

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council  
of Khachatur Abovian  
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic  
named after Academician Georg Brutian



# W I S D O M

3(23), 2022



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources  
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2022

DOI: 10.24234/wisdom.v23i3.717

## SOCIAL SYNERGETICS: SYNERGETIC HISTORICISM AND HUMANISM

Davit KHITARYAN<sup>1</sup>  | Lusine STEPANYAN<sup>1</sup>  | Kadzhik OGANYAN<sup>2,\*</sup>  |  
Vladimir OGORODNIKOV<sup>3</sup> | Karina OGANYAN<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Armenian State Institute of Physical Culture and Sport, Yerevan, Armenia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, National State University of Physical Culture, Sports and Health, named after P. F. Lesgaft, Saint Petersburg, Russia

<sup>3</sup> Department of Training and Professional Excellence of Teachers in the Educational Institutions of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, Military Space Academy A. F. Mozhaisky, Saint Petersburg, Russia

*\* Correspondence*

Kadzhik OGANYAN, 43-61, Bogatyrsky Street, Saint Petersburg, 197 372, Russia.

E-mail: koganyan53@mail.ru

*Abstract:* The article deals with the essence of abstract humanism through the identification of the main principles of synergetic historicism. It is argued that the process of self-organization of mankind is revealed through the implementation of the mechanism of the concept of the synergetic mind. The regularities of the development of social self-organization through a harmonious “synergistic person” are considered. The mechanism for realizing the ideal of synergetic humanism in reality with the help of social progress as an increase in the degree of confrontation between social chaos and social order (freedom and responsibility) is revealed.

*Keywords:* globalization, synergistic historicism, abstract humanism, humanistic ideal, super attractor, education of a new person, eschatology, universal value, ideal of a “synergistic person”, social progress.

### Introduction

In the middle of the XX century, the classical dialectical concept of development (Hegel, Marx, Spencer, etc.) was replaced by universal evolutionism (V. I. Vernadsky, N. N. Moiseev, A. D. Ursul, etc.). The novelty of the latter was that he combined the idea of the internal interaction of the elements of a developing system (i.e., a systematic approach) with the idea of selection, as a result of which selection acquired a universal character as a “driving force” of development not only biological (as it was in Darwinism) but also any natural and social systems. As applied to the development of society, this led to the conclusion that humanity is gradually approach-

ing such a global organization, in which all the activities of the members of this organization proceed according to strictly rational laws. In other words, this means the complete dominance of the “collective mind” in all public and private affairs (“noosphere”). Any disorder associated with the emergence of uncontrolled and unpredictable feelings in society is excluded due to the strict rationalization of all aspects of life and the strict regulation of all activities. It is no accident that Academician N. N. Moiseev called one of his main works devoted to universal evolutionism “Ascension to Reason” (1993). Under this expression, the followers of “noospheric thinking” usually mean the rational globalization of social life (Moiseev, 2000, pp. 123-124). It was

to her that Academician V. I. Vernadsky.

However, after the emergence of the general scientific theory of self-organization (Prigozhin & Stengers (2003), Haken (1985, 2003), Knyazeva, Kurdyumov (2006) and others), one serious difficulty emerged the concept of universal evolutionism inevitably faces. The difficulty lies in the paradoxical combination in the social development of two mutually exclusive tendencies:

1. the growth of the universal interdependence of all members of society from each other and the strengthening of the regulation of their activities (the tendency towards the formation of an ideally programmed human community);
2. the growth of influence on the state of the global system of human individuality, which is a source of unpredictable random perturbations in the entire global system (a tendency to disrupt the interdependence and regulation of individual actions).

We have called the clash of these tendencies Prigozhin's paradox (Prigozhin & Stengers, 2003). As synergetic studies show, the solution to this paradox is possible within the framework of the concept of synergetic historicism. The concept of universal evolutionism is unable to resolve this paradox. The reason for this is that the concept of universal evolutionism is limited to the concept of selection as the fundamental "driving force" of development, while the concept of synergetic historicism generalizes the usual concept of selection to the concept of superselection. This immediately leads to the concept of a super attractor (Oganyan, Branskij, & Oganyan, 2018), which gives a relatively simple and, at the same time, very elegant solution to Prigogine's paradox.

## The Problem and Ways to Solve It

### *Social Synergetics and Synergetic Historicism*

The solution of Prigogine's paradox given by the concept of synergetic historicism leads, in turn, to the following very important result: the noospheric thinking is replaced by the aesthetospheric thinking, or, in other words, the noospheric strategy of sustainable development of mankind is replaced by the aesthetospheric strategy of such development. In contrast to noospheric

thinking, which is built solely on the basis of the philosophy of science, aesthetospheric thinking is based on a deep synthesis of the philosophy of science and the philosophy of art (Branskij, 1999).

If noospheric thinking from a synergetic point of view is characterized by a one-sided cult of order, then aesthetospheric thinking is characterized by a harmonic synthesis of order and freedom ("chaos"). Revealing the novelty of synergetic historicism in comparison with universal evolutionism, synergetic acmeology at the same time shows their real relationship: synergetic historicism, being a natural development and generalization of universal evolutionism, includes universal evolutionism as an aspect but is not reduced to it. This is especially evident in the fact that the concept of the esthetosphere contains the concept of the noosphere but cannot be reduced to this latter concept. After all, the aesthetic sphere is not only the sphere of domination in all public and personal affairs of the "collective mind" but also the "collective (generally significant) feeling" (charismatic empathy).<sup>1</sup>

Research shows that at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries, synergetics has become fashionable, and fashion in science (unlike in everyday life) is very dangerous because it can compromise the corresponding theory. To avoid pseudo-scientific "synergetic" verbiage, we recommend that you adhere to the following rules.

It is necessary to distinguish between 1) natural science and social synergetics (Oganyan, Branskij, 2018) (instead of talking about "synergetics in general"); 2) applied and fundamental social synergetics (instead of reducing the discussion of the problems of social synergetics to the analysis of very specific technical issues); 3) model and conceptual approaches to fundamental social synergetics. The model approach is characterized by the consideration of one of the sides of the self-organization process (most often, the phenomenology of self-organization). At the same time, the task of a comprehensive con-

<sup>1</sup> Synergetic acmeology convincingly shows that the global acme (the pinnacle of self-organization) of both the individual and society lies in the transformation of all mankind into a masterpiece of art for a person in general, i.e. not only into an absolute (universal) technical, but also into an absolute (universal) artistic work. Thus, in the course of the movement towards the global acme, the "Ascent to Reason" turns out to be only one of the steps of the "Ascent to the Ideal".

sideration of all categories of fundamental social synergy with the aim of revealing their interconnection and interaction is not set. On the contrary, the conceptual approach sets as its main goal the construction of a system of fundamental concepts of this synergetics.

To do this, he approaches the subject of fundamental social synergetics comprehensively, including in the scope of his consideration both phenomenology and the essentiality and eschatology of self-organization. Moreover, these three sections, in turn, are considered at three levels: ontological, epistemological and axiological (Branskij, 1999; Oganyan, Oganyan, Pyzh, & Petrov, 2018; Branskij, Oganyan, & Oganyan, 2018; Ogorodnikov, 1997a).

But here, in turn, two variants are revealed: synergetic historicism without the idea of a super attractor and the same with a super attractor. It shows the fundamental importance in the analysis of social self-organization of such synergetic concepts as bifurcation and attractor. It is the concept of bifurcation (Borodkin, 2002) that leads to the substantiation of the nonlinearity of social development and the formulation of the problem of choosing different historical scenarios. In this case, the responsibility for the choice rests with the attractor. It is argued that the reason for the choice is a certain “call of the attractor”. Some authors (Kurdyumov, Knyazeva, and others) also use such an expression – “the future time is the past.” All such expressions hint at the fact that the laws of self-organization allegedly allow the possibility of the future affecting the past, while according to the general scientific principle of “acting” causality, this is impossible. It is obvious that such an explanation of synergetic choice is equivalent to the introduction of Aristotle’s “target” (“final”) causes, independent of “acting” causes and demonstrating the limitations of explanation with the help of “acting” causes. Such an impression really arises with a purely phenomenological approach to self-organization.

However, as soon as we move from the phenomenological to the essential (essential) level of analysis, it immediately becomes clear that the driving force of social self-organization, which explains its entire phenomenology (including both bifurcations and attractors), is the confrontation of many opposite principles and social selection (leading contradictions) with its three factors

(social thesaurus<sup>2</sup>, social detector and social selector (Branskij & Oganyan, 2009; Oganyan & Branskij, 2015; Branskij & Pozharskii, 2009; Oganyan, 2010, 2015).

And then, it becomes clear that the expressions “call of the attractor” and “the future time and the past” are nothing more than beautiful metaphors that cannot be attributed to a literal physical meaning.

Consequently, the transition from the phenomenology of self-organization to its essence makes it possible to avoid the old teleological approach to phenomena (which takes us beyond the limits of the scientific worldview and returns us to the era of the 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries). This can only be fully achieved by moving even further - moving from the essence of self-organization to its eschatology, to the final meaning, the essence of any evolutionary process, which leads from selection to superselection, and then to the concept of the super attractor (Branskij & Oganyan, 2003).

Thus, synergetic historicism without a super attractor suffers from a serious inconsistency: it is limited only to the description of self-organization as a phenomenon but does not reveal the essence of this phenomenon. Thus, consistent synergetic historicism must necessarily end with the idea of a super attractor (eschatology of self-organization). Nevertheless, there are authors who, while accepting the concept of synergetic historicism, at the same time reject the idea of a super attractor. How can one explain that the idea of a super attractor is often perceived with great difficulty?

Usually, one of the following arguments is put forward against the existence of a super attractor:

1. this idea is wishful thinking (the thirst for an optimistic solution to the problem of the “meaning of history”);
2. it fetters our freedom (it excludes alternative ways of development and, in general, a variety of ways of development);
3. it has no solid foundations, being either a postulate, a hypothesis, or a prophecy, but nothing more.

All of these considerations are untenable for

<sup>2</sup> A social thesaurus constitutes a set of possible dissipative structures that potentially arise in the depths of a given actually existing structure as a result of a corresponding bifurcation.

the following reason:

1. Historical optimism is not an argument in favour of the existence of a super attractor but a consequence of the existence of a super attractor. Therefore, it cannot be used as an argument within the framework of synergetic historicism.
2. The super attractor cannot fetter our freedom because it is the result of the interaction of an infinite number of free actions (acts of choice at bifurcation points) of free people. In other words, a super attractor arises as a result of the interaction of many individual “freedoms”, and without these “freedoms”, it cannot form at all. Even more, it can be asserted: that the super attractor is a product of “militant freedom” because it presupposes a consistent neutralization of some objective laws with the help of other objective laws.

If the actions of one free person (or a group of such persons) begin to oppose the movement towards the super attractor, then sooner or later, the actions of another free person or group of persons begin to oppose this primary opposition; that is, they contribute to the movement towards the super attractor. This nature of the interaction is a consequence of its nonlinearity, i.e., the propensity of the elements of the system not only to interact with each other but also to self-action. Since the super attractor is the result of many bifurcations leading to local attractors, it not only does not exclude the diversity of development paths, but it implies a much greater variety, something with which local attractors are associated (Oganyan, K. M. & Oganyan, K. K., 2013; Oganyan, Branskij, & Oganyan, 2013; 2014; Ogorodnikov, 1997b).

Thus, the free actions of free people can speed up or slow down the movement towards the super attractor, but they cannot prevent this movement. So, ultimately, all roads lead to Rome. The more vigorously individuals make their free choice, the more confidently the society moves toward the limit of its cultural development, which is naturally called a super attractor.

3. Within the framework of consistent synergetic historicism, the existence of a super attractor is neither a postulate, a hypothesis, nor a prophecy, for the reason that there is proof of the existence of a super attractor, which boils

down to the following main arguments:

- a) the existence of superselection, i.e., feedback between selection results and selection factors;
- b) the interaction of the tendency of the global social system towards stability with the tendency of the same system towards variability;
- c) the formation and implementation of an absolute (general human) ideal as a consequence of the law of differentiation and integration of social ideals, and the formation of an absolute value on this basis;
- d) since the super attractor turns out to be an objective possibility in the singular, the movement toward it becomes a necessity. The existence of a super attractor implies the formation of such mechanisms of self-regulation and self-defence, which, of course, exclude the possibility of the physical self-destruction of mankind. By virtue of what has been said, the meaning of history is in no way reduced, as is often said, to the “survival of mankind”.

### *Synergetic Historicism and Abstract Humanism*

In order to fully feel and appreciate the novelty and depth of the concept of synergetic historicism in the approach to fundamental social problems, it is necessary to compare this concept not only with the concept of universal evolutionism but also with the concept of abstract humanism, which has an old and very rich tradition.

Abstract humanism gained wide popularity in the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, on the one hand, as a specific program for solving global problems faced by humanity, and on the other hand, as a reaction to the collapse of totalitarian regimes that opposed this humanism with their own class or racial humanism. Although abstract humanism has a long history, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it began to be designated by new terms (“new” (A. Peccei) humanism, “global” (M. Gorbachev) humanism, etc.). The essence of abstract humanism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century lies in three main principles:

1. the priority of global problems over all other social problems, since their solution is a condition for the survival of mankind; since glob-

al problems are interconnected, they can only be solved in a complex (jointly), and this requires the participation of all earthly regions, that is, the globalization of mankind is required - the strengthening of the interdependence of all its parts, the transformation of mankind into a single integrated whole (based on the division of labour between regions);

2. the priority of universal human values over private human values;
3. complete rejection of violent methods of solving any social problems.

### *Abstract Humanism and the Humanistic Ideal*

Opposing the ideology of the unlimited growth of the material well-being of an ever larger part of humanity, contributing to the aggravation of global problems and threatening the very existence of mankind, abstract humanism puts forward the education of a new person with new human qualities as the only effective means of overcoming the impasse – “it is impossible to change only the world: it is necessary to change the person too” (Pechei, 1985, p. 244). This person should be free from the cult of utilitarian consumption, should be guided in his activities exclusively by universal human interests, should contribute to the globalization of life on Earth and under no circumstances should resort to violence. The real inhabitants of our planet brought up in the spirit of this ideal of man will be able to effectively control the growth of technology, population and the exploitation of natural resources. Only such behaviour will help humanity to free itself from the global problems that threaten its existence. But the hope for an abstract, divorced from objective reality and activity, education resembles the well-known fable of I. A. Krylova about a cook who shamed and urged the cat, Vaska, not to steal or eat stolen food. The result of the educational impact is expressed in words that have become an aphorism: “And Vaska listens and eats”. Abstract education is one of the forms of abstract humanism.

Characteristically, in contrast to universal evolutionism, which sees the meaning of history in the “survival of mankind”, global humanism strongly disagrees with such a formulation of the eschatological problem.

Perhaps the founder of the Club of Rome, Pechei (1985), said it best: “The goals of mankind cannot be limited to the desire to avoid catastrophe, provide opportunities for survival and then drag out a prosaic and flawed existence in their semi-artificial world. It is necessary to raise the spirit of a person, and he needs ideals in which he could really believe, for the sake of which he could live and fight and, if necessary, die. And these ideals should grow out of his awareness of his new role on the planet” (p. 244).

Although at first sight a very attractive concept, abstract humanism nevertheless faces very serious philosophical problems. In fact, as is known, humanism (since the Renaissance in the 15th-16th centuries) means nothing more than love for a person. He is opposed to anti-humanism - hatred of man. But what determines this love and this hatred?

As the history of mankind for many centuries shows, the love of a person for a person is ultimately connected with the coincidence of the value system that both partners adhere to; accordingly, hatred is with the opposite nature of the value system. To put it simply, we usually love like-minded people and, of course, do not love those whose worldview is alternative to ours. Therefore, in the general case, “love of the neighbour” is necessarily combined with “hatred of the far”. Abstract humanism is called abstract because it abstracts from this very harsh but, unfortunately, extremely “stubborn” fact.

Consequently, abstract humanism ignores the inconsistency of real humanism - a combination (in one proportion or another) of love for some people and dislike (or even hatred) for others. The consequence of such a one-sided approach to real humanism is three fundamental contradictions in which abstract humanism is entangled:

1. globalization is opposed to autonomization;
2. universal human values - private human values;
3. non-violent methods - violent.

From the point of view of abstract humanism, it is completely incomprehensible why the globalization of life on Earth, that is, the growth of the interdependence of everyone from everyone (the craving for integration, unionism, unity), is accompanied by a diametrically opposite process - the desire for independence of individual regions, choosing one’s own path of develop-

ment, not similar to the global (main) path (a craving for differentiation, separatism, diversity). No less strange is the constant emergence, along with universal human values, of private human values and the latter's unwillingness to dissolve in universal human values. Moreover, universal human values always appear in private human attire (it turns out to be extremely difficult to single them out in their pure form), and private human values claim a universal human status (pretend to be universal). But what is perhaps most surprising is the combination of centuries-old calls for peaceful dialogue and non-violence and the constant return, despite these calls, to new forms of violence. Periodically, the verbal dialogue ends with a weapon "dialogue".

It is abstract humanism that has been demonstrated in the past and continues to demonstrate its complete inability to explain from scientific positions the strange commitment of mankind to violent methods of solving their problems.

If we now look at the above contradictions from the standpoint of the concept of synergetic historicism, then their mystery disappears. It turns out that all the difficulties of abstract humanism are connected with the wrong solution to the question of the relationship between values and ideals. Abstract humanism either enrols the ideal among the values or puts the values ahead of the ideal; that is, it considers them to be something more fundamental than the ideal. But we have already seen that from the point of view of synergetic historicism, the ideal is not a value but a criterion of value; therefore, put it after value, that is, consider it as something derived from value.

Similarly, it is unacceptable to regard moral norms as something basic and fundamental, as if they determine values and ideals. In fact, the ideal determines the system of moral norms on the basis of which the pragmatic aspect of the ideal is realized and thanks to which certain values are created. At the same time, it should be emphasized that in practical life (and not in scholastic word disputes), "value" always turns out to be a unity ("alloy") of the ideal and material (ideal meaning and material sign). Purely ideal values are just as impossible as purely material ones.

The ideal therefore determines the system of values of a given culture because serving it determines the "meaning of life" on the basis of

which culture is formed. The matter, however, becomes more complicated due to the fact that different ideals operate in society, including those that oppose each other. This means that attempts to implement one ideal are hindered by attempts to implement another ideal (which is an anti-ideal in relation to the given one). As we have already seen, the interaction of ideals (their "struggle") ultimately leads to a competition of sacrifices since the realization of any ideal requires some kind of sacrifice. After all, failure in the realization of one's ideal is tantamount to the loss of the "meaning of life". Therefore, in the course of the struggle for ideals, not just a temptation inevitably arises, but an organic need to realize one's ideal at any cost. But for this, it is necessary to paralyze any attempts to implement alternative ideals, which is why the development of the struggle of ideals inevitably and without any malicious intent leads to violence. Consequently, violence in the history of mankind has an exclusively social origin (if we mean, of course, mentally healthy people), but the social roots of violence are very deep: after all, they run into the problem of "the meaning of life." The struggle of ideals as the driving force of history is actually a struggle for the right to implement different ideas about the "meaning of life"<sup>3</sup> (Bran-skij, 2017).

Because of this, the self-organization of culture, paradoxically as it may sound, cannot but lead to such a social phenomenon as the cruelty of the treatment of one person (one social group) with another person (with another social group). That is why humanism in history is so closely associated with anti-humanism.

<sup>3</sup> It is shown how the problem of the meaning of individual life is connected with the problem of the "meaning of life". The idea is substantiated that the "meaning of history" is revealed not by science, but by ideology, but how it does this can be understood only with the help of science. The most important idea of this work lies in the scientific description of the natural transition from the global interaction of chaos and order in nature to their global interaction in culture (society), leading, ultimately, to overcoming the global conflict between human freedom and responsibility and to achieving between them a complete harmony. The concept presented here differs from most publications on this topic, because it is built on the basis of a synthesis of natural science and humanitarian thinking.

### *Synergetic Humanism and the Law of Differentiation and Integration of Ideals*

So, in order to solve global problems and save humanity, abstract humanism requires the upbringing of a new person, corresponding to the ideal of this humanism. When there is a need to concretize this ideal, then, in particular, tolerance, solidarity, justice, etc., are put forward as its necessary standards. But here, many questions immediately arise: tolerance towards whom? Solidarity with whom? Justice in what respect? etc. And instead of a single ideal of a new man, many of its varieties arise, and it turns out to be an extremely difficult matter to achieve unity of opinion on this issue. However, the uncertainty and vagueness of the ideal of a new person (which would correspond to the era of globalization of mankind) are not surprising: after all, long ago, philosophers realized the deep truth that “the educator himself needs to be educated”. This means that the authors of the new humanistic ideal must themselves go through the appropriate school of education, whether these new pupils will, in turn, require new educators, and so on. It is synergistic historicism that overcomes this paradox of going into the “bad” infinity.

It follows from it that the global (absolute, universal) humanistic ideal cannot be formed as a result of the actions of any one organizer: the role of the global educator of mankind is played by the process of self-organization of mankind. In other words, the absolute humanistic ideal can only be the result of global self-education (global self-education and self-education). What is the mechanism of this process?

To answer this question, we must use two very important results of the concept of synergetic historicism:

1. a synergistic criterion of social progress as an increase in the degree of synthesis of social chaos (freedom) and social order (responsibility), determined by the desire of the social system for maximum stability;
2. the law of differentiation and integration of social ideals (respectively, systems of social values).

It is these two regularities of social self-organization that lead to an essentially new concept of synergetic humanism. Unlike abstract humanism, synergetic humanism presupposes love, not for everyone, but only for the so-called

“synergistic” person, that is, for a person striving for the harmony of a threefold kind:

- a) between freedom (chaos) and responsibility (order) in the utilitarian sphere (in the field of economics and politics);
- b) between freedom and responsibility in the spiritual sphere (in the field of ethics, aesthetics and worldview);
- c) to such coordination (co-evolution) of the utilitarian and spiritual spheres, which excludes both the priority of the utilitarian sphere in relation to the spiritual and the spiritual in relation to the utilitarian one.

As the history of various societies shows, the priority of the utilitarian over the spiritual ultimately leads to immorality (complete moral relativism), and the priority of the spiritual over the utilitarian leads to hypocrisy (complete moral dogmatism).

It is easy to see that point (c) ensures the harmony between (a) and (b), figuratively speaking, the harmony between the harmonies (a) and (b). Thus, complete self-consistency of freedom and responsibility is achieved in both utilitarian and spiritual activities. It is easy to see that the concept of a “synergistic person” is an exact interpretation of the concept of a “harmonic person”.

Obviously, the ideal of synergetic humanism is built on the basis of using the synergetic criterion of social progress as an increase in the degree of synthesis of social chaos and social order, that is, freedom and responsibility.

The question arises: what is the mechanism for realizing this ideal in reality? Isn't it too complicated and too demanding for a real person? It is easy to guess that the law of differentiation and integration of ideals provides the answer to these questions. According to this law, the formation and realization of the ideal of a “synergistic person” are carried out by the method of successive approximations - through the periodic “glass game” - the decomposition of old humanistic ideals and the formation of new ideals on their ruins. Subjecting the old ideals to analysis, decomposing them into separate components and creating new, unusual combinations from these components, we select a new integrative synthetic ideal such a combination that distances itself to the maximum extent both from the new ideal of the anarchist man and from the new ideal of the totalitarian person. The result is a new humanistic ideal, the ideal of a liberal person (Oganyan,



2021).

Thus, one can, in principle, approach the ideal of a “synergistic person” and its embodiment in reality as close as one likes, without reaching it, but never completely. Therefore, the ideal of absolute humanism can only be realized in a super-attractor (on the way, engaging in an endless “glass game”, but each time at a new ideological level). At the same time, it should always be remembered that real humanism in every historical era always remains relative because it is always combined with anti-humanism in relation to those who strive to realize certain alternative ideals. History shows that one cannot revere the life of terrorists or maniacs because such reverence usually ends tragically. It is impossible to experience a feeling of love for the shameless initiators of violent actions - love for the “neighbour” here must always be combined with hatred for the “far”.

Due to the presence of many contradictory trends in social development, at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the problem of the relationship between ideological monism and ideological pluralism (or, in other words, ideological unity and ideological diversity) acquired particular importance. From the law of differentiation and integration of social ideals follows a very important and by no means trivial consequence concerning the solution of this problem. First of all, it becomes obvious that at each specific stage of social development, it is impossible to absolutize either ideological unity or ideological diversity. If the absolutization of ideological monism is characteristic, in particular, of many religious teachings, then the absolutization of ideological pluralism is characteristic of those forms of modern secular humanism that are connected (directly or indirectly) with the philosophy of deconstructivism. In general, philosophical totalitarianism gravitates toward ideological monism and philosophical anarchism toward ideological pluralism.

At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it became especially fashionable to insist on the “value in itself” of ideological pluralism and to reject (in connection with the sad experience of totalitarian regimes) any kind of ideological monism (See, in particular, Berlin, 2000; Ogorodnikov, 2015).

But from the law of differentiation and integration of ideals, it clearly follows that ideological diversity is by no means the “ultimate” goal

of social development but only an important and necessary means for the formation of a new, wider and deeper ideological unity. Any particular human ideological unity, like any particular human diversity, is historically transient and limited. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to move towards absolute ideological unity (so to speak, ideological globalization). But this absolute ideological unity can only be achieved in an infinite asymptotic approximation to the super attractor. Therefore, to achieve such unity, an endless deployment of absolute ideological diversity is required.

The last question that arises when comparing synergetic historicism with abstract humanism is the following: will humanity have time to re-educate itself (by introducing the ideal of a “synergistic” person into the consciousness of the broad masses) before the aggravation of global problems?; reaches a critical level? Neither universal evolutionism nor abstract humanism give and cannot give an answer to this question. But synergetic historicism gives the following answer. As already noted, due to the action of superselection (learning from history, i.e., hierarchical learning from one’s own mistakes), social self-organization acquires an asymptotic character. This means that the distance separating humanity from the state of the super attractor is progressively and, moreover, rapidly decreasing. It follows from this that more and more favourable conditions are being created (in particular, more and more effective methods are being developed) for introducing the ideal of a “synergistic” person into the consciousness of the masses. The acceleration of a practical approach to this ideal should lead to a new trend - a gradual transition from the aggravation of global problems to their gradual mitigation.

Thus, it is the asymptotic nature of global self-organization (its movement towards a super attractor) that gives reason to hope that human self-organization can not only overtake the aggravation of global problems but must do so.

## Conclusion

1. In its developed form, fundamental social synergetics inevitably takes the form of the concept of synergetic historicism, in which the phenomenology, essentiology and escha-

tology of self-organization are clearly distinguished at the ontological epistemological and axiological levels. At the same time, the interconnection and interaction of all these components of fundamental social synergetics are revealed. Therefore, further progress in fundamental social synergetics is currently possible only on the path of constructive critical analysis of this concept.

2. Discussing the problem of the super attractor (which is undoubtedly the main problem of social synergetics), one should not forget about the consequences that the rejection of the idea of the super attractor leads to. It is quite obvious that within the framework of the scientific worldview, without the idea of a super attractor, it is impossible to substantiate the existence of an absolute value. And without such a value, the history of world culture loses its meaning, and with it, individual life becomes meaningless. Thus, an optimistic scientific worldview cannot, in principle, avoid the idea of a super attractor. Therefore, anyone who wants to remain an optimist must paraphrase the well-known words that "if there were no super attractor, it would have to be invented." Anyone who, out of fear of communist, Nazi or any other totalitarian "bright future", rejects any "bright future" should think about what awaits him in the absence of any "bright future". In this case, there are two possibilities: either a "dark future" or no future. True, at first glance, it seems that there is another option - an indefinite future. But this one is reduced to the previous ones, for the indefinite means either "light" or "dark" or zero.
3. Let us now sum up our comparative analysis of synergetic historicism and abstract humanism. As already noted, abstract humanism expresses indignation at the paradoxical combination in history: the trend towards unity (in particular, towards globalization) with the tendency towards diversity (in particular, towards autonomization); the desire for universal human values (in particular, cosmopolitanism) with the desire for private human values (in particular, nationalism); the desire to use in conflict situations only non-violent means (in particular, to pacifism) with the desire to use violent means (in particular, to militarism).
4. Synergetic historicism approaches this problem quite differently. From the point of view of synergetic historicism, as is clear from the above, all three of the above-mentioned trends are a natural and necessary consequence of the law of differentiation and integration of social ideals. The differentiation and integration of ideals inevitably lead to the differentiation and integration of values created on the basis of the implementation of the corresponding ideals (in particular, various social institutions), as well as to the differentiation and integration of moral norms determined by the ideals. The struggle of ideals and the competition of sacrifices associated with it inevitably leads to a combination of peaceful means of resolving conflicts with violent ones.
5. But the differentiation and integration of ideals is one side of the process of social self-organization. The other side, as we have already seen, is meta-idealization (idealization of the ideals themselves), as a result of which the chain of differentiation and integration of relative (private human) ideals leads to the formation and realization of an absolute (general human) ideal. Since this process is associated with the mitigation and gradual "fading" of social contradictions, it leads to the following conclusion: although it is impossible to completely eliminate violence in history, there is a tendency for its endless minimization.
6. So, synergetic historicism, instead of being indignant at the existence of contradictory tendencies in social development, accepts them as they are and explains them with the help of new laws. And not only explains but also predicts, with the help of these laws, the direction in which real modern humanism should develop and in which the formation of a new humanism can take place. It is clear from the foregoing that synergetic historicism, in contrast to abstract humanism, indicates a realistic way of realizing the ideal of a "new man with new human qualities" in reality. This also outlines a realistic method for solving global problems that humanity faced at the turn of the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

Thus, spontaneously developing synergistic humanism, humanity is getting closer and

closer to absolute humanism - exactly the kind of humanism that is so longed for and to which the supporters of abstract humanism are constantly calling. Although this humanism, as already noted, is achievable only in an infinite limit, nevertheless, it plays an important psychological and heuristic role, being a strategic value guideline in the formation of plans for a very distant future.

## References

- Berlin, I. (2000). *Podlinnaja celj poznanja. Izbrannije esse* (The true purpose of knowledge. Selected essays, in Russian). Moscow: Canon.
- Borodkin, L. I. (2002). *Bifurkacii v processax evolucii prirodi I obshchestva: obshhee i osobennoe v ocnke I. Prigozina* (Bifurcations of the evolution and nature processes: general and particular in I. Prigozhin's assessment, in Russian). *Informacionnij buleten Asociacii "Istoria I kompjuter"* (Newsletter of the Association "History and Computer", in Russian), 29, 143-153.
- Branskij, V. P. (1999). *Iskusstvo i filosofija* (Art and philosophy, in Russian). Kalinin-grad: Jantarnij skaz.
- Branskij, V. P. (2017). *Problema smisla zhizni: obshhefilosofskoe i obshenauchnoe znachenie* (The problem of the meaning life: General philosophical and scientific meaning, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: SPbGEU.
- Branskij, V. P., & Oganyan, K. M. (2003). *Rezultat perexoda mezdu porjadkom i xaosom (esxatologija samoorganizacii)* (The result of the transition between order and chaos (Eschatology of self-organization, in Russian). In K. M. Oganyan, *Socialnie texnologii: teorija i praktica. Tezisi dokladov (Social technologies: theory and practice, in Russian)* (pp. 15-23). Saint Petersburg: SPbGIEU.
- Branskij, V. P., & Oganyan, K. M. (2009). *Globalizatsiya i sinergeticheskaya filosofiya istorii* (Globalization and synergetic philosophy of history, in Russian). *Vestnik Yerevanskogo universiteta. Obshchestvennye nauki (Bulletin of the Yerevan University. Social Sciences, in Russian)*, 3(129), 48-57.
- Branskij, V., & Pozharskii, S. (2009). *Sinergeticheskaya filosofiya istorii* (Synergetic philosophy of history, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: SPbGU.
- Branskij, V., Oganyan, K. M., & Oganyan, K. K. (2018). A new line of research: Synergetic philosophy and sociology of personality. *WISDOM*, 10(1), 57-73.
- Haken, H. (1985). *Sinergetica* (Synergy, in Russian). Moscow: Mir.
- Haken, H. (2003). *Tajni prirodi. Sinergetica: uchenie i vzaimodejstvie* (Secrets of nature. Synergy: Teaching and interaction, in Russian). Moskva-Izhevsk: Institut computernix issledovanii.
- Knyazeva, E. N., & Kurdyumov, S. P. (2006). *Osnovania sinergetiki. Chelovek, konstruiruyushij sebja sam I svoe budushee* (Foundations of synergetic. A person constructing himself and his future, in Russian). Moscow: Komkniga.
- Moiseev, N. N. (1993). *Vosxozhdenie k razumu* (Rise to the mind, in Russian). Moscow: Izdat.
- Moiseev, N. N. (2000). *Sistemnaja organizacia biosferi i koncepcia koevolucii* (Systemic organization of the biosphere and the concept of co-evolution, in Russian). *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremenosti (Social Sciences and Modernity, in Russian)*, 2, 123-124.
- Oganyan, K. M., & Branskij, V. P. (2018). *Social'naya sinergetica* (Social synergy, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Petropolis.
- Oganyan, K. M. (2010). *Globalizatsiya i sotsialnyi ideal v sovremennom rossiiskom obshchestve* (Globalization and social ideal in modern russian society, in Russian). *Vestnik Yerevanskogo universiteta. Obshchestvennye nauki (Social Sciences, in Russian)*, 4(138), 42-50.
- Oganyan, K. M. (2015). *Dukhovnost cheloveka i ego glavnye tsennostnye orientatsii* (Spirituality of a man and his main values, in Russian). *Sovremennaya obrazovatel'naya praktika i dukhovnye tsennosti obshchestva (Modern Educational Practice and Spiritual Values of Socie*

- ty, in Russian), 2, 16-21.
- Oganyan, K. M., & Branskij, V. P. (2015). *Realizatsiya zakona differentsiatsii i integratsii etnicheskikh stereotipov kak faktor razvitiya mezhkulturnykh vliyaniy. Sotsiologiya kultury: opyt i novye paradigmy* (Implementation of differentiation and integration law of ethnic stereotypes as a factor for developing intercultural impacts. Culture sociology: Experience and new paradigms, in Russian). *Trudy Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta kul'tury (Works of Saint Petersburg State University of Culture, in Russian)*, 206, 385-391.
- Oganyan, K. M., & Oganyan, K. K. (2013). *Sotsialnyi ideal i vybor optimal'nogo puti globalizatsii* (Social ideal and choice of optimal globalization path, in Russian). In V. V. Pavlov, *Global Crisis of Contemporaneity in the Sphere of Mindset? Social Values and Political Interests Correlation. Materials digest of the XXXV International Research and Practice Conference and the III Stage of the Championship in Political, Philosophical and Military Sciences* (pp. 108-112). London. International Academy of Sciences and Higher Education.
- Oganyan, K. M., Branskij, V. P., & Oganyan, K. K. (2013). *Globalizatsiya i obshchechelovecheskaya tsennost'* (Globalization and universal value, in Russian). *Yevraziyskie issledovaniya: aktualnye problemy i perspektivy razvitiya (Eurasian Studies: Actual Problems and Development Prospects, in Russian)*, 89-99.
- Oganyan, K. M., Branskij, V. P., & Oganyan, K. K. (2014). *Sinergeticheskaya filosofiya istorii i filosofiya cheloveka: vvedenie v sinergeticheskuyu teoriyu ideologicheskogo i potrebitelskogo obshchestva* (Synergetic philosophy of history and philosophy of a man: Introduction into synergetic theory of ideological and consumption society, in Russian). *Nauchnaya mysl' – ezhekvartalnyi nauchnyi zhurnal (Scientific Thought – A Quarterly Scientific Journal, in Russian)*, 1(12), 7-13; 2-3(13), 11-20.
- Oganyan, K. M., Branskij, V., Oganyan, & K. K. (2018). *Teoreticheskoe i empiricheskoe obosnovanie sociologicheskogo osmysleniya zhizni s pomoshchyu ponyatiya "superattractor"* (Theoretical and empirical substantiation of the sociological understanding of life using the concept of a super attractor, in Russian). *Sociologia i parvo (Sociology and law, in Russian)*, 1(39), 31-38.
- Oganyan, K. M., Oganyan, K. K., Pyzh, & V., Petrov, S. (2018). The self-organization law of intersubjective ideals: The problem of chaos, order, freedom and liability relationship. *WISDOM*, 11(2), 71-85.
- Oganyan, K. M. (2021). *Filosofia cheloveka* (Human philosophy, in Russian). Moscow: Urajt.
- Ogorodnikov, V. P. (1997a). *Porjadok iz haosa vmesto porjadka?* (Order out of chaos or chaos instead of order?, in Russian). "Chelovek. Filosofija. Gumanizm. Tezisi pervogo rossijskogo filosofskogo kongressa in 7 Vols. (Human. Philosophy. Humanism. Abstracts of the first Russian Philosophical Congress, in Russian) (Vol. 3., pp. 402-406). Saint Petersburg: SPbGU.
- Ogorodnikov, V. P. (1997b). *Celi, istina i svoboda v zizni* (Goal, meaning, truth and freedom in human life, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: PGUPS.
- Ogorodnikov, V. P. (2015). *Monizm i pluralizm?* (Monism or pluralism?, in Russian). *Rossijskij gumanitarnij zhurnal, Socialno-gumanitarnoe znanie (Russian Humanitarian Journal Social and Humanitarian Knowledge, in Russian)*, 4, 50 - 56.
- Pechei, A. (1985). *Chelovecheskie kachestva* (Human qualities, in Russian). Moscow: Progress.
- Prigozhin, I., & Stengers, I. (2003). *Vremja, porjadok, kvant. K resheniu paradoksa vremeni* (Time, order, quantum. To the solution of the time's paradox, in Russian). Moscow: Editorial URSS.