions and changes. However, in the early nineties of the last century, these concepts began to be used interchangeably. Although some theorists of postmodernism believe that the concept of “postmodernity” contains a reaction to the era of modernity and modernization. Under the last term, they increasingly began to denote a complex process that leads to the development of a new social structure and its complication. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “modernization” as the economic and technological development of an industrial, capitalist society. Whereby “modernization” is considered as the main characteristic of modernity.

As Margaret A. Rose notes in her book “The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial” (Cambridge University Press, 1996), the term post-modern is a word which has so far been used by a variety of thinkers on the basis of several different understandings of both the concept of the modern and the meaning of the prefix “The prefix “post” shows a connection with the content of the preceding concept. Though, some understand this connection either as a kind of denial, overcoming or disconnecting with the previous state. While others interpret the prefix as a continuation of development, transition to a new qualitative level.

Modernism /modernity. Difficulties in determining the meaning of postmodernism are also caused by many interpretations of modernism and modernity. Many researchers however agree with the definition of “Modern” from the Oxford English Dictionary: “The end of the Fifteenth century was universally recognized as the starting point ... of Modern, a period which essential characteristics are different from the Middle Ages. Modern means the present, the present time (Oxford English Dictionary, 1933). Under the term “modernism” some understand the ideology of modernity or the so-called project of modern, which was expressed in the philosophy of Rationalism and reached its peak in the Enlightening ideals of freedom, equality and faith in the progress of a rational society. Others out a different meaning in this concept For example, it is functionalism in architecture, abstractionism in art or literary and artistic movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Dictionary gives the following definition: “Post-modern, also post-Modern. Next to or later than “modern” in particular in art and especially in architecture. It applies to the movement against what is denoted by the word “modern”. (Oxford English Dictionary, 2d edn, 1989) The Dictionary also notes various problems associated with a large number of definitions of postmodernism. First of all, it is emphasized that the word “post-modern” does not always have to be interpreted as something that follows modern. Since it can be before or contemporary to modern. In case of architecture, referencing postmodern theoretician Charles Jenks, it is unacceptable to consider postmodernism, only as a simple reaction against modernity.

To confirm this idea, the Dictionary refers to Joseph Hudnut, who used the term “post-Modern” in 1945 as applied to architecture. He believed that the postmodern architecture is nothing more than mass-produced, fabricated buildings. In his article “The Post-Modern House” (1945), Hudnut described new buildings embodying the miracle of technology, science and the collective-industrial scheme of life, devoid of any sentimentality, fantasy or whim. He believed that the nature of the era, when the world became socialized, mechanized and standardized should inevitably be reflected in the homes of people living in this era. (Joseph Hudnut, 1945) Hudnut gives a description of modern architecture, while not using the term “post-modern” as a better alternative to modern. Today many theorists of postmodern architecture consider his concept to be ultra-modernist rather than post-modernist.

The concept of Arnold Toynbee. Another understanding of postmodernism is given by Arnold Toynbee in his “Study of History”. Particularly in post-war publications, where he gives an analysis of the urban working class emergence. The term “Modern” is used by him to describe the

middle classes of Western society. Toynbee believed that the new page of Western history of the late 15th - early 16th centuries was opened by the middle class (those whom we call today the bourgeoisie), which was competent and numerous enough to become a dominant element in the life of the society, which from that moment began to be called modernist for the next four centuries. By the end of the 19th - beginning of the 20th centuries, the middle class has become the most prominent and advanced part of the whole Western world. (Toynbee A., 1954) Western culture of Modern is a phase of the Western cultural development in general. It is distinguished by the domination of the middle class, covering the period before the arrival of the working urban class. During the Modern era in the Western history, the ability to become Western was directly proportional to the ability to adapt to the style of the Western middle class.

Later Toynbee noted that the post-Modern era is not only distinguished by the emergence of a new working class in the West, but also by the rise and determination of other nations, the emergence of their proletariat and the simultaneous emergence of "post-Christian" religious cults and science. Using the idea of Oswald Spengler about the inevitable decline of the West, Toynbee speaks of the end of Western domination, Christian culture and individualism. Although, he rather shares an optimistic view of the future unlike Spengler's pessimistic one.

Toynbee examines two existing points of view on the essence of post-Modern. The first view holds that post-Modern goes after Modern and brings with it both new tragedies and new achievements. Another one is a pessimistic view of the Western history, which is coming to its inevitable end. Toynbee evaluates both points of view as subjective and egocentric. Since the first and the second believe that further improvement in history is impossible. Moreover, history just does not need them. They either say that this period was as good as it could have been or argue that everything was so bad that nothing new might have been arisen. Toynbee describes them as "rationalizing feelings that are actually irrationally subjective". (Toynbee A., 1954)

According to Toynbee, these views and theories, resonating in the society testify that humanity has lost control of its destinies. They signify a social disease that is a consequence of moral degradation.

Koehler and others. Another example of the term "postmodernism" usage is Wright Mills's work "The Sociological Imagination" (1959). Mills uses it to describe a new so-called "fourth era", which is following the modern era. (C. Wright Mills., 1983) He characterizes the "fourth era" as the era of socialism and liberalism generated by the Enlightenment. Moreover, both socialism and liberalism were practically untenable as attempts to adequately explain the world. The ideas of freedom and reason have become controversial, as increasing rationality does not imply the rise of the mind.

For a more complete understanding of the term "postmodernism", there are references in relation to the new style in literature, called the postmodern style. For example, Michael Koehler in his article "Postmodernism" (1977) provides a historical overview of the use of the term "post-modern". In his research, he considers Federico de Onis (1934), Dudley Fitts (1942), Charles Olson (1960), Leslie Fiedler (1965), John Perreault (1968), and Ihab Hassan (1971).

Koehler writes that de Onis dates modernism from 1896 to 1905 followed by two phases: "postmodernism" from 1905 to 1914 and "ultramodernism" from 1914 to 1932. The first phase is defined by him as a reaction to the "excesses" of modernism, and the second as an attempt to expand the search for modernism of poetic innovation and freedom. De Onis uses the term "postmodernism" to describe the works of Spanish and Latin American poets, performed in a new style.

Fitts in his work "The Anthology of Modern Latin American poetry" (1942) also uses the word "post-modernism", analyzing the works of Enrique Gonzalez Martinez. From his point of view, the Mexican poet differs from the others, by force, clarity, accuracy and intellectualism. Fitts called his work the manifesto of postmodernism.

Koehler notes in his review that there is still no so-called agreements what to call “post-modern”. Among the main reasons, he calls the double meaning of the concept of modernity. He considers that the word “modern” can be used as “die Neuzeit” which means “new age” or “new era”. Although it is usually translated as “modern time” or “New time”. It can imply a period of history starting from the European Renaissance or the comparatively modern period from 1900, when the Cultural Studies concepts of modernism began to emerge. Likewise, this concept can be divided into several different periods and movements. For example, it can start with symbolism and finish with surrealism.

Koehler argues that Toynbee and Olson created confusion by applying the word “Post-Modern” to the period, when modernism was already born and developed. For example, he criticizes Toynbee's position regarding his understanding of post-Modern as the time of a new urban working class emergence.

Koehler also analyzes theories that identify modernity with modernism. He provides an example of Irving Howe and Harry Levin, who believe that the end of the modern period is associated with the completion of the Second World War. Koehler argues that the 50s were marked by a reaction to the extremes of modernist formalism and a return to realism. It was not so obvious in the more avant-garde 60s, which, in turn, can more likely be called “ultra-modern”. Whereby he describes the 50s as post-modern.

Koehler considers another point of view that belongs to Leslie Fiedler and Ihab Hassan. On the contrary, they affirm “postmodern sensuality”. According to their view, the 50s are only an early phase of postmodernity. For Koehler, this approach appears to be a rebellion against the canonization of classical modernism, which distinguishes the “aesthetic background” of alternative modern traditions such as Dada and surrealism. However, as Koehler notes, if “post” and “postmodern” not only hint at a temporary relationship but also indicate a break with the previous style, then this approach leads to an internal contradiction. He writes: “Postmodernism breaks only with the conventions of the so-called classical modernism but not with its alternative traditions”. (Michael Koehler, 1977)

Although the point of view that the term “postmodern” does not imply complete break with modernity or “postmodernism” with “modernism” is controversial. Koehler concludes that the former should be considered as late modernism, and not as postmodern. Clearly, the disputes arise again regarding what to call the “late” or “post” modern. According to Koehler, postmodernism begins only after 70s, while the period from 1945 to 1970 should be called “late modern”.

Despite the fact that Koehler often does not share such concepts like “postmodernism”, “postmodernity” and “postmodernism”, his work is recognized by many authors as one of the first systematic attempts to describe the history of the emergence and use of the term postmodernism.

The concept of post-industrial society. One of the main differences between modern theories of postmodernism and its earliest predecessors is the first appeal to the concept of post-industrial society, which was formed in the last three decades of the twentieth century. This concept describes certain changes that have occurred in the field of technology, scientific knowledge and the nature of labor. In other words, the concept of a post-industrial society is a concept of a modern society, that is, a computerized and informational, so-called “knowledge society”. It should be noted that the history of this theory also includes a lot of debate about what is information or knowledge, what is the nature of the relationship of post-industrial to industrial society, etc. The most important work in this regard is the book by Danielle Bell “The Coming of Post-Industrial Society” (1973).

As Bell explains in the Introduction to his book, he first formulated the concept of postindustrial society in an unpublished report “Postindustrial Society: A Speculative Look at the United States in and of 1958” presented by him at the forum on Technology and its Role in Social Change in Society in Boston in 1962. In this report, he was the first to give an analysis of the

phenomenon of intelligent technology and its role in the social changes of society. He noted that the term “industrial” does not inevitably mean “post-capitalist”.

Bell considers works of Arthur Pentty, William Morris and John Raskin as the earliest concept of a postindustrial society. (Arthur J. Pentty, 1917)

The main idea of Pentty is that post-industrialism is expressed in the ability to regulate machines, thereby sharing the work of people and machines. Although his theory was subsequently criticized as unrealistic and reactionary. His idea of the division of labor has developed a basis of many concepts of post-industrial society.

For example, other theories include the work of Zbigniew Brzezinski “Between Two Eras: America's Role in the Technotoronic Era” (1970) Where the term “technotoronic society” is introduced. It is a society dominated by new technologies and electronics. This direction was called “technical determinism”, which also includes A. Toffler’s work “Shock of the future” (1970), where he considers the future society as domination of new technologies.

Marshall McLuhan also writes about the growth of electronic communications systems marking the entry into a new technological era, where electronic media will create a new “global village”. Baudrillard characterizes modern society as a society of electronic media and cybernetics. He writes: “After the phonetic alphabet and the printed book, radio and cinema came. After radio - television. We live here and now in an instant epoch, global communication”. (Baudrillard, 1981) This is a new era that has replaced the Faustian, Promethean period of production and consumption which can be called the era of communication, contacts, connections and reverse connections. With a television image (television is absolute and perfect object for this new era) our own body and everything around us becomes a controlling screen. (Baudrillard, 1985). Unlike McLuhan’s belief in a person’s ability to control electronic media, Baudrillard, on the contrary, sees the individual as being controlled by the latter. This characterization of modern society as subordinate to electronic media was subsequently borrowed by several theorists to describe the new era of postmodernity.

French sociologist Alain Touraine also speaks about a post-industrial society as programmed by technology and subordinate to technocratic power. Although it does not imply pessimism about the possibility of any changes, which is so obvious in many Baudrillard texts. He writes: “A new type of society has been developed. It can be called post-industrial. In order to emphasize how excellent it is from the preceding industrial, some elements of which have nevertheless been retained in both capitalist and socialist states. The new society can also be called technocratic because of the power presented within. Or it can be called programmed, which corresponds to the essence of its production methods and economic organization”. (Alain Touraine, *The Post-Industrial Society, Tomorrow's Social History: Classes, Conflicts and Culture in the Programmed Society*. London, 1974, p.3) If we want to define a new society based on the ruling class, the so-called technocrats, it should be called technocratic. Touraine claims that technocrats support technological development, which likewise is transforming into an irrational accumulation of power. A technocratic society will also control and inhibit new forms of development and social interaction.

Bell, criticizing technological determinism, says that a post-industrial society is not distinguished by the dominance of technology but primarily by the growth of scientific knowledge. Therefore, according to Bell, one of the main characteristics of a post-industrial society, is the division in the field of mental work and increasing professional specialization. For example, it is the allocation of the information sector of work.

In the introduction to “The Emergence of a Post-Industrial Society”, Bell writes that in the next 30-50 years we will see the emergence of a new post-industrial society, which will be primarily marked by changes in the sphere of social structure with various kinds of consequences in different countries. Here, Bell emphasizes that One should not compare his assumptions with the theory of Marx about the initial necessary changes in the superstructure, which then change

the basis. Bell insists on a crucial, new role for theoretical knowledge in innovations in the social sphere, which set the direction for changes in each other sphere of society.

Bell did not only consider changes in social structure, ways of transforming the economy through a new relationship between science and technology. As instead, he also tried to show a deep relationship between politics, economics, and culture. He claimed that postmodern culture is an extended narcissus' culture of Modern.

It is important to emphasize here that for Bell, the theoretical knowledge, which plays an important role in the formation of a post-industrial society is not the discourse of postmodern culture. In contrast of Lyotard, Bell distinguishes between technical intelligentsia, which acts rationally and literary intellectuals, who are highly tuned apocalyptic, hedonistic and nihilistic.

Bell also disagrees with Lyotard's interpretation of science as disinterested skepticism. Lyotard wrote that at the end of the 18th century, the first industrial revolution gave a rise to a reciprocal equation: there is no technology without wealth, and there is no wealth without technology. The current commercialization of scientific research means that scientists, technology, equipment are not bought to find the truth but to strengthen the power. (Daniel Bell, 1976)

Bell, called his concept of post-industrial society as "the largest generalization". And he broke it into five main components:

1. The economic sector: the transition from manufacturing to service;
2. Professional distribution: excellence of professionals and technical class;
3. Axial principle: the central position of theoretical knowledge as a source of innovation in society;
4. Future orientation: technology control;
5. Decision-making: the creation of a new intelligent technology.

Some of the items listed, as Bell himself points out, were described in the 19th century by Saint-Simon. He was the first to introduce the idea of the intellectual avant-garde to the social theory of modernity. He also argued that the leading role in transforming a feudal society into a new industrial society can only belong to scientists and engineers, thereby emphasizing the undeniable contribution of science to increasing economic productivity.

Bell believed that it was Saint-Simon who popularized the word "industrialism", designating it as a society, where wealth is created by production and machinery. Although, according to Bell, Saint-Simon and Marx were obsessed with the idea of the critical role of engineers and science in the transformation of society None of them had and could not have any idea about changes in fundamental relativity of sciences to economics and technological development. For example by the end of 19th - beginning of 20th century, the main parts of industry: steel production, telegraph, telephone, electricity, auto and aircraft construction were developed due to talented inventors working completely independently of each other. If the dominant persons involved in the past century were entrepreneurs and businessmen, then the "new men" today are scientists, mathematicians, economists and engineers of new intellectual technology. (Daniel Bell. 1976)

From Bell's point of view, modernism and postmodernism were unable to provide modern society with the necessary, relevant time values. Although he did not deny that some elements of Protestant ethics are viable and functional, but only in some areas of production. The culture of capitalism (which includes both modernism and postmodernism) is based on contradictory pursuit of pleasure and play. (Daniel Bell. 1976)

Regarding this subject, Jürgen Habermas claimed that Bell accused the culture of modernism in the disappearance of Protestant ethics. However, Bell himself believed that the Protestant ethics were not undermined by modernism but capitalism. Ironically, the only system of values of the 19th century bourgeois society was destroyed by capitalism. Through mass production and mass consumption, Protestant ethics fell underactive promotion of a hedonistic lifestyle. Protestant ethics were designed to limit the accumulation of excess luxury (not capital).

However, when it was defeated by the capitalist offense of quick loans, only hedonism remained from bourgeois society. Indeed, the capitalist system lost its transcendental ethics. The real problem of modernity is the problem of faith or, in other words, the problem of a spiritual crisis that has created a situation that throws the West back to nihilism. (Daniel Bell.1976)

For Bell postmodern theories of deconstruction, structuralism and neo-Freudianism are also symptoms of the crisis caused by modernist hedonism. Bell makes a special reference to what he considers to be the deconstructive nature of postmodernism, describing Michel's Foucault ideas: "Foucault sees a person as a briefly living historical incarnation, as a "footprint in the sand" washed away by the waves. It is no longer sunset of the West and the end of all civilization. A lot of it all tribute to fashion, a pun leading the thought to absurd logic. Like Dada's wicked playfulness or surrealism, it may be remembered as a footnote, a note, an appendix to cultural history". (Daniel Bell. 1976)

Bell attributed Foucault along with Norman Brown, and the entire "pornographic popculture" to the general trend of the 60s, which he called the postmodern extension of modernism. He interpreted postmodernism as a hedonistic concept opposed to Protestant ethics. Besides it has been displaced from the central positions of Western culture. For example, abstracting expression of contemporary art, which he called post-modernist, simultaneously meaning post-Christian art. In his opinion, the new art has lost all genres. Moreover, it denies the existence of any connection between art and life.

In his work, "The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism," Bell writes: "Efforts to find something exciting and significant in literature and art that could replace religion have led to modernism as cultural fashion. Now modernism is exhausted and various types of postmodernism (with their psychopathic efforts to expand consciousness without borders) are just a decomposition of the Self in an attempt to erase the individual ego". (Daniel Bell.1976) Clearly, Bell interpreted postmodernism only as the destruction of former cultural values, which naturally was typical for his time.

As showed above, in the search for original approaches to the analysis of economic processes, postmodernists came to the conclusion that production should be interpreted in the broad sense. It is a production of material goods and creative personality. In the same time, the consumption also should not be interpreted as the disposal of a substance of nature or goods produced but as a process of assimilation of status states and cultural forms. Hence, the true content of utility is not reduced to the universal use value of the product but is expressed in its highly individualized sign value.

The combination of the two concepts of postmodernism and postindustrial society has led to concrete results: rethinking of the meaning use value and utility, consideration of status and cultural aspects of consumption, research on a new role and the meanings of time and space as cultural forms and at the same time factors of production. Society has come to be seen as a post-market type of social structure, with increasing features of more likely of hyper-reality and hyperactivity. (Baudnillard J., 1996) In such a society, a person expresses himself, his subjective aspirations. Then the value as an economic category reaches fractal stage (Baudrillard), where the value has no fulcrum and where there is no longer any equivalence - neither natural nor universal, where we can no longer talk about any value. (Baudrillard J. ,1996)

The study of a multifaceted personality, the results of its activities in combination with the debunking of social, political and economic vices of capitalist and post-capitalist society and the search for a way out of the crisis led to the creation of a unique doctrine of postmodernity. Seemingly unconnected directions were combined from the concepts of architecture and criticism of literature to post-structuralism and the theory of post-industrial society in this movement. However, all of them are united by the strong spirit of the doctrine of postmodernity, a sense of a new era, criticism, the denial and opposition of modernity to the past, postmodernity - modernity.

Conclusion. So, a historical review of the concept of postmodernism shows its vastness, versatility and eclecticism, which creates certain difficulties in its interpretation. It is clear that postmodernism is not a separate movement in philosophy, literature, architecture, economic or political theory. It means a general expression of the worldview of a certain era.

The terms “postmodern” and “postmodernism” did not immediately acquire their current semantic meaning. Until the eighties of the last century, they designated individual cultural phenomena and events but not the worldview of the era as a whole. For the first time, the status of the philosophical concept of “postmodernism” was obtained on the basis of generalizations of French poststructuralism and American deconstructivism, which some researchers call the real ideology of postmodernism. Philosophical postmodernism immediately began to claim both the role of the general theory of modern art as a whole and the most adequate concept of special postmodern sensitivity as a specific postmodern mentality. As a result postmodernism began to be conceptualized as an expression of the spirit of the times in all spheres of human activity: art, sociology, science, economics, politics, etc.

Postmodernism was born at first as a phenomenon of art. Firstly, it was comprehended as a literary movement. Later, it was identified with one of forms of the stylistic directions of architecture of the second half of the century. And at the verge of the 70s-80s, it began to be perceived as the most appropriate expression of the intellectual and emotional perceptions of the epoch. Arising as a reflection on new phenomena in the field of art, postmodernism gradually turned into a specific philosophy of the cultural consciousness of modernity. And in search of a theoretical basis, it turned to the concepts of poststructuralism.

Apparently, there is reason to argue that there is a single set of ideas, including poststructuralism, postmodernism and deconstructivism. This complex is an influential interdisciplinary trend in modern cultural Western life, manifested in various fields of humanitarian knowledge and connected by a certain unity of philosophical and general theoretical assumptions and analysis methodology. Theoretical basis of this complex are the concepts developed within the framework of French post-structuralism by such representatives as J.Lacan, M-F.Lyotard, M. Foucault, J.Derrida and others. The involvement of poststructuralists in demonstration of their positions and postulates of primarily literature material led to the considerable popularity of their ideas among literary scholars and gave rise to the phenomenon of deconstructivism. In the narrow sense of the word, deconstructivism is a theory of literature and specific practice of analysis of art works, based on general theoretical concepts of poststructuralism.

At the verge of the 70-80s, worldview and methodological parallels between poststructuralism and postmodernism emerged. Initially, postmodernism was developed as a theory of art and literature trying to master the experience of various neo-avant-garde movements and reduce them to a common ideological and aesthetic denominator. From the second half of the 80s, postmodernism began to be conceptualized as a phenomenon identical to poststructuralism. In some studies these terms are characterized as synonymous.

Many theories that use the term “postmodern” developed in different time and cultural periods and therefore were based on a different understanding of the terms “modern”, “modernism”, “modernization”, “modernity” as well as the prefix “post” itself. Hence, the various meanings embedded in the word “postmodernism” and in the various areas of its application. One fact remains undoubted. Theoretical and ideological foundations of both modernism and postmodernism were formulated and justified by philosophy that not only met the needs of its time or “expressed the spirit of the epoch” but also radically changed it. Richard Rorty in the book “Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature” writes to the chapter “Philosophy in Conversation with Humanity” that he is attempting to make some allusions to replace the vision of philosophy only as a “matrix” of reality that does not affect people's simple everyday lives. A modern conversation needs to be built otherwise. (Richard Rorty, 1979)

Today around the world a large number of researchers continue to address to the topic of modernism and postmodernism, which shows the continuing interest in the problems posed, their criticism and possible solutions in the future to which they are oriented.

REFERENCES

1. Alain Touraine, *The Post-Industrial Society, Tomorrow's Social History: Classes and Culture in the Programmed Society*. London, 1974
2. Arthur J. Penty, *Old Worlds for New: a Study of the Post-Industrial state*. London, 1917
3. Aigul Bokayeva. *Modernism and Postmodernism*, Karaganda, 2005
4. Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, StLouis, 1981
5. Baudrillard, *The Ecstasy of Communication*, in Hal Foster (ed.), *Postmodern Culture*, London, 1985
6. Baudrillard J. *Consumer Society // Selected Writings*. Cambridge, 1996
7. Baudrillard J. *The Transparency of Evil. Essays on Extreme Phenomena*. New York, 1996
8. C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*. Harmond-Sworth, 1983
9. Daniel Bell. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York, 1976
10. Dick Hebdige. *Hiding in the Light: on Images and Things*. London and New York, 1988
11. Gerd Zacher *Encounter. Deconstruction in Music - The Jacques Derrida*. Rotterdam, 2002
12. *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edition, vol IX, Oxford 1933
13. *Oxford English Dictionary*, vol XII, Oxford 1989
14. Jacques Derrida. *Between the Blinds*. Columbia University Press, 1991
15. Jean-François Lyotard : *Writings on Contemporary Art and Artists*, Six volumes. Ed. Herman Parret, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010-2013
16. Joseph Hudnut, *The Post-modern House*, the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada
17. Kuspit, Donald. *The End of Art*. — Cambridge, 2004.
18. Margaret A. Rose. «The post-modern and the post-industrial» (Cambridge University Press, 1996
19. Michael Koehler, *Postmodernismus, Amerikastudien*, vol. 22, no, 1, 1977
20. Richard Rorty. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton University Press, 1979
21. Taylor, Brandon. *Art Today*. New York, 2004.
22. Toynbee A. *Study of History*, vol 8, New York, 1954

Information about the author:

Aigul Bokayeva Candidate of Philosophical Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor, Astana International University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, bokayevaigul@gmail.com