

Volodymyr Bekh

**A NOOMAN
OF THE SOCIAL ORGANISM**

Monography



Sumy
University Book
2010

УДК 316.3(=111)
ББК 60.54
Б 55

Translated by Olena Tytarenko

The monograph considers a social life to be a coherent process of functioning and development of a rational living substance that occurs in an organismic form. The book examines the world view approach, the ideology of comprehension and the quality of methodological devices with the help of which social life is scrutinized; reasons causing pathology in a family of social organisms of neolithic origin are originally accounted for.

In the context of the philosophical analysis a nooman of the social organism is seen as a dialectical contradiction between personal identity and society; the mechanism of interaction of subjective and objective ingredients of social integrity is thoroughly elucidated; the approaches to investigation of morphology of polar forms of life, functioning, self-regulation and development of a social organism are provided, other characteristics of a social organism are also formulated. The systematic analysis of a social organism of the country is conducted, its heuristic model is given; the models of a generic type and the simplest social organisms are suggested. The social organism is determined as a substance of noomanal world or as a contradiction between personality and society on the basis of the philosophical analysis.

The monograph is addressed to researchers of social processes, scholars, postgraduates, students, and to everyone who deals with problems of noosociogenesis comprehension.

У монографії розкривається суспільне життя як цілісний процес функціонування та розвитку розумної живої речовини, що відбувається в організмі формі. Аналізуються світоглядний підхід, ідеологія осягнення та якість методологічного інструментарію, за допомогою якого вивчається суспільне життя, оригінально пояснюються причини, що викликали патологію у сімействі соціальних організмів неолітичного походження.

У процесі теоретичного аналізу ноомен соціального організму розкривається як діалектичне протиріччя між особистістю та суспільством, ґрунтовно висвітлюються механізми взаємодії суб'єктивного та об'єктивного інгредієнтів соціальної цілісності, підходи до вивчення морфології польової форми життя, функціонування, саморегуляції та розвитку соціального організму тощо. Системно аналізується соціальний організм країни, подається його евристична модель, пропонуються моделі видових та найпростіших соціальних організмів.

Монографія розрахована на дослідників соціальних процесів, викладачів вузів, аспірантів, студентів, а також на тих, хто займається проблемами осягнення ноосоціогенезу.

ISBN 978-966-680-538-9

© Bekh, Volodymir, 2010

© University book, 2010

CONTENTS

Preface to the readers	4
Introduction	6
Chapter 1. Philosophical and methodological foundation of research of the social organism	23
1.1. Outlook and ideological bases of comprehension of the social organism	23
1.2. Methodological approach to comprehension of the social organism	43
Chapter 2. Epistemological analysis of the social world	99
2.1. The origin of the social phenomenon	99
2.2. Quantum-wave nature of the social phenomenon	112
2.3. The essence of the social world	133
2.4. The content of the social reality	150
2.5. The form of the social world	180
Chapter 3. The social organism and its attributive characteristics	201
3.1. The social organism as the contradiction between society and personality	201
3.2. The morphological aspect of the social organism	211
3.3. The topological aspect of the social organism	216
3.4. The functional aspect of the social organism	223
3.6. The evolutionary aspect of the social organism	240
Chapter 4. The systemic analysis of the social organism	254
4.1. The heuristic model of the (generic) state's social organism	257
4.2. The social organism as the equipotential system of functional constructions	275
Conclusions	288
Bibliography and references	292

PREFACE TO THE READERS

The contemporary social crisis attracts much attention of philosophers and scientists from different fields of science. It is apparent that, if a researcher wants to put to order the chaos that has occurred as a result of the civilization shift on the planetary level, it is inefficient and inadequate to analyze separate disconnected fragments of social reality. Yet it is possible to understand the algorithm of the world community's transition from one historical supercycle to another if it conforms with the laws of universal evolutionary progress in which every social phase is nothing as one of its stages.

Besides, it is necessary to note that the theoretical landscape of the research field in which the social crisis is being scrutinized after "the breakdown of totalitarianism" and collapse of "ideologems" of "radical westerners" is littered with shells of several ideological periods. The solution of this rather complicated problem can be found in the deductive search for means of optimization of social life. This method will take much more time and efforts than the other one, which deals with analysis of the aggregate facts of "hot" experiences, but it will be more important.

The first step on this road was undertaken in my research devoted to interrelations of Man and Universe. The main results of it were published in the monograph *Man and Universe* (1998). This publication was very popular and had one more edition in 1999. The above-mentioned books demonstrate that personal identity is a functional organ of person's biological organism. The incomplete scientific knowledge of personal identity has been considerably improved by a complete model of man's informational organization, which is given in the both editions. It is proven that the potential social world first appears in man's organization and then, due to trans-actions, transcends into external environment where it creates a special object, e.g. society. Some special attention is paid to the problem of formation of a new

outlook, which could cope with a new informational phase in the development of the world community in the XXI century.

The second step of my research was devoted to the foundation of the quantum-wave origin of the social world, the development of the theory of the field structure of social life, basing on the idea of professional character of every social process and proving that, organizationally, social structures have organismic forms. The main results of this research were published in the monograph *Philosophy of Social Universe* (1999).

The third step of the research of the universe self-development's social form was directed to investigate an application of the organismic idea as a philosophical instrument that can eliminate the contradiction between man and society. The theoretical investigation in this field resulted in the monograph *Social Organism* (1998).

The fourth step was devoted to examination of the social world, which is as organizational form localized on the levels of the hierarchical structure of the Universe. Here we have deal with the special substance of *noomanal* origin, i.e. created by the man's mind, from which society and, at last, noosphere are built. The results of my research are the basis for the given monograph *A Nooman of the Social Organism*. I consider all these research steps as the natural way from the abstract things to the concrete ones in the fundamental investigation of the social phase in the self-development of the Universe.

The English version of the given research has appeared thanks to the persistent work of As. Professor Olena Tytarenko from Foreign Philology Institute of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. The scientific editing was carried out by my philosophy department colleague Professor Iryna Predborska, PhD on Philosophy. She did not only edited the text according to the standards of international publications but also scrupulously examined a set of nuances concerning the interpretation of the notions' meanings in Ukrainian and English versions, constantly consulting with linguists and debating with me. Thus, I am much obliged to these Professors – specialists of the highest level who introduced my philosophical reflections about the problems of noosociogenesis, self-organization and self-regulation of the functional systems to English-speaking readers.

Volodymyr Bekh
June, 2010

INTRODUCTION

In the mid-80s and beginning-90s of the XXth century it became clear that we are living through the epoch of a great turning point in the development of society. The crisis of social life accompanied by negative consequences of theoretical, methodological, ideological, and outlook character leading man's everyday existence up a blind alley.

The speculations about the future become the urgent duty of philosophers and scholars. Pathology in social life likewise in physiology is a priceless in diagnosing the causes of illness of a social organism without detecting of which any assistance for its recovery is certain to fail. In addition, the modern crisis convincingly proves that it is optimization of human life in planetary magnitude that is a pivotal problem of the theory of knowledge of the end of the XXth – beginning of the XXIst century. National, demographic, military, resource, energetic, ecological and other global problems as against the global social crisis are interpreted as its consequences.

The process of fundamental rationalization of the social life has been in a progress for a long time, and within it, at least, three stages can be distinguished: the first is connected with substantiating of priority of a man's role in the history and terrestrial origin of society and state (Renaissance); the second is connected with establishment of Marxist social doctrine, that on the basis of primacy of material things over the spiritual things showed the creative role of people as a subject of social life (the end of the XVIIth – mid. of the XXth cent.); the third one is connected with the search for “philosophical unity” among endless number of relatively independent and incompatible means of explanations of courses of development of social world – theological, materialistic, technocratic, phenomenological, existentialistic, and others (from the mid. of the XXth cent.).

There is nothing to be surprised at: poorly developed theoretical thought got beyond such powerful and multidirectional intellectual and physical energy. The reason lies in the fact that practical con-

consciousness of people keeps placing great emphasis on adopting the logics of external state of things. People lost their connection with the inner world; they ceased to understand its logic; confusion triggered the trap of ecology which reflects the demand to keep the regularities of a cosmic character.

In such situation the division of researchers into two big groups – pessimists and optimists – seems quite logic. Pessimists who are prevailing in number (K. Popper, A. Koyre, B. Pascal, and others) demonstrate the sceptical comprehension of the social development's possibilities. Nevertheless, there are optimists who keep working enthusiastically at elucidating a mystery of the mechanism of the social life's self-evolvement. Among them, in its turn, two groups can be also distinguished. One group takes the course of actualized models of social development construction incorporating for this purpose the tendencies which have been discovered in the process of scientific technological revolution. The other group of researchers-optimists endeavors to conceptualize totality of social life by means of employing the *concept of social organism*, which has its own destiny and centuries-old history. However, its heuristic potential still waits for its cogitation and development.

Scholars repeatedly endeavored to account for organismic development of the second nature. In the ancient Indian Vedas already the very first notes on social organism as a form of man's existence are found (about 3,500 BC.). Other record related to the matter, namely that world of people, is a cohesive organism, is found in a different ancient Indian manuscript the Mahabharata (the first half of the 1000 B.C.). One of its episodes tells about unitary spiritual substance which all empirical phenomena go back to.

Later this concept was supported by Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Comte, Spenser, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Durkheim, and many other philosophers. Moreover, within the world sociology a separate trend has emerged; it received the name of Organic School. Among the contemporary scholars such as M. Moiseyev, A. Ahabehyin, R. Abdeyev, M. Archer, P. Shtompka, V. Andrushchenko, V. Volovyc, V. Voronkova, M. Mykhalchenko, M. Moklyak, V. Pylypenko, V. Piddubnyi, I. Chernenko, V. Shapovalov, and many others are the proponents of this school.

At the present moment we are not able to distinguish consciously between the notions of "social organism", "public organism", "spiritual organism", "ethnic and social organism", "logic organism",

“sobornal (conciliar) organism”, “church organism”, “state organism”, “national – state organism”, “institutional organism”, “culturological organism”, “cultural and historical organism”, “collective organism”, “ethnic organism”, “formational organism”, and other analogical notions.

Our standpoint in this research is that organic totality of social world does exist and we recognize its immanent ties with the first nature and Cosmos. Moreover, we claim that it is in the process of overcoming of the present planetary crisis, that human thought discovers qualitatively different means of conceptual explanation of its further development. In our opinion answers to all questions which challenged philosophical and scientific consciousness of the world commonwealth at the end of the XXth century should be searched for within such phenomenon as noocosmogogenesis, more precisely noosociogenesis. Spontaneous self-transformation of social world is caused, to our mind, by aggravation of need of Cosmos in effectively functioning *planetary mind* called to compensate its structural instability.

To speak in another way, we do support M. Moiseyev’s standpoint, that there is a rigid tendency of formation of peculiar automatic pilot that secures supersystem of planetary mind and its fragments from spontaneous devastation in a “synergetic machine”, the world process of self-organization of the universum appears to be. In evolutionary development of the universum such special function as being an automatic regulator belongs to noosphere in which personal identity plays a central role [See: 155, 196–202].

It follows from our analysis that it is for reflection of a specific planetary phenomenon in a logical form that the concept of social organism has emerged, namely: self – evolvment of social life or intelligent living substance co-existing along with common protein-nuclein life or simple living substance. It is deduced from practice, that from the very beginning the material aspect of the Universe in a form of a family of physical organisms has been exhibited before us, however, at present *the image of its spiritual constituent in the form of a family of social organisms is being revealed.*

This accounts for consisting desire of researchers to employ the means of analogues to pattern *living kind of planetary substance after living rational substance.* From this it can be inferred why the history of self – evolvment, apparently, is closely interwoven with the notion “physical” organism. Stated connection can be presented in a following way: it is a metaphor for Plato, an analogue – for Aris-

title, parallelism – for Spenser, absolute identity – for Lilienfeld. At present we do determine this connection as a special object of, first of all, philosophical analysis, and then of scientific analysis.

Practically the essence of the matter is to turn this idea into philosophical conception of self-evolution of social reality as relatively independent geological process. Genetically social reality comes into being out of biosphere development. It has independent being within noosphere, and then naturally transcends into electromagnitosphere as an element of cosmic environment. This mode of the phenomenon of noocosmogogenesis is developing by comprising of three levels: the Preamble, the Life and the Super life.

Nowadays it is erroneous to begin the investigation of the problem without undertaking the analysis of the reasons of global crisis that has been unceasingly raged. Not underestimating the role of subjective factors (individuals, parties, public movements) involved in the process of self-evolution of social world, the determinative role of spontaneous manifestation of such factor of social development as human mind should also be taken into account. We have not understood completely or taken seriously Hegel's warning in his political philosophy, that as soon as the spirit of people attains much higher level, all moments of social order connected with the previous levels of its development lose their ascertainment; they should decay, and there is no force to withhold them [51, 379]. Hereby, it became clear that we are completely lacking the vision of cosmological character or the depth of changes taking place, and the sense of continuance of transitional period.

The deep and systemic crisis of social development enveloped the whole world. It occurs in such truculent form that some researchers speak even about anthropological catastrophe. From scientific standpoint it is apparently fallacious thing to consider the present social collapse to be exclusively in character of the former USSR, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, and other countries of Eastern Europe. Turning events are in progress in China and Mongolia. In a peculiar way the crisis takes place in France, Italy, and Spain. These first, remote underground shocks of social turmoil contributed in many aspects to replacing of the political leaders of the USA, Great Britain, and Germany. It is only in Sweden that social element might be still under control at expense of relatively more even distribution of profits meticulously put to balance by governing social-democratic party.

Establishment of Ukraine as an independent state raises the issue of theoretical study of its development. Having taken an independent course Ukraine only in a very general way has delineated direction where to go, and even less, the methods to use. Up to the present day we lack a conceptual vision of self-evolvement of social organism of state; outlook foundation of social development has not been constructed yet. All this in an utterly negative way influences on the determination of national strategy; the very practice of state development, performing of social -economic reforms in society. Without strong exclusive vision of the ways of development Ukraine will fail to take the course of dynamic and effective social-economic transformations cohesive by character. Such realities have already caused the severe difficulties of present transition period in development of Ukraine; have provoked additional challenges to society increasing impoverishment of the population.

Analysis proves that **explication** of bifurcational nature of modern social processes should be sought for in the Universe changes of modes of which are objective reason causing gigantic collapses of cultural and historical world. Geological process is such total reality within which both above mentioned tendencies of social process have been removed; through it the very motive of the second nature is being reconstructed. The humanity begins its own development at its very own foundation. So, **the task of philosophy is to conceptualize the nature of changes, which have been taking place at present, to be able to elaborate an adequate to them mode of thinking and behavior of a subject of historical efficiency, perspective for the third millennium.**

Nowadays we are not simply witnesses of qualitative move in the developing of the Universe, but are immediate participants of that process; of how the universum is curving its qualitatively different way of development which is going to return to us in a new type of civilization. In addition, we are the witnesses and the participants of a process of a unique megasystem's planetary organism origin which is not familiar for us property type. Its formation is directly connected with noospheric explosion that is predicted by many investigations. We should get ready to it, not to be caught unexpectedly, as it has been taking place at present. It is *from a strategic side*.

From the *operative side*, all variety of notional forms in which idea of organismic structure of social world is being revealed should be aggregated to unity. *From the tactical side*, it is important to

examine the nature and content of two contrary tendencies of modern stage of development of **planetary humanity**. *One* of them is connected with activation of the processes of particular countries establishment as the independent subjects of the world social process. *Other* tendency consists in obvious process of establishment of planetary humanity as the totality. Integration of world commonwealth has been already gaining its form in a way of specific intercontinental and continental structures of such type as the Organization of American States, Organization of African Unity, All-European House, Euro-Asian Commonwealth, The North – American Free Trade Zone and others. It is the reason that cause increasing role of collective organs of self-regulation of all aspects of life of the world commonwealth – United Nations Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund, Security Council, European Economic Community, Roman Club, European Parliament and others.

Creation of the seventh continent – the Internet, European and other specialized informational System (GII, EII, NII, B-ISDN, ATM, SDN, “UTYP”, BSFOOS), TV (WRON), telex-telegraph and mobile phone nets (DEST, SDMA), all-European currency unit – euro, also specific flow and many others – is a positive proof of enhancing of establishment of continental, intercontinental and planetary forms of everyday people’s activities organization.

In order to be able to determine the degree of complexity of selected for analysis problem, we should know the degree of its elaboration in philosophical and scientific thought. The survey of existing scientific-philosophic literature exhibits that the problem of social organism, at least, in the soviet and national publications, has not received purposeful elaboration. It was kept under secret taboo. The same status was given to its study as to the problem of perpetuum mobile in mechanics. At the same time the concept of social organism keeps exciting the minds of people, and saturating, in the direct sense of this word, our life.

From the examined publications it is deduced that this concept has changed several modes of its historical existence. Initially it has existed in *morphological mode* for rather a long period of time, even nowadays its echo can be experienced. To prove this, suffice it to give an example of descriptions encountered in available literature. Here it is how A. Gramsci describes it in his *Prison Notebooks*, that it is somewhere beyond dependency of individuals that something

phantasmagoric exists; there is abstraction of collective organism, autonomous deity, which without a particular head but does think, which doesn't move with the aid of human legs, but still moves and etc [62, 257–258].

Then the morphological concept of world totality was naturally replaced by the *theological one*. In Paul's teaching it is said that "society is one in the body of Christ". However, principles of submission to authority, according to Paul and Apostle's teaching, cannot be incorporated to domain of belief; they declare the right of resistance, but the only way is the passive one, and only through martyrdom. The principle of equality, brotherhood, human solidarity, which the philosophy of the epoch has already attained, transcends different teaching, and by doing this descends from philosophic heights to people's beliefs. Seneca Lutsiy Anney (near 4 B.C. – 65 A.D) – a Roman philosopher, educator, emperor Nero's councilor – conceptualizes the world as indivisible intellectual-divine totality all parts of which are organically tied to each other [200, 441].

Theological form suffered from knock-down blow on the part of Aristotle, that surprising or not, but had passed by unnoticed by philosophers, though its religious configuration still had been filling with the content back during Hegel's epoch. Thus, for instance, H. Hreyef writes: "His (Aristotle. – V.B.) thought goes far beyond Greek state order: he studies and compares a hundred and fifty variable political forms. He does not study society as artifact made up by gods and people any more, but rather as natural organism. Thus, the most prominent forerunner of scientific sociology makes tremendous revolution in the domain of social teaching. It surprises, however, that that pivotal idea was given the less attention in thousands volumes of commentaries dedicated to Aristotle; nevertheless, this significant standpoint connects Greek world with the most leading contemporary thoughts" [62, 39].

From Aristotle organismic vision of society precedes to Hobbes, Hegel, Pyer Leru, and others philosophers favoring theological standpoint. Krause's theology as well is saturated by theology. But it is its nobility and scope of its social desires that favorably distinguish it from philosophies of Hegel, Schelling, and Shlegel. Moreover, it is one of the first systems studying society in general as organism with certain functions and organs.

The most complete description of historical aspect of development of social organism we encounter in sociological literature of the be-

ginning of the XXth century. Sometime later it is marginalized by the materialistic directive. Thus, for example, M. Kovalevsky in his work *Sociology* emphasizes, “as it is known that Spenser, then later Sheffle, Liliyenfeld, Vorms, Izule, Novykov, and partially Khref’s view of society as organism that develops has already been encountered in its embryo in Comte who employs such comparison with complete understanding that analogy and tautology are different things, and, thus, withholding from such adjusting of particular institutions and social functions to different parts of human body, which in so many ways has contributed in distortion of true in its essence thought, true as much as it rejects purely mechanic, that is to say, artificial converging of different elements of community” [94, 205]. In addition, he leaves us with facts that this concept can be traced even in much earlier historical period. No need to remind that the very first springs of theory, according to which different social classes and correspondent to them establishments should be recognized as components of one organic totality, takes its origin from Plato. Many centuries later on Plutarch in his *Moralia* enhances the same idea. Plutarch’s *Moralia* was very popular in Byzantium and mid centuries’ societies. It managed to preserve for future generations Plato’s theory about organic nature of the state even in times when the ideas of the most renowned Greek philosopher were known to the world only by way of fragments. In the XII century Ioann Salisberiytskyi, following Plato, again made a statement about state as organism. It was even before the issue of *Summa Theologia* by Foma Aquinata that Ioann Salisberiytskyi in his *Polycraticus* had summarized all social and political knowledge of middle ages. That book was constantly referred to, and repeatedly slavishly copied. Due to it the organic theory of state had penetrated into works of the first representatives of scholastic philosophy, particularly, into the *Specula* of Vincent from Bovey” [94, 205].

Then M. Kovalevsky goes on rightly concluding that “this theory connected traditionally with Hobbe’s name, thus, had been known for many centuries before him. Hobbes in his Leviathan, however, was able to enrich it with originality and excellent form. H. Spenser’s theory, however, is simply novel expression of the doctrine which had already been existed, as we have seen, for more than 2000 years” [94, 207–208].

Then its vulgarization is connected with Sheffle, Liliyenfeld, Rene Worms’ works, who present it as their own thing going into rather

considerable exaggerations in its development. In the course of search of analogues between the state and living organism they have gone as far as identification of human heart with stock-exchange.

Thus Plato already gives to a state a name of a huge human being. But Aristotle turns this Plato's metaphor from poetical fiction into a real analogy. A state became an organism, namely, huge human being, recognized, in its turn, as a social being. Consequently Aristotle should be considered as a real father of the theory of social macrocosmos. Nevertheless, for Aristotle that comparison was nothing more than simply comparison; Spenser, however, considers it already as a parallelism. Exoderm, endoderm, mezoderm are recognized as existing in both structure of organism and structure of society. In fact, it is only correspondences, encounters, and parallelisms that can be spoken about. Liliyennifer brings the findings of such undertaken search to a close by saying that "society not only looks like a living organism but it, by itself, is this very living organism" [94, 262].

The concept of social organism has been tending towards gaining **a philosophical form** for a long period of time. It became widely used as a cognitive tool for analysis of social life. At that stage it has gained a universal character and began to be applied practically to all aspects of human life. As practice proves, this concept, even not having clearly determined content, has been operating successfully within the theory of knowledge for centuries. V. Vernadsky accounted for its viability in a rightly way, "A new peculiar methodology of penetrating into unknown, that is justified by success but which we cannot imagine graphically (as a model), is being developed. It seems to be a new notion expressed by way of "symbol" corresponding to reality, created by intuition, that is to say, by unconscious for researcher coverage of countless number of facts. These symbols are still beyond our logical understanding; however, what we still can do is to add to them mathematical analysis, and whereby to discover new phenomena or add to them theoretical generalization, that are verified in all logical deductions by facts, firmly accounting them by measure and number" [36, 77].

It is quite natural that the concept of social organism originally was employed in study of a *domain of political relations*. And since politics is rather complicated phenomenon, in scientific literature then the following types of social organism can be distinguished: state, administrative, and strictly political. Ideal state, as Plato

(347 B.C.) suggests should be all in all fair. Characterizing his project of ideal state Plato writes, that we found this state not intending to make people of particular class happy, but on the contrary, to make happy the state all in all.

In 1762 J.J. Rousseau in his work *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*, following Beyl in his critic toward Montesquieu and Hobbes, came to deistic concept of essentiality of God, God who punished and rewarded ensuring viability of state organism and immutability of social morality” [188, 432].

Hegel’s definition of content of notion “state organism” is of special value. He (*Philosophy of Law*) points out, that a particular state as a whole is disjoined into some particular circles [54, 347]. In his work dedicated to issues of aesthetics the following characteristics of social organism can be found. Hegel describes this organism as a whole in a real state is well organized inwardly, coherent and self – completed [58, 107]. In addition to this, as he asserts in his letter to Shelling back in January, 1795, orthodoxy will remain unshakable as long as its sermon is connected with earthly benefits and is interwoven in coherent state organism [52, 218].

In modern political publications the notion “social organism” is often used concerning various social institutions: political parties, also other social organizations and movements.

Due to works of K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin and even in broader sense – to materialistic direction in the theory of knowledge, today productive organism is the most described one [See: 123, 79]. According to K. Marx’s standpoint, under capitalism, “within the system of machines big industry possesses rather objective productive organism which has been found by a worker as already ready material condition of production” [130, 397].

V. Lenin in his work *The Economic Content of Narodism* writes, that each such system of productive relations is a specific social organism, attributed with particular laws of its inception, function, and transition to a higher form, conversion into different social organism [See: 109, 429].

Analysis of management “as essential attribute of organism” was offered by the renowned Bulgarian scientist Marko Markov [See: 118, 38]. In connection with elaboration of problem of management the notion of social organism was expanded to region, city. Giving characteristic to social nature of cities K. Marx points out that in this case a whole doesn’t equal the sum of its constituents. It is a peculiar

autonomous organism [See: 136, 470]. V. Lenin didn't accidentally, as it is known, demand excellent job management in every particular area, since he considered a region to be also a coherent self-developing system.

No one doubts the fact that the notion of social organism was applied to economical domain in a concrete sense. It was Marx who originally employed it to above-named domain of our reality; he pointed out that along with elimination of capitalistic basis and as soon as the immediate character of living labor is transcended, i.e. its character as merely individual, or as only internally or only externally general, with the positing of the activity of individuals as immediately general or social activity, this form of alienation is stripped from the reified moments of production. Then they are posited as [social] property, as the organic social body in which the individuals reproduce themselves as individuals, but as social individuals [136, 347]. Than K. Marx employs the notion of social organism for analysis of a problem of cooperation [See: 130, 343]. The same notions and concepts of social organism he applies to analysis of regularities of functioning of branches of national economy [See: 125, 712, 720].

In the recent publications the concept of social organism is correlated with all traditional and modern structures of economic sphere: associations of different types, joint-stock companies, markets, banks etc. There is endless number of facts in confirmation of this. Suffice it to examine the content of planning of development of economic and social domains which have stimulated the spread of the concept of social organism. The plan of social development envelops all aspects of vital activity of social organism with regard to enterprise, branch, or region.

Nowadays when in all places the former Soviet Union countries initiate a process of privatization and corporatization of former state enterprises, the process of bringing into use the notion of social organism is intensified. M. Moiseyev accounting for the reason of this rightly asserted that "gaining independence any enterprise immediately turns into organism: its private goals and along with them particular possibilities to achieve them emerge. These new goals should not completely match the goal of complete economic organism; they always are different – not alternative but different" [141, 323].

A. Ahabebian, for example, while examining the reasons of failure of economic reform of 1965 came to conclusion that roots of failure were hidden in coherent organism of enterprise, that functioned

as an organic system according to its own and unitary for all its constituents law. It is it that torn away an alien body had been imposed from outside. Universal for all living things law of conservation of system was activated.

The findings from available publications show that above-named concept is very effective in social domain for examining the problems linked with single individuals, collectives, and other social communities. Thus, for instance, K. Marx employs the concept of social organism to both a single individual [See: 136, 213–214] and to a collective of laborers [See: 130, 345].

The concept of organism employed to a collective also surpasses domain of material production. It received the citizenship in such domain as education. Thus, for example, the renowned educator A. Makarenko wrote about a collective as a social and living organism, that it was an organism because it had organs sharing duties and responsibilities; all its members – balanced and interconnected; without all that it was nothing but simply a crowd.

Today researchers proceeded even farther and employed even the larger-scale analogues. M. Moiseyev, for instance, following this tendency in his work *Man and Noosphere* expands the concept of social organism to a planetary society [143, 318–319].

Almost the same picture of multifunctional employment of the concept of a social organism can be found also in a spiritual domain. By this we mean organism of science, arts, religion etc. But this domain of social life possesses some essential distinct characteristics in comparison to other mentioned earlier domains, because “the soul with its inner life doesn’t shine through the entire reality of bodily form”. As Hegel underlines in *Aesthetics*, in a higher way still, the same deficiency makes itself evident likewise in the spiritual world and its organisms that are considered in its immediate life. The greater and the richer these spiritual world’s productions are the more does the one aim, which animate this whole and constitutes its inner soul, require co-operative means. Now in immediate reality these means of course manifest themselves as purposeful organs, and what happens and is produced comes into being only by means of the will; every point of such organism (a state or a family) that is to say every single individual, wills; and he manifests himself indeed in connection with the other members of organism but the one inner soul of this association (the freedom and reason of the one aim) does not come forward into reality as this one free and total inner animation [58, 155].

Especially actively the notion “organism” is used in Russian philosophic thought in discussion of essence of such phenomenon as “sobornist” (conciliarism). Suffice it to refer to M. Berdyayev, O. Khomyakova’s work, and works of other thinkers. Thus, for instance, according to M. Berdyayev “the only possible way to experience the true consciousness of Being is by placing ourselves under authority of a collective mind (conciliarism), by integrating with congregational “we”, by denying individual “Self”...” [16, 20–21].

Category “organism” is also employed in the theory of knowledge to study hidden components of social reality. Thus, for instance, authors of the work *Structures in Non-Linear Environments* write the following: “Physical energy of the word does not differ from any other kind of physical energy... a word in this sense is interpreted as a light and invisible airy organism (italicized by V.B.) has been endowed with a magic power to signify something particular and to penetrate into especial depths and produce invisibly great developments” [106, 20].

It is known that the concept “organism” is expanded by some investigators to domain of Cosmos. Thus, for example, Berdiayev in his works paid a particular attention to a place of man in a cosmic organism.

It surprises that regardless of possessing such powerful heuristic potential, this philosophical concept has not found its reflection in modern native social philosophy. Only some brief survey of it can be found in the course of lectures on Contemporary Social Philosophy published in 1993, edited by V. Andrushchenko and M. Mykhalchenko [See: 7, 217].

However, in the collective work *Social Laws and Their Action*, published by Institute of Philosophy, NAS of Ukraine in 1995, this term is used more often though without decoding of the content, that is to say, as a methodological tool [See: 30].

As a methodological tool this term is also employed in the work of V. Kremen, D. Tabachnik, V. Tkachenko who emphasize that “modern sociology” considers that developing of any social organism (civilization is not an exception) is inevitably connected with the deepening of its differentiation. Such disintegration causes simplification of social organism which goes as far as to the level of bipolarity, gets standardized providing strong evidence of civilization break” [100, 52].

The process of attaining of a scientific form by this concept is rather slow. However, it is in this part of theory of knowledge that a separate trend has been formed known to us as organitsism. Within

it social reality is likened to a living organism. A. Kovalev defines it as “a methodological orientation of concepts of society towards analogies with understanding of organism as indivisible whole, contrary to the mechanistic models of society with understanding of organism as a set of functional components where each component can be studied separately from each other” [93, 248]. He distinguishes three types of organitsism:

First of all, philosophical organicism which is given in the writings of F. Schelling, H. Hegel, romantists, A. Whitehead and others; it is derived from the pristine concept of spiritual macrocosmic order, universal unity, and is contrary to minimalism and mechaniticism of French enlighteners, social physicist, English economists, utilitarians etc.

Secondly, bioorganical theories of a society, based on the ideas of the evolutionary biology and according to the similar processes in the living organism, consider it as a superior organism, (sociologism).

Thirdly, social-psychological organitsism, which considers that totality of society consists in collective mind, consciousness, will as independent reality not reduced to the consciousness of single individuals constituting “socium”.

The findings of such brief historical excursus of employing the notion “social organism” proved that the concept under consideration exists only by virtue of conventionality. It is used, indeed, as the effective methodological research tool for investigation of variability of social reality.

With its aid researchers of all nations and times embrace and analyze organic totality of the world surrounding us. From recently natural scientists have expanded the organism concept even to domain of engineering. That was pioneered by V. Vernadsky who wrote that “the course of evolution of thought of machine creation was completely analogical to course of organisms’ propagation” [36, 32]. This distinguished Vernadsky’s idea was deepened and developed further by B. Kudrin [164, 236–237].

From everything stated above the following conclusions can be deduced:

First of all, the point of origin of the concept of social organism is hidden not in the depth of centuries but rather of millenniums of human history; it is necessary we should carry out more strict historical analysis of appointed problem to describe the roots of its origin.

Secondly, evolution of the concept of social organism which has been purpose fully evolving over mythological form through theological and philosophical towards scientific one is well elucidated in existing publications; however, this concept has received neither theoretical filling nor scientific embodiment in theory of “neosociogenesis”.

Thirdly, the notion under the consideration embraces practically all diversity of social reality and is employed by researchers of social processes regarding to man identification as well as to community, society and its particular realms, such as to national economy, to commonwealth and , after all, to domain of Cosmos.

Fourthly, the notion of social organism is being expanded to subjective and objective forms of a social world; this on the ground of substantial unity of the world demands their conformation to organic unity by means of philosophy.

Fifthly, researchers fail to solve determined complicated epistemological problem not as much as because of shortage of plenitude of general philosophic, political- economical, sociological, political science, psychological and other definitions, but rather because of invalid outlook approach and deficiency of methodological apparatus, obscurity of general characteristics of essence and place of phenomenon under our consideration, interrelations of its constituents and, especially, inter transitions.

Thus, as we can see, mankind has gone a long way to be able to create, after all, the integral concept of its own development. To elaborate it is one of the most urgent tasks of modern social philosophy. There are all necessary and sufficient premises to furnish the concept of social organism with the outlook perspective, ideological attractiveness, precise methodological form, and inherent theoretical purity.

The factological base (date-base) of the book is furnished by highly-intellectual heritage of previous generations of researchers – concepts of the collective development of planetary humanity in which empirical data about the social life of people has found its reflection. It implies that in the process of investigation the principle ideas of self-evolving of social life should be thoroughly reinterpreted from philosophical standpoint.

It means that in the process of investigation the principle ideas of self-evolvement of social life should undergo detail philosophical reconceptualization. Those ideas are laid in social doctrine of Marxism,

M. Weber's theory of social integration, K. Manheim's "mass society", D. Bell's "postindustrial society", U. Rostow and J. Schumpeter's "stages of economic growth", "democratic elitism", Z. Bzhezinski's "technotronic era", R. Aron's "unitary industrial society", "deideologization", M. Oakeshott's "political utopia", Ch. Birr's "collective democracy", K. Popper's "mild designing of social institutions", N. Rottenshtaykh's "social institutions as forms of objectivizing of human will", A. Toffler's "superindustrial and society of the third wave", A. Etzioni's "active society", Y. Galtung's "post-revolutionary society", J. Deytor's "transformational society", J. Platt's "cybernetic society", K. Boldyinh's post-civilization society", A. Gartman and F. Rysman's "society of consumers", M. McLuhan's "society of world village", L. Broun's "society without boundaries", L. Memford's "society of balance", S. Huntington's "models of societal and political system", V. Wilson's "models of administrative productivity", H. Khurshfeld, Zh. Roben, R. Cocks' "planetary society", Harrington's "new forms of a wide democratic control", R. Collingwood's New Leviathan, "labor society", "information society" and many other concepts of social eastern and western researchers. That is why nowadays all the efforts should be focused on constructive synthesis of all existing ideas into a coherent doctrine of self-evolvement of social life of planetary humanity.

In addition to this, we truly believe that each of existing concepts of similar type is a unique achievement of human mind, is a peak of intellectual mastery of their creators; each of them reflects one or several aspects of the problem under consideration, and thus, is priceless for humanity. In other words, if they had not been developed they should have been developed on purpose.

Thus, nowadays theoretical and practical comprehension of social organism is likely to be the most complicated and urgent problem of social philosophy. All existing intellectual and other resources should be mobilized for its solution.

At the same time the research problem symbolizes the beginning of era of quantum philosophy. Besides the only two classes recognized by Aristotle logics – "true" or "false", now such classes as "true", "false", "indefinite" (unverified yet), and "ridiculous" (in principle unverified) can be distinguished. More simply saying Aristotelian Universe, emerging as a collection of "things" possessing intrinsic "essence" or "properties", is transformed into quantum (or existential) Universe which is considered as a net of structural interrelations.

The world of things has melted giving a place for the world of processes.

Social philosophy is being enriched by number of approaches to develop the theory of noosociogenesis that not only discovers a source of generation of social phenomenon, integrates it with the system of universum, unveils the essence, content, and organismic form of social world, and moreover multiplies our knowledge about mechanism of ontogenesis and phylogenesis of a family of social organisms. It comes up closely to development of social technology of projecting and construction of social organism.

Modern social science will find itself rather close to the scientific adoption of social and logical forms of motion of the universum. The further comprehension of the world is not possible unless this problem is solved. With the discovery of elementary particles that perform as the bearers of social and logical forms of motion, natural science, and, of course, first of all, quantum physics can supply the investigation of the universum.

Overall, the system of management, under appropriate program and mathematic assistance, gains greater perspective and freedom to accomplish the following: to imitate the systemic development of economic, social, political, and ideological processes within the framework of not only separate countries but regions as well; to lead effective searching and regulatory forecasting of social progress of commonwealth and its particular elements; to specify with the aid of model of social organism of a state a system of laws, construct models of different subsystems of such organism; to conduct the operations of projection and construction of social processes; to specify the objects of social science and lead the preparation of personnel for XXI-st century based on different from current one ideological and methodological foundation, etc.

Philosophical and methodological foundation of research of the social organism

1.1. Outlook and ideological bases of comprehension of the social organism

Search after solution to the problem underlying the current research can be started from any notion. However, the logic requires to begin the analysis with a central notion of research. If the concept in a theory plays integrating role, as I. Kant in his time emphasized with reference to a system of science, it can be asserted that the concept of social organism contains a program of construction of a theory of social relations, ways of its construction or using Kant's terminology a schema. As rightly P.Kopnin admits, it constitutes a base to draw abstract nearer to concrete.

Priority in attempt to conceptualize a concept of social organism belongs to sociology not philosophy. Sociology had to get over many difficulties on its way of searching after a key category to unveil the problem of an order in social life. On its way it has changed scores of times the key category by virtue of which it had been striving to arrange social reality. We are merely pointing out the directions of search for the key category has been emerged to clear determined problem. First of all, they are:

- functional theories: early functionalism (E. Durkheim), functional imperativism (T. Parsons), functional structuralism (R. Merton);
- conflict theory: dialectical conflict theory (K. Marx, R. Dahrendorf), conflict functionalism (H. Zimmel, L. Coser);
- theory of interaction: interactionism, “role theory”, symbolic interactionism;

- theory of exchange: utilitarianism, behaviorism (G. Homans), structuralism of interexchange;
- ethnomethodology which, indeed, denies the very procedure of grounding of a key notion. For ethnomethodologist the fact that is being immediately observed is nothing but people's endeavour to create a general sense of social reality. The substance of this reality is recognized as something less interesting than means of creation of a form of something that exists "beyond". Though such approach is a new one and doesn't have clearly formulated principles determining how the co-partnership of active individuals energetically facilitate a convention on general forms of reality, nevertheless, the ethnomethodology involvement is considered to be a revolutionary phenomenon for a process of sociological theorization. The outcomes (materials, documents) of the XII and XIIIth World Sociology Congresses prove this.

However, it is relevantly independent study of social reality in a form of social theory that has made the largest contribution to the development of concept of social organism, and that is why absorbs greatly our interest; it has emerged within the Western science, and is known as organicism. Organicism comprises the bioorganismic concepts of society such as super-organism led by the concepts of evolutionary biology and analogy with construction and functions of a living organism [See: 169, 248].

However, despite of such variety of existing approaches of comprehension of superorganic construction of a social world, to construct methodological complex of research instruments more information about essence and attributes of social reality is required.

To get more complete picture of attributes of the concept of social organism and taking into consideration the fact of existing dependency between generic – type notion "social organism" and genus-type notion "organism", let's approach it as if from a different side. To achieve this aim the sense of a notion "organism" should be decoded; this notion with the help of corresponding semantic filters can be interpreted, compared with the generic – type formations, and presented, after all, as a particular text.

Besides the concept of organism determines the limits in its own development by providing entirely corresponding to its nature reality. The same attribute of a notion was underlined by M. Serov – author of the original theory of functional organization, "Lexical language units turned to be a specific system substance which 'set', de-

termine the class of probable structures that can be realized at this very substance” [154, 199]. It means that in practice some specific substance of social structure corresponds to the concept of social organism, and it is this substance that “bears” it within itself in space and time.

Indeed, any notion can be decoded, and after that what is reasonable becomes valid. Sense becomes accessible, and we discover the essence and content of any notion considering it as totality. In other words, this very idea by itself contains the “pattern of organism”. According to Hegel (*Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*), conceptualization of the Notion does not require any external stimulus for its actualization since it embraces the contradiction of simplicity and difference, and therefore its own restless nature impels it to actualize itself, to unfold into actuality the difference which, in the notion itself, is present only in an ideal manner, that is to say, in the contradictory form of differencelessness, and by this removal of its simplicity as of a defect, a onesidedness, to make itself actually that whole, of which to begin with it contained only the possibility [57, 12].

Thus, quantum “organism” as a concept is such specific amount of information which represents social reality in all fullness of its internal and external aspects. In addition, the concept “organism” possesses a particular meaning or sense. Together with other particles-senses it constitutes the Semantic continuum within the Universe structure.

There are, as it is known, several explanations of origin of the sense. Subjective – that is to say, information transcends from the other world – one of them; the possibility of its including into continuum of the semantic space by alien civilization is not excluded. There is another way – materialistic one. It is considered to be the outcome of purpose-driven cognitive process taking place in human brains.

Within the framework of the current research we are of the opinion that the concept of organism originated in the course of practical interaction; people in a process of comprehension of particular objects of the world named them relating to particular senses. Accumulation of generic – type notions caused springing up of genus-type the Semantic structures. In short, the notion of organism is likely to origin inductively, as an outcome of practical interaction, that is to say, is formed according to the general law of origin of genus-type notions.