REVIEW
There is No Mystery in Social System

Haitao Liu[*]

School of Marxism, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 200240, China

Abstract: There is a gap between the properties of social reality and the natural properties of the material bearer that carries it. Language constructivism uses language representations to bridge this gap, arguing that language constructs social reality. Emergence theory holds that the attributes of social reality cannot be reduced to the physical attributes of the carrier. This process is emergent. Language constructivism regards the process from mental reality to social reality as the product of language's own operation and the secret is hidden in language itself. Emergentism directly led social reality to mysticism. Mental reality is an initial existence, which includes both innate desires and needs and acquired values. Social reality is the external reality created by the subject through action according to his internal needs and desires. Mental reality and social reality are dynamically integrated into each other, which is achieved through rule-based action.

Keywords: Mental reality; Social reality; Rules; Action

1. Introduction

Human society is composed of social realities such as currency and law, many theories explain the construction of social realities. Among them, the relationship between social reality and the material carrier that carries that social reality is a very meaningful theme. Assuming that the physical property of the paper used to make a five-dollar bill is X and the property of a five-dollar bill is Y, how is Y generated from X, or how is the property X of paper instantiated into banknote Y [1]? Similarly, why a person's physical act X of walking across a road is considered an illegal red light-running act Y? Searle believes that the functional attributes of Y only exist within the scope of

*Corresponding Author:
Haitao Liu,
School of Marxism, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 200240, China;
Email: liuhaitao907@163.com

language representation, the process from X to Y is language construction [2]. The foundation of social reality is collective intentionality (collective acceptance and recognition) [3]. Silver maintains that X emerges from Y and this emergence which including downward causality is strong emergence [1]. Language constructivism transfers the contradiction between mental reality and social reality to the operation of language, as if social reality is the power of language itself. Emergentism completely places social reality outside mental reality and makes social reality incomprehensible by the dichotomy of subject and object. They all lead to the mystification. This paper takes the subject's desire, instinct, needs and other mental reality as the basic natural fact to analyze how to achieve the construction from mental reality to social reality. The creation of social reality is the externalization of inner mental reality, there is no absolute objective social reality and absolute subjective mental reality, they are dynamic integration process which the structure is realized through the action of the subject. Accordingly, this paper proposes a kind of rules-centered social realism based on the structure of action.

2. Social Reality in Language Constructivism

Searle holds that: first, all institutional facts of human beings, and even all human civilizations in this sense, are built by simple language operations in their initial existence and maintenance. Second, the language operation is essentially a declaration of status function. Third, the recurrent use of language operations in a recursive way constitutes the complex structure of social civilization [2]. People create or change events in the social world through declaration, such as declaration of war, marriage, etc. Language consists of representational forms. In the case of human natural language, the syntactic structure of these representations contains semantic content and gives us expressions about states of affairs and objects in the world. Society is an organization of human beings in the form of collective intentionality. Collective intentionality which is the ability of humans and other animals has to cooperate with each other in various forms of activity is the basic condition of society. Whether it is human society or animal society, all social facts are composed of phenomena that contain factors of collective intentionality. The remarkable feature of human civilization is that collective intentionality can be expanded by various linguistic representations, which is the creation of deontology. Humans have a rich system of linguistic signs, while animals do not. Language constructivism describes the representational structure of human civilization as opposed to animal society. Human civilization is composed of various

institutional facts, which are also status functions. Status functions give people moral rights and reasons for action independent of their desires. At the same time, institutional facts are also subject to the human rationality that motivates people to act.

Searle attaches importance to collective intentionality and linguistic representation. The intentionality among individuals is expressed through desires, needs, beliefs and so on, thus forming collective intentionality. It is the internal process of human brain, while language is the external presentation of the internal mental state. The constructive process of social reality manifests the inner mental reality through linguistic representation, which may be an important feature of language constructivism. But using intentionality and language alone to explain social reality produces the following problems: First, collective intentionality might produce group irrational consequences. Social fact is constructed by people's common recognition and acceptance through collective intentionality, so it is the result of people's rationality. However, the society as a complex system, there are a lot of seemingly rational but actually irrational phenomena. For example, in financial activities, different organizations and individuals rationally choose to maximize their interests within jointly accepted rules, but often leads to unexpected economic crises. In turn, these unexpected social realities become the background of people's activities, further forming new social reality. In other words, the social reality that the collective recognition or acceptance gives rise to the reality that the collective does not accept. This is beyond the bounds of intentionality itself. Second, linguistic representations ultimately need to be indicated in actions and sustained in collectively accepted actions. Therefore, if discourse pronouncements cannot produce or presupposition appropriate commitments or non-verbal actions, it cannot perform functions other than language and cannot be used to create intersubjective institutional facts, at most to create some concepts or conceptual features about them [3].

Language describes the superficial process of social reality, but there should be deeper reasons behind it. Linguistic acts are only the forms of actions, which cannot be separated from the preexisting social system. The discourse of following rules is rooted in life practice. Language has almost infinite generativity and creativity, but it itself is a system of rules. Linguistic signs are only the representation of social reality which is fundamentally a series of action system and sets the possibility and norm of action. Language is the direct expression of the mind, but is not the whole about it. The potential for action is beyond the representation of language. People's actions, on the one hand, repeat and strengthen the existing social

reality, on the other hand, create new social reality. Language is both the representation and the product of this process.

Social reality has the dual characteristics of objectivity and subjectivity. First, the objectivity has two meanings. The social system is outside the individual will. The life of the individual is only a fragment of the whole society, which existed before he was born and continues to exist after he dies. The established social system is the external environment that each individual must face and is the order of meaning for survival, which are strongly placed in front of the individual. Thus, preexisting social systems precede individual experience and knowledge. Although social reality is constructed by people, it is immobilized and legalized through specific procedures and gradually integrates with nature, exerting coercive force similar to nature facts. This objectivity makes it impossible for the individual to easily change it according to his own desires. The social reality is objective in that it is the overall force of collective acceptance and recognition [4]. It has no fixed logical form and exists as long as people accept it to exist.

The second is the subjectivity. Social realities are essentially created by human to satisfy his needs. They are mutually shared objects of meaning and mutually subjective realities. The objectification of social facts is maintained mainly through the signification of language. Language has the ability to transcend the "here and now", which make it span the different fields of life and integrate them into a meaningful whole [5]. Language has a powerful function of constructing social facts. However, when language is separated from the needs of life, the process of constructing will become dramatic and mysterious. It seems that social facts are the secret of language itself and the result of its operation.

3. Social Reality in Emergentism

Silver pays attention to the instantiated attributes of elements in the social system, such as a five-dollar bill or a pawn event, which he believes appear in a unique way. The banknote and its material carrier are the same piece of paper. To a certain extent, the property Y of the banknote comes from the physical property X of the paper, but the Y instantiated by X cannot be reduced to X, so it must be emergent in a sense. Silver is not saying that the physical property Y will suddenly and miraculously generate a new irreducible property Y. The emergence of social properties depends in part on the system to which it belongs. The characteristic of emergence is caused by the elements in its supervenient foundation. The system not only contains many elements, but also contains rules for how these elements interact in time, so emergence is diachronic. The

social attributes based on a system can at least lead to the instantiation of further attributes in that system. A serious ontological conclusion is that the social properties are strongly emergent [1]. Compared with language constructionism, which hides the creation of social reality in the secret of language, emergentism straightforwardly leads social reality to mystification.

Strictly speaking, the mind can only know the "manifested world" within it and from the "manifested world" it can infer that there must be a "causal world" outside the mind. The mind can never know the "causal world". It is only a necessary setting to satisfy the logic of causation. The world of manifestation is internal subjectivity and the world of cause is external objectivity. There is a chasm between them: the mind can know only what it produces within itself, which in a sense is still within itself, though it needs external causes for its origin and to define its behavioral characteristics [6]. When X, the material carrier of the "manifested world", cannot fully deduce the "causal world" of Y, the easy solution is to say that Y emerges from X, or that Y is created by language, even if the realization of Y requires a larger system to support it.

In understanding the world of cause, it is necessary to ensure the "objective reality", so that human is abstracted as an observer dissociating from the world. When the world becomes the "picture" in front of the observer, human is the existence outside the "picture" and the world also becomes the object to be known. Human solidifies as an absolute subject in front of the world and the world becomes an absolute object apart from human. Once people disengage themselves from the world, the relationship between human and the world becomes an epistemological relationship. This is the inevitable result of the subject-object binary world view. However, if a certain reality is to be explained, it has to be placed in a larger system, that is, a specific reality is only possible in the system to which it belongs, its function and meaning can only be realized in the system. Thus, this observed reality can only become some concrete being and the world behind the Being has no boundaries. As a result, the world of cause only becomes the context of other beings and cannot settle itself. In this sense, the "causal world" is impossible to understand and the "picture" observed by the subject is only the apparent phenomenal world. Phenomenology interprets reality as a process of self-generation, which is self-presented based on the self-revelation of experience. Self-presented reality is neither the entity of mechanical materialism, nor can it be understood as an intuitive object under the framework of subject and object dichotomy [7]. From this point of view, what is revealed to us is the property Y of money and the property X of paper, but the "causal world"

of how X produces Y is classified as a mystery.

What does the world mean when we think about the "world"? In fact, when we regard the world as an object of cognition, we are already in the world and have "dealings" with it. Therefore, the world is rather understood as the "environment" in which we have always been [8]. Environment is not the object of intuition, but the presence of activities. In a word, what the environment calls out is "being" of human, which is not exactly an object of knowledge, nor can it be exhausted by human's rational thinking. Mechanical materialism regards the relationship between human and the world as a directly cognitive relationship. When explaining how natural facts have social attributes, it will produce linguistic representation or mystification in emergentism, because the bounded rationality of the subject faces the boundless world. However, the relationship between human and the world is not the original static relationship of "unity of hunan and nature" advocated by Chinese philosophy, because it goes to the opposite of mechanical materialism and covers human's understanding and creating of the world. That is to say, the pure nature which has nothing to do with human and the unity of man and nature are not the real subject-object relationship. For Marx, the consistency of environmental change and human activity or self-change can only be regarded and reasonably understood as revolutionary practice [9]. Marx attempts to dynamically combine subject and object dynamically. The contradiction between subject and object makes the world a cognitive object outside the subject, which in turn leads to the fact that the world cannot be exhausted by reason, so knowledge is always on the way. Phenomenology endows reality with self-illumination, but the self-presentation of reality also needs to be grasped by the subject in the "dealing" with the world. Their purpose is to bridge the conflict between inner mental reality and outer social reality.

4. The Relationship between Mental Reality and Social Reality

The mental reality includes not only the innate desire and instinct of the subject, but also the cultural habits and values formed through the acquired education. Social reality is established according to the needs of the subject and the needs, desires, instincts and cognitive framework of the subject have a decisive impact on the production of social reality. The mental needs are objective. Both Marx and Nietzsche accept that the physical and psychological needs of human beings are basic natural facts. However, Marx paid more attention to the impact of economic, historical and other social conditions on human beings, while Nietzsche regarded human desires and other natural instincts as the starting point, human beings created external realities according to their own needs and desires. In other words, social realities are really the external counterparts of internal mental needs. All external reality is related to internal reality, which means that there is no such thing as an absolutely independent internal reality or an absolutely independent external reality. For Nietzsche, the absolute external reality corresponds to the absolute subject: neither exists, so far as its actuality is concerned. The external realities which are absolutely perfect and free from any subjective influence can only be understood by God. The subject is not something inherent, but something added by fiction, something hidden behind it [10]. The constant "reality" corresponds to the absolute "subject" and is determined by the absolute subject. Without such absolute subject, there is no such fixed reality. Although the reality and the symbol describing the reality are different, the symbol is increasingly replacing the reality it wants to depict. The absolute external reality corresponds to the subject who is incapable and therefore needs to hold on to it once and for all. Just as Christianity constructs the world to meet the needs of the subject, it reflects the weakness of the subject.

Because the external social reality is the presentation of the internal reality, it needs the active action of the subject, through which the externalization of mental reality can be effectively realized. Marx endows the proletariat with the main body of action so as to achieve his goal of social revolution. Nietzsche interprets the external reality according to the needs of the subject, transforms the external reality into the existence related to the subject, thus bringing the external existence into the dominant domain of the subject. The dominant force of the subject is the will to life. The purpose of reasonable settlement of external reality according to one's own needs is not to better explain external reality, but to adapt to the needs and cognitive structure of the subject, so it can be said that the mental reality into projection of the external world that forms the social reality. Any understanding of social reality cannot be separated from the cultural background and psychological structure of the subject. If we grasp the social reality directly without the internal reality, we will regard the subject as the God who controls everything or the perfect machine [11]. The result is that the subject does not know how social reality magically emerges from natural objects.

From the perspective of evolution, the evolution of nature produces human and society is formed among people. Modern science offers a worldview that everything in the world is ultimately physical. Thus, the explanation of all

objects depends on whether the causal principle that explains the object can be provided. It is undeniable that the natural environment and human physiological factors will affect the society, but the social order is by no means the biological result of the organism. The society will also shape people. Physicallation is a form of objectification of the human world, but even in the case of objectification, human continues to create the world. Human beings have a paradoxical capacity to create a reality that negates itself [5]. This means that there is no absolute subjectivity and absolute objectivity. The society is the result of the interaction between subject and object. In essence, social reality is the social representation of mental reality. Between the subject and the society is a two-way adjustment process, people in life practice according to their own needs to create social reality, but also create themselves. However, it is not enough to clarify this point. It is necessary to further analyze how mental reality is externalized into social reality and how social reality shapes the subject. In this paper, a rules-centered social realism is proposed.

5. Rules-centered Social Realism

Language constructivism dramatizes the creation of social reality while emergent theory mystifies it based on the radically dichotomous position of subject and object. Between mobility and stability, society really remains dynamic. The process from mental reality to social reality is achieved by rule-based action. Following the rules itself is a reflective double act, which is not only the interpretation of the current rules but also the construction of new rules in the interpretation. Therefore, the construction of social reality and the construction of rules are identical. At the same time, because the essence of social reality is a set of norms of action, it contains deontological relations such as power, responsibility and obligation. Thus, this paper defines social reality as a rules-centered structure of action. This could be explained from the following two aspects:

First, social reality provides the space of possibility for action and it contains rules inherently. Wittgenstein linked the meaning of words with its rules [12]. Austin's speech act theory focuses on the different types and appropriateness conditions of speech acts, which uses it as a tool to analyze the traditional philosophical issues, without paying much attention to the rules and social conventions of language [13] Searle divided rules and conventions into two categories: one is a regulatory rule. It regulates preexisting behavior, like traffic rules, it regulates preexisting traffic behavior. The other is constructive rules. Such rules not only regulate behavior, but also create it, making certain behavior possible, such as sports rules, without corresponding rules, there is no sports action. The creation of social facts is a constructive rule [14]. Behind the focus of speech acts on communication is the emphasis on the actual effect of semantics. It seeks to flesh out the construction of meaning into the norms of practice. Here, the rules themselves are defended in the relativity of society. Speech act itself cannot be divorced from existing social rules and habits. It is concerned with what has already happened. That is to say, the successful implementation of the action is due to the compliance of social rules. However, action is open at the end, and new rules potentially maintain tension with existing rules, which can be broken from the original rules. Otherwise, people will not be able to obtain a relatively independent creative space. Any innovation that is contrary to the current social norms will become impossible. Therefore, not only the compliance with norms is successful communication, but violation of norms is also communication. Action provides the rules of communication and creative space, which are also the possibility space of free between the restriction and the generation.

Second, the norm of action is the core content of social reality. The internal unity of society is formed through the structure of action. Individuals always live in a specific social community. The relationship between individuals and others is a specific deontological relationship. Large communities, such as the state and government, and small ones, such as families and schools, are essentially deontological relations between each other. In the dualist context of subject and object opposition, social reality is neither purely objective nor purely subjective, it has the dual structure of objectivity and subjectivity. In ontology, the objectivity of social reality is different from natural fact, which is permeated with the desire and demand of the subject. However, once the social reality is formed, it becomes the external objective cause to play functions, individual recognition or resistance cannot fundamentally maintain or deny it. Although the foundation and premise of human society is nature and cannot be separated from the basic material environment provided by it, human civilization cannot be generated directly by nature. The real social civilization and the norms of behavior can only be created by the participation of human activities. In this sense, it may be said that action rules are the essence of social reality, the process of social progress is the continuous rationalization process of action rules. Starting from the idea that speech acts can create a new social reality, language constructivism connects the internal reality with the external reality, thus connecting the mind, language and society. The speech act is consistent with the mental state of the subject, so the social reality contains factors about subjectivity and linguistic signs. However, the im-

plementation of a speech act is also the implementation of a rule regulated action. Obviously, human activities cannot be freed from existing social norms and habits. But the action is open and uncertain, the interpretation of the current rules includes the construction of new rules, which is the space of the subject's free will. The creation of social reality and the formation of rules are united in the actions of the subject.

Society changes constantly and maintains its structure and order. This change is rooted in the actions of the subject. Social reality is essentially a system of norms for action. Action contains the inner understanding of rules. In practice, the subject repeatedly interprets the rules while constantly reconstructing the old rules, and this reconstructing process constructs the social reality. It provides the possibility for the development of society. Restricted by the existing rules, the subject does not have complete freedom, but has relative freedom to make history, because the interpretation of the rules has a certain autonomy. The key to understanding this is to realise that new rules arise from the interpretation of old ones. It is possible because the rules themselves have an open structure. The openness of rules stems from the fact that rules arise from actions that result in openness. Because of this, the interpretive behavior of actors also provides the basis for the continuity and discontinuity of social life. So human society is characterized by its uncertainty, which is rooted in the openness of the structure of desire in face of reality. It is such action driven by the structure of desire that creates social reality and promotes social change. This process is neither a gamified linguistic construction nor a mystical emergence.

6. Conclusions

Individuals are subject to collective morality and norms not because they refer to a collective concept, but because of the universality of the subject's internal nature and needs [15]. As rational actor, the subject can understand the meaning of actions and anticipate the actions of others because of the universal criterion of action of the community, rather than because the criterion is a linguistic construct or an irreducible existence that emerges. The necessity and possibility of the norm of action is both the reason and the result of the community. The vitality and stability of social reality lie in: on the one hand, the actor has relative freedom to construct external reality according to his desires and needs. On the other hand, the actor is subject to the established external reality. The mental realities such as desire, instinct and need are the basic existence. To explain the social reality without the mental reality of the subject will place the social reality in the mysterious

domain, because the social reality which has nothing to do with the mental reality can only be realized by God and understood by God alone. There is no such thing as an absolutely objective social reality unaffected by the desires and values of the subject. At the same time, as a secular individual, it is impossible to get absolutely mental reality away from external reality. The result, therefore, is the coordination of mental reality and social reality. To define social reality as an action structure centered on rules is actually to regard the creation of social reality as a process of constant interpretation and reconstruction of rules in the action of the subject, so as to establish a dynamic connection from mental reality to social reality.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares to have no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Silver, K., 2021. Emergence within social systems. Synthese. 198(4), 1-23.

[2] Searle, J., 2010. Making the social world: the structure of human civilization. New York: Oxford University Press.

[3] Tuomela, R., 2007. The philosophy of sociality: the shared point of view. New York: Oxford University Press.

[4] Haitao, L., 2020. Wholeness and Collective Intention. Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science. 55(1), 1-13.

[5] Berger, P.L., Luckmann, T., 2009. The Social Construction of Reality. translated by Wang Yong, Beijing: Beijing Press. (in Chinese). (Original work published in English in 1967).

[6] Whitehead, A.N., 1978. Process and Reality. New York: The Free Press.

[7] Whitehead, A.N., 1961. Alfred North Whitehead Anthology. New York: The Macmillan Company.

[8] Heidegger, M., 1996. Elected Works of Heidegger (Part 2). edited by Sun Zhouxing, Shanghai: Sanlian Bookstore. (in Chinese). (Original work published in German in 1927).

[9] Marx, K., Engels, F., 2009. Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. 1. Beijing: People's Press. (in Chinese). (Original work published in German in 1847).

[10] Nietzsche, F.W., 2013. Revaluation of All Values, Ed. Witzbach, translated by Lin Jia, Shanghai: East China Normal University Press. (in Chinese). (Original work published in German in 1867).

[11] Liu, S.L., 2020. Inner Reality and External Reality: Rethinking Marx's Concept of Reality. Social Sciences in Chinese Universities. (1), 17-26. (in Chinese).

[12] Vitgenstein, L.J., 2004. Philosophical Research. translated by Li Bulou, Beijing: Commercial Press. (in Chinese). (Original work published in German in 1945).

[13] Austin, J.L., 2012. How to Do things with Words. Translated by Yang Yucheng et al., Beijing: The Commercial Press. (in Chinese). (Original work pub-lished in English in 1955).

[14] Searle, J., 1995. The construction of social reality. London: Penguin Press.

[15] Swindler, J.K., 1996. Social Intentions: Aggregate, Collective, and General. Philosophy of Social Science. (3), 61-76.