

**ON THE QUESTION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE TWO PROVISIONS OF C. JUNG IN MODERN EPISTEMOLOGY**

Tural Najafquluzade,

Doctoral Student of NAS of Azerbaijan, Institute of philosophy, Sociology and Law, sector "Theory of cognition and philosophy of science", 09.00.01 – Ontology and theory of cognition

E-mail: [tural.najafov@mail.ru](mailto:tural.najafov@mail.ru)

Accepted: OCT.22. 2021

**ABSTRACT**

The terms "introversion" and "extraversion" were introduced into science by K. Jung. According to the author, these key concepts are applicable not only in a psychological context, but also in a broader sense. Epistemology is no exception in this sense.

The article analyzes the process of introverted and extraverted cognition. Using the terminology of C. Jung, the author introduces these concepts into epistemology, considering them as features of conscious systems. The author is interested in the process of cognition of two systems, which can be called as - introverted and extroverted.

Key words: philosophy, introversion, extraversion, system, cognition, epistemology, psychology, post- neoclassical

The place of epistemology in the philosophical system of knowledge is peculiar. Before moving on to the topic, let's briefly consider this feature of the theory of knowledge or epistemology, because our interpretation is largely based on this feature and its post-non-classical understanding.

We think that it will not be wrong if we note: At the center of philosophical knowledge is ontology, looking for an answer to the question "what?". Ontology, in particular, is interested in the answer to this question from the side of not scientific, but philosophical knowledge. Trying to penetrate the essence of the moral and material, ontology, this area of philosophy, where, along with this fundamental question, there is a search for answers to many "auxiliary questions". One of the questions is "how?" - is the central issue of both methodology and the epistemology that interests us. This question aims to identify a process that is moral in its essence. We believe that there is a basis for considering ontology in relative dependence on epistemology (of course, we cannot talk about absolute dependence). Cognition, trying to find out the essence of creation, is faced with the need to clarify: "What?" is the knowledge itself. Questions - "what is existence?" and "what is knowledge?" - are inextricably linked. So, if we consider this situation in an analogy, we can compare philosophical thinking with a kind of palace, where ontology is the crown hall, and epistemology is the entrance gate of this house. So, of course, the path to ontology - must lie through the gate - epistemology. We considered philosophy as a system where there is a certain relationship between the elements of the system, however, it should be borne in mind that the very existence of such a system is a controversial moment in the history of philosophy and one can meet philosophers who focus on a particular area. In our example, this can be assessed as an attempt to "get into the palace through the window", but we repeat - this is due to the fact that the question of considering philosophical knowledge as a system remains open.

In the considered status, epistemology is of particular interest in post-non-classical cognition. Post-non-classical cognition implies new styles and methods of the scientific approach, and two of them determine the relevance of our topic: integration and new ways of studying the scientific heritage of the past. For epistemology, integration with psychology, which is related to it in terms of the scientific object of study, is quite natural. There is a high probability of applying the scientific results of psychology to epistemology as empirical material. On the other hand, the theoretical models proposed by epistemology may be the subject of new research for psychology. The topic we are

considering is based on this connection and aims to reveal the extent to which K. Jung's interpretation of the concepts of "introversion" and "extroversion" is applicable to the modern analysis of the cognitive process.

The terms "introversion" and "extroversion" were first used in science by K. Jung (see 1). Based on interpersonal relationships, Jung defined introversion as a behavioral type based on internal subjective mental activity, and extraversion as a type of behavior facing the outside world, the external environment. The difference between these two types of behavior, according to Jung, comes down to the direction of movement of the libido. If during extraversion the vital energy-libido is directed from the outside, into the environment, in other words, outside the system, then introversion implies, in contrast to this process, the concentration of energy within the system, on intrasystem operations. Thus, if the first type is more open to communication, dialogue, participation in interpersonal relationships, then the second type is a closed mental form, predisposed to internal "dialogue" and experiences. But at the same time, it should be borne in mind that, according to Jung, a person is a complex mental structure and in various life situations is able to respond with behavior that is characteristic of different types of behavior. According to Jung, if one of the types appears as a primary function, then the other acts as a secondary function. Jung noted that introverted or extraverted predominance of one of the four psychological functions of the human psyche - "thinking", "feeling", "intuitive" and a function based on "experience" is possible. These features, in a somewhat distinctive form, underlie the ambivert (divert) behavioral type, which in modern psychology is given preference in the analysis of human behavior.

We can assume that for K. Jung, who himself can be ranked among the intuitive, or "thinking" introverts, the introverted model of cognition is closer, which can reveal the essence of archetypes, or the subconscious, in general. In our opinion, Jung's interest in Indian philosophy, especially in R. Maharshi, is not accidental (see 2). The Maharshi's question is "who am I?" - which has both ontological and epistemological meaning, and the Maharshi's way of finding the answer - is much more than a simple sensual-psychological, spiritual state of an introvert, it is a different level of cognition. What caught Jung's attention in the Maharshi, we think, was the peculiarity of the fundamental question "Who am I?" environment.

We have given a very short overview of the teachings of K. Jung. Now, let's analyze the results associated with the comparison of the obtained empirical materials with the method of a systematic approach.

Imagine two systems. For an introverted system, its own elements and their mutual relations with each other are "more interesting". There is a strict balance between the elements of the system, the arrangement of elements in a certain form and according to a certain content, their hierarchical status are of decisive importance for the system, because the very existence and security of the system depends on it. The intra-system balance is organized, mobility and the process of development of elements is too slow, the system constantly monitors processes. The relationships between the elements of a system are quite complex and the main activity of the system - to keep it safe and whole - is to comprehend and "represent" this complexity, in the simplest possible way for itself (this is typical for conscious systems). The energy of the system is spent on these processes, and the sources of energy, apparently, have different origins, in different systems. This system is not closed, as it may seem at first glance (we believe that there are no closed systems, especially when it comes to conscious systems), it has more or less stable relations with the external environment and other systems. The most dangerous thing for such a system is to "feel" oneself as one of the elements of some large mega-system, because in this case a risk is created for the existence of the system, since the intra-system energy is intended to regulate its internal balance and to stay alive in "whirlpool" of complex relations of the megasystem, the system must "produce" additional energy or extract from the existing part, which, in any case, is a destabilizing factor for the system.

In the extraverted system, a different structure and mechanisms of activity are observed. This system has active integrative relationships with external systems. Intrasystem relations and elemental structure are quite mobile. These relations are ready to receive a new form and content at any time, and this does not pose any threat to the system; on the contrary, the existence and development of the system largely depends on this. The peculiarity of this system is the ability to "see" itself as an element of a mega-system. At the same time, one can notice a universal ability to adapt. This ability is a determining factor in choosing a position in the structure of a megasystem and in choosing a function in intra-system relations (it seems to us that, it should be a question of choice, because it is unlikely that it will be possible to "indicate a place" for this system in the ranks of a megasystem). For such a system, the direction and accumulation of energy inside is very dangerous. In this case, unlike

the introverted system, the extraverted system can be destroyed in the internal complexity of the system, it can not get out of the chaos of this complexity. This state of the extraverted system and the integration of the extraverted system into the mega-system - in conscious human systems, is a state referred to as "absurdity". Here it is necessary to note the meaning of the categories "absurd" and its anti-meaning "meaning" for systems that are able to "work out" consciousness and indicate what function they perform in the process of the system, called "cognition".

The aforementioned energy of the system plays the role of the basis for the process of cognition in conscious systems. Both rational and irrational processes of cognition ultimately involve the identification of the absurdity or logic (meaningful) of the "product" of cognition. Meaning, regardless of the cognitive process that the ego produces, is a systemic response that is designed to keep in balance intra-system relations and relations between the system and the external environment. It is obvious that in this status the meaning is very important for the existence of a conscious system and is characteristic of conscious systems. Particular attention is paid to the understanding of meaning in autopoietic epistemology, but due to the absence of the concepts of "extraversion" and "introversion", as well as subject-object relations, meaning is interpreted as a means of ensuring the system's endurance against environmental influences (see 3). This interpretation is in principle correct, but it should be noted that there are different reactions in different systems. Let's see how this process occurs within the framework of "classical" subject-object relations.

The production of meaning occurs as a result of reflexive contact between the subject and the object of knowledge. If the cognitive situation is simple, then the difference in comprehension between the two systems is negligible. These small differences, almost identical even, are the basic conditions for the formation of language, the oldest form of communication between conscious systems. Consider one of the simplest cognitive situations: "The sea, the sun above the sea and trees on the seashore." Here, the subject fixed, in a certain period of time, objects and their location in space. This conclusion is reflected in the language, in the form of symbolic signs. The situation is simple, therefore the results of cognition of the introverted and extraverted systems are relatively the same (this, one might say, is typical for the "differentiation" stage in cognition), but the following processes are different. An introverted system (for example, an artist), passing this situation through its "filter" of intra-system relations, and, in other words, comparing it with its own system, can react in the form of a scoreboard, in the "landscape" genre. And an extraverted system (for example, a businessman), while evaluating objects and their sequence, takes into account the role they play in the structure and relations of the mega-system and interprets this situation as a "trading object". Making a small digression, we can say that the statement put forward by socionics - "an introverted subject accepts interobject relationships, but he is dissatisfied with the objects themselves. An extrovert is satisfied with objects, but he is not satisfied with the relationships" (see 4) - in principle, true.

Let's consider two other stages of thinking: "assessment" and "understanding". Extraverted cognition in the "assessment" stage, observes the environment from the outside and evaluates the situation. At this moment, the elements and relationships in the environment or megasystem are considered, the prospects for integrating the system there, which is the carrier of the subject of knowledge. And comprehension occurs already in the process of connecting and integrating this system to relationships, after which both processes run in parallel. Introverted cognition observes from within, and, on the contrary, the integration of the environment into this system is considered, taking into account the laws of the system. Comprehension consists in assessing the position - whether it is violated or not, the internal balance and equilibrium as a result of integration, how this position fits the system, etc.

In the example above, we observed a simple cognitive process. We believe that complex cognitive processes proceed in the same form. And such parts of cognitive activity as science and philosophy are no exception. Considering the history of the development of science, we seem to see an action directed along a vector, from extroversion c ii to introversion c ii. If the classical scientific idea of the world, Newton's time, can be compared with extraverted cognition, then post-non-classical cognition is more like introverted cognition. It is a process flowing from extraversion to introversion. But the whole difficulty is that, for a person, the criterion of the truth of scientific, as well as philosophical positions, is hidden in its ambiguity. Related to this is the fragility of theories based on extreme subjectivism or objectivism. Ambiverted cognition implies active "cooperation" and a situation of some kind of balance between both cognitive processes, and it is very difficult to give a theoretical and practical mechanism for this situation. We can only note and assume that, the method of a systematic approach, on which we were based in the analysis of the cognitive process, in the post-

non-classical period, together with this period, as if reached the end of the linear movement and the next period of cognition can begin with the use of a new method, which can be conditionally called "post-system approach".

### **References**

1. Jung K.G. "Psychological types", St. Petersburg, "Azbuka", 2001, 733 from.
2. Carl Jung "Message to Modern Man" // "Sri Ramana Maharshi: Life and Path", St. Petersburg - Tiruvannamalai, "Ecopolis and Culture" - Sri Ramanashrama, 1995, 416 p. p.359-362
3. Maturana U., Varela F. "Tree of Knowledge", M., "Progress-Tradition", 2001, 224p.
4. [www.socionics.wiki-wiki.ru/socionics-wiki/index.php/introversion](http://www.socionics.wiki-wiki.ru/socionics-wiki/index.php/introversion)
5. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/introversion-extroversion
6. E. Ilyin "Personal features of extroverts and introverts" // [www . elitarium . en](http://www.elitarium.en)