

# CONTENTS

Preface to the readers .....	4
Introduction .....	6
<b>Chapter 1. Philosophical and methodological foundation of research of the social organism .....</b>	<b>23</b>
1.1. Outlook and ideological bases of comprehension of the social organism .....	23
1.2. Methodological approach to comprehension of the social organism .....	43
<b>Chapter 2. Epistemological analysis of the social world .....</b>	<b>99</b>
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
<b>Chapter 3. The social organism and its attributive characteristics .....</b>	<b>201</b>
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
<b>Chapter 4. The systemic analysis of the social organism .....</b>	<b>254</b>
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-evolvement 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-evolvement 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. Liliyefeld 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