



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CIENCIA EN LOS NUEVOS TIEMPOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov

South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie

Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar

Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,
México*

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandía

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar

Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau

Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez

Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire

Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera

Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre

Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",
España*

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros

Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández

Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango

Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut

Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,
Honduras*

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Dra. Elian Araujo
Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa
Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Noemí Brenta
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca
Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik
Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec
INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant
Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro
Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez
Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio
Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad
de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



THE DIALECTICS OF RATIONAL AND EXISTENTIAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL AUTOPOIESIS

Ph. D. (C) Alexander Pavlovich Pavlov

Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education
Siberian Federal University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0001-6706-8374
pavloff56@list.ru

Dr. Mikhail Petrovich Yatsenko

Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education
Siberian Federal University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0002-0224-5955
mikhailyatzenko@yandex.ru

Ph. D. Vera Viktorovna Koreneva

Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education
Siberian Federal University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0001-5092-2976
2517191@mail.ru

Ph. D. (C) Irina Georgievna Sinkovskaya

Reshetnev Siberian State University of Science and Technology, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0001-8591-2073
iranet.75@mail.ru

Ph. D. (C) Liudmila Gennadyevna Korol

Reshetnev Siberian State University of Science and Technology, Russia
Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education
Siberian Federal University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0001-7664-1814
kinghouse@yandex.ru

Dr. Dmitry Vladimirovich Rakhinsky

Prof. V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky Krasnoyarsk State Medical University, Russia
State Medical University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0003-4971-7523
siridar@mail.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 13 de marzo de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 21 de abril de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 11 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

Abstract

The article is devoted to the phenomenon of social order involving the dialectic unity of existential and societal conditions of social reproduction. The methodological and epistemological base of the study is formed by the theory of autopoiesis by N. Luhmann and ideas of M. Bakhtin, P. Berger, T. Luckmann, E. Terikian, etc. The key issue is what allows for social order and its reproduction (autopoiesis). This problem is examined from the point of fundamental ontology and existential philosophy. The main idea of the article is related to social order being examined as the process of social reproduction (autopoiesis). Social reproduction is not reduced to the reproduction of society and individuals but presents the unity of both. The article also examines the phenomenon of rational society and its main component – “the picture of the world” (symbolic universum). The authors

PH. D. (C) ALEXANDER PAVLOVICH PAVLOV / DR. MIKHAIL PETROVICH YATSENKO / PH. D. VERA VIKTOROVNA KORENEVA
PH. D. (C) IRINA GEORGIEVNA SINKOVSKAYA / PH. D. (C) LIUDMILA GENNADYEVNA KOROL
DR. DMITRY VLADIMIROVICH RAKHINSKY

highlight the fact that a new type of autopoiesis adapted for the network conditions of social life is forming in the modern world. The specific feature of this type of autopoiesis is that social reproduction takes place in the conditions of the lack of pictures of the world that have become obsolete as historical phenomena. The fundamental element of social reproduction (autopoiesis) is the social actor that belongs to two worlds: the societal rational world (the world of the System) and the existential world (the world of existence). The article includes the analysis of these worlds and their interrelation and synthesis that allows for the reproduction of social actors.

Keywords

Rational society – Autopoiesis – Pictures of the world – Societal world – Existential world

Para Citar este Artículo:

Pavlov, Alexander Pavlovich; Yatsenko, Mikhail Petrovich; Koreneva, Vera Viktorovna; Sinkovskaya, Irina Georgievna; Korol, Liudmila Gennadyevna y Rakhinsky, Dmitry Vladimirovich. The dialectics of rational and existential analysis of social autopoiesis. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 431-446.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)
Licencia Internacional



Introduction

The problem of social order is the eternal problem of philosophy and other social sciences. Among the many problems of social philosophy, the question about the sources of the social order as a relatively stable system of ties, relationships, basic norms, and values forming in society posed by T. Hobbes stands apart. What is social order determined by, how does it emerge and reproduce? What ensures the reproduction of social integrity in the conditions of uncontrollability of an innumerable amount of interactions simultaneously performed by social actors? A German sociologist G. Simmel outlined this issue in the form of a simple question: “How is society possible?”

Until the end of the 20th century, the problem of social order was practically monopolized by the representatives of sociology and economic sciences. The research on this issue was predominantly carried out within the discursive framework of sociology – a scientific principle combining classical and non-classical approaches and methods of analysis: social determinism and functionalism.

Sociology is usually linked to the methodology of E. Durkheim. However, the social thinkers whose works and teaching contain the main idea of sociology can also be considered its followers (K. Marx, G. Spencer, T. Parsons, etc.).

The fundamental idea of sociology is that everything that takes place in social and personal life is determined by the state of society as a *universum*: an autonomous and self-sufficient entity (society, social organism, formation, social system, etc).

The social *universum* has no voids: everything that happens, such as orders and commotions, significant or insignificant events, moods and thoughts of people, occur exclusively within it and are determined by its basic algorithms. In other words, sociology is social determinism and social ontology that is based on it. The principle of sociology means the objective existence of society as a self-sufficient entity independent of individual living people.

Another important feature of sociology is ontological teleology. As a self-sufficient entity (social organism), society has an inner goal, an immanent program, and a basic algorithm of development. A specific mode of teleology is presented by substantialism: the social world order and the nature of the development of society are determined by the basic algorithm, the “picture of the world”.

Utilitarianism relates to the problem of social order as a resource (human, political, and cultural) for resolving the problems of effective functioning and reproduction of society as a whole considering the features of the environment it interacts with. The triumph of sociology as epistemology, social ontology, and scientific discourse during the 19th and the first half of the 20th century is caused by several reasons. The hegemony of this trend in sociology is explained by the evolution of industrial western society in the given period.

Industrial (developed capitalist) society is a giant social machine with a rational system of distribution of labor. It is the system of objective interactions rather than individual human qualities that determine social progress. An individual themselves becomes an element, a function of the social system, the society which turns into a demiurge of itself (sociology).

An individual as a social construct does not disappear or dissolve in society but becomes its agent. This manifests most clearly in rational bureaucracies and mass culture, in various practices of alienation. An individual of industrial society is personified, individualized. However, personification and individualization come not from the person themselves but society, the social system.

Social life and meanings are determined by societal algorithms individuals are included in. The epistemological margins of sociology are limited by the explication of social order as a social mechanism, the basic condition providing resource conditions for the existence and dynamics of society as a social system. For instance, along the process of development of society, the role of the family as a social institute underwent major changes determined by various factors, primarily by the transformation of social and economic relations and the changes in moral and ethical rules and regulations¹.

At the same time, the discursive field of sociology has no place for existential topics. The existential world of people is not accounted for in most social studies. Indeed, it is difficult to include people's existence into the orbit of social research since it is unique and can be controlled neither by scientists, nor politicians nor by the people themselves. One such option is presented by the eventfulness in the discourse of time which can essentially be interpreted as a phenomenon in the individual consciousness that is presented to a person (individual) in the process of their training (education) as history².

However, the existential world exists. Moreover, as will be demonstrated further, social reproduction and order are impossible without existential architectonics.

The question of the connection between the social and existential order is largely understudied. An American sociologist E. Terikian writes: "Arranging the meeting of sociology and existentialism in a form of "brotherly duel" requires honest recognition of the areas of apparent disagreement between them, primarily on the issue of evaluation of society"³.

This issue became especially acute at the beginning of the new millennium. The essence of it lies in the fact that in the modern world there is no bond between people's behavior and fundamental values and patterns (pictures of the world). There is instead a forming new paradigm of order where actors create and reproduce their own reality building their life strategy without relying on substantial bonds, large narratives, ontic sources, etc. In the postmodern era, the imperatives of collective intentionality no longer bound individuals to society as a great social body as strongly as they used to. In other words, individuals as actors gain sovereignty in relation to the society they live in. However, this does not mean the absolute independence of actors from society as this aspect involves the fundamentally new ways of their relationship.

¹ I. V. Malimonov; D. V. Rakhinskiy; I. G. Sinkovskaya; L. G. Korol; L. Y. Aisner y S. V. Bershadskaya, S. M. Trashkova, "Global changes of family unit in modern Russia", *Astra Salvensis* Vol: 6 num 12 (2018): 623-633.

² V. I. Kudashov; S. I. Chernykh; M. P. Yatsenko; L. I. Grigoreva; I. A. Pfanenshtil y D. V. Rakhinsky, "Historical reflection in the educational process: an axiological approach", *Analele Universitatii din Craiova - Seria Istorie* Vol: 22 num 1 (2017): 139-147.

³ E. Terikian, "Sotsiologizm i ekzistantsializm", *Voprosy sotsialnoi teorii* Vol: 1 num 1 (2007): 50-84

PH. D. (C) ALEXANDER PAVLOVICH PAVLOV / DR. MIKHAIL PETROVICH YATSENKO / PH. D. VERA VIKTOROVNA KORENEVA

PH. D. (C) IRINA GEORGIEVNA SINKOVSKAYA / PH. D. (C) LIUDMILA GENNADYEVNA KOROL

DR. DMITRY VLADIMIROVICH RAKHINSKY

Problem statement

In its essence, social order presents social reproduction. It is, therefore, important to note here that this definition refers to social reproduction rather than the reproduction of society⁴.

Social reproduction and the reproduction of society may overlap partially in the context of reproduction of a historical formation (society): a social unity that has its own territory, stable characteristics, and the ways of sustaining its identity. Such a formation has its own name: the name of a country (Russia), the type of socio-political structure (Russian monarchy, Soviet socialist republic).

Considering social reproduction and the reproduction of society, the same phenomenon leads to the emergence of what can be called sociologism. The author of the term, E. Durkheim, essentially considered them equal.

However, social reproduction goes beyond the reproduction of society when it comes to the participation of real living people in their own lives, in the construction of their own being. The social sciences present numerous studies where individuals are declared the true actors of social order.

Some authors individualize social life to the point when no space is left in it for society itself (J. Urry, A. Touraine, M. Mafessoli). Social reproduction is not reduced to the reproduction of society and individuals but presents the unity of both.

Possibly for the first time the effect of double reproduction was highlighted by G. Simmel who wrote that people “form groups in the process of interaction and are themselves determined by the existence (presence) of these groups”⁵.

The specifics of this approach that was further developed by N. Luhmann and acquired the form of the concept of autopoiesis are that social reproduction has no social actors that are readily available and programmed to construct social order. Society itself has no characteristics of a subject. Subjectivity lies not in the society of individuals but the special relationships, network connections that constitute the basis of social reproduction or autopoiesis in Luhmann’s terms.

The German sociologist develops the idea of self-sufficiency of society. The nature of this self-sufficiency is found in its communicative structure⁶. “Society produces its own basic elements; creates its own margins and structures; it is self-referential and closed”⁷. Moreover, “society presents a system that – completely or partially – defines itself by the means of itself”⁸.

⁴ A. P. Pavlov; P. A. Pavlov; D. V. Lvov; A. S. Novikov; I. G. Sinkovskaya; D. V. Rakhinsky, “Existential and archetypal architectonics of social (societal) order”, *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering* Vol: 8 num 2 (2019): 4148-4153.

⁵ G. Simmel, *Grundfragen der Soziologie (Individuum und Gesellschaft)* (Berlin: Sammlung Göschen, 1917).

⁶ N. Luhmann, *The Autopoiesis of social systems. Essays on self-reference* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).

⁷ D. Ritzer, *Sovremennye sotsiologicheskie teorii* (Saint Petersburg: Piter, 2002).

⁸ N. Luhmann, *Obshchestvo kak sotsialnaia sistema* (Moscow: “Logos” Publishing House, 2004).

PH. D. (C) ALEXANDER PAVLOVICH PAVLOV / DR. MIKHAIL PETROVICH YATSENKO / PH. D. VERA VIKTOROVNA KORENEVA

PH. D. (C) IRINA GEORGIEVNA SINKOVSKAYA / PH. D. (C) LIUDMILA GENNADYEVNA KOROL

DR. DMITRY VLADIMIROVICH RAKHINSKY

The elements of society as a social system are presented by communicative actions – systematic operations that not only communicate something but also track and fixate what is relevant and belongs to the social system itself.

However, it is unlikely that social systems possess autopoietic qualities themselves (from what and how would these qualities form in that case?). We believe (and agree with Luhmann in this regard) that these qualities are immanent to the system itself. However, they are to the same degree immanent to the actors, i.e. people who actualize this system. We should probably disagree with the German scientist who argued that “it is not an individual who can communicate – the ability to communicate belongs solely to communication itself”⁸.

N. Luhmann is mistaken about what extrapolates autopoietic qualities of biological entities to social life. Social autopoiesis is executed by people who actively reproduce what the system forces on them but present the authors of their own history and themselves while creating and reproducing the social matrix that presents the construct of themselves.

The problem of rationality of social order has a long history. Of course, any society, even the most archaic ones (like primitive communities), cannot be constructed irrationally. Various types of civilizations and societies are constructed on the base of rational principles.

The limitations of this study do not allow for an extensive excursion into the history of the genesis of rational types of societies (civilizations). We will only note the primary conditions and features of this genesis. Rational society presents a world of ideal constructs that not only reflect reality but also become the reality itself or at least its major component.

Rational society is, of course, an ideal society. The life of the social world is much richer than that of any rational systematically organized society. It includes enclaves of existential being that are either not controlled or poorly controlled by the social system actors and, at the same time, form the primary construct based on which the social order itself is formed.

In any society, there is a mismatch, a contradiction between people’s life plans and a rationally organized society. Despite being unoriginal, this idea is crucial for understanding the nature of social order.

A British sociologist R. Collins highlights that “society and rationality itself rest at an irrational basis”⁹. R. Merton notes the latent functional consequences of positive (useful) institutionalized practices¹⁰. A. Giddens indicates the unintended consequences of meaningful actions (reflexive monitoring) of social agents¹¹.

Such unintended consequences of rational actions are unavoidable even in case of easily trackable and accountable objective determinants and factors that, in Durkheim’s terms, exert pressure on social actors.

⁹ P. Berger; B. Berger y R. Collins, *Lichnostno-orientirovannaia sotsiologija* (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2004).

¹⁰ R. Merton, *Sotsialnaia teoriia i sotsialnaia struktura* (AST: Moscow: Khramitel, 2006).

¹¹ A. Giddens, *Ustroenie obshchestva. Ocherk teorii strukturatsii*. (Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2005), 528.

PH. D. (C) ALEXANDER PAVLOVICH PAVLOV / DR. MIKHAIL PETROVICH YATSENKO / PH. D. VERA VIKTOROVNA KORENEVA

PH. D. (C) IRINA GEORGIEVNA SINKOVSKAYA / PH. D. (C) LIUDMILA GENNADYEVNA KOROL

DR. DMITRY VLADIMIROVICH RAKHINSKY

Social actors belong to two worlds: the existential world and the social (rationally organized) world. Where can the balance between rational imperatives contained in social structures and existential being of people be found? American sociologist D. Alexander highlighted that “the secret of the coercive power of social structures is that they have an inner side. These forces are not exclusively external but also internal to the actors. They are full of meanings. These meanings are generated by society and are ordered even when undetectable. We need to learn how to make them visible”¹².

Discussion

Let us return to the rational structure of society. It can be assumed that the rational structure is constituted via the so-called pictures of the world.

What is a picture of the world? First of all, what picture of the world are we talking about? Every person has their own picture of the world which is called a worldview. The social picture of the world is not only an idea or an image of the world as a whole. It is primarily a relevant mental space where an individual worldview is brought into correspondence and becomes an accomplice to the social world.

Pictures of the world execute the function of semantic examples (patterns) of social activity. Moreover, they outline the symbolic margins of cultural space relevant to the present society. They implicitly involve the discursive means of inclusion of individuals into the social order.

The picture of the world allows an individual to recognize themselves on the eidetic scale: from the life position closest to their private space to the most distant and alienated status position of the Generalized Other. Pictures of the world present a fusion of ideal (epistemic) and ordinary (doxical) knowledge.

Picture of the world exposes each member of society, which allows them to be a participant of social actions and be included in the process of social reproduction as a social actor.

A critical condition of inclusion in this process is the position of outsidership (M. Bakhtin). Outsidership allows the actor to engage in the dialogue with the world on behalf of the world itself representing the world as its legitimate representative.

Pictures of the world define the basic semantic reference points and, most importantly, the semantic horizons and limits beyond which these meanings disappear. On the one hand, the eidetic meanings are emancipated and even alienated from people. “People transcend beyond themselves in the direction of meanings and these meanings are in essence none other than people themselves”¹³. On the other hand, eidetic meanings are ontologized and become a part of existence or, more specifically, its intentional basis.

Thus, pictures of the world are the semantic and symbolically marked limits of individuals’ positioning as actors that take the position outsidership that allows them to engage in dialogue with the world and other actors. Due to the pictures of the world, the

¹² J. Alexander, *Smysly sotsialnoi zhizni: Kultursotsiologiiia* (Moscow: Praxis, 2013).

¹³ V. Frankl, *Chelovek v poiskakh smysla* (Moscow: Progress, 1990).

social world itself acquires the architectonics of the world order in which a person (as an actor) functions in two qualities: as a universal individual (generalized other, carrier of social relations, a social subject) and as an individual, a private person.

In developed societies, pictures of the world are generalized and institutionalized in a form of symbolic universums. "A symbolic universum is perceived as a matrix of all socially objectified and subjectively real meanings; society as an integral historical formation and the entire biography of an individual person is considered as something that takes place within this universum"¹⁴.

The basis of the picture of the world is formed by the substantial core, an ontological center the function of which lies in the constitution and retention of the supreme transcendental reality (higher ontological meanings, explicated horizons, and the origins of social being). The cultural and historical chronotopes, institutions, and solidarities constructed on its base are included in the processes of social reproduction. For example, this is supported by the fact that an Artistic picture of the world has certain independence and, therefore, has the ability for self-development and self-organization and influences other systems and subsystems of public consciousness¹⁵.

Positioning within the limits defined by the picture of the world allows an actor to not only master (interiorize) the readily available behavioral patterns imposed by the social system but also use the pictures of the world as a construct for building a personal life strategy.

Most importantly, however, pictures of the world are a space of dialogue between actors. Pictures of the world create ontological conditions for the constitution of existential world architectonics. The essence of existential architectonics is the realization of basic existentials and archetypes related to them: ontological safety, ontological care, the preservation of one's self, etc. through special institutional practices and structures (narratives, rites, initiations, ethos, etc.). For example, existential catharsis (overcoming the terror of death) acquires an institutional form of celebrations (especially religious ones) and carnivals. Meanwhile, the sphere of religious experience is extremely difficult for an outside observer to penetrate and is far from transparent for self-observation¹⁶.

Overcoming the ontological abandonment is possible via the activity of existential communities (the term introduced by O. Bolnov): fraternities, communities, sects, etc. The zones of ontological safety are examined by an American sociologist A. Giddens as "confidentiality of trust that presents the natural and social worlds including the basic existential parameters of the self and social identity"¹⁷. They are localized around the institutions of motherhood, fatherhood, and teaching.

¹⁴ P. Berger y T. Luckmann, *Sotsialnoe konstruirovaniye realnosti. Traktat po sotsiologii znaniya* (Moscow: "Medium", 1995).

¹⁵ R. P. Musat; V. V. Mineev; O. F. Neskryabina; G. V. Panasenko; S. V. Maksimov y D. V. Rakhinsky, "The artistic worldview in the context of sociocultural reality", *Amazonia Investiga* Vol: 8 num 23 (2019): 350-357

¹⁶ O. F. Neskryabina; D. A. Ustyuzhanina; O. F. Morozova; I. V. Malimonov; S. Yu. Piskorskaya y D. V. Rakhinsky, "Media representation of religiousness in modern Russian society", *Amazonia Investiga* Vol: 9 num 29 (2020): 87-94.

¹⁷ A. Giddens, *Ustroenie obshchestva. Ocherk teorii strukturatsii*. (Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2005).

PH. D. (C) ALEXANDER PAVLOVICH PAVLOV / DR. MIKHAIL PETROVICH YATSENKO / PH. D. VERA VIKTOROVNA KORENEVA

PH. D. (C) IRINA GEORGIEVNA SINKOVSKAYA / PH. D. (C) LIUDMILA GENNADYEVNA KOROL

DR. DMITRY VLADIMIROVICH RAKHINSKY

Pictures of the world are somehow related to reality. This connection, however, is historical and transcendental rather than causal. “At the early stages of social history, an individual accepts the schemes of action as a natural law of their existence. They practically identify with the sequence of schemes offered by their clan: a person forms and lives as an individual embodiment of a tribal ritual or a tribal myth repeating (and thereby preserving) the long-established forms of communication and action in their behavior”¹⁸.

Therefore, pictures of the world present not only the construct of knowledge but also the construct of human existence and, most importantly, a crucial element of autopoiesis – social reproduction (self-reproduction). Being based on eidetic rationality, autopoiesis most certainly contributed to social, cultural, and humanitarian progress.

The social world is impossible without its rational component manifesting in the monitoring of the state and changes of society and the design of its development. Rational pictures make people’s world predictable and understandable. Existential anxieties are translated to the transcendental plane of the “symbolic universum” – the symbolic matrix that contains the recipes for overcoming them.

Due to the pictures of the world, each individual receives a personal code in the form of a personal name. Their personal life is embedded in the general story that is for everyone in the form of biographies. The constructs of eidetic rationality inevitably marginalize and even repress the existential world that despite its invisibility somehow participates in the world order.

Thus, the dialectics of rational and existential nature are as follows. Rationality is a way of overcoming uncertainty and anxiety caused by existential fears of the finiteness of life and the possibility of its loss and destruction. On the other hand, existence is involved in the constitution and reproduction of social worlds despite not being their systemic element. The existential world is a social world. This was even recognized by M. Heidegger, an opponent of all forms of sociology.

Of course, existential sociality is peculiar. Here we examine the compatibility of being as an opportunity to be heard by others, the ability to communicate with others without leaving one’s own existential experience, and even being in solitude with oneself. The expected existential response of others is the chance of salvation and self-affirmation of a person abandoned in the world. The response can be understood as a certain existential code, as an evidence of being included in the world and the authenticity of the world (Dasein).

While the rational modus of social reproduction presents the modus oriented on the future, the existential modus is centered around returning. The intentionality of existential being is the intentionality of eternal return. Returning presents an irreplaceable modus of the existential world. Returning manifests not only as a nostalgic experience of lost childhood, the good and glorious times. The ontology of returning is a critical moment in the architectonics of presence in the world as a whole. Presence in the world (or near-the-world) is actualized in the acts of permanent returning.

¹⁸ V. E. Kemerov, *Vvedenie v sotsialnuiu filosofiiu*. Uchebnik dlia vuzov. 4th ed., corrected (Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2001).

Second, the existential world is a world shared with others. Being together with others is a constitutive moment of human existence. Therefore, one's world is always something already shared with others – a joint world, co-world. "Since "I" and "the world" are interdependent concepts"¹⁹.

In our interpretation, the interdependence of the world of the system and the existential world is the basis of autopoiesis. It is exactly this correspondence and the distribution of duties between them that determines the historical type of autopoiesis.

The existential world creates the architectonics of fulfillment, perfection while the social world is the architectonics of the possible.

The existential world is aimed at a person's being. The societal world refers to a practical (resource) existence.

At the early stages of the development of humanity, the social world was almost dissolved in the existential being. The social (existential) world existed thanks to the practices of replication, the continuous return to the sources, rituals, participatory thinking, etc.

The type of autopoiesis based on eidoses emancipated from existential being forms starting from class communities.

A characteristic feature of this type of autopoiesis is the border within which the meeting of existential being and the social world (the world of the system) emancipated from it occurs. However, the social world does not have enough grounds and opportunities for establishing a legitimate connection with existence. The existence simply does not recognize and accept it. Therefore, an important condition for autopoiesis as a dialogue of two types of orders is the suprasocial transcendental world: the eidetic world of the supermundane.

The societal picture of the world and the societal type of autopoiesis began to form starting from the 19th century. The essence of this type of autopoiesis is that society (represented by its institutions) becomes a construct of itself. Society establishes the rules and channels of transcendence on its own. Such a tamed transcendence manifests in the social order becoming a sacred legitimate order that does not need the transcendental bonds. It presents a substance in itself (the cause of itself). Everything that happens to a person happens exclusively within society as a microcosm. The society established itself as a demiurge of all existence that constantly transcends to itself as its own primary source. At every discrete point of its being, society is identical to itself. However, social actors can also actualize their own being exclusively within society.

Incarnation involves the presence of a supermundane transcendental meaning. This meaning coexists in all parts of the world. It is proportionate to the world but does not completely coincide with it. This presents the internal space. The actor is the carrier of the semantic center. They present an observer from within the circle and its jealous controller

¹⁹ L. Binswanger, *Ekzistentsialnii analiz* (Moscow: Institut Obshchegumanitarnykh Issledovaniy, 2014).

at the same time. The world exists only for those who are “of its own” people. In turn, its own people can only find themselves in their own social world.

The person as an actor having their own view of the world forms at the border. It simultaneously presents a transcendental subject (the generalized other) and the carrier of their own existential being.

The phenomenon of this border is that it does not combine the existential and the social but creates a space of transcendental communication (the term introduced by K. Jaspers) between them. Transcendental communication (dialogue) is possible due to a fundamental mismatch: the existential will never dissolve in the social (the system) and the system will never subordinate to existence. The border creates and reproduces this ontological tension between them that presents a melting pot of social mood, well-being, and its modes (social trust, responsibility). Without tension and anxiety actors become unable to respond to others' calls.

As noted by a Russian philosopher S. Frank, “a person, therefore, lives as if alternating between two worlds – in the world shared by everyone, openly visible to all, the “public” objective world in which their own being is only a small, insignificant, and subordinate private reality, – and in the “intimate” world not seen from the outside, the “inner” world of their dreams, joys, sufferings, and desires – in the world of everything that constitutes the true essence of human life, its true *focus* in comparison to which the objective world seen and recognized by everyone as if intended for “common use” has only a derivative, utilitarian, purely relative value”²⁰.

However, using the metaphor suggested by K. Marx, autopoiesis based on societal pictures of the world is a gravedigger to itself. The creation of the fundamentals of world order in the form of extremely rational relations, communications, and bureaucratic institutions ultimately led to social actors being able to dispense completely with the societal matrices in the form of ideologies, social doctrines, and even basic cultural patterns.

In other words, starting from the second half of the 20th century, people (actors) begin to dispense with pictures of the world. Pragmatic goals replace the social values that are either marginalized or turned into museum exhibits.

Results

The essence of the new post-societal autopoiesis lies in the fact that actors arrange themselves in the world. The world presents a mere tool, a resource for the self-organization of actors.

Modern (or, more accurately, postmodern) autopoiesis requires the abandonment of a stationary identity that binds the individual to the roots of the past. An actor must become something they have never been before. They can be compared to the actors of traditional societies. A knight, a priest, an apprentice, a peasant, a gentleman cannot become other social types that are not outlined by the traditional rules and the way of life.

²⁰ S. L. Frank, *Sochineniia* (Moscow: “Pravda” Publishing House, 1990).

In modern times, there is no rigid bond between people's behavior and the fundamental values and patterns. The new forming paradigm of order involves actors creating and reproducing their own reality and building their own life strategy without relying on substantial bonds, large narratives, ontic sources, etc. In the postmodern era, the imperatives of collective intentionality no longer bound individuals to society as a great social body as strongly as they used to.

A German sociologist J. Habermas assumed that the social system colonizes the world of life. "Having dropped the ideological covers, the imperatives of autonomous subsystems conquer the world of life from the outside and impose the process of assimilation on it much like colonialists who came to a primitive society"²¹.

"The colonization of the world of life allows for increasing complexity of a system that hypertrophies to the point that the released systemic imperatives destabilize the world of life"²². The societal system (that will be called the System from this point) seeks to subjugate the world of life. However, the world of life cannot be assimilated into the system or be destroyed as a formation that is inconvenient and interferes with the implementation of the rational projects of the System. The world resisting the System's pressure often self-isolates forming its own enclaves and ethos. An example of this is the Old Believer communities, which retained their existential architectonics away from the spaces created by the System after the famous church schism of the 17th century. The conditions of the collapse of the societal institutional and legal foundations of the Soviet society in the 1990's lead to the emergence of social ethos uncontrolled by the System and their social actors who set their own life regulations (life by the rules).

The coexistence of existential worlds and the world of the System guarantees the stability and successful development of society. This coexistence, however, should not be understood as mutual influence and interpenetration. Existence does not produce anything or reproduce itself since it does not possess an objective essence and cannot be objectified. Existence refers to transcendental being (Dasein) but not to the objective (objectified) existence.

The social system is the objectified world (the world of the existing) and, therefore, cannot produce (reproduce) existence. It can only produce (reproduce) itself, its own elements, and structure. The connection between the existential worlds and the world of the System, however, exists, although it is not functional but transcendental.

Existence means being-with-others. Social transcendence is what connects existence with the Others. Transcendence is not an objective embodiment in Other (in this case, transcendence was considered to be the same as objectification). The meaning of social transcendence is that a person can become an actor by performing a two-sided procedure: leaving the world and returning to the world. People settle down and equip their own world: the primordial world of childhood, home, family, one's dreams, innermost desires, hopes, and existential fears.

²¹ J. Habermas, Otnoshenie mezhdou sistemoi i zhiznennym mirom v usloviyakh pozdnego kapitalizma, THESIS num 2 (1993): 123-136.

²² V. N. Furs, Filosofii nezavershennogo moderna Iurgena Habermasa (Minsk: "Ekonompress" CJSC, 2000).

However, a person is forced to leave this small and cozy world of their own and enter the big world of Others. In this big world (that we call the societal society), they become a generalized other (the term introduced by D.G. Mead), an abstract individual, a social agent. The big world allows a person to exist providing the necessary vital resources and ensuring their personal safety and comfort. In the big world, a person takes the position of outsideness (the term introduced by M. Bakhtin).

However, the big world does not allow an individual to be themselves. Without returning to their own existential world a person loses themselves, loses the ability to bring oneself together as an ontological unity, the ability to take the position of insideness, and, therefore, be responsible for their actions.

The big and the small worlds are not always in agreement and they never intersect completely. However, these worlds need one another. Their fusion makes a person a true actor who not only adapts to the externally imposed living conditions but takes their own place in the social world. Each civilization creates and reproduces the borders: phenomenal zones in which the transitions to the big world and back to the small existential world of one's own are made. Social transcendence is a mechanism for the reproduction of social ethos: sustainable ethical and ontological practices, moods, and intentions (social trust, responsibility, self-discipline, etc.).

The risks of the destruction of these borders and the mechanism of social transcendence itself exist, for instance, in the process of the modernization of society. This is, however, an issue for a separate study.

Conclusion

Any societies, including the primitive pre-class clan formations, were based and are still based on rational (reasonable) foundations. In other words, irrational societies do not exist. However, the historical types of rational foundations of social orders and the reproduction of society are different.

Until the middle of the last century, the social orders were constructed and reproduced on the rational basis immanent to the society itself. In primitive pre-class societies, the rational orders were based on traditions, long narratives (legends, epics, myths) supported by the sacred participatory practices, gifts, sacrifices, carnivals, and initiations.

The order and reproduction of the more developed class societies (civilizations) were based on the transcendental (religious) and secular (ideological) pictures of the world. The specific feature of pictures of the world is that they contained not only the principles of the world order, the basic semantic guidelines, but also the ways of being of a person as a social actor, as a type of personality.

Each historical type of rational civilization has its own corresponding personality type adequate to the established way of being: ancient Greek, ancient Roman, Jewish, early Christian, Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant. In the 19th century, such social forces as the bourgeois and the proletarians that dominated up to the middle of the 20th century, advanced into the historical arena. In the second half of the 20th century, the middle class acted as the primary social carrier in the developed industrial societies.

As was subtly noted by M. Weber at one time, social rationality is not a purely instrumental, technical rationality. It involves an ethical and religious component. The pictures of the world ensure the balance, the equilibrium of the instrumental technological order and the mechanism of reproduction, management, and existential architectonics of human life including traditional ethos, solidarity, fraternities, sacred practices (initiations, holidays), chronotopes, living spaces with existential domains, etc.

As demonstrated in the article, the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century were marked by the destruction of the pictures of the world and consequently the violation of the above-mentioned balance. Instrumental rationality reinforced by modern technologies dominates in the present times. This dominance is confirmed by the fact that the problem of artificial intelligence as a demiurge, the master of the modern world aggravated at the beginning of the 21st century.

Scholars and politicians should think about how to live in the absence of pictures of the world. The rational world loses its predictability in the absence of pictures of the world. Pictures of the world present a guarantee of stability, predictability, and semantic certainty. As was previously noted, social worlds organized based on the pictures of the world present symbolic universums. "These are the essences of a theoretical tradition that integrate the different areas of meaning and encompass the institutional order in symbolic totality"²³.

As indicated above, the pictures of the world establish legitimate boundaries within which not only the rules, forms, and ways of human existence are constructed but also the architectonics of existential being are reproduced. In the second half of the 20th century, the pictures of the world can no longer hold the social reality. The vulnerability of the method of social reproduction (autopoiesis) using the pictures of the world is due to the fact that this method is static and is unable to adequately respond to the rapidly changing dynamics of changes in the social life and to control the complex communication processes that involve social actors.

The meaning of the new methods of autopoiesis (in the absence of stationary pictures of the world) is that social actors become the direct participants in the reproduction of virtual (network) social realities that correspond to their goals and interests. The society no longer establishes the substantial rules of being. Such concepts as "calling", "service", and "duty" lose their sacred existential meaning to a large extent and turn into office rules and formal obligations.

We live in an era of change when the old paradigm of autopoiesis based on the pictures of the world is no longer relevant both in a practical and scientific sense. Although the major part of Russian society experiences nostalgia for the past Soviet era when everything was fair and right, and people had a bright future ahead of them. The new paradigm of network autopoiesis is formed on the ruins of the old paradigm. Its main advantage is the freedom of a social actor to choose independently their life strategy and tactics. They are not bound by basic values and substantial bonds, which allows them to react to the changing conditions of life in a flexible manner and control and use them to their own advantage. The modern network world creates unprecedented opportunities for the development of innovative technologies and creative self-realization of individuals.

²³ P. Berger y T. Luckmann, *Sotsialnoe konstruirovaniye realnosti. Traktat po sotsiologii znaniia* (Moscow: "Medium", 1995).

On the other hand, the destruction of pictures of the world and universal values related to them leads to the destruction of the thin and often hidden connection between existential architectonics and the systemic (societal) organization of social life. V. Frankl wrote: “Universal values are in decline. Thus, an increasing number of people are overpowered by a sense of aimlessness and emptiness, or, as I call it, by the existential vacuum”²⁴. Although the Swiss psychologist wrote these words several decades ago, they are relevant to this day.

References

- Alexander, J. Smysly sotsialnoi zhizni: Kultursotsiologiya. Moscow: Praksis. 2013.
- Berger, P.; Berger, B. y Collins, R. Lichnostno-orientirovannaya sotsiologiya. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt. 2004.
- Berger, P. y Luckmann T. Sotsialnoe konstruirovaniye realnosti. Traktat po sotsiologii znaniya. Moscow: “Medium”. 1995.
- Binswanger, L. Ekzistentsialnii analiz. Moscow: Institut Obshchegumanitarnykh Issledovaniy. 2014.
- Frank, S. L. Sochineniya. Moscow: “Pravda” Publishing House. 1990.
- Frankl, V. Chelovek v poiskakh smysla. Moscow: Progress. 1990.
- Furs, V. N. Filosofiya nezavershennogo moderna Iurgena Habermasa. Minsk: “Ekonompress” CJSC. 2000.
- Giddens, A. Ustroenie obshchestva. Ocherk teorii strukturatsii. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt. 2005.
- Habermas, J. Otnosheniye mezhdum sistemoy i zhiznennym mirom v usloviyakh pozdnego kapitalizma. THESIS num 2 (1993): 123-136.
- Kemerov, V. E. Vvedeniye v sotsialnuyu filosofiyu. Uchebnyk dlya vuzov. 4th ed., corrected Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt. 2001.
- Kudashov, V. I.; Chernykh, S. I.; Yatsenko, M. P.; Grigoreva, L. I.; Pfanenshtil, I. A. y Rakhinsky, D. V. “Historical reflection in the educational process: an axiological approach”. Analele Universitatii din Craiova - Seria Istorie Vol: 22 num 1 (2017): 139-147.
- Luhmann, N. Obshchestvo kak sotsialnaya sistema. Moscow: “Logos” Publishing House. 2004.
- Luhmann, N. The Autopoiesis of social systems. Essays on self-reference. New York: Columbia University Press. 1990.

²⁴ V. Frankl, Chelovek v poiskakh smysla (Moscow: Progress, 1990).

Malimonov, I. V.; Rakhinskiy, D. V.; Sinkovskaya, I. G.; Korol, L. G.; Aisner, L. Y.; Bershanskaya, S. V. y Trashkova, S. M. "Global changes of family unit in modern Russia". *Astra Salvensis* Vol: 6 num 12 (2018): 623-633.

Merton, R. *Sotsialnaia teoriia i sotsialnaia struktura*. AST: Moscow: Khranitel. 2006.

Musat R. P.; Mineev, V. V.; Neskryabina, O. F.; Panasenko, G. V.; Maksimov, S. V. y Rakhinsky, D. V. "Ehe artistic worldview in the context of sociocultural realia". *Amazonia Investiga* Vol: 8 num 23 (2019): 350-357.

Neskryabina, O. F.; Ustyuzhanina, D. A.; Morozova, O. F.; Malimonov I. V.; Piskorskaya, S. Yu. y Rakhinsky, D. V. "Media representation of religiousness in modern Russian society". *Amazonia Investiga* Vol: 9 num 29 (2020): 87-94.

Pavlov, A. P.; Pavlov, P. A.; Lvov, D. V.; Novikov, A. S.; Sinkovskaya, I. G. y Rakhinsky, D. V. "Existential and archetypal architectonics of social (societal) order". *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering* Vol: 8 num 2 (2019): 4148-4153.

Ritzer, D. *Sovremennye sotsiologicheskie teorii*. Saint Petersburg: Piter. 2002.

Simmel, G. *Grundfragen der Soziologie (Individuum und Gesellschaft)*. Berlin: Sammlung Göschen. 1917.

Terikian, E. *Sotsiologizm i ekzistantsializm. Voprosy sotsialnoi teorii* Vol: 1 num 1 (2007): 50-84.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**, citando la fuente.