UDC 124.4

CHORNA, LYDIA,
PhD in Political Science,
assistant professor of Philosophical Anthropology department
(Kyiv, Ukraine) E-mail: roztam21@gmail.com

IDEAL AS A FUNCTIONAL SYSTEM: THEORETICO-METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Проблема ідеалу залишається у XXI столітті актуальною для дослідження. Взаємовідносини між ідеалом та його практичним втіленням є гострою темою для дискусій в сучасній філософії, політології, теорії державного управління. Мета статті - надати теоретико-методологічний аналіз розуміння ідеалу, розглянути ідеал як функціональну систему. Тому основним методом – є метод системно-структурного аналізу. Сучасне полісистемне бачення проблеми ідеалу базується на теорії динамічних систем, що надає можливість досліджувати ідеал як ідентичність на межі деструкцій, втрати ідентичності та тих процесів, що пов'язані з глобалізацією, з метаекологічним контекстом, з соціокультурними трансформаціями. Діалог культур у глобалізаційних процесах призводить до адаптації однієї культури іншою. «Щеплення» ідеалів часто-густо призводить до перетворення культури, яка колонізує у культуру, яка здатна до адаптації. Формуються ідеали як актори метакультурних відносин, актори цивілізаційного процесу. Це стає запорукою методологічного аналізу ідеалу як функціональної системи.

Ключові слова: ідеал, суспільний ідеал, ідеал як функціональна система, діалог культур.

The category of "ideal" is semantically heavily loaded. It comprises both the understanding of the necessary future, the models, the set-ups, everything that is considered best, essential and regulatory active. At the same time it includes the phenomenon of the individual that carries the universal in itself. The problem of the "ideal" interested thinkers of all times and peoples. Today it remains no less valid for research. Interrelation between ideal and its practical implementation is a much discussed issue in present-day philosophical thought. In this way or another the problem of contemporary social ideal has been treated by every philosopher from antiquity to our day. Understanding social ideals is basic for the philosophical comprehension of human existence. Ideals and purposes, that people or society have, fully determine their future.

This article suggests that the problem of ideal be treated in the context of comprehending the future. Attention will be paid to the analysis of the ambivalency of ideal and the problem of the ideal will be discussed as a functional system.

It is rather difficult to present a full list of authors who dealt with the given problem. Among Ukrainian researchers who devoted their scientific work to the problem of ideal it is possible to name B.Barkov, M.Popovich, T.Rosova, S.Samchuk, V. Shinkaruk et al.

The purpose of the article is to analyse the understanding of ideal in the context of forms of developing the future and examine ideal as a functional system. The

basic method used to research the problem is systemic functional analysis. Ambivalency of ideal is the reason why it is understood in many different ways. On the one hand, it is presented as the ideal, that is the accomplished, that which is constructed in images, norms, specimens and models of the essential and necessary future. On the other hand, it is understood as a stable, established way of life and the ideal construction that is a guarantee of realising and realised harmony in various spheres of culture, from ethic, artistic, aesthetic up to juridical, legal standards that are of precise instructive character. But the very approach to ideal as a functional system shows that ideal is determined within the realm of sociopragmatics. It is examined within the social system oriented to a certain user, to a certain social community which in one way or another legitimizes this ideal and sees in it their purpose, target and goal. It is in some way oriented to the regulatory functions that implement this ideal.

The concept of "functional system", as is known, was first discussed by neurophysiologists. Anohin, e.g., singles out such mechanisms as action acceptor [1]. But it is important to widen the meaning of functional system, from the concept in which the boundaries, horizons and selfrealization indicate space-time continuum, to the concept of "functional system of culture".

It means that culture can also be interpreted as a certain social system in which there function mechanisms of some prevision of the future and this future is a polysystemic unity for it is described in the context of different systems. These systems embrace the spheres of art, ethics and aesthetics. In other words, we at once get into the context where systemic analysis becomes polisystemic and functionality is widely interpretered as a project, as a system of purpose setting and a mechanism of identifying purpose setting and purpose realization which in advance are formed as an ideal, as a model of the necessary future which becomes a system creating source and a guarantee for the functioning of various systems in the socium.

P. Anohin writes: nowadays the development of some concrete scientific disciplines sets the task of researching specific forms of space-time structure of the world on different levels of matter organization, in particular, on the level of living matter. The world space-time structure is the basis on which prehistoric life acquires its basic qualities and living creatures get the qualities which make them adaptive in the process of their evolution up to the highest stage – the human being [1.p.7].

That is, philosophic aspects of a functional system are discussed mainly as types of man's system of adaptation to space-time continuum, meaning it as a unity of social time and space which is fixed in various forms of activity. This makes it necessary to define the specific features of the world time structure which became a sort of a categorical imperative for the development of life on Earth [1,p.8]. Here Anohin uses Kant's category of 'categorical imperative' not because it appears to be a good metaphore but because ideal always exists as a certain normative base, a certain system of purposes or a nucleus of purpose setting, thus creating a certain possibility of realization which may be defined as imperative, i.e. assigned, and which is described in the system of social prediction and purpose realization as a project.

Project is interpreted in a rather wide sense. It is defined as an activity mechanism of all living creatures, which even on the level of a cell works as an action acceptor. It is also interpreted as activity of purpose setting, which denotes a certain overpurpose of human existence. This overpurpose is in some way connected with the nucleus or with the system of purposes that defines a polysystemic whole and which creates a universal unity of systems of human existence or of cultural practices as action mechanisms of the functional system of culture.

Anohin states that the system of purpose setting in anticipating the future and a certain vision of the future as the accomplished is a rhythm, a cyclical mode, thanks to which the organism adapts to certain extreme phases of development. This cyclical mode makes it possible to enter the space-time context of the existence of the system, which provides the possibility for the chronotop to exist, i.e., to understand space-time as a life cycle and thus develop the strategy of adaptation and survival. But if to speak about the functional system within the boundaries of culture, adaption alone is not enough. No doubt adaptation is important as oriented activity, but besides adaptation there exists another reality of remaking and transforming space-time relations. That other reality provides even more than that, it opens the way for the creation of a new product, a new continuum and a new chronotop which in fact becomes a new chronotop of culture or of those cultural practices within which new temporalities of human activity are realized.

P. Anohin writes: in the history of civilization it is difficult to pinpoint the moment when the idea of the wholeness and unity of the world arose. Probably when a thinking man first tried to understand the world he came across the beautiful harmony between the whole, the universe and separate parts and details. But due to the nature of the human mind man has always had to deal with the with his immediate competitive surrounding, with a certain niche of division. And this creates those concrete images that influence the activity of knowing the world [1, p.49].

Thus, it is about what is universe. Ideal itself can also be understood as a universe, a projection of the ideal on the world, meaning the ideal as " all possible and impossible worlds", if to understand the universe according to S.Crimsky [3;4]. It is the universe, as a projection on the world of the ideal of all possible and impossible worlds, that realizes the complex dichotomy of idea and reality. It is the universe that brings forth the ideal as a definition of consciousness, as that which denotes purpose, target, modes of purpose setting and foresees the future result and it also designates all those artifacts of culture that become the carriers of that ideal. This is not only the consciousness of man. It is also separate images, specimens and norms verbalized and realized in represented constructions, in certain acts of purpose setting in whatever form. They can even be embodied in a subtle form, in a form of a jesture, a form, defining a volition imperative. But it all testifies to the fact that there appears an image which can be called a universe. As it is, the difficulty of today's interpretation of ideal and the ideal consists of the fact that the world around us is no longer a universe. It is a multiverse, as there exist many universal systems, and a lot of interpretations of the universe. There are many possibilities to find wholeness on the level of metaconstructions and these metaconstructions can no longer bear the arising overstress. That is why, there again appears a temptation to turn to

protosubstances – be it nature, spirit, activity or the absolute in the form of a heavenly source. Or on the contrary – to define ideal quite nominalistically as a realized construction, which is presented in a single thing, in the imperative jesture of human volition, purpose setting which is fixed as a norm, as a standard, as a cliché, as a canon and as a rule that can be understood either in the system of deviating from following it, or in the system of singleminded imperative recognition of the rule. It is possible to say that all the set of these considerations raises the problem of polyfunctionality of ideal, where not only one function is realized, but there appears a vector of functional selfrealization of ideal as a certain problem of adequacy or adequacies to ideal in the context of a multiverse, in the context of those universal intentions, those universal motives that exist in culture in the complex expanse of space-time temporalities of the ideal. P.Anohin writes: supporters of a system approach stress it more and more that the system itself is that isomorphic principle that pierces, passes through all borders that have historically appeared between different sciences, no matter that these sciences deal with different at first sight classes of phenomena – organisms, society, machines [1,p.50].

It is for a reason that the author gives rather a capacious character to the class of phenomena – organisms, society and machines. It is possible to interpret society as a mechanism, organism as a mechanism and vice versa. These are all quite capacious metaphors and constructions, beginning with Lametry and to mechanicism and industrialism, to the interpretation of a machine of desires in the postmodernist discourse. They testify to the fact that purpose setting and ideal as a functional system carry in itself the image of mechanicism, i.e. same type schemes, mapschemes or adaptive principles and regulators of people in the socium. Ideal carries in itself features of an organism as a systemity.

If to treat socium as a unity of the organismic and the mechanistic, and there have been quite a lot of such attempts to present it as an interpretative scheme, it makes it possible to define ideal as some matrix creating a model which together with the activity and functionality of a machine, i.e. of a functional mechanism, performs certain normative actions. As a an organism it also carries in itself a certain evolutionary branch, a folded code which is denoted in various ways. Most often it is presented within the context of preformism as a kind of a folded historical process of the existence of organisms in history, culture and socium. All of it, in this way or another, is filled with the definition of harmony which on the wide sociocultural material acquires its organismic or mechanistic features that connect it with the mechanism of determination. Whether we want it or not, civilization is getting more and more industrialized. It comes to dialogue relations of man and nature, man and machine, man and all functionally acting devices where man in some measure plays the role of either an organism, or a machine, or a quantum of socium. The latter becomes the carrier of the very sociality and ideality that we connect with various differentially structured ideals: ethic, aesthetic, legal, political etc. Thus a fuctional system is first of all connected with the system of activity. The questions, that must be decided in the context of activity, are as follows: What result must be achieved? In what way must this result be achieved? With the help of what mechanisms must

this result be achieved? How can the system be sure of getting the achieved result?[1, p.70].

Thus the functional system is a system of activity acts and of the verification necessary for its adequate functioning. But if we try to widen the category of functional system to sociopragmatics, to the functioning of cultural structures and subcultures that realize the function of ideal, such statements are certainly not enough. To widen the concept of functional system, as an independent scientific term, to the level of a sociocultural matrix of a polysystemic reality of purpose setting and purpose realization in the realm of culture. It is by all means necessary in the frame of a system or a polysystem to draw up a model of the culture itself and then, starting from this model turn to defining its systemcreating components, and develop its functional mechanisms. It is the mechanisms which already deliver us from the notorious functionality of the era of Modernity that was characteristic of the vanguard, structuralism, functionality of social systems, which is also defined within mechanical determinism as some adaptivity matrix, that defines functionality itself more widely within integrative processes . These processes in the contemporary setting, particularly in the context of postsoviet space, undergo difficulties in changing and adapting to other systemic factors which are connected with modernization, transformation, transit and other mechanisms of carrying over systemic quality from other systems into the systems of those cultures which are at a deadlock when functioning in the so called communist ideal. It is all this context that will be our problem field of describing and interpreting the phenomenon of the ideal as the functional, i.e. a polyfunctional whole in the frame of polysystemic analysis of sociocultural practices.

But if to turn to the system activity interpretation of culture it is worth while to address the work of Kyiv philosophical school in which the category of "activity" has undergone a complex transformation. The very complex of purpose setting remained systemcreating where simple components of labour, according to Marx, labour itself, instruments of labour and its result were interpreted as purpose, method and achievement of the purpose, i.e they were interpreted as the very result which was defined as the object of labour before the activity itself. In time the subject of labour, the subject of activity, which was first of all defined as a carrier of all sociocultural potential, as a certain universe, according to S.Crimsky; instruments of labour, which looked like a full-blooded palette of all instruments of culture creation and already motivated result, in which the precondition of its achievement was fixed as a polysystemic whole. All this is a real achievement. It widens the activity of purpose setting in the space of cultural artifacts and systemically enriches the model of the future.

Still it is important to mention that culture is not only activity. It embraces the sphere of state, which is connected with sensibility and with the aesthetic aspect as sensitive activity. It is also connected with the sphere of motivation, the sphere of behaviour which is tied with morals, ethics, and generally with the categorical imperative which Kant describes as a necessary condition of behavioural action space of selfrealization in any kind of activity. If it is so, there arises a problem – which of these components – behaviour, state, activity - is systemcreating. Many scientists

tried to prove that the first stage of culture formation was not activity but behaviour. This is the opinion of L.Gumilev, who writes that all archaic cultures began with taboo systems, i.e. a behavioural complex, with a system of initiation – transferring from one social whole to another gave the possibility to realize tabooed behaviour, whereas activity system was already determined by this behavioural complex [2].

State began to take shape as an overreality of culture rather late and the greatest attention to the transformation of states, their formation and definition took place in Middle Ages. Activity as the main formcreating principle appears in the first interactive civilization as a systemforming code. This civilization was Antiquity. Thus, T.Petrov designates nominal cultural social codes in archaic cultures, and in European culture he points out professional social codes which testifies to the detailed system of activity as a marker of culture per se [6]. As can be seen, this analysis already testifies to the fact that culture in its evolutional space, i.e. in the chronotop of culture creation, was not homogeneous. It was not totally determined by any one factor of culture creation. The same can be said about ideal, which can be described as an ideal of activity, an ideal of state, an ideal of behaviour. It is also that subjective principle, the carrier, the motive, which was achieved in these spheres and was predominate. It is possible to state that there was a period when the expression of culture was in essence substantial - and it is analysed in various conceptions: in different systems of idealism that start from Antiquity, where spirit, eidos, ideal and the ideal per se is the sructurizing principle of matter. In materialism (marxism) the structurizing principle is activity. Later there appears postinterpretation, in which substantilism returns. V.Bichkov, e.g., develops the theory of postculture which is first of all a possibility of producing and of carrying ideal, " the great other", the absolute. If a culture loses these qualities, it in fact, loses what is called culture, i.e. it becomes postculture. But such substantialism demonstrates a certain archaization of culture.

In Chinese philosophy there is another vision of culture which differs from substantialism. This model may be called phenomenological. It is presented in the works of V.Shinkaruk, S.Crimsky, V.Ivanov, E. Bistritsky. In their presentation culture is a phenomenon in which man is given light. It is not simply a space-time continuum, as Anohin states. It is not simply all the variety of developed activity which is the basic principle of the marxist approach to the interpretation of culture. It is a place, the place of the European paradigm where man is possible. Following Heraclitus, M. Heidegger explains ethos as a place in which a deity is possible.[10] He states that it is the predication of the ethic in culture, beginning from antiquity, that is shaped as a place. The same concept may be found even earlier – in the culture of Mesopotamia. We can see an interesting situation: exchange of places, paradigm of the exchange of places, production of places – this is the principle of European culture that testifies to the interact. If that is so, the first place is allotted to the volitional active Man. It is for a reason that Heidegger writes that the first atom bomb exploded in Parmenides' poem "About Nature", i.e. Man became volitional, active, able to change the world.

This is the source of the problems that are described by E.Moren, one of the researchers of great systems, director of Strategic Research Institute, France. He

states that the order of nature is much better than the order of man [5]. All post postmodernist paradigm is a new wave of returning to nature. But it is a returning which is enriched with determinism, with computer electronic revolution, when man begins to probe not only his own area of the conscious and the subconscious but also the sacred of the sacred - the creative laboratory space of natural foundations of existence, the space of the cell. Man tries to see those innovative processes which take place on the microlevel and interpret them in the context of present-day reading. Thus it is an attempt to adapt project as a purpose setting activity to those bi-furcations, to those creative motivating processes which realize themselves automatically, if to spread the mechanistic principle of determinism to nature. It is that final model principle which is connected with the so called fractal type systems, i.e. oriented to microintervals of existence and with the so called genetic algorhythm when the genetic algorhythm, which in fact creates the image, is shaped in the project activity.

We find ourselves in an interesting stage of the the new postpositivism. We are forced to be oriented not to the transcendental projects of the German classics and to the marxist sociopragmatics with its economic determinism . Niether are we to take into consideration the well-known ethic and aesthetic structures of the ideal which are rather well described in the systems of Schelling's transcendental idealism or in I.Kant's, and later Hegel's system of critique [7;8;9]. We can only state that sociopragmatics of the ideal, as a functional system, becomes the dimension that is now being formed in the context of the algorhythm search for the ideal or ideal as a multiverse, as a polymodal system which is forming as a polysystemic whole in the context of various subsystems of culture.

At the beginning of the XXI century the present-day vision of the problem of ideal is based on the theory of dynamic systems. Today it is necessary to study ideal as an identity on the border of destruction or loss of identity - all those processes that are connected with globalization, ecology and that metaecological context that testifies to the rather complex sociocutural transformations. The latter are based on the dialogue of cultures and globalization processes which bring forth adaptation of one culture by another, to inculcation of ideals, principles and norms. It brings about transformation of a colonizing culture into a culture that is able to adapt. It brings about creation of new subcultural realities which demand not only formulation of new programmes and projects but lead to the suggestion of new ideals as actors of metacultural relations. They become actors of the general civilization process where ideal, as an ambivalent whole, which unites in itself a dichotomy, still keeps universal polyvalency, i.e. a pull to the universal, which in any dimensions preserves the possibility of the whole. It creates that antiethics of ideal, of its functioning and of its ideal quality that becomes the pledge of today's methodological analysis of ideal as a functional system and of ideal as prevision of the future.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Анохин П.К. Философские аспекты теории функциональной системы. Избр. Труды. — М.: Наука, 1978. — 388 с.

2. Гумилев Л.Н. Этногенез и биосфера земли / Лев Николаевич Гумилев. – М.: ДИ – КАРТ, 1993. – 503 с.

3. Крымский С.Б. Эпистемиология культуры / Б. С. Крымский, Б.А. Парахонский, В. М. Мейзерский. – К. : Наукова думка, 1993. – 216с.
4. Крымский С.Б. Философия как путь человечности и надежды / Сергей Борисович Крымский. – К. : Курс, 2000. – 308 с.

5. Морен Э. Метод. Природа Природы / Эдгар Морен ; пер. с фр. Е.Н. Князевой. – М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2005. – 464 с.

6. Петров М. К. Язык, знак, культура / Михаил Константинович Петров. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 328 с.

7. Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Вчення про людину у філософії Йогана Готліба Фіхте / Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Актуальні проблеми філософії та соціології.- №1.- 2014. – С.16-20.

8. Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Культуротворче осягнення людини у філософії Іммануїла Канта / Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Гілея: Збірник наукових праць / гол. ред. В.М. Вашкевич. – К.: ВІР УАН, 2013. – Вип. 72 (№ 5). – С. 658 – 664.

9. Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Філософська система Гегеля як вчення про етапи розвитку Абсолютної Ідеї / Розова Т.В., Чорна Л.В. Гілея: Збірник наукових праць / гол.ред. В.М. Вашкевич. – К.: ВІР УАН, 2015. – Вип. 93 (№2). – С.226-233.

10. Хайдеггер М. Время и бытие / Мартин Хайдеггер. – М.: Республика, 1993. – 448 с.

REFERENCES

1. Anohin P.K. Filosofskie aspekty teorii funkcional'noj sistemy. [Philosophical Aspects of the Functional System Theory] Izbr. Trudy [Selected Works]. Moscow: Nauka, 1978, 388p. [in Russian].

2. Gumilev L.N. Etnogenez i biosfera zemli. Lev Nikolaevich Gumilev. [Ethnogenesis and Biosphere of the Earth]. Moscow: DI – KART, 1993, 503p. [in Russian].

3. Krymskij S.B. Epistemiologiya kul'tury. B.S. Krymskij, B.A. Parahonskij, V.M. Mejzerskij. [Epistemology of Culture]. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1993, 216p. [in Russian]

4. Krymskij S.B. Filosofiya kak put' chelovechnosti i nadezhdy / Sergej Borisovich Krymskij. [Philosophy as a Way of Humanity and Hope]. Kiev: Kurs, 2000. 308 p. [in Russian]

5. Moren E. Metod: Priroda Prirody. Edgar Morin [The Method: The Nature of Nature]; translated from French by E.N. Knyazeva. Moscow: Progress-Tradiciya, 2005, 464 p. [in Russian].

6. Petrov M.K. Yazyk, znak, kul'tura. Mikhail Konstantinovich Petrov. [Language, Sign, Culture]. Moscow: Nauka, 1991, 328 p. [in Russian].

7. Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. Vchennia pro liudynu u filosofii Yohana Hotliba Fikhte. Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. [The Doctrine of Human in the Philosophy of Johann Gottlieb Fichte]. Aktualni problemy filosofii ta sotsiolohii, [Actual Problems of Philosophy and Sociology], 2014, No.11, pp.16-20. [in Ukrainian].

8. Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. Kulturotvorche osiahnennia liudyny u filosofii Immanuila Kanta / Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. Rozova, T.V., Chorna, L.V. [The Culture-creative Comprehension of a Man in the Philosophy of Immanuel Kant] Hileya: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats [Hileya: Collected papers, Editor-in-Chief V.M. Vashkevych]. Kyiv: VIR UAN, 2013, Vol. 72 (No 5), pp. 658 – 664. [in Ukrainian].

9. Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. Filosofska systema Hehelia yak vchennia pro etapy rozvytku Absoliutnoi Idei. Rozova T.V., Chorna L.V. [Hegel's Philosophical System as the Doctrine of Evolution Stages of the Absolute Idea] Hileya: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats [Hileya: Collected papers, Editor-in-Chief V.M. Vashkevych]. Kyiv: VIR UAN, 2013, Vol. 93 (No2), pp. 226 – 233. [in Ukrainian].

10. Haidegger M. Vremia y bitye. Martin Heidegger. [Being and Time]. Moscow: Respublyka, 1993, 448 p. [in Russian]

ЧЕРНАЯ Л.В., кандидат политических нуак, доцент, докторант Национальной Академии государственного управления (Киев, Украина) E-mail: roztam21@gmail.com

ИДЕАЛ КАК ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ СИСТЕМА: ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Проблема идеала остается в XXI веке актуальной для исследования. Взаимосвязь между идеалом и его практическим воплощением является острой темой для дискуссий в современной философии, политологии, теории государственного управления. Цель статьи – дать теоретико-методологический анализ понимания идеала, рассмотреть идеал как функциональную систему. Поэтому основным методом исследования есть метод системно-структурного анализа. Современное полисистемное видение проблемы идеала базируется на теории динамических систем, что дает возможность исследовать идеал как идентичность на границе деструкций, утраты идентичности и тех процессов, которые связаны с глобализацией, с метаэкологическим контекстом, с социокультурными трансформациями. Диалог культур в глобализационных процессах ведет к адаптации одной культуры другой. «Прививка» идеалов нередко приводит к перевоплощению культуры, которая колонизирует, в культуру, которая способна к адаптации. Формируются идеалы как акторы метакультурных отношений, акторы цивилизационного процесса. Это дает возможность методологического анализа идеала как функциональной системы.

Ключевые слова: идеал, общественный идеал, идеал как функциональная система, диалог культур.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 10.03.16 р.
Рекомендовано до друку 15.03.16 р.