

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

THE TRUTH AND NON-TRUTH OF THE “SOCIAL”. THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN IDENTITY AND COEXISTENCE

Anahit JIJYAN^{1,2*}  | Romik KOCHARYAN^{3,1,2}  | Nerses KOCHARYAN¹ 

1 Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law NAS RA, Yerevan, Armenia

2 Chair of Sociology and Social Work at ASPU, Yerevan, Armenia

3 Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts Yerevan, Armenia

* *Correspondence*

Anahit JIJYAN, Davit Anhakht st., ap. 30, 4, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
E-mail: jijyan@mail.ru

Abstract: The article discusses the concept of the “social”, which is basic for all social sciences and the object of study and perfecting impact. In professional literature, it has been revealed that the concept of the social is determined through predication with other significant phenomena of social life, such as relationships, actions, actors, structures, etc. Authors, in regard to their conception of “wisdom-oriented social science” and concretely of “sociology of wisdom”, suggest their own definition of the “social” as the intention, the image and the fulfilment of the improvement of human existence, coexistence and interaction of human beings as such. The new definition reveals the profound council of wisdom expressing the essential and principally preferable properties of nature, being and inner-perfection of the “social”.

Keywords: the construct of “social”, human identity, human existence, human coexistence, the truth of the “social”, non-truth of the “social”.

Introduction

In modern scientific discussions on the formation, transformation, and use of the conceptual apparatus of sociology, the disclosure of consequences of the so-called “paradigmatic”, ambiguous, and willful application in regard to basic categories, concepts, and scientific terms push into the background the very purpose of scientific study – the question of the true explication of the “social”. In the social-humanities sciences, the postmodern approach often leads to the substitution of scientific judgments by allocution (discourse) and consequently to the denial of both the results of research and the criteria of “scientific” character applied to the conceptual apparatus: authenticity and adequacy, reliability

and validity, necessity and logical connection.

In monographs, textbooks, and articles of social philosophy and sociology as a unique object of study of social science is distinguished as “society as such”, or “social”, or “social relations”, or “social institutions”, or “social structure”, etc... (Giddens, 2006) “Social” is often used as a synonym for the term “communal” and later – “societal”. In definitions, we often encounter identification when “social” is defined by “community” (Collins, 2002).

Discussing the definitions of the terms “social” and “society”, P. I. Smirnov concludes that society should be defined on the basis of the “activity” approach. “Society unites people on the basis of partnership”, and “social” should be considered as an activity partnership of people

(Boronev & Smimov, 2003). According to another interpretation, “social” is the relations of society, which are integrated into the course of joint activity (interaction) of physical persons or individuals in specific conditions of time and place. In such a case, there is a kind of logical tautology when “social” is defined by the notion of “societal” and the opposite (Luhmann, 1997).

There were suggested for the “social” following interpretations in professional discussions:

1. The social is a borderline, general philosophical category, which is called to distinguish the human from the natural (from objects of nature) (Comte, 1974).
2. The social as the antithesis of the individual (Durkheim, 1982),
3. The “social” as the content that a person interprets as social (Tiryakian, 2009),
4. The social as human interactions, relationships, and communication (Parsons, 1951; Sorokin, 1937/2010).

Nevertheless, the definition of “social” is often absent in social science literature, such as monographs, textbooks, and dictionaries, and is perceived as something that exists in itself and needs no definition or interpretation (Shmerlina, 2009). In the social science literature, there is not a unifying and universal definition of the “social”, which is the subject of our contemplation.

Definition and Interpretative Disclosure of the Concept “Social”

The term “social” can be considered as a concrete concept indicating an entity of reality or can be considered as an abstract concept indicating the feature of any entity: human life, society, or culture (Reznik, 1999). “Social” on both sides, “as a concrete” and as an abstract concept, has been used in text culture with its direct and allegorical meanings. In its allegorical meaning, “social” can refer to wildlife - quadrupeds, birds, and even insects, such as bees and ants. And, on the contrary, in the sense of expressing the true identity of the reality or property indicated by it, not in an allegorical sense, but in the very direct sense, it refers to “purely human realities” - just to human coexistence.

In order to interpret the multifaceted function and the meaning of the unifying truth and council of the wisdom of the “social”, it is necessary and

preferable to examine it in its *inner* side of the existence of the *one and same society* in its own state, as well as in the *external* side of the existence of a *variety of societies in different states that enable the coexistence in favourable and supportive conditions* and just in the universal way of life.

In the past and present, the *real life* of nations, the “social”, has been realized differently due to the “true” and/or non-true existence of its essential structural elements, with their defects and faults. “Social” was implemented in the conditions of the *spiritual-civilized achievements and opportunities* of the society at that time as a principal goal, necessary and preferable for the *improvement of the joint and united life of the people*.

These conditions include the following:

- *existing state and public structures*,
- in all these structures, as a potential and an internal tendency, the *present perspective opportunities*,
- initiatives that, through the *education of generations, go beyond existing opportunities, create and increase new perspective opportunities* in the life of society,
- purposeful multi-content “task-oriented” problem system that enables feasible, promoting and providing voluntary inner-self-perfection of human identity, life, culture, life-and culture-creating activities.

Authors in regard to their conception of “wisdom oriented social science” and concretely of “sociology of wisdom” (Jijyan, Kocharyan, & Qocharyan, 2022) – the main goal of social philosophy – offer their own understanding, definition and interpretation of the “social”, aiming to explicate into inter-impaction of human beings the profound council of wisdom in the being of the “social”. The new definition reveals the profound council of wisdom expressing the essential and principally preferable properties of nature, being and inner-perfection of the “social”. The problem of critical contemplation, compared with manifestations of the implemented in real-life “social” – sometimes to a certain extent adequate, sometimes with shortcomings, sometimes with flaws – requires to understand and interpret *the meaning of the truth of the existence of the social as such and the contained in it a council of wisdom*. The very realization of this goal can form a spiritually-civilizational society: free vol-

untarily inner-perfecting ascension of the human identity, life and culture at spirituality, at wisdom and all virtue and good life order (Jijyan, Kocharyan, & Qocharyan, 2021).

It is important to note also that the problems of *revealing the necessary and preferable truth of the “social”*, which are fundamental for the study of the “realities of human life”, actually contain the question of how the *“common and united life of people” emerges and how this process is possible, necessary and preferred*. Due to answers to these questions, it can be possible, in principle, to promote and provide for all individuals, groups and the whole society to live in a virtuous human identity – helped by the inner power of self-perfection – and accordingly, to provide *the well-being of life and culture*, divinely created in the image and likeness of God.

In this regard, it should be noted that not only for the whole of humanity, in which including nations and people, but specifically for the Armenian life in the past and in the present, therefore in the whole social science, in the ancestral social theories and also in the modern disciplines has been and still is *essential and indeed vital* the question about the “social” and by which also about the *“enabling”, “promoting” and “ensuring” of the improvement of the social*.

Compared to family and a group of relatives, “social” means the unity of a greater number of people. The family is the closest grouping with blood, united by the childbearing of the spouses and by the regulation of the spiritual love relationship (Jijyan, Kocharyan, & Kocharyan, 2017). The group of relatives is a family-like structure with the inner subdivision into separate unit families, reunited by the regulation of spiritual love relations, with closest blood ties. For the *emergence* of the “social” and for its very *existence in principle*, it is necessary to have the unity of people and coexistence based on human families with closest blood ties and family-like bigger groups of relatives united by the regulation of spiritual love relations and still with the inner subdivision, again human grouping and life by uniting connections.

Now, if not the principle origin of the “social”, then *a good-order and well-structured society* is a sign of a steadily developing and functioning and improving for the better existence, for which is essential the presence of a *“state” structure that cares about it*. And yet, it is not in

all states and societies that the “social” has been established, functioned and improved in accordance with the truth of its calling, that is, with its true existence, but, on the contrary, with its non-true calling and untrue existence.

In the life of nations, and specifically in Armenian life, the “social” does not always have the *opportunity to develop and improve and/or to be formed by truth and council of wisdom adequate to its calling*. The “social” was established and functioned sometimes with its truth, sometimes with its non-truth, mainly with its truth and non-truth though in principle incompatible, contradictory and inseparable of its qualities, alas, in real life - jointly mixed. The imperfect and, moreover, erroneous and distorted conceptions of the “social” have caused deep social crises in the life of mankind and devastating consequences, and as a culmination, even *genocide*.

For the *emergence and establishment* and for the functioning with self-improving development of the “social” in Armenian life, not always were provided internal and external conditions, which *enable* all that, or, more importantly, *facilitate*, or at most, even *provide* them. *The Armenian Apostolic Church* played a significant role in the case of existence of the Armenian statehood, in the period of the establishment of the “social”, as well in the centuries of its absence, maintaining the operation of the “social” with relatively less power and order.

Let us remember that the Haykyan, Yervandyan, Artashisyan, Arshakunyats, Bagratunyats, then in Cilicia, after the fall of the Rubinian, Hetumyan, and Lusinian kingdoms, and in the time intervals of dynasty shifts, then for centuries the existence of the Armenian nation was essentially conditioned by the unfavourable policy of foreign states. *The Armenian Apostolic Church and the Christian-spiritual Armenian literary-cultural heritage* have realized in a figurative and substantial way the principle, fundamental and radical possibility, necessity and preference for the preservation of the national spiritual-civilizational identity.

Since the creation of printing, especially in the 19th-20th centuries, despite the difficulties, in the conditions of the growth of modern communication opportunities, the *Armenian secular culture* has presented itself in Armenian life with its intensive functions and diversity. Along with the transformation, while preserving the predomi-

nant spiritual function transferred from its ancestral tradition, the Armenian culture, which was already largely secular and branched out, presented itself in Armenian life by its fully inclusive and significant role.

By achieving its multifacetedness and language-communicative accessibility, and in addition to its spiritual and vital significance to all, the Armenian secular culture, together with the preservation of the Armenian spiritual-civilizational identity, has incorporated and activated perspective opportunities for the development of identity and coexistence. In the conditions of the unfavourable policy of foreign states towards the Armenians from the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century until these days, the participation of the “social” was very slight and even negligible *in the issue of the possibility of Armenian life and preservation and development of identity.* Even though there was influential participation of the Church and culture, that is, the effectiveness of activities for creating *the opportunity, encouragement and provision of the present and future existence and development of the human and Armenian Christian spiritual-civilizational identity, way of life and culture through the coexistence in the state based on principles of humanity the structured order was insignificant.*

“Social” in its literal sense is inherent and exists only in the life of intelligent human beings. In the primary and very fundamental sense, “social” *is the existence of human identities.* And with the utmost precision, “social” *is the coexistence of human identities.* With a slightly expanded definition, “social” *is the mutual existence and coexistence of human identities that are facilitates by voluntary choice, mutual opportunities and mutual assistance and perfection of existence.*

By defining “social” in relation to human identities as such, we mean the coexistence of individuals, groups, communities, nations, societies, and the whole of humanity, and thus, the coexistence that enables and contributes to the existence of all human identity, which is improved by the voluntary choice, mutually enables existence and the coexistence, with their multifaceted factors.

But can the notion of “coexistence” define the so-called “social” human reality with precise and exhaustive adequacy? Is the “coexistence” as

such inherent only to human beings? And is this concept the characteristic of human life only? It should be noted that coexistence is, in principle, characteristic of the inanimate, plant and especially animal world also.

The application of the concept of “coexistence” is universal for the entire world, to the whole of nature, to purely human and purely divine realities. The notion of “coexistence” in itself and/or by itself denotes and reveals the all-encompassing, very general order of mutual human existence. Why? This notion, in principle, signifies the *coexistence of all entities*, has *the maximum universality* and can be used to denote the coexistence of humans with all the beings. It presumes the mutual existence of mankind and the whole nature and the universe, the inanimate, flora and fauna, or “*man and others*”, thus, of all personal beings - people, groups, communities and all mankind, of course, Co-existence of God, angels and all-divine realities. In regard to disclosing the peculiarity of the “social”, “coexistence” is the most general concept, so it is necessary to define the “social” by mentioning properties of “coexistence” that eventually define it only as the existence of people with each other that is realized by using the phrase “coexistence of human identities”.

In order to understand the “social” as closely as possible, it is necessary, together with the *possibility* of the existence of man and human life, to discover the peculiarity of human life, which already establishes *unity and continuity*. It is necessary to find concepts in which the characteristic properties just of the coexistence of human beings are directly understood and mentioned.

In order to define the “social” precisely in its maximal correspondence with human nature, it is necessary to express it by such a concept that refers to the improvement of human spiritual-biological vital life to necessary and preferable, beneficial and improving the specific features of the human soul and life. The concepts of “*existentiality*” and “*existence*”, “*communal existence*”, and “*coexistence*” are interesting and noteworthy with the specific content introduced by “*human existence*” as well as “*truly human existence*”.

Indeed, the concept of “existence” is applied and, in principle, applicable only to humans and not to animals and/or plants and the inorganic world. We never do speak of the existence of

earth, air, water, fire, stars, plants, trees, or lions. It can be noticed that the notion of “existence” is in principle applicable not to separate individuals but to personalities, groups, community, nations, societies and humanity.

It can be seen that both the literal and non-allegorical meanings of the terms “existence” and “existentiality” express the special existence of human nature in this world, even though they express the necessity or possibility of applicability that indicates the existence of a number of people. Nevertheless, these concepts do not express the feature that bridges people and establishes a connection and unity, a possibility for people to live together, which is obviously present and evident in the concepts of “communal existence” and “coexistence”.

It can be seen that the concept of “*coexistence*” has a bigger content and narrower extension than the concepts of “*existence*” or/and “*existentiality*”. For example, when we describe or characterize the concept and reality of “*astronauts’ existence*” by emphasizing, firstly, the very life of *astronauts*, and secondly, the peculiarity of their life activity in space, we clearly distinguish it from the concept of “*astronauts’ cohabitation*” and from the reality mentioned by it. This way, we emphasize the peculiarity of the astronaut community’s distinction from the “*coexistence of astronauts*”, which emphasizes the vital activity in space of their alliance with the most effective cooperation.

One can observe and affirm that the notion of “*commonwealth*” has a narrower meaning than the notion of “*coexistence*”. Why? “*Commonwealth*” can describe the coexistence of nations and communities that are not related directly to each other, having as its ontic basis the *natural character* of human existence on the planet.

These concepts could also serve as an *ontological basis*, the *spiritual-civilizational notions* and concepts that represent the *spiritual feelings of “humanity”* and the resulting “*justice*”, the *intentions and ideas of universal values*, in which, of course, the established content of international law on the right to existence and human existence. For example, an Armenian individual or society in Armenia may have with the Eskimos, Icelanders, Finns, New Zealanders, and African nationalities both “*existence*” and “*communal existence*” as “*human and planetary*” existence but may not have “*here and now*” and

even for a while true “*coexistence*” in the absence of direct contact and communication in its existence, lifestyle, and participatory involvement.

Thus, the notion of “*commonality*” can be applied to all persons “*within the same society, under the same state,*” and in other societies under the care of different states. And it can already be seen that the concept of “*sociality*”, being able to refer to the entire population of the planet, has a wider scope and volume than the concept of “*social*”. Why? The reason is that the concept of “*social*” is applicable to *one community or society* and not applicable to all humanity. The concept of “*sociality*” would be an adequate means for the definition of “*social*” when the entire population of the planet would exist and function as a singularly united and whole society with *the same property of the structure that unites* in itself everyone with the “*social*” *spiritual and just mutually and life-supporting liberating feeling and idea*. Meanwhile, the population of the planet has not yet united and does not function as a single and complete society that includes all of mankind, integrating and unifying everyone’s existence and activities with “*social*” and just a sense of spiritual-civilizational feeling and ideas, and with the general property that asserts the existence and cooperation, interacting wholeness of “*we*”.

The concept of “*coexistence*” is an adequate concept for the definition that reveals the nature of the “*social*” and identifies its essential features. Because the concept of “*coexistence*” has a narrower application, it is, in principle, applicable only to the same community or persons living in a society. The same Armenian individual and society, who had only “*communal coexistence*” with people living in other societies and just with other societies, here and now has “*coexistence*” only in the Armenian society, under the care of the state he created.

The concept of “*general coexistence*” and even the narrower concepts of “*way of life*” and “*lifestyle*”, in contrast to the most comprehensive “*general existence*” and “*existence*”, and also to “*societal existence*”, which indicates the closeness of people only, are actually realized through direct contact or culturally mediated *communication with people*. Specifically, “*general coexistence*”, “*way of life*”, and “*lifestyle*” are realized through the *presence in everyday life and cultur-*

al “biosphere” with each other in the spirit of civilization, moral and educational-cultural, social, economic-financial and political interaction and cooperation, in a variety of ways and sizes.

The “social” as such is formed in the condition of the principle possibility of people “uniting” with each other and realizing this possibility. *The possibility and realization of “unity” are fundamental for the establishment of the “social” as such.* “Social” exists and could exist only in the presence of an essential factor that creates and nurtures the possibility of such a *relationship and connection* between people that can provide the necessary and preferable for such existence unity and “continuity” for “social”, with the procedure of its perfection.

What is that fundamental factor that creates and thus brings to the existence or perpetuates the “fundamentally necessary and preferably” improving “unity and continuity” for social existence? Spiritual love unites people while hatred divides. Animals mate and unite, but with purely instinctive specifics, such as the physical relation of the two sexes necessary for their continued existence, the need to find their livelihood in the wild, and to resist other species in the environment – flock, tribe, pack ... forming factors.

In human life, the “social” has as its starting point and intentional purpose in the “*spiritual union of people*”, so it is never limited to a married couple and family. *The “social” expands and is established by an involvement exceeding the connection of married couples and blood relatives within society, community, group association and the whole of humanity, having the potential and the power - now also a noticeable fulfilment - to include the whole of humanity.*

In contrast to the instinctive “physical connection” factor that enables, necessitates and ensures the continuity of existence of animals, the “social” as such is formed by a feature inherent in human life, that is, by “spiritual love”, “love of god”, and “humanity”. “Social” as such assumes mutually supporting moral feelings, a spiritual-civilized idea and a fundamental factor that can ensure the perfecting unity and continuity of the “social”.

Essential for the understanding of the “social” is the “*human interaction*” that weaves the unity of human life, which consists of *interrelation and interaction*. It should be fixed that the factor of the “social” as such, in the absence of spiritual

love, is the reluctance towards others, the *unfriendliness* that manifests itself in the interaction of people, in attitudes, relationships and interactions.

“Unkindness” in human life can be represented in various manifestations, such as “hatred” and “hostility”, and as such, as emotion and action, it destroys, disrupts and annihilates the “social”. In this way, the very idea of the “social” is destroyed - the deliberate intention of the spiritual-civilizational coexistence of all nations and humanity and/or perfection of mutual existence, according to human capacity, thus – forming its image and fulfilment.

It should also be fixed that *the willingness and realization of death to a person fundamentally nullifies the “social” as such.* There can be no union between human identities when they see the possibility and meaning of their existence by the principle condition of the *non-existence* of each other, and therefore the intention of life activity, planning and performance of causing death to one another.

The deadly hatred and the intention, planning and execution of murder destroy the human and humanity, the inner and the truly spiritual, and as a result – just the spirit-corporeal identity, and then the outer and the truly “social” - the common and universal order of life, in short, spiritual-civilizational and moral identity, way of life and coexistence.

Bringing the above together, one can fix the following formula of thought. *The “social” as such is formed by the coexistence of human identities, which also by spirit-giving and life-giving (Kocharyan, 2019) interactivity – interrelation, interrelationship and interaction.*

According to that, the definition of “social” can be formulated as follows:

“Social” as such is the coexistence of human identities, formed by kind humanness and benevolent spirit-giving and the life-giving mutual influence on human identity, life and culture.

In order to understand “social as such”, it is not enough to mean only the *existing* social realities authentically realized. In order to understand the truth of the existence of the “social” as such, it is necessary to consider and study, understand and reveal interpretatively together with the *existing* “social” also the *potential* of the “social” and to perform the study in order of comparison of these two by disclosing the *calling and poten-*

tial of the “social”. This study requires answers to questions what is the *realization* of the “social” in comparison to its calling and potential, does the realization of the “social” correspond to its potential, and in this case, how much do we deal with the *truth-of-being* of the “social” and how much – with the *untruth-of-being*?

The reality defined by the notion of “social” must be understood and interpreted not only from the point of view of “*ontological truth*” but also from the point of view of “*teleological truth*”, that is, by the strong unity of these two complementary components. *The social is the intention, the image and the fulfilment of the improvement of human existence, coexistence and interaction of human beings as such.*

The Former and Current Understanding of the “Social”: The Non-Truth of “Social”

In the ancestral social teachings, even in modern sociological theories, the “society” in that the “social” and the “societal” in their constituents – the legal- and bio-status components of individuals, groups, and communities – have been firmly established and determined by some presumption in which sometimes generalized, that is, with some general psychological prejudice and rational bias. In the life of humankind, which is essentially and significantly maintained in lingual culture and history itself, how became established the constituencies of “social” and “societal” in the ordered living conditions of groups of individuals and communities legalized only by pre-suppositions?

Formerly, in social teachings and sociological theories, the concepts “society”, “societal”, and “social” in their broadest sense were defined by “ancestral” origin and/or by the status of the societal stratum, by the sameness of human spirit-corporeal nature and by the similarity of the identity-forming peculiarities, the conceivable minimum commonness of a self-recognizing and self-determining, self-affirming and self-preserving, and adapting everyone to himself human quality.

In the case of slaves and free men, and landlords... , craftsmen, capitalists and hired workers, all social groups are divided by origin and status, and in the case of all equals have typified and functioned in different social status groups, the

above-presented stereotype presumption of cognition and self-preservation of their *common human identity*. According to this stereotype, everyone who has distinguished himself was seen as separating himself from the given class, social group, community and society, subject to a cautious attitude, deserving rejection and even perverted, who could, in principle, be nominated only for adaptation and this way only the issue of reintegration into society and its social structure.

In this way, natural phenomena and their concepts of *violence*, formation of identical and similar *adaptation*, which also forced coercion, entered into the life of society with a supposed “justification” and had its constant, “inevitable” presence in social teachings and theories of sociology. This stereotype and mechanism of forceful adaptation were in themselves principally non-identical and different in regard to human and cultural identities and caused ungrateful transfiguration, anonymity and non-identity of persons.

People have different gifts, abilities, talents and love and strive to function in life with the perfection of those capacities. And yet, in a given class or stratum of society, forced by their origin or status to adhere nonetheless to the stereotype of adapting, people go and do what does not belong to their nature, which does not correspond to their calling and spiritual abilities. And this is fulfilled to *the least extent of commonality (in all respects and problems, worldviews, understanding, mentalities and performance), being forced to obey this stereotype of adapting.*

Therefore, by acting in a manner inconsistent with their identity and free choice, the human inner world and external functioning are inwardly emptying and fall down to vanity, and afterwards becoming meaningless, the person lives a life not *dear to his soul* way and presents his *own* life to himself and to everyone with disfigurement and impersonality.

Meanwhile, the achievements of the people through their daily life- and culture-creating activities become maximally accessible and are introduced into their lives and social life following their graces and gifts, *acting with maximal condensation of the devotion of love* that, unfortunately, is nullified by persons’ disfigurement and impersonality of their identity and life.

Thus, in the theory and practice of life, human identity is realized as a mere forcibly coerced

adaptation and not a bon-adaptation process in regard to society, in which regarding the minimal commonality characterized by the *sameness* of human spirit-corporeal nature and by the *similarity* of the individuality forming features, resulting in the loss of multi-content spiritual richness of human graces and inner world of personalities and their uniqueness.

Thus, in theory and practice of life, human identity is realized in a society in which the minimum, determined by the identity of human nature and the similarities of soul-like features, is simply a process of resulting in many graces and incompatibilities.

It should be noted that the formula for the basic premise of “*social*” and “*societal*” has a broader scope, referring not only to these concepts but also to the concepts “human identity”, “human society”, “humanity”, and “nation”. The nations, society, humanity and in all these *universal and all-encompassing human identities*, by misunderstanding himself and his function in light of the above-disclosed principle, get a significant loss and just “poverty and hunger” being stripped of fruits of spiritual-civilizational and scientific-cultural achievements created through differentiated individuality of human graces and spiritual love. Thus, by such a misunderstanding of the “social”, they make it difficult and deprive everyone and just themselves of the possibility *to increase and improve themselves with the maximum wealth of spirit-giving and life-giving for spiritual-corporeal existence of human identity, coexistence and culture that can be created and attained by human grace and devotion*. People are also internally afraid and seeing a spiritual danger, they are driven away and pushed back from themselves, from the soul and the spiritual intimacy, while the society caring and looking after their identity – existence and functioning attained by spiritual-civilizational achievements through education and perfection of graces, state and social structures *does not accept and support, facilitate and just ensure* their creative activity and life in the direction of their spiritual love and abilities.

Why has the above-mentioned presumption been so universally established in social practice and theory? *Human nature is universal*, and, what is said about the complete uniqueness of a nation, a society’s common identity, and/or a particular individual’s wholly distinguishing

identity, is said in addition to that *universality*. And when we say “universal” in this case, we mean, in general, the *minimum commonality of the similarity of specific features that build the sameness of spiritual-corporeal nature and the identity as such of all people*, which is inherent to everyone.

Should such a minimum “commonality” be meant and understood when it is said “nation”, “society”, “humanity”, or is it possible, moreover, necessary and preferable that this same “commonality” and the above-mentioned phenomena and their concepts in which also the basic “human identity”, “social” or “societal”, should be understood in some other and just a new way?

The New Understanding of the “Social”: The Truth of the “Social”

The understanding of the “social”, the legalization and the very establishment of that understanding of the connection of human identities and groups as a life order of the society, which was called to ensure the coexistence of people under Abdul Hamid and Young Turks, not only allowed but even ensured the initiation, organization and implementation of the Armenian genocide. Genocide with any way of thinking, nature, form and component should be ruled out. The “social” uniting of different national identities, with its great weakness and distortion, was really the one that enabled, facilitated and secured the genocide, so it was not the case that the genocide could be ruled out by any way of thinking, nature, type of form and component. The connection between all persons must be unifying, and consequently, the inner connection of the “social” must be such as to ensure only a dignified life – for all and each one, with equal rights for access and availability to all goods.

And, of course, the connection between foreign national groups, communities and societies, excluding the weakness and distortion of the “social”, must be unified in such a way that genocide was excluded and impossible, but there were only the *improvement and good order of life through mutually beneficial interaction*. And all the good that is available to one or a certain group and/or to the public should be available to everyone and to all and should be just a dignified

life – for all and each one, with equal rights for access and availability to all goods.

“Social” can be called well-established and well developed in regard to society when society, that is, the union and coexistence of human identities, is established by *humanity* and the resulting *justice*. The accessibility and availability of all goods to one and/ or to any group can create and just creates inequality and just injustice.

Meanwhile, we must be guided by the principle of morality, humanity and human dignity, and in this way, just with the following principle of justice, that *all good that is available and accessible to at least one must be available and accessible to everyone and to all*. This is not only the most important principle of morality but also the principle of equality and legal justice itself, in the legal sphere of social life, in the universal human life order of individuals, society or the whole of humanity.

What is available and accessible to one, according to the Christian commandment and the principle of morality, love your neighbour as yourself, love everyone as yourself, when through social work, political processes ... it becomes accessible and available to everyone, is not it the standard of spiritual-civilizational quality in the life of a society? And isn't it barbaric, ferocious, and just vandalism when mankind, by divine graces, acquires education, health, vitality, and some good for the advancement of human life, whether it be for the sake of some people endowed only with money or power, or with other things and status, monopoly or privilege of functions, or connections, while others and everyone else remain neglected?

We would like to cite here Pope Francis' (2015) words: “Among our tasks as witnesses to the love of Christ is that of giving a voice to the cry of the poor, so that they are not abandoned to the laws of an economy that seems at times to treat people as mere consumers”. Indeed, human rights are not violated only by terrorism, repression or assassination, but also by unfair economic structures that create huge inequalities. Pope Francis is sure that so-called “unrestrained liberalism” only makes the strong stronger and the weak weaker and excludes the most excluded. Modern society needs great freedom and a lot of love. “We need rules of conduct and also, if necessary, direct intervention from the state to correct the more intolerable inequalities”, - right-

eously concluded Pope Francis (Pope Francis, 2015). It should be concluded that Christian sociology is essentially involved in the socio-economic aspects of modern society.

The understanding of the concepts of “human identity”, “social”, and “societal” as well as of “nation”, “human society”, and “humanity” existing in modern social theories and practice needs to be corrected in principle and brought maximally closer to the specific of “*human*”. By what basic idea, what preferred mode should be understood in all above formulas the concepts “human identity”, “nation”, “human society”, “humanity”, and saying “human”, “national”, “social” or “societal”, what meaning is assumed in them, and is this understanding correct, or it is necessary to understand their content in the light and meaning of a new idea with the necessary and preferred utility?

It is necessary and just preferable for the practice of social life, for social science and all social theories to understand and define “society”, “societal”, and “social” from the standpoint of the united concept of *ontological and teleological truth*. Thus, guided by the complementarity and completeness of truth in practice and theory, it provides an opportunity *to understand the community and the fundamental to its phenomenon and concept of “social” with the inclusive generality that philanthropically and caring gathers in itself, preserves, and grows the spiritual wealth of human identities and the very diversity of graces*.

How is such an understanding *possible and founded*? Note that in the case of such an understanding, we get closer to the specific of “human”, which is present in all above discussed concepts. Righteous, as said above, *human nature is universal for all human beings and for all possible and/or forms of communal life that have already taken place*. But “human identity”, and consequently, the concepts “life and culture of identity”, “humanity”, “nation”, “society”, in which “human”, “national”, “social”, or “societal” should be kept in mind, understood and interpretively defined in a *new light* with necessary and preferred utility.

Man's individuality and uniqueness (i.e., singularity or originality) *should be understood as individuality and uniqueness that are present in his person and that complements him with the unity of grace bestowed on him in life and in all*

creative activities. In fairness, human identity is not fully determined by one grace, but rather when defining his identity, life-creating and culture-creative activity, it is necessary to take into account the presence of other graces, and consequently, a specific feature determined by the unity of all these graces of a person and his vital activity. And do not graces, gifts, and acquired abilities interact, enhance and improve each other in human identity, life and all possible activities?

In connection with this question, it is possible to notice that it is inherent in everyone to attain superior good and perfection in the personal way of life as well as in the creative activity by the grace of *striving with love* and by another grace of *the effort of the will*. It is the same for everyone to *be influenced by the possibilities of "investigative thinking" and to further improve* the ability to think with "prudence" and "wisdom" by which to restrain the "rage" and "emotional-sensuous" inner movement from its exaggerated and extreme radical manifestations, to manage and shape the "spiritual feeling" and "courage" and identically also to moderate and refine "sensual desire" movement into the "common sense". Bringing the above together, one can fix the formula. *The individuality and uniqueness of human identity are formed and should be understood precisely as the unity of gifts, represented and improved by their mutual impaction in the inner world and lifestyle of a person.*

By saying "human identity", we mean not only a specific notion that refers to a human person but also a general notion that is applicable to a group, community, nation, society, humanity as a group, society, a "spiritual-civilizational "human identity" of a group, community. "Human identity" and, therefore, its inherent individuality and uniqueness, contained in them and formed by their interaction, becomes *human unity* as a multitude of "*communal identities*" - "nation", "society", "humanity", in which are present and fundamental the "human", "national", "societal" or "social". And it should be noted that in this way, together with various "communal identities" are becoming in the same way as "existence", "communal existence" or "coexistence" and as well the *whole culture* as "national and/or universal culture".

Now, the "human identity", in which its individuality and uniqueness, contained in themselves and formed by their interaction, is becoming,

in the same way, the collective human identity, the whole human life and culture, which in principle and permanently, in the past and from now also in the present, should be necessarily understood and interpreted not as *the minimum commonality* between human beings, determined only by the identity of human nature or by the similarity of spirit-corporeal features, but as *inclusiveness* that is composed and preferably united by *the spiritual richness of the varied graces the identities, life, and cultures* of all that is included into the extension of those concepts. And, of course, saying *the variety of graces*, it is necessary to distinguish them from mental illnesses and injuries, as well as from their results – from moral and behavioural deviations and distortions. Hence, all that can be said about "human identity", "human life", and "culture" is necessary to say in regard to the spiritual richness of the spirit-giving and life-giving "identities" of the variety of graces of all persons, existence and cultures, exactly to a humane assembly intended to wisdom and education of entire goodness and virtue, the intention of perfection and preservation, by performing and implementing council, words and deeds. It is necessary to fix that the understanding of the "social" is fundamental for society. The meaning of the truth as such (i.e., the unity of the truth and good of the existence of the society as such), which is also of the council of wisdom, is based on the understanding of the "social". And the meaning of "social", in the case of this understanding and realization, society does not want to lose anyone, of anyone's individual grace, separate individual grace of any person, group, community, or union. Accordingly, this understanding requires specifying its entire function, including the operation of state and public structures.

All people have graces – born gifted and endowed by nature, or baptized, or acquired through other graces that are multiplied during the fulfilment of their graces. *Graces or the gift of graces are divine in human identity and life, in life-creating and culture-creating activities*. Just the graces are, for sure, the various creative abilities in different fields like philosophy, social sciences, psychology, mathematics, natural sciences, physics, chemistry, and in arts - in music, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc. Along with it, the true graces and perfected by education virtues are godliness, humanity, wisdom, kindness,

mercy etc., which just make it possible in the mentioned above various fields *the preferable fulfilment of creative graces in human life*.

Righteous, how is it possible in philosophy, humanities, social, cultural, historical, and sciences to define the meaning of human identity, in which also of the council of wisdom, if the basis of these studies does not contain the spiritual feelings and ideas of “humanitarianism” and of the arising from it “justice”? How are social teachings, sociology and social work *brought to life with the need and intent for the good order of human coexistence if the activities of the thought and soul* of those studies and researchers are not based on the feelings and ideas of “humanitarianism” and the arising from it “justice”? And if knowledge and science, in principle, do not consider as the target and fulfilment of their inner perfection the disclosure of the true meaning and council of wisdom, how do they present themselves as scientific knowledge and science? Actually, only by discovering and describing the circumstances of realities, and not attaining their power and thus also their significance, the regulation of the being of things and works, thus discovering the regularity and also causes and effects, knowledge and science are presented as merely descriptive and just “proto-knowledge” and “proto-science” rather than knowledge and science of truth and wisdom.

Conclusion

With a new understanding and fulfilment of the “social”, society considers the diversity of human identities endowed with the gift, individuality of graces and their culture creating activities as its *content* and *wealth*, asserting the mutual life-giving its close relations and connection with their identities by self-understanding, structuring and fulfilment of its existence and functioning. According to the new self-understanding of the “social”, the society instils in itself an openness of understanding and care, communication and perception, and establishes in the human being and within it the joint existence of the spiritual and civilizational for enabling and fulfilling the possibility of the internal and external perfection of its vital activity. The understanding of “human”, “national”, “social”, or “societal” in the above presented new light interprets them as a

“universal inclusiveness” of the existence of identities (mutual existence and coexistence) and activities in the general sense of human beings defined by the specific of inner capacities of fulfilled and not fulfilled graces. Accordingly, the socially significant activities of state and non-governmental organizations just this way directly to the realization of those creative, mutually inspiring and life-giving graces and this way provide all people with the opportunity to live by spiritually-civilized identity, having supportive fostering and security.

References

- Boronoev, A. O., & Smirnov, P. I. (2003). *O ponyatiyakh “obschestvo” i “sotsial’noe”* (On the concepts of “society” and “social”, in Russian). *Sociological Research*, 8, 3-11
- Collins, R. (2002). *The sociology of philosophies*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Comte, A. (1974). *The positive philosophy*. New York: AMS Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1982). *The rules of the sociological method*. New York: The Free Press
- Giddens, A. (2006). *Sociology*. (5th ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jijyan, A., Kocharyan, R., & Kocharyan, N. (2017). *Qristoneakan kensakerpi armatorumy’ vorpes y’ntaniqu baroyahogebanakan vitchaki barelavman gortcon* (The rooting of the Christian way of life as a factor in improving the moral and psychological condition of the family, in Armenian). *KATCHAR, Scientific Yearbook*, 318-327. Yerevan: Zangak Publishing House
- Jijyan, A., Kocharyan, R., & Qocharyan, N. (2021). The problem of definition of Christian sociology, *WISDOM*, 20(4), 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v20i4.571>
- Jijyan, A., Kocharyan, R., & Qocharyan, N. (2022). Sociology of wisdom: The present and perspectives. *WISDOM*, 21(1), 66-74. <https://doi.org/10.24231/wisdom.v21i1.747>
- Kocharyan, R. (2019). The conception of the universal twelve dual categories of wis-

- dom in Movses Khorenatsi's doctrine of history. *WISDOM*, 12(1), 74-89.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Pope Francis (2015). *20 memorable quotes from Pope Francis*. Retrieved June 10, 2022 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/09/19-memorable-quotes-from-pope-francis/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CAmong%20our%20tasks%20as%20witnesses,treat%20people%20as%20mere%20consumers.%E2%80%9D>
- Reznik, U. (1999). *Vvedenie v social'muyu teoriyu. Social'naya epistemologiya* (Introduction to social theory. Social epistemology, in Russian). Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies RAS Press.
- Shmerlina, I. A. (2009). *Sotsialnost' i problema smysla: k vyirabotke mezhdistsiplinarnogo ponyatiya* (Sociality and the problem of meaning: Towards the development of an interdisciplinary concept, in Russian). *Epistemologiya & filosofiya nauki (Epistemology & Philosophy of Science, in Russian)*, XXI(3), 137-151.
- Sorokin, P. (1937/2010). *Social and cultural dynamics*. New Jersey: Rutgers-The State University.
- Tiryakian, E. A. (2009). *For Durkheim essays in historical and cultural sociology*. London: Routledge.