

M.M. Shumatova^{1*}, A.K. Bokayeva¹, E.G. Shumatov^{2*}¹ L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan² M. Gabdullina Civil Defense Academy of the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kokshetau, Kazakhstan(E-mail: shumatovamira@gmail.com; bokayevaagul@gmail.com; eldar83.83@mail.ru)

Symbolic Analysis of Security Concepts

This article examines collective ideas about dirty and clean of a person in a traditional society. First of all, modern hygienic ideas about dirty as contagious were abstracted from these ideas, which gave an understanding of clean and dirty as ordered and disordered, that is, an attempt was made to reveal the symbolic meaning of these ideas in the ordering, organization and systematization of social order. In particular, an attempt was made to reveal the symbolic meaning of the contents of the concepts of Kazakh culture “kir”, “ot”, “kasietti”, “bata”. At the same time, ideas about dirty and clean not only structure and systematize social experience, but also implement measures of social control to preserve and reproduce the established social order. These collective ideas, being at the same time necessary components of ethical consciousness, strengthen and focus human sensitivity to accept social order. Ethical consciousness, implementing not only external but also internal self-control over the order, recognizes it as given from outside or from above. Thus, social order and control, strictly regulating the daily life of members of a traditional society, develop protective mechanisms of social processes from factors that destroy them. An established and controlled social order contributes to the reproducibility and repeatability of social processes, and, consequently, the actions of individuals have a predictable and expected nature. Thus, the routinization of social activity contributes to the formation of a sense of ontological security in a traditional society.

Keywords: danger, clean, dirty, social norm, taboo, safety precautions, social order, social control, routine, ontological security.

Introduction

A human being, from the emergence of the first societies to the present day, has always solved the issues of his safe existence. Human existence from a natural point of view is protected at the level of the individual by the instinct of self-preservation, and at the level of the species — by the function of reproduction.

The chronicle of the history of the coexistence of people, unfortunately, has sad pages, when one clan, tribe or even nationality could completely physically destroy other social groups. However, the current situation with the possible self-destruction of mankind as a result of, for example, a nuclear catastrophe is unique in its own way. At the same time, the question of whether the atom is peaceful or not is insignificant. Regardless of the alternative, the consequences are equally destructive for the life of not only man, but also all living things on Earth. The security problem is not just planetary, but cosmic! It is within the framework of modern society that security issues have become more relevant than ever.

The complexity of the situation lies in the fact that today man is not only placed in conditions of danger, the consequence of which is a constant feeling of existential fear, but also in a situation of total risk. Risk has become an integral part of human existence. From an economic point of view, the higher the risk, the greater the profit and gain. Risk is the fate of a person in an individualized society. Or, in simple terms, without risk there is no success, glory and fame. An individualized society, according to Z. Bauman, is a society characterized by an increased level of uncertainty, and therefore uncontrollability of social processes [1].

The question arises: “Why exactly has modern society failed to properly develop mechanisms for its safe existence?” And also what mechanisms, factors or any other reasons have prevented and still prevent this.

To solve this type of difficulty, it is advisable to conduct a comparative analysis of modern society with previous forms of society's existence — to identify the protective mechanisms of self-reproduction of social systems and structures of traditional societies, trace their transformation in modern society and, through comparative analysis, identify the reasons for their non-functionality or limitations, as well as what actions the social subject of activity (actor) takes to resolve issues of safe reproduction of his social life.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: eldar83.83@mail.ru

According to E. Giddens, social structures are rules and resources for the reproduction of social systems. If social systems, controlled by social structures, have a reproduction practice in social space and time, then the actors of social actions develop a sense of ontological security [2]. Thus, the reproduction of social practices guarantees a familiar, one's own, native horizon of being, that is, the social subject — the actor — develops a trusting attitude towards the social world. Naturally, therefore, all mechanisms of reproduction are approved by society, and everything that threatens reproduction is fraught with danger and falls under a strict ban — taboo.

The relevance of the problem is also determined by its mass nature. A modern person is obliged to comply with labor and life safety standards from all sides, in the absence of which he has the right to declare them. So, for example, with the advent of the car, road safety appeared. Today, almost every family has a car, or better to say that a car is not a luxury, but a means of transportation. The absence of a car does not mean that there is no need to comply with traffic rules. A person is involved in traffic in one way or another, either as a driver, pedestrian, or as a user of public transport. But the most widespread and applied in the daily life of the average person should be recognized as safety measures and techniques with electrical appliances, the so-called electrical safety.

Issues of ensuring safety not only permeate the life of an individual and society, but form and form a certain sphere — a safety space, where society strictly regulates and regulates the activities and behavior of each member of society. So, the largest number of electrical appliances, as a rule, are located in the kitchen, therefore, when planning and building a house or apartment, a separate room is allocated — the kitchen. Also, in addition to this, it should be noted that the preparation and consumption of food is still given a special “ritual” meaning. Thus, the allocation of a separate room in a house or apartment for cooking has not only practical significance from the point of view of electrical safety, but also a certain sacred meaning from the standpoint of cleanliness and hygiene, which are also necessary elements of a safety culture.

At the same time, this allocated security space does not stand alone, like a kitchen in an apartment, but is intertwined with all human activity, whether he wants it or not. This space sets its own limitations; it is, as a rule, strictly and rigidly standardized and regulated. Naturally, security imposes its own limitations on the realization of a person's desires and the realization of his rights and freedoms. But it goes without saying that the realization of desires and the realization of rights and freedoms by a person outside of a safe space is impossible.

The relationship between security and freedom is directly proportional; they act hand in hand. The more a person wants to realize his freedom, the more he creates conditions of insecurity that he must overcome. And this situation of insecurity has such a negative impact on a person's existence that even such a phenomenon as flight from freedom (E. Fromm) arises. Freedom implies responsibility for a safe existence — are the new horizons of human creativity safe, because without security freedom degenerates into arbitrariness, and freedom without creativity degenerates into the routinization of everyday life, and the person himself turns into a part of the mechanism, its cog, or into a materially provided automaton [3].

Research methods

The theoretical and methodological basis for studying collective ideas about clean and dirty, as well as revealing and understanding the meaning and significance of such concepts as “kir”, “ot”, “kasietti”, “bata” and others was the hermeneutic method. Naturally, fragmentary and fragmentary interpretations of the rules and norms existing in the culture, reflecting the system of social order and control, are doomed to failure, therefore, to consider them in unity and integrity, methods of system analysis, a functional-structural approach and the principle of holism were used.

Results and discussion

The problem of safety has become most acute with the advent and development of technology. Mechanization and automation of labor processes, the use of technology in production processes, as well as in everyday human life, contributed to injuries or mutilations, the development of occupational diseases. As a rule, the harm caused to human health by technology was a consequence of violations of safety regulations. “Safety engineering is an outdated term that denoted part of the “labor protection” function — management of production activities aimed at preventing injuries and diseases associated with production. Currently, it is practically not used and is not found in official documents” [4].

Thus, the following concepts are used in the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

- “Safe working conditions — working conditions under which the levels of impact of production factors on workers do not exceed the established standards”;
- “Labor safety — the state of protection of workers, ensured by a set of measures that exclude the impact of harmful and (or) hazardous production factors on workers in the process of work” [5].

Basically, in the code and in other regulatory legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan, labor safety is used together with the concept of labor protection, which means “a system for ensuring the safety of life and health of workers in the process of work, including legal, socio-economic, organizational and technical, sanitary and epidemiological, medical and preventive, rehabilitation and other measures and means” [5]. It should be noted that in English the concepts of “safety” and “protection” are expressed in one word “security”. Thus, in English, safety is not a negative concept, the verbal existence of which is closely intertwined with the meanings of “protection”, “defense” and “reliability”.

We do not deny the legal, legal side of the issue, but the problem of safety can also be considered from the symbolic side. Society has not always had a developed legal form of regulating issues of safety and labor protection. Shifting the emphasis from a purely legal and legal to a symbolic point of view, an interesting fact catches the eye. In the symbolic world, each thing has a certain semantic meaning, depending on which the world is hierarchically structured and ordered. Of course, in the legal sphere we do not deny logical connection and consistency, but, as a rule, a balancing mechanism operates in the legal space, since everyone is equal before the law.

In the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the section on safety and labor protection is the fourth penultimate section. While, according to the rules and terms of training on occupational safety and health, “employees who have not undergone training and testing of knowledge on occupational safety and health are not allowed to work” [6], this is firstly. And, secondly, introductory or primary instruction, as well as testing of knowledge on occupational safety and health with registration in the appropriate journal, is carried out upon hiring or directly at the workplace before starting work. Consequently, safety should be not in the penultimate, but in the first place.

According to the hierarchy of regulatory legal acts, the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan has the highest legal force, which states that the highest values are a person, his life, rights and freedoms [7]. The question arises: “Why in the Labor Code are issues of ensuring the safety of life and health of workers (not people!) in the penultimate place?” Is this not a reflection of the capitalist attitude to man as a workforce (Arbeitskraft), which was criticized in the works of K. Marx. Legislatively, first of all, it is necessary to level a person down to an employee under a contract, and as a result, ensuring security and financial costs for it are carried out only within the framework of a person as a worker.

Naturally, a person is not only a workforce, and therefore security issues interest him not only in the legal field, but also from psychological, social, political, etc. points of view. Thus, E. Giddens, for example, speaks of ontological security, expanding this concept to explain social structures and systems, that is, society as a whole.

In the following presentation, we will focus our attention on the symbolic analysis of the problem of security. Thus, security found symbolic expression in collective ideas about the sacred or the forbidden. Consequently, the analysis of security in collective ideas presupposes the disclosure of their “logic”, and the prohibitions or prescriptive actions themselves must reveal their rational component.

In this regard, the work of M. Douglas “Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Ideas about Pollution and Taboo” [8] is of interest. In this work, the author rethinks the religious ideas and religious activity (ritual) of primitive man as a rational (logical) desire to protect society (family) from factors threatening or destroying it. Our concept of the “rational” is not alien to primitive man. Thus, the difference between modern religions and primitive beliefs is not associated with logical reasons, but depends on the social structure.

Taboo (prohibition) carries a supernatural threat and danger, but without a clear and distinct idea of them. For example, in the Kazakh language it is said abstractly “it will be bad” (zhaman bolady), but what is meant specifically by “zhaman” is not specified. This is what determines the complexity of defining the negative concept of “security”. The definition of a negative concept depends on its opposite positive concept, that is, what is “danger” and in what context it is used.

M. Douglas declares the difference between primitive and world (modern) religions to be a prejudice, which is quite firmly rooted in modern religious studies. Therefore, social prohibitions (taboos) are reconsidered not as something incomprehensible, but as collective ideas that organize and order the social experience of individuals, and thereby contribute to the systematic reproduction and functioning of primitive society.

The orderliness of social experience by collective ideas forms in the consciousness of an individual not only a sense of belonging, but also a sense of safety and security.

The author of the work “Cleanliness and Danger” reveals the symbolic meaning of the problem of safety in the social experience of a person through the paired categories of “dirty and clean”. However, the correct symbolic meaning of the specified conceptual pair is possible only when it is presented in a holistic system of culture, where their place, role and functional purpose are revealed.

Danger is symbolized with dirt. “Dirt is essentially disorder... Dirt rebels against order. Removing it is not a negative action, but a positive desire to organize the surrounding world” — writes M. Douglas [8; 2]. Therefore, if dirt is disorder, then cleanliness refers to order. Collective ideas about dirt and cleanliness, defining and managing the behavior of an individual, not only coordinate his behavior, but thereby it is an effective mechanism for the production and reproduction of the social. Collective ideas and reality in the activity of an individual are consistent with each other, or more precisely, social reality is reproduced, because the activity of an individual is guided by proven patterns and templates of actions reflected in social memory.

The current understanding of dirty is usually applicable in the area of hygiene, strict observance of which ensures the healthy state of the human body. Preventive hygienic measures are aimed at preventing infectious diseases. A broad understanding of dirty as infected with microbes or bacteria, which are therefore characterized as harmful, is widespread. M. Douglas does not agree with such a limited understanding and states that the understanding of dirty also has a symbolic expression, which has only external differences in different cultures. “If we can separate microbiology and hygiene from our ideas about dirt, we will get the old definition of dirt as something that is out of place,” says M. Douglas [8; 36].

The understanding of dirt (dangerous) is on the periphery of ordered and classified social experience, that is, only in a comparative relation to the specified order as cleanliness, is it possible to single out something as dirty, thus absolute (unrelated) dirt does not exist. For example, special clothing itself may be clean and tidy, but it is not customary to wear this clothing when visiting or at home. Disinfectants are dirty and dangerous if they are in the refrigerator with food products, but in the bathroom, on the contrary, they are means for cleanliness and order.

Consequently, a person’s individual experience passes through collective representations as if through a “filter mechanism”. What can be systematized and classified is in its place, and what is deviating and uncertain is dangerous because the consequences of their influence are unknown — there are no expected reactions that form a sense of security and trust.

In this aspect, culture can be considered as a set of classification schemes for organizing individual experience. Using the terminology of T. Kuhn, we can say that an individual act within the framework of a certain paradigm. Thus, with a large degree of conventionality, we speak of individual experience, since, in fact, through classification schemes (“paradigms”) the collective constantly reproduces itself.

Naturally, an individual is not able to change the categorical structure of consciousness, including the content of collective ideas, but what about deviant behavior, which, despite the strength of the “filtering mechanism”, takes place?

First of all, of course, deviant behavior is attempted to be brought into line with the current “paradigm”, just as it happens in scientific knowledge, that is, a deviation is not an anomaly. Another effective mechanism is the recognition of deviant behavior as dangerous. And dangerous, since it is prohibited, should not be discussed in society. What is not discussed will not be preserved in public memory, or at least is not widely disseminated.

There are many definitions of culture, but from the point of view of the problem we are studying — symbolic analysis of security — culture can be understood not just as a process of transition from chaos to order, from dirty to clean, but also a constant process of production and reproduction of social order and control over it. When social experience is ordered and the behavior of individuals is expected and predictable, then a sense of ontological security is formed in individual members of society. Everything that is in the cultural space is safe; the periphery and the border carry danger.

However, the said border is at the same time the beginning of culture, or in other words, culture begins with prohibitions (taboos). Taboo is the differentiating function of delimiting order from disorder (chaos), clean from dirty, safe from dangerous. The concepts of delimitation and beginning (border-entry), as well as dirty as disordered and forbidden and their strengthening role in ethical consciousness are covered in one concept “kir” of the Kazakh language.

According to the explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language, the first meaning of the word «kir» is dirt (dirty, soiled), that is, something that stains or makes dirty [9; 438]. The second common meaning is

laundry, namely things that are in the process of being washed (cleaned), that is, something unsystematized and lying together in one basket or more categorically lying in the corner of the bathroom, but in the process of washing itself begins to be systematized, for example, by color or by fabric. Thus, in the process of washing (“kir”), the process of ordering begins, and depending on the chosen criterion, an entrance into the filtering mechanism of social experience is carried out, or, in other words, an entrance into the social order.

This understanding of entrance is symbolically reflected in the third meaning. The verbal noun of the word “kir” — “kiru” or “kirgizu” means “to enter”, “to go in”, “to bring in”, “to bring in”, that is, “kir” has the meaning of an entrance, an entry. In colloquial language, the phrase “kireberis” is used in a literal meaning translated as an entrance room (corridor), where, as a rule, they take off their shoes and outerwear before entering the house.

The entrance (“kireberis”) is a border dividing the dirty and clean, the disordered and the ordered, chaos and harmony. But if we take a yurt for comparison, which is one solid structure without rooms, then the entrance is more associated with “bosaga”. The Kazakhs have a very reverent attitude to “bosaga”, which in translation means 1) the side post of the door frame; 2) the threshold [10; 164]. In the collective beliefs of the Kazakhs, the sacredness of the entrance-border is fixed by many prohibitions. For example, it is forbidden to stand on the threshold, as well as to stand leaning against the door frame. These are prohibitions that warn against danger. A girl is forbidden to sit on the threshold, because otherwise she will remain alone, that is, she will not get married.

But in the case of the blessing “Bosagang berik bolsyn!” means that happiness and well-being in the house (yurt) depend on the “door frame”. The fact is that, based on the structure of the yurt, a strong door frame, as in principle in any house, indicates that the yurt stands firmly and securely, that is, does not wobble or tilt. Therefore, an even door frame of the yurt indicates the integrity and correctness of the installation of the mobile home, and therefore the safety of living in it. Thus, dangerous (dirty) is not something that is repressed by consciousness, but, on the contrary, strictly stored in memory in the form of prohibitions and taboos, it is a memory of what should never be done, otherwise you will cause harm and put not only yourself, but also your entire family (community) in a dangerous situation.

In order for collective ideas about dangerous to have an effective force for unquestioning execution, they are not just a message and transmission of information, but also speak of responsibility, or rather a threat, for violating these restrictive rules. For example, you can not only bring on yourself some disease or even death, but you yourself can become its source — the evil eye, and therefore people will avoid you. A person strives for the good and kind with all his behavior, adheres to a moral way of life in order to receive social approval and support. The dichotomy “good — bad” (“dangerous — safe”) is perceived by people as “friend — foe”.

Here it is necessary to emphasize the role and place of ethical consciousness in the education of all members of society. Ethical consciousness not only consolidates social norms of order and control of safe existence, but has a principle of amplification and focusing. A person who even mentally violates the established order, endangers not only himself, but also society as a whole. Fear of danger and the desire to have a sense of security force a person to lead a moral way of life, since such behavior will be expected and predictable for other members, and therefore there will be a trusting and benevolent attitude towards the person himself, and the person himself will feel like a full-fledged member of society, and therefore count on its support and protection.

The so-called “forensic theory of danger” also gives an amplifying factor to ethical consciousness, according to which the world around a person is moralized [11]. The trick of this teaching is that a person who has been exposed to danger or some misfortune is to blame for this himself, that is, the guilt is imputed to the person himself who has been exposed to danger. Ethical consciousness strengthens a person’s desire to lead a righteous life, preserving and increasing the established order, and thereby protecting it from danger, forming a sense of security in it.

So, in the moral world, a decent person develops a trusting attitude towards the world and a sense of ontological security. It is better to be moral and responsible, since in this case, corresponding to social expectations, a person firmly knows his place and purpose in the world. Or, in other words, he is recognized by the world, and in the universe itself, any incomprehensible uncertainty is excluded.

If a person has stumbled, as they say, it happens to everyone, ethical consciousness condemns him through collective ideas. In fact, he condemns himself very strictly, since he is also a bearer of ethical consciousness. The intensifying factor here is also manifested in the fact that dirty and dangerous (“kir”) is part of the established phrases “kirbendik” (discontent), “kirbin” (distrust, suspicion), kirbelen (offense) or the

phrase “kirerge tesik tappady” [9; 438], which literally means “did not find an opening for entry”, and figuratively “did not know what to do out of shame or disgrace”. However, the controlling factor itself in colloquial language is more often used as the expression “it will be shameful” (uyat bolady).

The expression “kir keltiru” has also become widespread, that is, to denigrate, disgrace, compromise someone. Therefore, a person who has endangered others and/or himself, reflecting on his actions inevitably condemns himself, while everything looks logical and reasoned, since he is unable to go beyond the traps of the mechanism of collective representations, which are so logically expressed in the verbal tricks of language. As Zh.K. Karakuzova and M.Sh. Khasanov note, the installation of a yurt is a cosmogonic act of the emergence of the Cosmos from Chaos [12]. The yurt is a microcosm reflecting the macrocosm. Just as the entire horizon is an inverted bowl, so the yurt is its reflection. It is very symbolic that the installation of a yurt begins with a bosaga. A bosaga is not just a threshold, it is a symbolic image of the entrance to the cosmos-order, an ordered world, a socially organized experience. On the one hand, this is the lowest level of the hierarchically ordered world order, opposite to which is the most honorable place — *tör*. Thus, bosaga is the entrance-border, where the structuring and organization of the social experience of the behavior of the Kazakhs begins. Upon entering the yurt, there is an immediate division into right (male) and left (female); lower (bosaga) and more correctly (*tör*).

If chaos is located on the periphery, then it is logical that there should be order in the center. If this is so, then it should be assumed that in the yurt as a miniature reflection of the macrocosm, and possibly also in the language, this should have been reflected. Thus, in the center of the yurt there is a hearth (*oshak*) — this is the place where the fire is made (*ot*). Fire is one of the four elements, and is the primary element. If you imagine the image of a yurt, then fire is no longer the primary, but rather the central element.

According to the ancient Greek myth, Prometheus stole fire from his friend Hephaestus. But Prometheus not only stole fire, but also taught how to use it correctly, he also taught how to build houses, domesticated animals, taught how to treat diseases, etc. His image is symbolized with protection from the wrath of the gods. Despite the wrath of the gods, man, through the knowledge transmitted to him, is able to relatively secure his existence. The key to safe existence is knowledge. Fire itself is a destructive force, you just need to use it correctly, as they say, comply with fire safety regulations. The center of the yurt best meets fire safety standards, since it is equidistant from all walls. To some extent, any medicine is poison, but a correctly selected measure (norm) contributes to the healing of the body. Thus, the knowledge transmitted by Prometheus is knowledge of the measure and norm of ontological security. The norm (knowledge) curbs the threatening and destructive power of the gods (nature).

The issues of standardization (measure) interested ancient thinkers, as evidenced by quotes and individual aphorisms from their works, which, unfortunately, have not been fully preserved to this day. “Everything is good in moderation” (Hippocrates). “Nothing beyond measure”, “Moderation is the most important thing”, said one of the seven sages. But Protagoras went further than anyone, claiming that “Man is the measure of all things”.

Strength in itself does not belong to man. Man’s cunning is in taming one force by another. The most difficult thing is to maintain a balance of forces (measure). The fragility of a person’s safe existence is determined by the fact that the balance is relative and inconstant. This relativity and inconstancy of the norm (measure) is the central problem of Heraclitus’ philosophy. And in confirmation of our views, according to Heraclitus, a clear image of this inconstancy of standardization is fire.

But let’s return to the image of the yurt. According to fire safety regulations, the fire should be in the center of the yurt, that is, equidistant from the walls. Based on the above, the identical phonetic pronunciation of the words fire (*ot*), fire (*ört*), to ignite (*örttenu*) and the words middle (*orta*), center (*ortalyk*) does not seem accidental. Fire can only be located in the center, therefore fire as a primary element in the first philosophical systems of the world order is also primary, or more precisely central. The place of fire “*oshak*” is the very first determined place (*oryn*), which is what this word means in the Kazakh language. If bosaga is a symbolic boundary of the dangerous — safe, disorder and order, then the central place of fire “*oshak*” is the primary principle of ordering and forming a safe space, as well as the emergence of space in general.

The symbolic connection between fire and order is also evident in language. Thus, the phonetic sound of the Kazakh words and phrases “*ört*” (fire), “*orta*” (center) coincides with the phonetic sound of the word “order” in German “*die Ordnung*”, and in English “*order*”. Just as plants and animals reach for the sun, not only everyday life, but also the social space of human life is organized around the central fire. Literally speaking, society arose around fire. Thus, the primary unit of society — the family — in translation into the Kazakh language means “*ot-basy*”.

The primary function of fire to form a safe existence has not lost its significance today. “Abstract systems of modernity create vast spheres of relative security for the continuous flow of everyday life,” writes E. Giddens [12; 131]. An elementary power outage (electricity) essentially paralyzes all spheres of life in a modern civilizationally developed society — water supply, heating, sewerage, public catering, hospitals, etc. It is scary to imagine the horrific consequences of a power outage lasting more than three days.

The self-evident, the familiar, the ordinary is not valued, we do not cherish it, but as soon as it disappears, our attitude towards it changes. Without fire, without light (electricity), the world becomes disorganized, returns to its original chaotic state. The symbolic central (read — ordering) power of fire (energy) is still a basic component of ontological security. Where there is order and cleanliness, a person feels safe. For ancient man, the doctrine of the four elements is not just a statement of the elements of being, but it is also a doctrine of the ordering (cosmic) forces of the World Order.

If we take the pyramid of needs of A. Maslow, then the need for safety is in second place [13]. In first place are physiological needs. We do not deny that any division is conditional and should be judged according to the established criterion. A person cooks food on a fire, fire gives heat and light, protects from harmful insects and other predatory animals, etc. Of course, a hungry person thinks only about food, but when a person was in primitive conditions, he was also constantly in a state of self-defense and self-protection, so as not to become prey to someone. In this context, physiological needs can be considered as an integral part of the need for safety, that is, a safe existence includes ensuring the satisfaction of physiological needs. Thus, the next stage of the pyramid of needs reproduces the previous one as its necessary component. At a higher level, the previous stage is reproduced by the system as a necessary moment in the development of the system as a whole. Or, in other words, satisfying basic physiological needs without technical support and provision of a safe space for existence is not possible.

The physiological itself, obeying the principles of ordering, is subject to dietary restrictions. This concerns not only food prohibitions, but also the preparation and consumption of food. The process of cooking itself is a process of disinfection, in simple words, making food fit for consumption. And it is fire that has this cleansing power, therefore it is fire that is used to perform the purification ritual — “alastau”.

But what actually constitutes the danger from which we try to protect ourselves and defend ourselves in every possible way. As M. Douglas writes, the dangerous is dirty, that is, “it is a by-product of the systematic ordering and classification of matter” [8; 36]. Just like purity (order), “dirty” depends on our symbolic system. Where then is the criterion for distinguishing dirty and clean, dangerous and safe?

If the image of purity, protected and safe is fire, then the image of dirt (dangerous) is earth, since earth is deformed. It is no coincidence that the ancients’ ideas about chaos are associated with wet and damp earth (slush or quagmire). As is known, the first civilizations arose in the floodplains of rivers, which spread out in the spring and flood the coastal areas, from which the water subsequently leaves under the influence of the sun (heat), and the earth dries and hardens. But a more illustrative example can be given with the firing of clay, which not only dries, but becomes stronger.

Thus, dirt is dangerous, since it is formless, that is, indefinite. Therefore, in order to protect oneself from dirt, it is simply necessary to make the indefinite definite, that is, to define, or more precisely, to divide or separate, and thereby sanctify. What is divided is sanctified. This understanding of the sacred as division, that is, ordering and systematization in the Kazakh language is captured in one word “kasietti”.

Translated from Kazakh, “kasietti” means “holy”, “sacred”, but at the same time the word “kasiet” has the meaning of quality, or more precisely — a separated and isolated property. In general, the process of divine creativity itself is a process of sanctification, which is essentially a process of putting the world in order, that is, a process of ordering. For clarity, we can give an example from the book of Genesis — the first book of the Bible, where the creation of the world is carried out through pronunciation as a process of separation. The creation of the world is a separation — light from darkness (day — night), firmament from water (earth — sky), etc. Or, in other words, the creation of the world is a pronunciation of order. Thus, to sanctify, that is, to separate and put in order, and what has received a blessing is holy. Everything that is not classified, that is, was not sanctified, is bad, forbidden or insignificant (kasietsizdik).

Blessing (bata) is a powerful mechanism of social ordering and regulation, the power of which is still evident today. It is given special symbolic significance in sacred times — the time of the initial creation of order — which does not fit into the consistent routine of everyday life. Symbolic expressions of sacred times are holidays, such as the celebration of the New Year, Birthday, etc., when people who are close by kinship or by another principle gather at a common table not only to share a common meal, but also, most important-

ly, to express their wishes to each other, the essence of which lies in reproducing the order, repeating and fixing it in memory, that is, as if programming it in the collective memory.

The fact that blessing is the most important criterion of division is also indicated by the fact that in the Koran the opening first sura Al-Fatiha in Kazakh transcription is called “Bata”, where the principle of monotheism is clearly spelled out, and therefore only He can be trusted and hoped for help. A good wish (bata), reproducing this primary blessing, imparts sacredness to human affairs, as if legitimizing them, which in the consciousness of an individual representative of society causes a strengthening of feelings and acceptance of the existing order of things.

Conclusion

Thus, the existing order of things was perceived by man as given and established from the outside. Collective ideas not only reproduced the specified order, but also acted as effective mechanisms of social control over its strict observance and maintenance. A sense of danger has always accompanied man, but this feeling was conditioned by the fear of violating the existing order of things and thereby bringing troubles and misfortunes to society. Strict observance of established rules and norms regulating everyday life up to the process of its routinization contributed to the predictability and predictability of social processes. In particular, the expectability and predictability of the social behavior of individual members of society, including effective mechanisms of social control, contributed to the formation and development of a sense of ontological security.

However, the so-called era of modernity or modernism, having revised not only the collective ideas about the (in)security of previous societies, but also, in general, with its process of secularization, as well as the thirst for freedom up to the abolition and denial of everything given and conditioned from the outside, made an attempt that had never taken place before — to create its own history, and therefore to establish its own social order, a system of social control and security. In connection with this, the mechanisms of ontological security developed over the centuries ceased to be effective and suitable. Therefore, the questions of the theory of social control and the problem of security in this era were of such acute interest to the progressive-minded organizers of the new society, but the noted problem of security in this era deserves a separate scientific study.

References

- 1 Bauman Z. The Individualized Society / Z. Bauman. — Cambridge: Polity, 2001. — 272 p.
- 2 Giddens A. The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration / Giddens A. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984. — 402 p.
- 3 Эрих Ф. Бегство от свободы / Ф. Эрих. — Москва: Издательство AST, 2023. — 288 с.
- 4 Техника безопасности // Википедия: свободная энциклопедия [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Техника_безопасности (дата обращения: 22.12.2025).
- 5 Трудовой кодекс Республики Казахстан: Кодекс Республики Казахстан от 23 ноября 2015 года № 414-V // Информационно-правовая система нормативных правовых актов Республики Казахстан «Әділет». — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K1500000414> (дата обращения: 22.12.2025).
- 6 Об утверждении Правил и сроков проведения обучения, структурирования и проверки знаний по вопросам безопасности и охраны труда работников, руководителей и лиц, ответственных за обеспечение безопасности и охраны труда: приказ Министра здравоохранения и социального развития Республики Казахстан от 25 дек. 2015 г. № 1019. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/V1500012665> (дата обращения: 22.12.2025).
- 7 Конституция Республики Казахстан: принята на респ. референдуме 30 авг. 1995 г. (с изм. и доп.). — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://www.akorda.kz/ru/official_documents/constitution/ (дата обращения: 22.12.2025).
- 8 Douglas M. Purity and Danger: an analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo / M. Douglas. — London and New York: Routledge (Taylor & Francis e-Library), 2001. — 203 p.
- 9 Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі / жалпы ред. басқ. Т. Жанұзақов. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. — 968 б.
- 10 Қазақша-орысша сөздік = Казахско-русский словарь: 50 мыңға жуық сөз / около 50 тысяч слов / жалпы ред. басқ. Р.Ф. Сыздықова, К.Ш. Хұсайын. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. — 962 б.
- 11 Giddens A. Fate, Risk and Security / A. Giddens // Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, — P. 109–143.
- 12 Каракузова Ж.К. Космос казахской культуры / Ж.К. Каракузова, М.Ш. Хасанов. — Алматы: Эверо, 2011. — 200 с.
- 13 Маслоу А. Мотивация и личность / А. Маслоу; пер. с англ. Т. Гутман, Н. Мухина. — Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2019. — 400 с.

М.М. Шуматова, А.К. Бокаева, Э.Г. Шуматов

Қауіпсіздік ұсынымдардың символдық талдауы

Мақалада дәстүрлі қоғамдағы кір және таза адам туралы ұжымдық ұсынымдар зерттелген. Ең алдымен, осы ұсынымдарда кір туралы заманауи гигиеналық идеялар жұқпалы ретінде абстракцияланды, бұл таза және кірді реттелген және реттелмеген деп түсінуге мүмкіндік берді, яғни әлеуметтік тәртіпті ұйымдастыруда, жүйелеуде осы ұсынымдардың символдық мағынасын ашуға әрекет жасалды. Атап айтқанда, «кір», «от», «қасиетті», «бата» қазақ мәдениеті ұғымдарының мазмұнының символдық мәнін ашуға талпынған. Бұл ретте лас және таза туралы ұсынымдар әлеуметтік тәжірибені құрылымдап, жүйелеп қана қоймай, белгіленген әлеуметтік тәртіпті сақтау және жаңғырту бойынша әлеуметтік бақылау шараларын да жүзеге асырады. Бұл ұжымдық ұсынымдар, сонымен бірге этикалық сананың қажетті компоненттері бола отырып, әлеуметтік тәртіпті қабылдау үшін адамның сезімталдығын күшейтеді және шоғырландырады. Этикалық сана тек сыртқы ғана емес, сонымен қатар тәртіпті ішкі өзін-өзі бақылауды жүзеге асыра отырып, оны сырттан немесе жоғарыдан берілген деп таниды. Осылайша, әлеуметтік тәртіп пен бақылау дәстүрлі қоғам мүшелерінің күнделікті өмірін қатаң реттеп, әлеуметтік процестердің оларды бұзатын факторлардан қорғау тетіктерін жасайды. Белгіленген және бақыланатын әлеуметтік тәртіп әлеуметтік процестердің қайта қосылуы мен қайталануына ықпал етеді, демек, индивидтердің әрекеттері болжамды, күгілетін сипатқа ие болады. Осылайша, әлеуметтік өмірді күнделіктендіру дәстүрлі қоғамда онтологиялық қауіпсіздік сезімін қалыптастыруға ықпал етеді.

Кілт сөздер: қауіп, таза, кір, әлеуметтік норма, тыйым салу, қауіпсіздік техникасы, әлеуметтік тәртіп, әлеуметтік бақылау, күнделікті, онтологиялық қауіпсіздік.

М.М. Шуматова, А.К. Бокаева, Э.Г. Шуматов

Символический анализ представлений о безопасности

В данной статье исследуются коллективные представления о грязном и чистом человека традиционного общества. В первую очередь, от этих представлений были абстрагированы современные гигиенические представления о грязном как о заразном, что позволило понять чистое и грязное как упорядоченное и неупорядоченное, и была предпринята попытка раскрыть символическое значение данных представлений в упорядочивании, организации и систематизации социального порядка. В частности, предпринята попытка раскрыть символическое значение содержания понятий казахской культуры «кір», «от», «қасиетті», «бата». При этом представления о грязном и чистом не просто структурируют и систематизируют социальный опыт, но и осуществляют меры социального контроля по сохранению и воспроизведению установленного социального порядка. Указанные коллективные представления, являясь в то же время необходимыми компонентами этического сознания, усиливают и фокусируют чувственность человека для принятия социального порядка. Этическое сознание, осуществляя не только внешний, но и внутренний самоконтроль за порядком, признает его как данное извне или сверх. Тем самым социальный порядок и контроль, строго регламентируя повседневную жизнедеятельность членов традиционного общества, вырабатывают защитные механизмы социальных процессов от факторов, их разрушающих. Установленный и контролируемый социальный порядок способствует воспроизводимости и повторяемости социальных процессов, а, следовательно, действия индивидов имеют предсказуемый и ожидаемый характер. Таким образом, рутинизация социальной жизнедеятельности способствует формированию в традиционном обществе чувства онтологической безопасности.

Ключевые слова: опасность, чистое, грязное, социальная норма, табу, техника безопасности, социальный порядок, социальный контроль, рутина, онтологическая безопасность.

References

- 1 Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- 2 Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 3 Erich, F. (2023). *Begstvo ot svobody* [Escape from freedom]. Moscow: Isdatelstvo AST [in Russian].
- 4 Tekhnika bezopasnosti [Occupational safety]. (n.d.). *Vikipediia: svobodnaia entsiklopediia — Wikipedia: Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from https://bigenc.ru/technology_and_technique [in Russian].
- 5 (2015). *Trudovoi kodeks Respubliki Kazakhstan* [Labour Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. Information and legal system of normative legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan. *adilet.zan.kz*. Retrieved from <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K1500000414> [in Russian].

- 6 (2015). Ob utverzhenii Pravil i srokov provedeniia obucheniia, instruktirovaniia i proverki znaniia po voprosam bezopasnosti i okhrany truda rabotnikov, rukovoditelei i lits, otvetstvennykh za obespechenie bezopasnosti i okhrany truda [On approval of the rules and terms for training, instruction and knowledge testing on occupational safety]. *adilet.zan.kz*. Retrieved from <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/V1500012665> [in Russian].
- 7 (1995). Konstitutsiia Respubliki Kazakhstan [Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. *akorda.kz*. Retrieved from https://www.akorda.kz/ru/official_documents/constitution/ [in Russian].
- 8 Douglas, M. (2001). *Purity and danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo*. London and New York: Routledge (Taylor & Francis e-Library).
- 9 Zhanuzakov, T. (Ed.). (2008). *Qazaq tilinin tusindirme sozdigi* [Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Daik-Press [in Kazakh].
- 10 Syzdykova, R.G., & Khusaiyn, K.Sh. (Ed.). (2008). *Qazaqsha-oryssha sozdik = Kazakhsko-russkii slovar: 50 000 msnga zhuq soz / okolo 50 000 slov* [Kazakh–Russian dictionary: approx. 50,000 entries]. Almaty: Daik-Press [in Kazakh, in Russian].
- 11 Giddens, A. (1991). Fate, risk and security. In *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age* (pp. 109–143). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 12 Karakuzova, Zh.K., & Khasanov, M.Sh. (2011). *Kosmos kazakhskoi kultury* [Cosmos of Kazakh culture]. Almaty: Evero [in Russian].
- 13 Maslow, A. (2019). *Motivatsiia i lichnost* [Motivation and personality]. Saint Petersburg: Piter [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Shumatova Meruert — PhD student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7535-4482>

Bokayeva Aigul — Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0765-0107>

Shumatov Eldar — Candidate of Philosophy, Head of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines, Language and Psychological Training of the Academy of Civil Defense named after M. Gabdullin of the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kokshetau, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1434-5400>