Bouarfa Abdelkader
University of Oran
Department of Philosophy (Algeria) and URSH
bouarfa.abdelkader@univ-oran2.dz
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8631-872X

Epistemological Chaos the Question and the New Cognitive Landscape

Abstract

This study explores the concept of epistemological chaos in contemporary social sciences, particularly within the context of postmodern thought. Traditional notions of certainty are challenged in a world defined by uncertainty. We move beyond a simplistic portrayal of "anarchists" versus "strict rationalists" to examine the unconventional yet potentially transformative relationship between chaos, non-methodological approaches, and the evolving epistemic landscape. Departing from conventional methodologies, the paper investigates how embracing chaos and a certain degree of non-method can open new avenues for knowledge interpretation and production. Through a multi-faceted analysis that incorporates diverse perspectives and interdisciplinary approaches, the study sheds light on the potential for theoretical innovation. It explores how seemingly chaotic and unsystematic approaches can contribute to the formation of a more nuanced understanding of knowledge in contemporary social sciences.

The knowledge society seems to be transitioning towards an era characterized by uncertainty, where traditional concepts are challenged. This coincides with a growing emphasis on human agency. There's a movement advocating for liberation from the constraints of rigid methodologies, a return to the role of imagination in scientific inquiry, and even a renewed appreciation for the role of myth and legend in shaping knowledge.

The study ultimately asks: can "anarchic knowledge" (knowledge production outside established methods) be a viable alternative? Can it create a cognitive landscape that restores humanity's central role in the creative process of knowledge production?

Keywords: *epistemology, social sciences, chaos theory, non-methodological inquiry, knowledge production, creativity, interpretation*

Bouarfa Abdelkader
Oran Universiteti
Fəlsəfə Departamenti (Əlcəzair) və URSH
bouarfa.abdelkader@univ-oran2.dz
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8631-872X

Epistemoloji xaos: suallar və yeni koqnitiv mənzərə

Xülasə

Bu tədqiqat müasir sosial elmlərdə, xüsusən də postmodern düşüncə kontekstində qnoseoloji xaos anlayışını araşdırır. Ənənəvi əminlik anlayışları qeyri-müəyyənliklə xarakterizə olunan bir dünyada sorğulanır. Biz "anarxistlər"lə "sərt rasionalistlər" arasında sadə qarşıdurma təsvirindən uzaqlaşaraq, xaos, qeyri-metodiki yanaşmalar və inkişaf edən epistemik mənzərə arasında qeyri-ənənəvi, lakin potensial transformativ əlaqəni araşdırırıq.

Ənənəvi metodologiyalardan çıxış edərək, məqalə xaos və müəyyən bir dərəcədə qeyri-metodun mənimsənilməsinin biliyin təfsiri və istehsalı üçün necə yeni yollar aça biləcəyini araşdırır. Müxtəlif perspektivlər və fənlərarası yanaşmaları əhatə edən çoxşaxəli təhlil vasitəsilə tədqiqat nəzəri innovasiya potensialını işıqlandırır. O, xaotik və sistemsiz görünən yanaşmaların müasir sosial elmlərdə daha incə bilik anlayışının formalaşmasına necə kömək edə biləcəyini tədqiq edir.

Bilik cəmiyyəti, ənənəvi konsepsiyaların meydan oxunduğu və qeyri-müəyyənliklə səciyyə-lənən bir dövrə keçid edir. Bu, insan agentliyinə artan diqqət ilə üst-üstə düşür. Sərt metodo-logiyaların məhdudiyyətlərindən azad olmağı, elmi araşdırmada təxəyyülün roluna yenidən bax-mağı və hətta biliyin formalaşmasında mif və əfsanənin rolunu qiymətləndirməyi müdafiə edən bir hərəkət mövcuddur.

Tədqiqat sonda soruşur: "anarxik bilik" (müəyyən edilmiş metodlardan kənar bilik istehsalı) əlverişli alternativ ola bilərmi? O, bilik istehsalının yaradıcı prosesində bəşəriyyətin mərkəzi rolunu bərpa edən koqnitiv mənzərə yarada bilərmi?

Açar sözlər: epistemologiya, sosial elmlər, xaos nəzəriyyəsi, qeyri-metodiki sorğu, bilik istehsalı, yaradıcılıq, təfsir

Introduction

Understanding chaos from an epistemological perspective (How we know it) is crucial across various fields, especially the social sciences, which deal with complex systems and nonlinear dynamics often leading to chaotic behaviour. These principles can also be applied in biology and its branches, sociology and its subfields, economics and its various schools of thought, and even philosophy with its diverse branches. This raises questions about the nature of reality (*Ontology*) and the role of ethics when considering the familiar and unfamiliar. Today, humanity grapples with the decline of grand narratives (Overarching explanations of the world), the "*flatness of meaning*" (A sense of meaninglessness), and the clash between the world of personals, ideas, and things that have greatly dominated.

Research

In the social and human context, "Epistemological anarchism" holds particular importance for understanding complex phenomena like wars, revolutions, political transformations, and social changes. It also helps us grasp less predictable aspects like randomness, anxiety, and doubt. Researchers utilize chaos theory to understand the factors contributing to these occurrences and the emergence of the unfamiliar, ultimately seeking to assert human existence in a world where individuals can sometimes feel reduced to mere numbers.

The core question regarding chaos involves identifying the causes and factors that lead us to question chaos as a fixed state rather than a potential outcome, whether in the natural sciences or the social and human sciences.

Ultimately, studying "Epistemological anarchism" helps us understand the major influences shaping contemporary theories that aim to move beyond grand narratives and challenge dominant methodologies.

This revision clarifies the concepts, improves the overall flow, and suggests potential areas for further exploration.

1.1: A conceptual introduction

The notion of "*messy epistemology*" stands in stark contrast to the ideals championed by Enlightenment philosophers. They sought a foundation of knowledge built upon clarity and distinct ideas, a far cry from the current state of disarray. This "*messy epistemology*" as it is termed, contradicts the very essence of reason championed by Descartes. For him, certainty refutes the principle of probability and uncertainty, so he says:

"If my opinions are not more certain than that and cannot be approved without controversy, then I refuse to publish them never" (Descartes, 2006).

The new anarchist movement, in its search for alternatives to rigid systems, echoes a similar sentiment. Paul Karl Feyerabend, a man of intriguing ideas if not always sound judgment, might lament the stifling effects of these traditional structures. He might argue that these systems have choked the lifeblood of knowledge – the fertile ground of imagination, rich with hypotheses and inter-presentations (Ozumba, 2000, p. 51).

Knowledge, in their grip, may have become a sterile desert, barren of fruitful speculation and dependent solely on a "*deadlys rationalisms*" (Feyerabend, 1975).

His comparison between science, myth, sorcery, magic, and astrology is nothing but an attempt by him to draw the attention of those engaged in knowledge to the vastness of chaos, as Ozumba emphasized that goal in his saying:

"Everything goes, nothing goes, for anarchy and disorder would easily become the order of the day" (Ozumba, 2000, p. 51).

The central question, then, becomes this: How do we break free from these constraining systems and return the individual to a space of open contemplation? Have these methods, in their quest for order, not displaced the very essence of the mind? Have they not confined us, not explorers in the realm of ideas, but prisoners of mere facts and phenomena?

The current debate, a heated clash between the champions of order and the advocates of chaos, demands a deeper understanding of "*chaos*" itself within the context of epistemology.

The formation of a new epistemological landscape prompts us to define the concept of chaos and chaotic epistemology, to understand the nature of the contradiction between Chaos and Order.

The concept of chaos carries a rich history and diverse meanings. Its etymology traces back to the Latin "*Cāos*" signifying "*emptiness*", "*abyss*" and even "*gap*". Over time, this connotation evolved to encompass "*confusion*" and "*unpredictability*".

In Greek mythology, Chaos personified the primordial emptiness and disorder that existed before the creation of the universe. Interestingly, Chaos was linked to Eros (love), suggesting that even from disorder, creation can emerge.

Similarly, the Arabic translation of "*chaos*" emphasizes the lack of structure and discipline, contrasting with order and consistency.

Scientifically, chaos theory describes non-linear dynamic systems where slight initial variations can lead to vastly different long-term outcomes. A popular illustration of this is the Butterfly Effect, which suggests that a butterfly's wing beat in one location could theoretically trigger a hurricane elsewhere years later. While the Butterfly Effect holds a prominent place, other scientific examples further elucidate chaos, such as the unpredictable behaviour of weather patterns or the chaotic motion of fluid particles in turbulent flow.

Furthermore, scientific exploration has delved deeper, introducing concepts like "Spiral chaos" and "Spatio-temporal chaos", which represent a form of deterministic chaos believed to be contained within the partial differential equations of hydrodynamics appropriate for thermal convection. This is without the need for introducing sources of noise or random fluctuations (Baker & Gollub, 1990, p. 175).

Delving into the philosophical realm, the study of chaos embarks on a fascinating journey that enriches our understanding of the world. It explores chaos through the lens of the philosophy of science, raising profound questions about the ability to predict the future and the nature of the reality we inhabit yet often fail to grasp fully. This philosophical approach challenges the strict adherence to the laws of reason and traditional standards of rationality. Instead, it advocates for openness to all avenues and alternatives, including methodological and theoretical approaches deemed irrational by conventional standards. This perspective embraces elements such as imagination, intuition, emotion, myths, and traditions, as championed by Karl Paul Feyerabend. His concept of "*epistemological Chaos*" emphasizes the importance of embracing diverse perspectives and unconventional approaches to knowledge creation (Baker & Gollub, 1990, p. 175).

One theoretical framework that aligns with this openness is Chaos. As Peters stated:

"Chaos breaks across the lines that separate scientific disciplines" (Peters, 1991, p. 5).

This interdisciplinary nature of Chaos resonates with the philosophical exploration of Chaos. It suggests that challenging paradigms across various fields can be achieved by incorporating diverse methodologies and perspectives that may not traditionally be considered within those specific disciplines.

The concept of chaos is strikingly linked to postmodernism. The term post-modernism denotes a state of negative denial that preceded it, and some also like to call it post-structuralism. However, this latter refers directly to the deconstructionism school, which came as an antithesis of structuralism.

Besides, post-modernity is much broader than deconstructionism, which gives the impression of the fragmentation of the constructed building (Thoughts). Hence, deconstructing the human being and his statements (Enunciation) and textual products, applying a method to read texts and sounds according to a destructive mechanism. Whereas, post-modernity is much more comprehensive than that, as it is a general and comprehensive philosophy that seeks a decay of the included visions and perceptions. It also affects the non-social and human sciences, such as architecture.

The trend of post-modernism came in the 1970s in reaction to modernity, which could not prove its existence in a rapidly changing world. The Enlightenment discourse did not help to reshape a new philosophical and human scene, and as a result, some believe that post-modernism came primarily as an epistemic revolt that emphasizes the following themes:

1- Reject the "*Enlightenment discourse*" as a current philosophical scene, and believe that it is only a historical epoch (Stage).

2- Abolishment of the transcendent self

3- Immersion in the separatist and chaotic vision of time.

4- Rejection of any centralization.

5- Consider the reason and the truth as mere illusions at the time of human centrality.

The post-modernism project was linked to society, through the "theory of post-industrial society", which was specifically developed by many sociologists. Daniel Bell (1919/2011) is among those who predicted the formation of a new society in which material production would become less important than it was, and knowledge would be attained as a major force of economic development. This transformation would be gradual within the structure of modern society, where the transition would take place from the information society to the society of understanding and knowledge, which is the ultimate goal for post-modern philosophers.

Daniel Bell foresaw two things at the same time, the first which he mentioned in his book *"The End of Ideology"*, where he considered that Western culture would announce its failure. The social sciences which made the Western miracle would soon announce its death because instead of retaining its epistemological character, it was transformed into a religion:

"Is an all-inclusive system of comprehensive reality, it is a set of beliefs, infused with passion, and seeks to transform the whole of a way of life. This commitment to ideology —the yearning for a 'cause' or the satisfaction of deep moral feelings— is not necessarily the reflection of interests in the shape of ideas. Ideology, in this sense, and in the sense that we use it here, is a secular religion" (Bell, 2000, p. 399).

The second was mentioned in his book "*The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*", in which he criticized capitalist culture, which is monopolized by certain successful people in particular. Culture plays a role in self-actualization and glorification, even with delusion and oriented propaganda, which would ultimately fail the Western model and the end of its ideology, which was the reason for its success in the first place.

Post-modern sayings have been associated with the social sciences in particular, which should have independence far from the science that it longed to imitate. However, postmodernism has not developed sufficiently because the stimuli of social sciences must be from the depth of a society that believes in knowledge. He wondered about this defect in his saying:

"The simple thought occurred to many: if the widespread mobilization of science, and the concentration on some specific objectives, could produce scientific and technological breakthroughs, why could not a similar mobilization -the building of interdisciplinary teams- produce similar results in the social sciences?" (Bell, 1985, p. 13)

The knowledge societies, according to Jean-François Lyotard (1924/1998), are societies that reject the notions of centre and irrational positioning. Through his book (The Post-Modern Condition), he sees postmodernism as a deconstructive tendency of major doctrines and theories, which caused a terrible shock. He uses the saying *"the collapse of the grand narratives"* to denote the dissolution of the theories that underpin modernity and industrial society.

The *"knowledge society"* is a postmodern society, and Lyotard believes that relying on knowledge rather than a physical product will make knowledge itself an end and a commodity of exchange:

"Knowledge is and will be produced to be sold, it is and will be consumed to be valorised in a new production: in both cases, the goal is exchange" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 4-5).

We can learn more about post-modern philosophy through the work of a group of Western thinkers, such as Gilles Deleuze (1925/1995), Michel Foucault (1926/1984), Jean Baudrillard (1929/2007), Jacques Derrida (1930/2004). Most of them start from the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, to criticize the supporters of the Enlightenment and modernity and to think of a new society based on the philosophy of demolition and social consciousness.

We can say that postmodern society is a society that seeks to reshape a theoretical and philosophical horizon that overturns the fixed categories, in particular, the categories of reason, method, and *"knowing subject"* (Keuth, 2005, p. 295).

It is a society that desires to substitute matter for knowledge, certainty for the possible, the centre for the margin, the method for the *"No-method"*, the order for the regular chaos, and the consensus for the Difference. In other words, it wants to form a new epistemology for all the sciences, in particular the social and human sciences.

Since perceptions of the knowledge society (*post-modern*) are numerous and various, we will limit our study to the method as one of the most important and complex epistemic topics.

1.2. Problematic space

From the Enlightenment to the epoch of modernity, the method has been associated with the idea of certainty and unilateralism, as its supporters chanted the saying that certainty can only be reached through a strict scientific method. However, scholars in the postmodern stage realized that the idea of certainty was only a station in the history of science. It does not believe in stopping or finality:

"The possibility of complete certainty and objectivity has been abandoned for a long time. Because of repetition, the most acceptable idea undoubtedly is the statement that all knowledge is hypothetical, as it is always waiting to be inverted or modified by subsequent knowledge" (Hamouda, 1998, p. 92).

In general, it is noticeable that the revolutionary current has also affected the precise scientific aspect, as some philosophers and scientists have revolted over the foundations of experimental and abstract science. The concepts most used in scientific research have become vulgar and express only a narrow view of science. The roots of this minor view are due to the interference between power and knowledge, knowing subject and subject, past and future, quantity and quality. On this basis, these idols, and icons must be destroyed, because scientific research has become retrograde in many fields, despite its illusory victory in the technology field.

This confusion is due to the series of transformations in the concept of the knowing self itself, as the experimental school made it merely a sense, but a self with a self-entity without excessive transcendence, which is something that the rational school tried to overcome, as Descartes considered that the knowing subject is transcendent and central one, and it resulted from the Cartesian concept that the belief among Enlightenment philosophers that the knowing subject is the centre concerning the object of knowledge.

Method

The analysis requires defining two main steps, for the analysis to be complete and the matter to reach its goal, as many have tried. Many postmodern philosophers attempted to *"ground the knowledgeable subject"* by decentralizing it and its excessive transcendence and linking it only to perceptual powers and the distinctions of consciousness. This is what the thinker C. J. Preston stated in the introduction to his book, where he says:

"Epistemology" because it is a study of what is going on when we claim to know something about the world. It is *"postmodern"* because it builds upon work in the late twentieth century that began to unravel modernist views of how we know the world" (Preston, 2010, p. 11).

We referred to this shift when we spoke of the fissures of the *knowing subject* in the path of understanding the subject. Hans Bertens also explained when he said:

"What is wrong with modern philosophy is that it has abandoned modest Baconian "self-assertion" for "self-grounding", and that its self-consciousness has ever since driven it relentlessly in a futile search for essence" (Bertens, 1995, p. 140).

It will appear as follows:

2.1. Against the method: epistemic awareness at a time when traditional systems and curricula dominate.

The crisis of sciences did not deviate from the previous triad, as Karl Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994) adopted the theory of No-method (Epistemological anarchism), according to the precursors of Episteme. It was based on the necessity of not restricting the mind and the imagination, and paved the way for the scientist and the thinker to have a liberal and creative view. All aspects of culture and nature overlap each other.

It should also be noted that the school of sophistry is considered one of the most important ancient schools that tended to announce *the death of the method* because the truth does not exist in a changing and unstable world. Man is the measure of truth. This means that the truth is relative as the relativism of man who produced it. Such a tendency was represented by the wise Socrates, the last philosopher of the school. His method of dialogue is not considered a strict method but rather a method based on flexibility, movement, freedom, and fluency. It appears when his practice of rhetoric creates a kind of deliberate anarchism, that why he does not answer at all, but rather he aims at generating questions after questions.

We find the same thing in the writings of Frederick Nietzsche, in his books "*Thus Speaks Zarathustra*" and "*The Decline of Idols*". We see the absence of the method. Rather, Nietzsche tended towards the language of imagination, misleading the reader into the contents of creative chaos, and drowning him in the sea of rhetoric and metaphor.

The German philosopher and mathematician Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) spoke at length about the crisis of science in the West (*The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendent Philosophy*). He tried to overcome this stifling crisis, by introducing phenomenology as an open method and philosophy at the turn of the 20th century, which was a combination of several approaches that were pioneering in his day.

In the same context, I referred to the nature of the social sciences and humanities crisis in a study I previously published, as it is a crisis of "*knowing subject*" and method at the same time:

"The social sciences are considered as a very difficult cognitive field because the human being is the "knowing" and being the subject at the same time.

For that, it is difficult for the researcher self to study the topic independently and objectively, because the topic has a magical effect on the knowledgeable subject through the influence exerted by both the emotional and subconscious forces, the ideological and belief tendencies, desires, and tendencies.... are all considered as obstacles to serious scientific research" (Bouarfa, 2010b, p. 24).

This opinion is close to that presented by Najeeb Al-Hasadi, for he believes that the human sciences are surrounded by broad difficulties. Trying to subject them to universally accepted approaches may put them in a state of decline and crisis:

"For all of this, the difficulties that are not inherent like the subjects of study must be eliminated, as far as researchers were able to do so, such as the difficulty of relying on moral judgments and the difficulty of extrapolating analogy, which does not take into account individual differences and what leads to the extraction of overall hypotheses in a way that is not supported by the facts, such as explaining human behaviours with holistic theories indicative of them. Researchers should reduce their excessive enthusiasm and eagerness to achieve a complete analogy with the natural sciences" (Al-Hasadi, p. 139).

Some philosophers and scientists regard the method as a restriction and the "no-method" as a chase, the former depends on rules and calculated steps while the latter depends on the seizing of favourable opportunities through moments of intuition, judgment, and imagination ... Accordingly, the main question which can be asked: *can the philosophical and social discourse to be more giving*

and creative when freeing it from the method? Can the non-method develop the discourse of the social sciences, which has become a discourse which is not in phase with the great changes in the world?

This perception leads to the view that social sciences cannot become an accurate science as Edmund Husserl and other philosophers, sociologists and psychologists dreamed of.

Positivism has attempted to make philosophy a stand-alone, positivist science by liberating it from metaphysics and transcendent language from the lived reality, by comparing it with experimental and abstract sciences.

In the Arab world, the thinker Zaki Naguib Mahmoud worked to transfer philosophical research from metaphysical discourse to positivist scientific discourse. He directed researchers, in the field of philosophy and human sciences in general, to apply rigorous scientific approaches to human and social investigations. This is to advance and reach accuracy:

"The human sciences have not achieved a share of progress and accuracy equivalent to that reached by physics for example, so this delay in the human sciences tempted a group of people to hesitate to make them participate in the natural sciences in one approach and to tend to say that they need a special method. The subject of human relations, as we see it, is obliged to follow the same logical path that was followed by the natural sciences to be a science, and it does not contradict the fulfilment of the necessary logical conditions in every scientific research" (Mahmoud, 1961, p. 303).

2.2. Epistemic inversion and normal scientific thinking

Nowadays, science has begun to alienate from that closed scientific and rationalism that has been in place for a long time. We note this clearly in the writings of Paul Feierabend, Thomas Cohen, Emery Lactus and others... In this regard, Thomas Samuel Kuhn (1922-1996) refers to a major problem in the history of science. It is represented by the fact that it has proven by definitive evidence in many of its historical stations the occurrence of major upheavals in the structure of scientific theories. Many theories have lost their validity and credibility that they gained through the strength of their method and the rigour of their tools at the moment of their emergence and their reliance on a specific indicative model. The same declaration that knowledge should not adhere to the saying of a single rigid approach, for development, is sufficient to prove the invalidity of that perception:

"The act of judgment that leads scientists to a previously accepted theory is always based upon more than a comparison. The decision to reject one paradigm is always simultaneously the decision to accept another, and the judgment leading to that decision involves the comparison of both paradigms with nature and with each other" (Kuhn, 2012, p. 77-78).

From the above, the research problem revolves around the idea of "*the end of the method*" by saying that the truth only exists at the level of the history of constantly evolving ideas. Truth, whatever its nature, always remains relative and subject to renewal and manifestation throughout its history, which leads us to say that most of what has happened to it is a codification of knowledge. And not the discovery of facts. The methods used, as precise as they are, remain captive of time, place and the knowing subject. We approach the area of truth more than the truth itself:

"I believe that most methods of study lead to discovering the focus and frontier of truth, not the truth, and therefore we should not epistemically claim that a given method is the way towards it. Thus, the distinction between methods depends on which one is closer to the focus and the frontier" (Bouarfa, 2018, p. 09).

This assertion is useful to say that methods of study provide many services to science in general and social sciences in particular. Meanwhile, they put an end to the spirit of science, since it has mummified science by linking it to rigid models and ready-made paradigms.

Conclusion

Reconciling chaos with our desire for control can be a perplexing endeavour. Humans strive to predict and manipulate phenomena, aiming for a world where everything is calculable. However, everyday experiences often reveal the limitations of such control. Take weather patterns, for

instance. Despite advanced forecasting tools, the weather can still defy expectations. As Leonard Smith points out in "*Chaos: a very short introduction*", also we can say: Chaos exists in systems all around us. Even the simplest system of cause and effect can be subject to chaos, denying us accurate predictions of its behaviour, and sometimes giving rise to astonishing structures of large-scale order. Our growing understanding of Chaos Theory is having fascinating applications in the real world-from technology to global warming, politics, human behaviour, and even gambling on the stock market (Leonard, 2007).

However, despite this, it can be said that our results are not results of certainty, but rather they are closer to what is possible and likely, and they can be monitored as follows:

3.1. From Unilateral Method to Multiplicity of Methods

Supporters of scientific anarchism try to say that the method has died in victory for the spirit of science more than its results, because the spirit of science does not cancel the artistic and human aspect of science, but rather tries to transform science towards the space of art and humanism to establish scientific rationality open to the possible.

And if the state of science requires this transformation, as advocates of the "*No-method*" argue, then social sciences are more worthy of moving towards this epistemic direction, especially since it has been trying, since the nineteenth century, as much as possible to become an accurate science like experimental and abstract sciences. This illusion caused the social sciences to lose their spirit and humanistic aspect, and to engage in the logic of mathematically quantified results. Daniel Bell says that social sciences are in a schizophrenic state:

"The social sciences suffer from a case of acute schizophrenia in their treatment of rationality" (Bell, 1985, p. 86).

3.2. Under development of social and human sciences

Research within the field of social sciences finds itself the most lagging field behind parallel sciences, due to the attempts of many researchers to triumph for the method at the expense of the research itself.

The very nature of the social sciences repels from the constraints imposed by the method, so what is possible is its essence in terms of looking at the manifestations of the truth, and the philosopher, sociologist ...., it is not he who stands at the results and certainties, but he is the one who raises doubt and produces criticism to open the topic to possible assumptions.

The above can be summed up:

"This crisis was translated by the advocates of "No-method", headed by Feierabend, who were convinced that innovation and progress take place when we liberate the sciences from the authority of the method because it is capable of bringing about a qualitative shift and making science develop in the era of obsessive approach" (Bouarfa, 2010a, p. 24).

3.3. Cognitive Shift

Philosophical inquiry into chaos challenges traditional cognitive frameworks by highlighting the limitations of linear deterministic approaches to knowledge. It prompts a reassessment of how we understand and interpret reality, focusing on inherent complexity and the inability to predict natural and social phenomena.

Feyerabend's first rebellious project was directed against philosophical empiricism, which claims that what is to be believed is what experiments prove, and nothing more. However, in reality, this view is incorrect, which led Feyerabend to launch a broad attack that applies to any foundational cognitive theory. These theories, aside from naively resorting to experience, assume that the meaning of the term "*observation*" is determined unambiguously through observational procedures such as looking, listening, etc. Likewise, scientific theories can be based on other possibilities, including the illogical, imagination, and myths (Sarkar & Pfeifer, 2006, p. 306).

3.4-Existential Contemplation

The philosophy of chaos invites us to reconsider our existential assumptions about the nature of reality, as questions are raised about the existence of order within the space of chaos and absurdity, and the role of randomness in shaping daily events.

Existential absurdity is one of the forms of embodying chaos in life. According to Albert Camus, an existentialist is someone who believes that life has no meaning, and that we achieve our existence when we master the game of absurdity (Sagi, 2022, p. 43).

I am neither a supporter of existentialism nor a supporter of anarchism, but I consider the questions raised within this space necessary to understand existence.

3.4. Ethical Implications

Philosophically invoking chaos raises ethical questions about our relationship with complexity, uncertainty, and emergent phenomena. It urges considerations about the ethical responsibilities of individuals in navigating chaotic fields, mitigating potential harm behind the growing tendency towards chaos in social and human sciences, and enhancing flexibility and adaptability in cognitive shifts.

African researcher Chris. O. Akpan confirms that one of the benefits of the anarchist tendency is to delineate the features of uncertainty, and through this principle it can be said that we as Africans can benefit morally and philosophically from the anarchist lesson in limiting the dominance of technology and science, and belief in their authority:

"*Furthermore, Feyerabend's philosophy of science poses a serious advice to African nations to be wary of the kind of technology and science they import into the continent. The fact is that not all scientific and technological knowledge is congenial to the African world view. It is a fact of life that some of these imported technological devices have more or less help to erode or reduce our moral value to a near zero mark*" (Chris, 2005, p. 61).

3.5. Aesthetic and Cultural Emergence

Philosophical reflections on chaos extend beyond scientific research to include aesthetic and cultural dimensions. Chaos theory inspires artists, writers, and thinkers to explore themes of randomness, disorder, and nonlinearity in creative expression, promoting new forms of cultural criticism and aesthetic appreciation beyond ready-made, codified frameworks.

Chaos and aesthetic ecstasy may seem like an odd or counterintuitive pairing at the beginning of any talk about aesthetic experience. Still, there is a close relationship between chaos and aesthetic pleasure, especially when the expression is against oppressive authoritarianism, which includes all forms of coercion.

I will give a group of examples that make chaos aesthetically fruitful. For example, street art is an example of artistic chaos on the walls, where artistic forms are used as a tool for social expression and criticism of power structures. This embodies the chaotic rejection of all forms of censorship and the desire to communicate directly with the public without government media committed to an authoritarian political approach (in a sense, Neronian).

The idea of "*reclaiming beauty*" by returning to searching for it in daily life seems strange to those who are accustomed to linking beauty to the rules of art and aesthetics. Anarchist perspectives often emphasize that beauty is found in nature, just as order is found in chaos, and that this perspective inspires the artist to depict the raw power of nature and simple life in a beautiful artistic painting, whether at the level of sight, sound, or any aesthetic representation.

The cultural euphoria generated from aesthetic pleasure also lies in the feeling of freedom through the practice of expression, which can lead to a feeling of liberation in artistic creativity. At the same time, it promotes individual freedom, as demonstrated by the example of DIY culture, where Anarchy-punk embraces a raw aesthetic that rejects the polish and control of mainstream music. It starts from a simple idea: "*Make it yourself,*" creating works of art that express individual and collective ideas outside commercial restrictions, the rules of aesthetics, and artistic and social norms.

This aesthetic feature can be observed in the ABCs of artistic movements such as Dadaism, which believes that chaos is creative. They enacted their slogan: fighting art with art, ignoring aesthetics codified with strict rules that do not serve art while believing that the recipient should understand it however they want, as art must address feelings and conscience. Therefore, it cannot be reduced to rules; rather, we let chaos work its magic (Elger, 2004, p. 13).

Surrealism, which emerged from Dadaism, was itself aimed at expressing the subconscious mind in a way that lacks order and logic, according to the vision of its theorist André Breton, who presented the idea of soap bubbles as an example of the aesthetic landscape of surreal (Caws, 1997, p. 205).

The Situationism movement, through its invention of the "*scene theory*," seems to lead to the need to move from individual expression through experiences and true living that satisfy authentic desires presently, to indirect individual expression, which makes change, self-management, and independence the prerogatives of the right. This makes the revolution, the realization of dreams, and the changing possibilities of life fall within the field of creating the revolutionary horizon (Plant, 2002, p. 76).

Also, the aesthetic dimension of chaos can be found in theatrical work, especially with Julian Beck and his wife Malina, who formed the Living Theatre, where theatre was considered a language with a renewed and lively character, transporting the recipient to the space of direct participation in the scene. It is a vision that seeks to create a revolutionary kinetic language based on sensations and feelings, with the spontaneity imposed by the theatrical scene (Rostagno et al., 1970).

3.6. Reviewing Fundamentals

The study of chaos poses fundamental challenges to philosophical concepts such as causality, determinism, and free will. It calls upon philosophers to reassess these concepts in light of nonlinear dynamics, sensitivity to initial conditions, and the limits of predictability, sparking discussions about agency, responsibility, and the nature of causality.

Overall, a philosophical study of chaos enriches our understanding of the universe by inviting us to engage with its inherent complexity, uncertainty, and dynamism. It challenges us to embrace ambiguity, cultivate humility in the face of uncertainty, and recognize the interconnectedness among diverse phenomena across scales and disciplines.

4. Discussion

Chaos is not as ugly as some make it out to be. Chaos may be creative in the fields of art, literature, and politics, and it may be gentle in the field of psychological and social studies. It cannot be linked to ugliness and evil because it is linked to the destruction of the conventional. For example, it does not mean that we support the theory of the "end of the method", rather it is merely a presentation of an opinion that has found itself in postmodern society epistemic acceptance, not because it is a substitute for the method but since it has opened the possibility of liberation from the method, and this liberation is not necessarily a rejection of it, but rather a prospect for its plurality, diversity and flexibility.

The research in the field of social and human sciences can only develop within an epistemic revolution according to the requirements of the postmodern situation, whose features can be drawn from the most important founding principles of a postmodern society.

Philosophical engagement with chaos theory encourages methodological pluralism, recognizing that different approaches may be necessary to capture the multifaceted nature of chaotic systems. This openness to diverse methodologies fosters interdisciplinary collaboration and innovation in research practices.

The consequences of studying chaos philosophically have profound implications across various fields of research and human experience, perhaps the most important of which are the following:

4.1. Cognitive transformation

Engaging with chaos theory from a philosophical perspective leads to a fundamental shift in how we understand how we acquire and represent knowledge. This shift can even lead to a form of intellectual liberation. By recognizing the limitations imposed by linear and reductionist approaches that try to break down reality into simple parts, we are freed from the constraints of these traditional thought patterns. This liberation allows us to see the world through a more open lens. Chaos theory encourages humility in the face of complexity and uncertainty, emphasizing the value of probabilistic thinking. We learn to be open to possibilities, recognize patterns that might not be readily apparent, and move beyond rigid, dogmatic forms of reasoning. This openness fosters

innovative and creative thinking, allowing us to develop new frameworks for understanding an inherently complex universe.

4.2. Revolutionary Illusion

This position raises a concern that the emphasis on a cognitive shift due to chaos theory could lead to a revolutionary illusion.

The potential Downside is the focus on abandoning traditional thought might lead philosophers to believe they're making a complete break with the past, neglecting the historical context.

For this, it may be disappearing Origins, this "*revolutionary illusion*" could cause the original ideas to be forgotten, making it seem like new concepts arise from a vacuum.

The result is the trivialization of Philosophy, engaging with "*triviality*" (focusing on unimportant matters) could undermine the importance of philosophy, especially considering the potential for a one-dimensional mindset obsessed with control in modern society.

4.3. Transcendental Meditation

Going beyond the great narratives and certainties in philosophy and science leads us to reconsider our existential assumptions about the nature of reality first, and the future of the mind and human experience. Instead of looking at the world as an absolute inevitability, or as being conditionally organized, we realize that complexity lies in the ability to not predict natural and social phenomena and to depend on randomness or organized chaos. This raises questions about the apparent disorder and confused thought of modern man. Such transcendental reflections may enrich our understanding of the ontological foundations of existence, and strongly challenge simplistic binaries between order and chaos.

4.4. Multiplicity of approaches

The best benefit we may achieve is freedom from the dominance of one approach (***Method***), as philosophical dealing with chaos theory encourages belief in the diversity of approaches in scientific research and philosophical consideration. Since the multiplicity of approaches opens the field of understanding to the possible, based on the fact that different phenomena may require diverse approaches. It appears that this trend may lead to the adoption of various methodologies, ranging from deterministic modelling to probabilistic simulation and qualitative analysis. This openness to methodological diversity fosters collaboration and innovation between disciplines, enriching our understanding of complex systems and phenomena.

Feyerabend created spaces in which people could breathe again. He demanded of philosophers that they be receptive to ideas from the most disparate and far-flung domains, and insisted that only in this way could they understand the processes whereby knowledge grows (Krige, 1980, pp. 106-107).

4.5. Moral Challenges in a Chaotic World

Our engagement with complexity, uncertainty, emerging phenomena, and the realm of possibility "*the philosophy of why not?*" presents numerous challenges and difficult moral questions. A key challenge is letting go of absolute certainty and embracing the flexibility of probabilistic thinking. A philosophical approach to these thorny issues can pave the way for ethical decision-making in a world of constant change and evolving considerations across various aspects of life.

4.6. The Aesthetic and Cultural Dimension

Chaos theory has a positive impact on aesthetics and culture by fostering the emergence of unconventional and unfamiliar artistic and cultural models. This enriches the creative landscape, revitalizes cultural criticism and appreciation, and promotes new forms of artistic expression and cultural interpretation.

However, there's a potential downside. The unfamiliar nature of chaotic art might lead to confusion or discomfort among audiences. This negative reaction could result in a lack of intellectual engagement when encountering such works.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the philosophical exploration of chaos has given rise to a new trend, unveiling its multifaceted dimensions in diverse ways that may reshape our cognitive, existential, methodological, ethical, and aesthetic frameworks. By engaging with the question of chaos and embracing complexity and uncertainty, we enrich our understanding of the universe and ourselves, fostering enhanced dialogue and restoring the greatness of philosophy through the creation of new spaces for free thinking.

The reinvigoration of this discourse involves a shift from viewing chaos solely as a revolutionary concept to recognizing it as a moment of immediate tension that challenges our belief in cognitive certainty. This pause prompt's philosophy to explore topics previously absent from its literature, particularly during periods when philosophy seemed to lack a subject.

Gilles Deleuze remarked on chaos:

"We require just a little order to protect us from chaos. . . We ask only that our ideas be linked together according to a minimum of constant rules. All that the association of ideas has ever meant is providing us with these protective rule's resemblance, contiguity, and causal- which enable us to put some order into ideas, preventing our "fantasy" (delirium, madness) from crossing the universe in an instant, producing winged horses and dragons breathing" (Deleuze, Guattari, 1996, p. 201).

References

1. Al-Hasadi, N. (n.d). *Approach of a method*. Al-Jamahiriya House for Publishing.
2. Baker, Gregory. L., & Gollub, Jerry. P. (1990). *Chaotic Dynamics: An Introduction*. (1st ed., Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
3. Baker, G. L. & Gollub, J. P. (1990). *Chaotic Dynamics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Bell, D. (1985). *The Social Sciences Since the Second World War*. (1st ed.). Transaction Publishers.
5. Bell, D. (2000). *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*. (Vol. 3). Harvard University Press.
6. Bertens, J. W. (1995). *The idea of the Postmodern history*. Psychology Press Routledge.
7. Bouarfa, A. (2010). The Crisis of method in the Humanities (Introduction). *Al Kalima Magazine*, 69, 12–36.
8. Bouarfa, A. (2018). The Phenomenological Approach in the Humanities, the Épochè Moment as a paradigm. *Journal of Social and Human Science Studies*, 7(1), 9–22.
9. Caws, M. A. (1997). *He Surrealist Look: An Erotics of Encounter*. MIT Press.
10. Chris, O. A. (2005, December 4). Feyerabend's Philosophy of Science and its Implications for National Development in Africa. *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research* (JICPR), 45–64.
11. Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1996). *What Is Philosophy?* Trd: Hugh Tomlinson, Graham Burchell. Columbia University Press.
12. Descartes, R. (2006). *A discourse on the method of correctly conducting one's reason and seeking truth in the sciences*. Oxford University Press.
13. Elger, D. (2004). *Dadaism*. Taschen.
14. Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. New Left Books.
15. Feyerabend, P. K. (1975). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. Verso Books.
16. Hamouda, A. A. (1998). *The Convex Mirrors*. The National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters.
17. Keuth, H. (2005). *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Krige, J. (1980). *Science, Revolution and Discontinuity*. Harvester Press.
19. Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
20. Krige, Johan. (1980). *Science, Revolution and Discontinuity*. Harvester Press.

21. Leonard, S. (2026). *The Analogue of Chaos*. Translated by Muhammad Saad Tantawi. Hindawi Foundation.
22. Leonard, S. (2007). *Chaos: A very short introduction*. OUP Oxford.
23. Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.
24. Mahmoud, Z. M. (1961). *Positivist Logic*. Part 2, 3rd Edition. The Anglo-Egyptian Library.
25. Mahmoud, Z. M. (1961). *Positivist Logic*. (3rd ed., Vols. 1–2). The Anglo-Egyptian Library.
26. Ozumba, G. O. (2000, Summer). '*Epistemology and the Science of Politics*'. African Journal of Philosophy, 40–54.
27. Preston, C. J. (2010). *Grounding Knowledge: Environmental Philosophy, Epistemology, and Place*. University of Georgia Press.
28. Peters, E. (1991). *Chaos and order in capital markets*. Wiley & Sons.
29. Plant, S. (2002). *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age*. (2nd ed.). Routledge.
30. Preston, C. J. (2010). *Grounding Knowledge: Environmental Philosophy, Epistemology, and Place*. University of Georgia Press.
31. Rostagno, A., Judith, M., & Beck, J. (1970). *We, the Living Theatre*. Ballantine Books.
32. Sagi, A. (2022). *Albert Camus and the Philosophy of the Absurd*. BRILL.
33. Sarkar, S., & Pfeifer, J. (2006). *The Philosophy of Science*. Psychology Press.