2-2. Basis for a multicultural dialog of civilizations about harmonious peace

TETRASOCIOLOGY: FROM A SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION THROUGH DIALOG TO UNIVERSAL VALUES AND HARMONY

presented in English, Russian, and Esperanto

by
Leo Semashko

and dialog contributors
Bernard Phillips, Reimon Bachika, Alexander Yuriev, Martha Ross DeWitt, Hilarie Roseman, Valerie Isaev, Ann Butkevich, Boris Kondratiev, Valeria Cvetkova, Bernd Hornung, Bernard Scott, Vladimir Kavtorin, Michael Lebedinsky, and Maria Abolskaya

WITH FAITH THAT SPHERE CLASSES WILL BRING HARMONY TO NATIONS.

SAINT-PETERSBURG
SPBSTU Publishing House
2003

DEDICATED to the

fond memory of my mother Augusta,

St.-Petersburg's 300th Anniversary,

and

the 36th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology
Beijing, China, July 7-11, 2004

Semashko, Leo M.
and dialog contributors
Phillips, Bernard; Bachika, Reimon; Yuriev, Alexander; DeWitt, Martha Ross; Roseman, Hilarie; Isaev, Valerie; Butkevich, Ann; Kondratiev, Boris; Cvetkova, Valeria; Hornung, Bernd; Scott, Bernard; Kavtorin, Vladimir; Lebedinsky, Michael; and Abolskaya, Maria.

TETRASOCIOLOGY: FROM A SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION THROUGH DIALOG TO UNIVERSAL VALUES AND HARMONY

First publishing in Russia 2003
St.-Petersburg State Technical University
29, Polytechnicheskaya st.,
St.-Petersburg, 195251, Russia

Editor of the English book: Martha Ross DeWitt, PhD, Sociology, Research consultant, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

ISBN 5-7422-0445-X

Leo M. Semashko, Ph.D., A/Professor, member of the ISA, Director of the Private Institute of Strategic Sphere (Tetrasociological) Studies, St. Petersburg, Russia.

Abstract

This book's central theme is multicultural dialog, a dialog of civilizations, religions, and languages that begins with a dialog of sociological theories, representing different philosophical platforms. Tetrasociology represents one such platform. The book is unique in content and form. The content is unique because the book contains ten essays about, and dialogs with, tetrasociological theory. The dialogs are written by contributors from four continents, representing different cultures and social philosophies. Tetrasociology, which theorizes a multi-dimensional model of the social world, in 24 dimensions of four-dimensional metrics, is treated as one topic for multicultural dialog. Tetrasociology is comparable with other humanitarian disciplines, and many others have joined in a dialogical discussion with this theory.

The book is unique in form because it is published in three different languages simultaneously:

Russian, English, and Esperanto. The fact that translations in three languages are bound in one volume supplements our theoretical dialog with a dialog of languages, especially international languages. This book gives birth to a new genre of academic, humanitarian literature, which might be called a "dialogical genre." A dialog of ideas, combined with a dialog of languages, creates a qualitatively new, multi-dimensional cultural artefact. It allows the readers' perception to be interactive, widens its scope, and enriches and stimulates the creative imagination.

The book is intended for social science and humanities scholars, but also for a wide audience with humanitarian interests and imaginations.

CONTENTS

2.12. "Dialog among civilizations: Key to a safe future." Press release of the International Conference. 23-26 April 2003, Warsaw
2.13. The International Publishing Project: Multicultural Dialog of Languages, Communications, Beliefs, and Worldviews (LCBW). Conception

PREFACE. Clash or dialog?

S.Huntington, at the end of the 20th century, offered a hypothesis about the inevitability of a clash of civilizations and the certainty of civilizational conflicts in the 21st century. He regarded it as the highest point, a consummation of global conflicts. The clash of civilizations is a conflict between cultures, religions, languages, and the communities that carry them.

Tetrasociological theory is presented as an alternative to Huntington's thesis. It argues that civilizations can and should make efforts to achieve social harmony through a permanent dialog among themselves. Huntington's narrowly focussed, conflict-centered approach goes no further than to accept the status quo of the traditional confrontation of civilizations, and to extrapolate certainty of their anticipated clash. In contrast, the multi-dimensional, tetrasociological approach discovers, in different civilizations, common foundations and structures aspiring for social harmony, and precluding confrontations. A mechanism of self-consciousness insight, *dialog* is championed by tetrasociology as an instrument for discovering these commonalties and structures, and thereby preventing clashes between civilizations. However, this is a special kind of dialog. It proceeds along multiple lines, between different civilizations, cultures, religions, languages, ideologies, and theories, and therefore it is *multicultural*. From a tetrasociological viewpoint, any confrontation, global or local, is a sign of the absence or deficit of multicultural dialog. Tetrasociology is a proponent of multicultural dialog, and of societal foundations and forces of civilizations that aspire to ensure social harmony and peace. Thus, our book of dialogs takes issue with S.Huntington's theory, and offers for discussion alternative indicators of civilizational classes, whose orientation is to guarantee social harmony and lasting peace.

Confrontations and clashes of cultures lead to wars and mutual destruction of humankind. Inter-cultural dialog appears as the alternative, and a road to humankind's survival. However, this road is much more difficult than its opposite. Killing and making war is easier than preserving peace and creating harmony. In conflicts, the scales are still usually tipped in favor of military solutions rather than peaceful dialog. Hawks vanquish doves. For "doves of dialog" to win over "war hawks," dialog needs new, powerful social actions, and projects with practical relevance. One of these - the International Publishing Project - is described in our prolog. Our book begins to carry out the conception of this project.

Inter-civilizational dialog is becoming a powerful presence in international affairs. The United Nations announced 2003 the "Year for Dialog among Civilizations," and UNESCO, a UN branch, held an international conference: "Dialogue Between Civilizations - Key to a Safe Future" in Warsaw, April 23 - 26. An international "Academy of Dialog" was initiated at this conference. Earlier, the UN founded the International Center for Dialog between Civilizations in Tehran, Iran, and also instituted a UN prize "Ambassador of Dialog."

Multicultural dialog is polyfunctional. Psychologically, it encourages a more thoughtful attitude toward other cultures and a more sensitive appreciation of them. Intellectually, it promotes mutual understanding, awareness of general and specific problems of nations, and comparison of different cultures' strengths. Politically, it encourages equal rights. Morally, it re-affirms the highest moral values of peace, non-violence, justice, humanism, fellowship, harmony, and freedom. Socially, it promotes

racial and national equality, and mutual enrichment and development. With regard to the humanities, it is interdisciplinary and builds bridges between the disciplines. These functions, which counteract tendencies toward conflict, are explored further in our book.

You are holding a book of dialogs, unusual in content and form, written by 15 authors from four continents, and focused on tetrasociology as a theoretical platform for potential dialogs among civilizations. The book is special in form because three translations of the text - Russian, English, and Esperanto - are combined in one volume. It is special in content because it includes ten commentary-dialogs with tetrasociology from the positions of different social theories. Both features serve one goal - to provide a dialog that taps into the spiritual foundations of civilizations. Our book-dialog is a small-scale model of the spiritual dialog of civilizations, including such aspects as linguistic, humanistic, ideological, value-centred, sociophilosophical, communicative, academic, and interdisciplinary.

The structure of this book-dialog has two relatively autonomous aspects: linguistic and substantive. Linguistically, the book is presented in three languages: Russian (the primary author's mother tongue), English, and Esperanto, to include two different languages of international communication. Because the problem of a single international language is far from being solved, and the English language's spontaneous worldwide sprawl causes a lot of social, cultural, political and economic problems, the comparison and dialog of international languages is of paramount importance. There is no instant solution to the problem of an international language. It will take decades and possibly centuries to solve it. One effective way to handle this problem is continuous comparison of languages, which is possible in multi-language editions, and should habituate readers to comparing the strengths and weaknesses of different languages, to be able to make an enlightened choice between them. Imposing one language on international interlocutors, abolishing linguistic choice in international communication, is undemocratic, unjust and inhumane.

Publication of various series of multi-language book-dialogs, which, like ours, contain, along with a national language, translations into two international languages, will be tantamount to pursuing a democratic linguistic policy worldwide. The foremost objective of this policy is to affirm international bilinguism, and to recognize Esperanto as an international language. Certainly, this goal can be achieved under the aegis of the most influential among international organizations, the United Nations and UNESCO. For two international languages to compete, they must be placed in an equal position in at least one aspect. Publication of multi-language book-dialogs creates such an equality, albeit in an as yet limited, but very important domain of cultural dialog. And the linguistic structure of our book-dialog helps to accomplish this mission.

Another goal of the book is to persuasively demonstrate to every reader that Esperanto has capacities that are comparable to those of other languages, and in no way inferior to them. Esperanto has long been accused of having failed to become a language of science, lacking the ability to render complex scientific ideas. Our book-dialog, composed of the most complex humanitarian texts in psychology, philosophy, sociology, socionics, sociocybernetics, and axiology, translated into Esperanto, demonstrates that Esperanto is in no way inferior to the Russian or English languages, and is fairly superior to them in grammatical simplicity and accessibility. Faced with new academic trends, with new terminology, especially in tetrasociology, Esperanto successfully assimilates it, and this enriches Esperanto and expands its range of applicability. The unity of novel academic (tetrasociology), religious (Bahai), linguistic (Esperanto) and other trends not only enriches and promotes the advancement of each, but also brings us nearer to social harmony.

Content wise, the book consists of three parts: 1. Summary of the subject - tetrasociology as a postpluralist theory and platform for dialog; 2. Dialogs with tetrasociology; 3. Potential dialogs.

In the first part, the primary author recaps the basics of tetrasociology as a postpluralist trend,

i.e. as a social ideology that is broad and multi-dimensional, although having a definite number of foundations, that is, four. Tetrasociology is discussed as a theoretical and values-centred platform for multicultural dialog. To provide an illustration, and to show tetrasociology's new facets, part one also contains 14 abstracts written for different panels of the 36th World Congress of the International Institution of Sociology, to be held July 7 - 11, 2004, in Bejing, China. (The Congress was scheduled for July, 2003, but has been postponed for a year because of the SARS epidemic.)

In the second, central, part of the book, the following social theories join the dialog with tetrasociology: interactive (web) approach (B.Phillips), universal values (R.Bachika), political psychology (A.I.Yuriev), social action and transformation (M.R.DeWitt), communications (H.Roseman), socionics (V.Isaev), sociocybernetics (B.Hornung, B.Scott), general academic approach (V.V.Kavtorin), social philosophy (M.Yu.Lebedinsky), and Esperantology and interlinguistics (A.P.Butkevich, B.V.Kondratiev, V.P.Tsvetkova). These theories are represented in respective commentary-dialogs. So, readers of the book, too, join the multi-dimensional, sophisticated dialog, and get a knowledge of not only tetrasociology, but also of nine other theories, with constructive critiques of tetrasociology from each of these varied perspectives.

It was initially planned that every commentary-dialog would contain four sections: an account of the reviewer's own theoretical stance, an analysis of tetrasociology's merits, a criticism of its weaknesses, and possibilities of a synthesis with the reviewer's theory. However, not every dialog conforms to this pattern. All differ in content, complexity, emphasis, and the author's individual style. This makes the book quite varied, and interesting for a wide range of not only social scientists, but non-specialist readers, and especially students.

It should be emphasized that editing and publishing the book involved a complex dialog between the primary author and contributing authors, a dialog of different theories, cultures and ideologies, stimulating for the development of each. The range of participants in this book-dialog is quite broad: from Marxists to proponents of the newest, postpluralistic theories. The range of sociohumanitarian disciplines presented in the book is likewise inclusive: philosophy, sociology, psychology, socionics, sociocybernetics, axiology, Esperantology. Our book, rather than complete, merely starts the dialog, so it does not contain replies of the primary author to contributors, or a discussion among the proponents of other theories. However, the problems have been formulated to challenge discourse in future book-dialogs. Every social scientist, or so inclined individual with original theories and ideas, can assemble a group of 4-10 co-authors and edit a similar book of dialogs. Publishing such books of dialog can be a new and timely innovation in the academic literature of socio-humanitarian fields, and participants can enjoy the challenge of sharing interdisciplinarity ideas.

The third part of the book includes materials expanding the scope of dialog and formulating new goals for it, such as a practical application of culture in the politics of peace (the example of Brazil); the expansion of an understanding of dialog by introducting the notion of "scholarly-and-public polylog," or simply "polylog" (N.S.Govorov); problems of a new trend in psychology -- tetrapsychology; a project for creating social harmony departments in humanitarian universities, for training specialists in the field of dialog and peace; and comparing different social philosophies' potential for dialog (L.M.Semashko); material about Esperanto as the language of cultural dialog (M.S.Abolskaya); a final statement of the International conference "Dialog among Civilizations - Key to a Safe Future" (Warsaw, April 23 – 26, 2003), the conference that opened up new prospects for the development of this dialog. Prospective topics for future dialogs, drawn from the third part of this book, may result in a number of multicultural projects with practical relevance: publication of similar book-dialogs in Brazil, establishment of dialog and social harmony departments in humanitarian universities, an international conference, in Warsaw under the UNESCO's aegis, the theme "Dialog among Civilizations through

Multicultural Publishing Project," etc.

The book's diverse content is intended for a mosaic, fragmentary and “net” reading rather than a continuous one. Every humanities scholar - sociologist, philosopher, psychologist, politologist, culturologist, sociolinguist, economist, historian, etc. - can choose those net/web fragments corresponding to her or his professional interests. This is the why main ideas are reiterated in various contexts throughout the book.

The compilation of this book-dialog required enormous effort on the part of its numerous participants, a full listing of whom is on the backcover. The author expresses profound gratitude to all of them, but first of all to the contributing authors, a long and difficult dialog with whom culminated in the reviews which constitute the book's central part. My most profound thanks are to professor Bernard Phillips, whose "Web (of sociological concepts) Approach" inspired this writer to publish this book, and to professor Reimon Bachika, who lent the author his moral support, demonstrating a keen sense of humor all along the way. My acknowledgements go to the translators, especially M.V.Solovieva (English) and M.S.Abolskaya (Esperanto). Special thanks to the editors of this book: V.V.Kavtorin (Russian), M.R.DeWitt (English), I.S.Plotnikov (Esperanto), and to the book graphic artist, G.N.Sosin, who put into drawing the author's ideas.

This book-dialog is the first, modest, and far from perfect attempt to start a systemic and long-term multicultural dialog of different social theories, languages, religions, and ideologies, buttressing the ideological bridges and efforts of cooperation between civilizations. To become truly international and comprehensive, this dialog should expand through the publication of different theme series (Culture, Religion, Language, Philosophy, Social theories, Axiology, etc.), in internet forums, and in television talk-shows across the globe. Authors hope that the publication of similar book-dialogs will result in the International Publishing Project, a blueprint conception presented in the Prolog, which explains the general idea of the series.

Leo Semashko, St. Petersburg, RUSSIA
June, 2003

PART 1.

TETRASOCIOLOGY AS A POSTPLURALISTIC PLATFORM FOR A DIALOG ON WAYS TO PEACE

1.1. From a tetrasociological imagination toward social harmony. Foundations of the tetrasociological theory

The purpose of this book of dialogs is not a detailed explication of tetrasociology, since that is provided in a previous book (Semashko, 2002). Our focus, rather, is on discussions with other modern, postpluralist social theorists, interested in building global harmony, to achieve a world at peace.

Platform for dialog: sociological imagination and postpluralistic theory

Why is so much attention paid to sociological theory? Why does our book-dialog begin with theory? Because a dialog of cultures, languages, religions, ideologies, and civilizations requires general ideas about society and its members, and only sociological theories provide these. In the absence of general theoretical formulations, dialog is impossible. It degenerates into a 'chorus of the deaf,' where everyone has his/her own way of thinking, without understanding or hearing others. Theory discovers, in different civilizations, their common, fundamental parameters, dimensions, and components, which constitute a social base for constructive dialog among them. Unless common ground is discovered,

dialog is impossible, and the outcome, inevitably, is a clash of civilizations.

Sociological theories are instruments to provide this base. A single theory is insufficient to provide a common base. Inevitably there are many theories, each reflecting the common base more or less fully, to serve as a more or less individualized platform for dialog. *Dialog among sociological theories is a beginning, and a necessary component of dialog among civilizations.* And dialog among theories is the focus of this book.

Dialog between civilizations starts with dialog between theories, with a selection of the most comprehensive and fitting theories. There is an important principle to guide the selection: the theories must be pluralistic, not monistic. Monism, recognizing as it does one primary (absolute) foundation, and one absolute truth (its own), by definition annihilates dialog and inevitably leads to confrontation: violent struggle, war, revolutions, terror, etc. Opportunities for dialog, and for peaceful, non-violent and level-headed solutions of social conflicts, can be found only within pluralism, especially within its modern, and most efficient, form - postpluralism (see below).

The social theories of the monist, Hegel, and of the pluralist-dualist, Kant, which laid the groundwork, respectively, of modern monism and pluralism almost 200 years ago, perfectly illustrate our idea. The idealist Hegel ended up believing in the inevitability and usefulness of wars, while the pluralist-dualist Kant capped his social philosophy with "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch." The materialist Marx, as a monist and an adherent of Hegelian dialectics of struggle, came to the same conclusions as Hegel, only concerning the opposite class. Another example is the 20th century as a century of never-ending local and world wars, where imperial systems, exemplifying one or another monistic theory, clashed inexorably. This century was a century of clashes between monistic theories; it couldn't have been a century of dialog between them, because with each one being the absolute and indisputable truth, any dialog is impossible.

The new, 21st century should become a century of dialog among relatively pluralistic truths, rather than of confrontations between absolute, monistic truths. In the latter case, the 21st century is doomed to become humankind's last century. Hegel's and Kant's followers are still around. If the last century saw a triumph of Hegelians, the new century will see Kant's triumph, or there will be not a living soul on earth to celebrate the victory. Only Kantians are capable of dialog and peaceful co-existence. Dialog is pluralistic, and pluralism is dialogical, something that cannot be said about monism of any kind. Only pluralism possesses spiritual values and theories that can withstand violence, war, and terror, and become a foundation for permanent peace and social harmony. Dialog among pluralistic theories, along with a dialog among civilizations, is the only way to achieve peace and harmony between civilizations; it rules out a confrontation between them. Dialog, a joint quest for harmony and peace, is the alternative to confrontation. Cultures and dialog among them, rather than armies, are the main weapon and defence of the modern world; and one of the important parts of the dialog is a dialog among postpluralistic theories. These include tetrasociology.

Every social theory is rooted in the sociological imagination of intellect, well described by C. Wright Mills (1959), in a book that was voted by the International Sociological Association as the second most influential sociological book of the 20th century. In it he wrote: «… the sociological imagination is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another - from the political to the psychological; from examination of a single family to comparative assessments of the national budgets of the world; from the theological school to the military establishment; from considerations of an oil industry to studies of contemporary poetry. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self - and to see the relations between the two. Back of its use there is always the urge to know the social and historical meaning of the individual in the society and in the period in which he has his quality and his being»(1959:7).

Tetrasociology originates from a broad imagination, which ranges from the comprehensive social space-time (SST) to the needs and abilities of an individual at different ages. Tetrasociological imagination enables us to create a wide web of 26 sociological concepts of different degrees of abstraction, as different dimensions or parameters of the social world and its individuals. Interesting enough, another scholar appears to have been thinking in this same direction.

Independently of us, Bernard Phillips in a trail-blazing book (2001) creates a similar, multi-dimensional web of 26 sociological concepts. He calls this web of concepts a "web approach" or "interactive dialogic worldview". The web reflects a new "more interactive scientific and cultural paradigm than our present bureaucratic ones," and transcends "away from our specialized tower of Babel" of contemporary sociology. Phillip's web approach creates a "general language of sociology" and builds bridges between its dozens of fragmented disciplines. It counteracts sociology's "present bureaucratic paradigm" (2001:27; Figure 1-3, p.24)[1].

The web of tetrasociological concepts, too, is oriented toward interactivity, dialog, and cultural and interdisciplinary research. Like Phillips's approach, it is an alternative to bureaucratic and parochial, monistic or amorphous paradigms.

Both webs of concepts, while having much in common, differ in certain concepts and metrics. Tetrasociological web of concepts has tetrary metrics, 4 x 4, while the web approach has triadic metrics, 3 x 3. However, in spite of the differences in metrics, I subsume both under one category of paradigms, which I call "*postpluralism*."

What is characteristic of a postpluralistic approach in sociology and philosophy is that it postulates multiple, although *definite in number*, primary factors of society and individuals, and also *synthesizes the foundations* of different philosophical and sociological theories. Postpluralistic concepts supplement and enhance one another, they are interactive and conduct a permanent dialog between one another. They point to one another's limitations, yet aspire toward inter-complementary synthesis, and this ensures their continuing progress, and augments their ability to penetrate the complexities of human behavior. Postpluralism does not simply say "many factors or causes" - this is something traditional pluralism says, too, - but specifies "how many" - two, three, four, etc., and, in addition to criticizing parallel theories, it synthesizes their strengths as well. Now, we'll build the web of concepts of postpluralistic tetrasociology.

Resources: social statics

The web of tetrasociological concepts, like Phillips's web (2001: 22, Figure 1-2), is not flat - rather, it is solid, «*spherical*», and has three spatial and one temporal axes of coordinates; this is why it is called "tetrary," i.e., four-dimensional. Figuratively speaking, its "concepts-cells" have a "four-sided" shape, while the web itself consists of four "quadrants," or fields of coordinates. Employing the initial four-dimensional "concepts-cells," a tetrasociological imagination links the "specialized fields" and fragmented concepts of social science, building "bridges" (Phillips, et al., 2002) between them. This solid web has no "loose ends," all of its cells (concepts) are interlinked, so that "the end," or the exit from one, is "the beginning," or the entrance to another. So, all cells, from micro- to macro- level, are directly or indirectly interlinked. The solid, spherical web of fundamental notions (of philosophical foundations) is four-dimensional, and its system of internal coordinates is, likewise, solid and four-dimensional.

The middle level of our solid, tetrary notional web is an axis of coordinates: "*social resources*."

---

[1] We'd like to note that it was B.Phillips's conception of a dialogical worldview, or interactive web approach, referred to in this book, that stirred my imagination, engendering the idea of creation and publishing the book-dialogs, the first of which is the one you see. I hope that tetrasociology, in turn, will become an inspiration to B.Phillips's imagination.

Social resources are the goods that people produce, which are indispensable for any society, any person. Social resources differ from natural ones in that they are created by people and not by nature; as a finished product they cannot be found in nature. But both kinds of resources are interlinked. Social resources are created by people only from or on the basis of natural ones, especially the most basic ones: sun energy, earth, water, air. The notion of social resources as things necessary for and created by society is a self-evident notion, and does not need further explanation. Obviously, without continuing consumption and use of resources (here and below we speak of social resources), persons and society cannot exist. Resources are what we constantly consume and what fuels our existence. Without resources we die.

"Resources" is a very broad concept. It needs to be specified, differentiating the necessary and the sufficient ones. Tetrasociology postulates four necessary and sufficient types (classes, spheres) of resources: PEOPLE, INFORMATION, ORGANIZATION, THINGS.

People are the totality of the population, from toddlers to the old.

Information (culture) is the totality of people's knowledge, from the most elementary sensations to the supreme social ideas: philosophical, scholarly, technical, artistic, etc.

Organization (order) is a system of interpersonal social relations, regulated by different norms: moral, political, legal, financial, managerial.

Things are the totality of all material wealth (including material services), from the simplest consumption products (elementary products, clothes, footgear, etc.) to the most complex technological systems of cities' communal services and global communications: highways and railroads, water and air transport, phone lines, television, etc.

Because of their infinite, internal variety and universality, these types, or classes, form four constant *spheres* of social resources, which we will call *sphere resources*, to differentiate from branch-based or other kinds of resources. We will term sphere resources as follows:

PEOPLE - *humanitarian (human) resource*,
INFORMATION - *informational (cultural) resource*,
ORGANIZATION - *organizational (political, managerial) resource*,
THINGS - *material (physical, material-and-technical) resource*.

A public need for precisely these sphere resources becomes manifest through the fact that, with at least one of them missing neither society nor individuals can exist. As an example, I suggest the reader simply imagine his/her life or the life, say, of a family or a city in the *total absence* of *either* people *or* information *or* organization *or* things. Obviously, neither persons, nor families, nor cities, nor, for that matter, any community, can exist in the total absence of any of the classes of resources indicated, when at least one resource sphere is at zero level. This is the ***first fact*** of tetrasociology. (Human history does not provide a single example to refute it.) Two extremely important conclusions can be drawn from this. First: resource spheres mentioned are EQUALLY necessary for the existence of society and individuals, because society and individuals cannot exist in the absence of ANY of these resources. Second: neither in theory nor in fact can we recognize any ONE of the resources as *absolute, primordial, begetting the other resources*, i.e. we cannot take a monistic stance. Monism contradicts this fact, and therefore monism is a *delusion, generating a false, distorted, one-sided knowledge* about society and individuals. Therefore, adequate knowledge must be pluralistic[2].

On the other hand, with all sphere resources in place, the ***second fact*** of tetrasociology is

[2] We shall not further elaborate this idea, because there are many kinds of pluralism, and the question of which one is authentic, as well as the question of the elements of truth in monism, requires a separate extensive investigation, which we partially conducted in our previous books: Semashko L. (1999) Sociology for Pragmatics. St.-Petersburg. (Russian); and (2002).

resources' VARYING roles (significance), or varying prioritization[3], in the life of society and individuals. Indeed, at any given period in life, there is always one or another resource that gets priority, or becomes paramount. Therefore, at any given stage in a society's or individual's life, all sphere resources get graded, from those that get top priority down to those that get the least priority. At other stages, the priority rankings of the same resources will be different. So, the most important qualities of sphere resources are their EQUAL needfulness yet VARIABLE prioritization, simultaneously. This dual quality reflects variable and complex relations between resources in society's and individual's lives. Readers can easily imagine the relevance of this variability and complexity of resources to their lives if they ask themselves simple questions, such as which sphere resource had top priority/paramount importance for him/her when (s)he was born, went to school, started to work, married, became a parent, a boss, etc.

Tetrasociology postulates two kinds of prioritization for sphere resources: constant (substantive, qualitative, adequate) and temporary (functional). The constant prioritization is determined by the resource's quality or substance, while the temporary priority by its significance at one or another stage, in one or more of life's circumstances. The kinds of prioritization can concur at certain stages of society's and individual's existence, while diverging from and contradicting one another at some others.

And, which sphere resource has substantive priority? If we compare the resources and try to find out whether they have equal priority for individual's and society's life, we will have to admit that they are unequal, or differently prioritized. One resource stands out among the others - namely, *people, the humanitarian resource, which produces all the resources including itself, while other resources do not produce anything*. This is the ***second definite fact*** of tetrasociology. What logically follows from it is *that people have the highest substantive priority in society's and an individual's life*.

However, people do not produce the resources from themselves (people) - *they produce it with the help of all other resources*. This is the ***third fact*** of tetrasociology. It shows that people are just as relative and dependent a resource as the others. But it does not mean that people are the primordial, absolute resource, begetting all the others. Here lies the fine, dialectical, and therefore difficult for understanding, boundary between sociological monism and pluralism.

So, people possess two conflicting qualities: people resource is no more important than other resources, but it is also cardinally different from those, because it is the only resource that produces all resources including itself. This makes people the top-priority resource for society and individuals, and therefore, people always represent to society and individuals the *supreme immutable goal*. All good and bad things that people do, they do it themselves and only for themselves.

Second in priority is the informational resource, information, whose carrier and producer is individual's conscience. While people have the highest priority, in them, information and conscience have the highest priority, because only by possessing information and conscience does a human being become human, and people become people. People without conscience are corpses or animals. This is tetrasociology's ***fourth definite fact***. From this fact comes the paramount meaning of *culture,* for humanity and society to follow. Culture is maximized, second order information, i.e., it is the information for production of information. To it belongs philosophical and religious values, and scientific and methodological information creating *spiritual culture*, which defines *humanitarian, organizational, and material culture*.

Organizational resource ranks third in priority. The life of people who possess conscience and free will requires a certain organizational arrangement, which gets established by different norms and

[3] Priority in tetrasociology has nothing in common with "primordiality" in monism, where the two are often identical. Priorities in tetrasociology are nothing but varying roles, varying weight, varying significance of different resources in the lives of individuals and society. Tetrasociology carefully distinguishes priority from primordiality.

institutions regulating people's life. And the mode and organizational pattern of people's life and their social relations stem from the structural frames of conscience, from the organizational patterns of thinking. Conscience and thinking cannot be absolutely unregulated and disorganized. They can be disorderly or organized to a different degree, but they cannot be devoid of a structural/organizational backbone altogether. This is tetrasociology's ***fifth fact***.

Things, or material-and-technical resources rank fourth in priority. Things complete the set of fundamental, necessary and sufficient resources of society, hypostatize (materialize) all previous resources, and ensure their autonomous, separate from the individual existence. Without hypostatization (materialization) the other three resources cannot have a life of their own and transcend the individual. This is tetrasociology's ***sixth fact***.

So, the substantive, or qualitative, priorities of sphere resources rank as follows, in the order of diminution of priority: people - information - organization - things. Two conclusions can be drawn from this.

First: substantive prioritization is not the only kind of resources prioritization; another one is functional prioritization, whereby at any given stage of society's and individual's existence, i.e., temporarily, any single resource can take the highest priority. This is tetrasociology's ***seventh fact***. For instance, at different stages of an individual's life, even in the course of a day, resources shift their priority rankings. When person eats, things have the highest priority; when (s)he talks with his/her children, people have the highest priority; when (s)he writes a scholarly article, information has the highest priority; when (s)he is giving orders as a boss, organization holds the top priority.

Second conclusion: the substantive prioritization of sphere resources demonstrates their *sufficiency*. Resource spheres encompass the totality of the stages of resources' existence, from their origination in individuals as a need and an idea, to their specific hypostatization. They encompass the entire range of society's and individual's necessary resources. Therefore, they are not only necessary resources, but also sufficient *sphere components* of both society and individuals. Society and individuals consist of the same kinds of sphere components: human (humanitarian) component, informational, organizational and physical (material), which are constantly consumed (used, expended) as resources by society and individuals, and are constantly reproduced by them as products. Neither individuals nor society need any other, additional resources/products/components. The four reviewed above are SUFFICIENT. This is tetrasociology's ***eighth fact***.

Four sphere resources/components of society and individuals are dialectically (variably) interinclusive, as whole and its parts. The principle of variable interinclusion of whole/parts (Parsons, 1964: 15-17; Munch, 1982; Scheff, 1997) is that every resource/component of society and individuals includes the others as its parts. This means that people, or, rather, every person contains not only the humanitarian component, but three others, informational, organizational, and material, as well; and they are ancillary to the humanitarian component as parts to the whole. Any information, be it a book, a technical drawing, a painting, etc., contains not only the informational component, but also three others: humanitarian (person's work), organizational, and material, all three ancillary to the informational component. And so on. The principle of interinclusion of society's and individual's resources/components reflects the fact of their actual interinclusion, which is tetrasociology's ***ninth fact***.

The interinclusion principle, embracing resources/components, also embraces and applies to society and individuals. Society and individuals, having common sphere resources/components, also have a *common sphere-based backbone*, and are two different aspects of one sphere “medal”. To put it differently, spheres of resources/components are the *single essence*, the *single core* of society and individuals. Individuals are part of society, and society is part of individuals. The one does not exist without the other. So, it would be more appropriate to speak of them as a *single object*

"society/individual" or "individual/society." Therefore, all sociocentric and anthropocentric approaches to society and individuals are equally narrow and parochial. Inseparability of society and individuals, their common, sphere-based (resource-component-based) core, is tetrasociology's ***tenth fundamental fact***.

So, our interpretation of society/individual's sphere resources is built on ten fairly obvious facts, which constitute tetrasociology's evidentiary, factual base. To rebut tetrasociology, one has to rebut its ten facts. This is something for our opponents to do; we, meanwhile, will continue the social construction of a solid web of tetrasociological concepts. There are two options here: to proceed "in breadth," toward complex abstractions, or "deep down," to more specific abstractions, which dialectically flow in and from one another, as Mobius ribbon. The latter option seems more logical, so we'll proceed with analysis of the second axis of coordinates of tetrasociological concepts.

Processes: social dynamics

The second axis of coordinates of our conceptual web is "social reproduction processes," or "*social processes*." The processes are transformations of resources, of any of their qualitative or quantitative features. Therefore, the reproduction of resources by society/individuals is a process, too. All social processes are reproductive, i.e., connected with the reproduction of resources/components, which are the subject and product of the processes; and all society's/individual's reproductive processes are social, socially conditioned resources. As ancient a thinker as Adam Smith, and Karl Marx after him, thoroughly examined the processes of social reproduction of things and divided them into four classes, which are dialectically interinclusive: Production, Distribution, Exchange, Consumption. Tetrasociology postulates that reproduction processes *encompass all sphere resources/components*. All resources/components are not only consumed, but also produced, distributed, and exchanged by society/individuals.

As social transformations, all reproductive processes are effected by people, alone, but with the help of other resources. However, neither information nor organizations (norms, customs), nor things can produce social transformations - only people can. Although, the physical hypostases of all resources are liable to physical-biological, natural transformations, which, while affecting social transformations, are separate from them. If people, alone, are employed in social reproduction processes, if people, alone, are the source and the carrier of the processes, then to what degree? and permanently or not? This is tetrasociology's key question, and the answer to it introduces a cardinally novel sociological concept - the notion of *people's reproductive employment, or people's R-employment*.

People's R-employment is employment of people *in all* processes of social reproduction of all social resources/components of society/individuals in the course of persons' *entire* life from birth to death. R-employment is universal and common to all of humankind. It is R-employment that creates and destroys, transforms and preserves, ameliorates and worsens all resources/components. Any historical or contemporary event can serve as an example. R-employment is identical with the totality of all and any life practices of a person. People ALWAYS, at every given moment of their life, are involved in reproduction. Because this thesis provokes debate more frequently than the others, we'll give several examples.

When a person sleeps ((s)he spends more than a third of her/his life in sleep) - what does (s)he produce? When a person eats, takes a rest, idles, is sick, or immerses him(her)self in nirvana, - what does (s)he produce? What does a toddler produce, who only eats, drinks, cries, sleeps and performs other physiological functions? When a person retires and does not work anymore - what does (s)he produce? What does (s)he produce, when (s)he studies, does athletics, goes to the movies, concerts, museums, etc.? In these and numerous other similar examples, a person reproduces HER/HIMSELF as

a person, as a personality, an individuality, one of his/her numerous facets. Can a person do without SELF-reproduction? Certainly not! We spend the biggest part of our lives precisely on self-reproduction: sleep, food, study, physical fitness, leisure, self-development, medical treatment, etc. Self-production has priority in the employment structure of individuals. The more perfect and efficient is self-production, the more time persons have for social employment, and the higher is its quality.

Self-reproduction, or individual R-employment, is not only the biggest, but also the most significant, and therefore is the highest priority type of employment, both for individuals and for society. Why? Because the quality of self-reproduction affects the quality of the individual as a public person (actor), as a personality, and as a carrier of a certain kind of socially useful work. Ultimately, all social reproduction has one goal, which is to provide persons with, and to improve, resources necessary for their self-reproduction. Thus, R-employment is an extremely broad sociological category, including not only social, work-related, but individual employment, self-production as well. It is broader than activity, because persons can also be inactively employed - in sleep, in sickness, in passivity, idleness. It is broader than work, because persons' activity can be also non-work-related and consumption-based; employment can be leisure-, transportation-, etc. related. At the same time, R-employment also includes, as one of its parts, work-related, social employment. We will not examine here the different kinds of five major types of R-employment: individual, social, beneficial, detrimental, and preventive. It is explored in our book (2002).

R-employment is the dynamic backbone that people and society share, and this backbone differentiates them from nature, and makes them cardinally different from natural phenomena. Thus, R-employment is *identical with the social* as the systemic quality which radically distinguishes society/individuals from nature. If people's entire life is the employment in reproduction of the four resources, and every sphere resource exemplifies dialectical unity of the four, then the social is likewise multi-dimensional. The social, like employment, is four-dimensional, exemplifying the indissoluble unity of four components: humanitarian (human), informational, organizational and material (physical). And the humanitarian component has the highest priority among the four. The backbone of this component is the primary human property - people's life energy, their activity. Everything in society/individuals is the product of this energy, or bears a stamp of it. Thus, all things social are the products of this energy, its (creature) artefact.

The social stretches out to the same limits as the life energy of people's R-employment. But the social is not limited to the humanitarian component, life energy. Life energy is not godlike, it is unable to create from itself. It is able to create out of other substances, with the help of other instruments, i.e., out of natural and social objects, with the help of social instruments. Thus, the social's humanitarian component requires such instruments as the informational component (knowledge), organizational component (norms, order), and material component (things). In employment processes, people's energy transfers four components of the social, which are incorporated in people, to physical or social objects, which either become social or modify their social characteristics. Persons themselves - as humanitarian resource - become the first such object and product; information, informational resource, becomes the second; organizations, organizational resource, becomes the third; things, material and technical resource, become the fourth.

Finally, R-employment allows us to formulate yet another fundamental category of tetrasociology - *social space-time* (SST). R-employment ensures the fusion of social space and social time, and for this reason the two are used as a single category, although each has its own specific content. Below we provide brief definitions and explanations for each.

Social time: Society has no other social time than people's time, and, therefore, than their R-employment time. Social time is the time of people's R-employment. The past social time is people's

past R-employment, or the employment of past generations. The current social time is people's current, live R-employment. Future social time is people's future R-employment, or employment of future generations. All forms of the social are different manifestations of R-employment, and different hypostases of its time, i.e., of social time.

Social space: Society does not have another social space besides R-employment's space. Because employment occurs in reproduction processes, while resulting in sphere products/resources (people, information, organization, things - PIOT), *social space* (and the social as well) is delimited by the spatial boundaries of reproduction processes and PIOT resources. Social space expands and contracts to the same degree as do R-employment, its processes, and PIOT products/resources. Where they are present, there social space is present too, and where they are not present, neither is social space.

The *unity of social space and social time* is also determined by R-employment: where there is R-employment's space, there its time is present, too, and vice versa. Thus, they are inseparable and can be designated as a single category of SST. However, they are also contradictory and dialectical: social time (employment time) creates social space (PIOT resources), and contracts or expands it, while social space (PIOT resources) delimits R-employment, setting limits for social time. R-employment creates the social world as the totality of all past and present PIOT resources; it creates SST.

So, R-employment allows us to define such fundamental qualities and concepts as the social, social world, SST, social universality (four-dimensionality), cosmopolitism (relevance to all and every human being), and social culture (sociocultural quality, reflecting R-employment's transformatory and creative aspect).

R-employment, too, is contradictory. Now we'll analyze its contradictions, such as equality/inequality, and harmony/disharmony. R-employment is identical in its volume to the notion of "life," people's "life time." But life pertains to other sphere resources, too, while R-employment is exclusively specific to humans, making human lives qualitatively different from the life of other resources. R-employment is a universal/cosmopolitan sociocultural backbone of people's and society's life. *In this backbone, all people are equal and different*. People *are equal* in R-employment, because it is cosmopolitan (relevant to all and every human being), sociocultural (transformatory) and universal (embraces all sphere resources and the relevant components of the social). In other words, people's R-employment makes people equal, because it connects everyone to cosmopolitism, universality and culture. It makes everyone a universal sociocultural person, or a sociocultural universalist. In R-employment's fundamental characteristics - humanness, culture, universality - all people are equal. These qualities are innate in everyone, and if they are gone for whatever reason, the person dies either physically or socially, turning into an animal. God created people equal not only in their physical qualities, but also in their universal, cosmopolitan and cultural employment. This is an essential fact of being.

On the other hand, as the gradations and content of R-employment's properties are infinite, all people, with regard to the level and content of these qualities, are *always different*, individualized, and therefore *unequal*. People are unequal with regard to the level of employment, to the quality of its objects, instruments and products. The single universal/cosmopolitan essence of employment is distributed among people unevenly, unequally, and this is the source of people's progress, as well as the conflicts between them. This means that people's R-employment, while common to all people, is dialectically contradictory. It makes people - *simultaneously, but in different aspects - equal and unequal* to one another.

R-employment, as the universal/cosmopolitan sociocultural essence of people's life, is *harmonious and disharmonious*. The social foundation of R-employment contains a fundamental contradiction between harmony and disharmony of its sphere components. On the one hand, sphere

components (aspects, characteristics) of employment aspire at equilibrium, as the most optimal and efficient state; on the other hand, their branch- and sub-branch-based parts (aspects, characteristics), developing chaotically, result in an uneven distribution and disharmony of not only branch-based components, but sphere-based ones as well. These antithetical aspirations are continuous, and so they produce the *laws of R-employment: "the law of sphere harmony" and "the law of branch-based disharmony*"[4]. Aspirations to harmony and disharmony are at the very core of R-employment, and they are inherent to society's/individual's social nature. However, only aspiration toward harmony is adequate, because it ensures humankind's survival, through all the cataclysmic upheavals of humankind's existence, by its steady, however inconsistent, progress.

The law of sphere harmony (or, simply, *the law of harmony*) reflects the aspiration of R-employment's sphere components toward equilibrium, balance and proportion, and toward sustained development as the most optimal and efficient, and therefore, the most viable, state. The law of branch-based disharmony (or, simply, *the law of disharmony*) reflects the aspiration of branch-based, and, consecutively, sphere components of R-employment toward disbalance and disproportion, to spasmodic development, which leads to destruction and, ultimately, to self-destruction and obliteration of R-employment and the social. The unity of these aspirations, and inseparability of the correlating laws, constitute the main contradiction of R-employment, and, therefore, of the social in its entirety. And so, this contradiction is the main source of their development and transformations. Because aspiration toward harmony is the top priority aspiration, ensuring the increase of viability of the social, the main dialectical contradiction of the social can be termed *the law of unity and harmony of opposites*. This law, rather than abolish, preserves and furthers the dialectics. However, it cardinally differs from *the law of unity and struggle of opposites* in Hegelian and Marxist dialectics. The difference between the key notions of "harmony" and "struggle" in the formulation of the key law of dialectics reflects the cardinal difference between the corresponding types of dialectics - tetrary (sphere-based) and monistic[5]. Tetrary dialectics can be called the *dialectics of harmony*, and monistic dialectics, the *dialectics of struggle*. However, this does not mean that harmony dialectics dismiss struggle. It does not write off struggle, but subordinates it to the harmony of opposites of sphere resources. In harmony dialectics, harmony, not struggle, is given priority. Harmony dialectics is founded on the principle (discussed above) of *interinclusion* of the opposites of parts and whole, and not on the principle of *interexclusion* and dismissal of opposites, which is at the "core" of struggle dialectics.

Among many implications of harmony dialectics we'll discuss only one, concerning dialog. From the viewpoint of harmony dialectics, it is aspiration toward harmony that constitutes the foundation and source of dialog, while aspiration toward disharmony, toward struggle and victory, precludes dialog. Or, rather, the "dialog," here, is translated into physical violence, and turns into a "dialog" of weapons, war, troops, etc. At war, a dialog (negotiations) can concern only surrender of one of the parties; it does not untangle contradictions that have led to the war. The true dialog is a peaceful dialog, rooted in a reciprocal aspiration toward harmony, toward a balanced (equipoised) solution of disagreements and conflicts. And with this, we finish constructing the second axis of coordinates of our solid, tetrary web of sociological concepts. Now, on the interlinked axes of "social resources" and "social processes," we'll build the third spatial axis, "social structures."

Structures: social structuratics

[4] The relationship between harmony and disharmony is the pivotal question of tetrary social philosophy (tetrasociophilosophy), which is examined more fully below, and in our other books (2002, 2000, 1999, 1992)

[5] Here we cannot compare tetrasociology's dialectics (or tetrary dialectics) with the Hegelian or Marxist dialectics of monism (or monistic dialectics). This complex theoretical problem was examined more fully in our books quoted above

In tetrasociology, *social structures* are the combinations of PIOT resources with the processes of their reproduction, and the function of these combinations is to produce new sphere resources in a specific space and time. What distinguishes the structures from the resources and processes is the combination of past R-employment (sphere resources) and current R-employment (processes) intended to create future sphere resources. Three axes of social space reflect three parameters of social time. Social sphere resources are past employment. Social reproduction processes are present employment. Social structures are the amalgamation of the two, for the purpose of people's future employment and life, and, so, social structures forge and exemplify future employment. They are future-oriented. Social structures are more complex, because they incorporate the medium (resource) and lower (processual) fields of coordinates. Social structure in tetrasociology is the aggregate of a great multitude of heterogenous societies, possessing varying organizational structures, and societal institutions at all levels of development. The biggest and most universal among social structures, those that constitute the social world, are four constant "social reproduction *spheres*," common to all societies and persons.

Social reproduction spheres differ in object and product of reproduction, as well as in the instruments and technologies employed. Products are reproduced from objects according to the principle "like from like," i.e., people are reproduced only from people; information, from information; organizations, from organizations; things, from things. There are four classes of necessary and sufficient resources/components of society/individuals that are permanently consumed and *permanently reproduced in the corresponding spheres*. According to the resources/components reproduced, tetrasociology postulates four necessary and sufficient social reproduction spheres: *Social* (humanitarian), *Informational* (cultural), *Organizational* (managerial), *Technical* (material, economic). Abbreviated, the names are as follows: *sociosphere, infosphere, organisphere, technosphere*. Sociosphere reproduces people from people: people are its object/product. Infosphere reproduces information from information: information is its object/product. Organisphere reproduces organizations: organizations are its object/product. Technosphere reproduces things: things are its object and product. Each sphere of reproduction represents a *sphere* of the appropriate *culture*: *humanitarian, spiritual, organizational, material*. Priority rankings for spheres of reproduction/culture correspond to those for the sphere resources/PIOT products they reproduce.

Each sphere employs all sphere resources as its instruments in the corresponding technologies. The distribution of four resources among four reproduction spheres is signified by the following 4 x 4 matrix[6]:

P = P1 + P2 + P3 + P4, where P stands for people, population, and P1, P2, P3, P4 - for its sphere classes,

I = I1 + I2 + I3 + I4, where I stands for information, and I1, I2, I3, I4 - for batches of information,

O = O1 + O2 + O3 + O4, where O stands for organizations, and O1, O2, O3, O4 - for groups thereof,

T = T1 + T2 + T3 + T4, where T stands for things, material possessions, and T1, T2, T3, T4 – for groups thereof.

The matrix lines denote the "outlets" of spheres and the *products* they generate for four spheres, and the matrix columns signify the "inlets" of spheres and the *resources* from four spheres used in them. An explanation is due. The P line signifies the reproduction of the classes of population in the 1st, social sphere, for the corresponding spheres: P1 - *for* sociosphere, P2 - *for* infosphere, P3 - *for* organisphere, P4 - *for* technosphere. The I line denotes the reproduction of the batches of information (and appropriate culture) in the 2nd, informational, sphere, for the corresponding spheres from the 1st to the 4th. The same with the rest of the lines.

---

[6] On the basis of this matrix, tetrasociology creates new, sociological statistics, unifying and supplementing economical statistics, and a new, informational technology; both were examined more fully in our books quoted above

As an example, let's look at the technosphere (the 4th sphere). The technosphere's *products* are things, which are parts of each of the four groups: they are designated by the 4th matrix *line*. Technosphere's *resources* are designated by the 4th matrix *column*. The T4 group of material resources combines at once the *object, the product, and the material instruments/technologies* of the sphere. The complex of organi-resources, O4, combines various economic, legal, managerial, and financial institutions, which are used in the technosphere as *organizational instruments/technologies*. I4, the complex of info-resources, combines various technical information, which is used as *informational instruments/technologies* of the technosphere. L 4, the class of socio-resources (technical class), combines people of different working-class and agricultural occupations as the *main productive force* of the technosphere. (We suggest the reader attempt a similar description of three other spheres, which can become the beginning of his/her dialog with tetrasociology.)

Spheres unite the corresponding branches of social reproduction, kindred types of family and individual activity, and also similar sphere needs, abilities, and components of the individual. Thus, spheres become common spheres of society/individuals, of all populations. Society and individuals are different sections and different facets of common, shared reproduction spheres[7]. Thus, the entire population employed in them is productive, participant in the reproduction of one or another sphere resource. First of all, the population is employed in the reproduction of itself. (Who else, besides the population's individuals would be employed in their reproduction? A rhetorical question.) Not a single theory of class has considered population, in its entirety, as productive. For the most part, these theories consider as productive key branch classes, employed in the key branches of the economy.

Sphere classes are the major component of spheres, and the major category of tetrasociology. *Sphere classes are large, productive groups of people, encompassing the population in its entirety, and differentiated by the kind of reproductive employment in one, central for them, sphere of social reproduction.* The priority rankings for sphere classes correspond with those for spheres and resources/products reproduced by them.

Tetrasociology postulates four productive, equally necessary and sufficient, sphere classes, corresponding with reproduction spheres:

1. SOCIOCLASS - people employed in the sociosphere. This includes, on the one hand, people working in healthcare, education, childcare, social welfare, athletics and sports, and on the other, all people who are non-working but employed in self-reproduction: pre-schoolers, students, unemployed, homemakers, non-working retirees and the disabled.
2. INFOCLASS are people employed in the infosphere, i.e., in academe, culture and arts, communications, informational services, and the mass media.
3. ORGANICLASS includes people employed in the organisphere, i.e., in politics, management, law, finance, defence, law enforcement, etc.
4. TECHNOCLASS includes people employed in the technosphere, i.e., manual workers and peasants/farmers.

Normally, people are employed not in one, but in several spheres, although one of the spheres consumes more time and, therefore, can be considered the major one. Employing this criterion, tetrasociology divides the totality of any country's or the world's population into sphere classes (see below, an example of contemporary sphere classes in Russia).

Reproduction spheres are *equally* important to and *variably* prioritized by society, and they aspire toward equilibrium and harmony. Sphere classes employed in these spheres are likewise *equally important* to and *variably prioritized* by society. They are equal in employment (in employment's

[7] The detailed description of public and individual sectors of each sphere, and also its branch structure, and resource ensuring is given in our book (2002: 59-69)

cosmopolitism, sociocultural quality and universality), but differ in quality and level of employment within each of the spheres. Sphere classes' equality and differences in employment, as well as their aspiration toward balance, make them *harmonious* and cohesive classes*, abolishing class struggle and antagonism*. Spheres and spheres classes, differing in employment, are *ruled by the law of harmony*, which counteracts the *law of disharmony* of branch-based classes, which are identified by ownership of property or branch-based employment.

The disharmony of branches is a result of their egoistical motivation: "to take more, to give less." Thus, several strong branches get richer by plundering weaker branches, which results in the branches' uneven development and, ultimately, society's collapse. Spheres counteract this tendency. They are governed by the principle of harmony, balance, "to give as much as to take" in order to enhance the balance. Otherwise, they cannot function and exist. Thus, the *harmony of spheres have always been and will always be the salvation of the social world*.

Branches are governed by the law of competition (victory to the strongest), and constantly reproduce this law and, consequently, social disharmony. Spheres, on the contrary, are governed by the law of harmony (partnership, cooperation, balance) and reproduce harmony. It is only in branches that the law of competition can govern, because if one branch, as a result of competition, collapses, topples or gets taken over by another branch, society does not cease to exist. Spheres, on the contrary, are not influenced by the law of competition, because if one of the spheres collapses, society collapses as well. This is why spheres have only the law of harmony as the ruling principle. Priority of one of the laws determines the type of societal development - disharmonious or harmonious. Historically, with very few and short-living exceptions, the first, disharmonious type of development has prevailed. In the 21st century the branch-based, crude and disharmonious period of history will come to an end, to be replaced by a sphere-based, self-conscious, harmonious history. Branches will cede priority to spheres. Competition will cede priority to harmony, and this will affect not only society, but private persons, and their individual development, as well.

In the course of nearly 3,000 years, different politicians and theoreticians have brought forward different class theories. In the table below we summarize the main ideas about class, and compare them with sphere classes, indicating the author or theory, the time, the place, the names of the classes, and their identifiers.

AUTHOR or THEORY	TIME PERIOD	WHERE	CLASSES	Identifier
Theseus, czar -- inception of the Athenian state	8th century BC	Athens	3: eupatridae -- nobility; geomoroi -- arable farmers; demiourgoi -- craftsmen	Employment in branches
Solon, the first archont, elected in 594 BC	6th century BC	Athens	4 classes/ranks, according to how many medimnos of grain are produced	Property
Servius Tullius, the penultimate czar	6th century BC	Rome	6 classes/ranks, according to property value	Property
Plato	427-347 BC	Athens	Three tiers: philosophers, soldiers, workers	Qualities of the soul
Aristotle	384-322 BC	Athens	3 classes: the rich, the middle, paupers	Wealth
Marx	1818-1883	Germany	2 basic classes: exploiters and exploited	Property

Pareto	1848-1923	Italy	2 basic classes: upper and lower	Psyche
Mosca	1858-1941	Italy	2 basic classes: rulers and the ruled	Power
Stratification theory	Second half of the 20th century	The West: Europe, USA	3 basic classes: upper, middle, lower	Income, status, and others
Tetrasociology	Late 20th -- early 21st century	The West: Russia	4 sphere classes: Socio, Info, Organi, Techno	Employment in spheres

The table demonstrates a diversity of class identifiers, and, consequently, a diversity of classes, themselves, in history and theory. Each historical period theorizes period-specific classes, castes, and tiers, which are historical modifications of sphere classes. The historical modifications of the classes, because of the narrowness and one-sidedness of its presumed identifiers (industry branch, soul, property, power, etc.), as well as the types of governments based on these class theories, have been distorting the harmonious essence of sphere classes and becoming the actors of total disharmony, inequality, antagonism, perennial wars and violence. Sphere classes, which combine the specific types of employment of previous classes into a universal employment, become a necessity for the new, informational society, for the new globalization period. These classes, like the new society, are more dynamic and open, and even, in some sense, "virtual." However, modern time need for sphere classes *is predicated primarily on the new society's need to harmonize* the development of spheres across the globe, with the purpose of tackling the growing global problems and challenges through a *communal* effort. And these problems can be solved only along the lines of social harmony, which only sphere classes can pursue self-consciously.

Sphere classes are not new to the social world and its history; they are new only to our limited sociological knowledge about them, to our traditional, narrow-minded approach to them. People know much less about the social world than they do about the natural world, because the social world is infinitely more complex than the natural world, and, therefore, requires far more complex and refined theoretical methods of academic research. Humankind has only recently approached a level of social science which allows us to "behold and see" sphere classes as the deep inner core of the social world.

Until now, sphere classes have existed like elementary and natural forces, alien to humans, unknown to social science, hidden from humans in the mysterious depths of the social. At the surface level of the social world that is visible and accessible to traditional sociology, sphere classes appear as either stratified or branch-based classes, paralleling the branches of the industrial society's economy. These are *classes of inequality*, identified by intrinsically unequal and partial criterion of wealth or property. For this reason, these classes are actors of total disharmony, chaotic development, social egoism, mutual alienation, branch-based parochialism, antagonism, wars, violence, etc. Sphere classes, on the contrary, are the *classes of equality*, differentiating people not by the partial criterion of wealth, but by the universal criterion of employment. This is why they are actors of social harmony, sustained development, social partnership, mutual assimilation, sphere universality, solidarity, peace, non-violence, etc. Branch-based classes appear to be *specific cases* of sphere classes, the latter remaining as an unsolved mystery at the heart of the former.

Why have sphere classes remained unknown? First, because an underdeveloped, *branch-based and one-dimensional society*, which is still primarily industrial, has not needed universal and harmonious actors. It has been able to live without them. Second, there has been no adequate social

theory and vision, able to "see" them and to recognize their seminal productive capacities for harmony, assimilation, universality, culture, cosmopolitism, equality, peace, partnership, etc. Just as a savage does not need, and therefore is not aware of a car, so humans, at their earlier, branch-based stage of development, which reached its zenith in industrial society, did not need and therefore were unaware of sphere classes. Because of the chaotic and slanted development of human society, it has always been dominated by one or another partial, branch-based class of a primarily economic-based sphere. Socially, these classes have needed to keep their economic and political domination by all means possible, the most effective of which was violence. So, branch-based classes have needed only the theories of class struggle and dictatorship akin to Marxism. Through the efforts of its ideologists, branch-based classes have been able to generate only the theories of class struggle and dictatorship.

Globalization, and the new, informational society, have generated new social problems and needs. These require new, sphere classes, with new social needs and capacities for tackling global, universal problems. There arises a social need for sphere classes as actors of the new era, actors with adequate goals, powers, and means. A theory of sphere classes has emerged, which is the first, but not the last, or the only one in the future, - tetrasociology, which discovers these classes, explains why they have been lingering in obscurity, explains the need for them, and for their active formation today. Tetrasociology reveals why branch-based classes are inadequate for the new global challenges, which they have generated, but the volume and substance of which make the traditional classes, powers and instruments helpless to meet these challenges. Tetrasociology shows that only new, sphere classes can provide both theoretical, along the lines of postpluralism, and practical, along the lines of social harmony, responses to the challenges of modernity. Tetrasociology shows how these classes can transform from crude, passive "*classes in themselves*" into active, self-conscious "*classes for themselves*." It creates for sphere classes a fitting theory and a system of universal values, which are oriented toward social harmony, rather than toward property, and which exemplify justice and equality. Meanwhile, tetrasociology does not frame the question as an antagonistic alternative: "*harmony or property*," which would lead to a new escalation of wars and violence; rather, it re-orients the classes' priorities, ensuring mutual complementarity and cooperation of the classes, and the continuity of a humanistic, cultural tradition. It conducts empirical research (albeit confined now only to Russia) of the intensive formation of sphere classes, starting in the late 20th century. This formative process manifests itself in a re-distribution of population among society's spheres, in the rapid contraction of the technoclass as industrial society's mainstay, and in the expansion of three other classes, however uneven and irregular across different countries and continents.

This process leads to the phasing out of traditional branch classes, and to the emergence, in the historical arena, of sphere classes, as new and harmonious actors. Concurrently, the process of *self-identification of the new community, the community of sphere classes*, is widening and deepening. We'll call this *identity "sphere identity.*" The rise of sphere self-consciousness has just begun, and this process is slower than the development of sphere classes. A transition from branch-based self-identification, to sphere-based self-identification of the population is a requisite for the formation of sphere classes. Without self-identification, sphere classes cannot become self-conscious actors who understand themselves, their mission in the social world, and the strategies, instruments, and technologies that will achieve their purpose.

Tetrasociology demonstrates that it is sphere classes that aspire toward social harmony and sphere equality for all people, i.e., fair distribution of resources among them. To achieve these ideals, we need a new form of democratic government, acceptable to all nations, - namely, *sphere (or tetra-) democracy*, whose distinctive feature is *equal distribution of power* among elected representatives of sphere classes. Only this kind of democratic government can consistently realize the sociocultural

technology and the long-term strategy of gradual non-violent harmonization of all spheres and sphere classes. Only sphere democracy is able to produce a fully humanitarian and truly public-needs-oriented government, to ensure, along with the equality of sphere classes, equality between older and younger generations, between men and women, and to recognize the priority of children, by giving votes to parents and guardians on behalf of their minor children. *Harmony of cultures and civilizations begins with children*.

Only sphere classes are able, through sphere democracy, to ensure a lasting and global peace. For this purpose, we need a permanent dialog among cultures and civilizations, a unified religion combining traditional religions' values, and a politically neutral language of international communication, while at the same time preserving ethnic cultures, religions, and languages. The best choice for a neutral, international language is Esperanto, as a language of equality, camaraderie and harmony, which has been tested for more than a hundred years, by millions of people, from almost all countries of the world. Sphere-based democracy can promote the study of Esperanto everywhere. For a dialog of civilizations, sphere classes can promote discussions of *dialogical, interactive, discursive ideology* as the basis for creating a new, global values system. Presently, tetrasociology can be one of the platforms for such a dialog of civilizations. The new ideology can be only dialogical and interactive. Instead of absolutist dogmas, it should offer only the most effective platform for dialogical and interactive discussion of solutions which would be acceptable to sphere classes in all civilizations.

For new, sphere self-identification to take shape, for a new ideology, with new values priorities, to develop, we need a *new Enlightenment*, to be part of the new era of inter-civilizational dialog. Enlightenment, today, is inseparable from dialog, and vice versa. Tetrasociology, like several other recent sociological theories, e.g., Phillips's interactive web approach (2001), recognizes the need for such an era, speaks about its arrival, and creates ideological pre-conditions. Only through a new Enlightenment can the transition be made from branch-based, transcorporational and trans-bureaucratic globalization, which augments disharmony at service of private interests, to sphere globalization, leading to justice and harmony for all of humankind. This new, just, and harmonious globalization will give the highest priority to social and cultural (socio- and info-) spheres, rather than to economic and political (techno- and organi-) spheres.

Post-globalization will be a humanitarian globalization. It will not be one-dimensional, branch but multi-dimensional, sphere, and also universal. Its universalism is reflected in the structural, sphere-based universalism of tetrasociology. Tetrasociological universalism reflects four kinds of universalism: *social* - four sphere classes of population; *informational/cultural* - four spheres of information and culture (humanitarian, spiritual, organizational, material); *organizationa*l - four spheres of power; and *economic* - four sphere-based world markets: of goods, capital, information, labor. Tetrasociology leads to a new understanding of globalization, culture and civilizations through the prism of sphere universalism.

The major manifestation of integratedness of society's spheres is that they concurrently, but in different respects and in different expressions, will prove to be spheres for every individual: spheres of CHARACTER, CONSCIOUSNESS, WILL and BODY. Society's spheres are the objectification (materialization and estrangement) of the corresponding spheres of individuals. They coincide in the object and product of reproduction. Character, reproducing people, including the individual, coincides with society's social/humanitarian sphere, and vice versa. Consciousness, reproducing information, including self-consciousness, coincides with society's informational sphere, and vice versa. Will, reproducing organizations, including individual's self-organization, coincides with society's organizational sphere, and vice versa. Body, reproducing things, including its own organism, coincides with society's technical/material sphere, and vice versa. Both society's spheres and individual's spheres

are identified by one of the four resources reproduced in them: people (individuals), information, organization, things. Society's spheres and individual's spheres, although not identical, are similar and inseparable. They are rooted in each other, inseparable from each another, reproduce each other and are each other's product, and for this reason they can and should be approached as UNITARY spheres of "society/individuals" or "individuals/society." Individuals and society coincide in spheres. In spheres, society and individuals coincide in all of their substantive dimensions: in reproductive employment and its classes, in needs and abilities, in humanitarian/social, cultural, organizational/political and economic dimensions. The concurrence of individuals and society in spheres is outlined in the table below:

Table of society/individual's spheres

SOCIETY	S P H E R E S of SOCIETY/INDIVIDUAL (S/I)	INDIVIDUAL
PEOPLE	SOCIOSPHERE: Humanitarian needs and abilities s/i Humanitarian employment s/i Socioclass (humanitarian class of population) s/i Humanitarian culture/information s/i Social politics (humanitarian organization s/i) Labor market (social economics s/i)	CHARACTER
INFORMATION	INFOSPHERE: Informational needs and abilities s/i Informational employment s/i Infoclass (informational class of population) s/i Spiritual culture/information s/i Cultural politics (organization of culture s/i) Information market (economics of culture s/i)	CONSCIOUSNESS
ORGANIZATIONS	ORGANISPHERE: Organizational needs and abilities s/i Organizational employment s/i Organiclass (organizational class of population) s/i Organizational culture/information s/i Administrative politics (organization of management s/i) Market of capital (economics of management s/i)	WILL
THINGS	TECHNOSPHERE: Material needs and abilities s/i Technical/material employment s/i Technoclass (technical class of population) s/i Material culture/technical information s/i Market of goods (economics of material production s/i)	BODY/UNCONSCIOUSNESS

Note: Interaction and inter-determination of the table's elements occur in all directions: horizontal, vertical, forward, backward. Tetrasociology appears as a cluster of tetrasocial disciplines: tetrapsychology, tetraculturology, tetraeconomics, tetraphilosophy, tetrapolitology, tetrasociocybernetics, tetraaxiology, tetrasocionics, tetrasociolinguistics, tetrahistory, etc., all growing from the same theoretical-methodological foundation of tetrary postpluralism.

In these spheres, man and society mutually alienate and appropriate each other, but in different ways and by different organization of social reproduction. By disharmonic branch organization, the mutual alienation of society and man dominates. They see in each other only means, not aims. Only by harmonic, spherical organization is the alienation counterbalanced with the opposite process of mutual appropriation of man and society. Here they see in each other, first of all, aims and not means. The harmony of man and society, their mutual appropriation, is reached thanks to sphere harmony and the harmony of sphere classes. «Horizontal» harmony, harmony at the level of branches, is provided by

«vertical» harmony, harmony BETWEEN spheres and sphere classes.

The branch world, on the one hand, having accumulated social disharmony and alienation up to a critical mass, and on the other hand, having created a lot of means for social harmony, first of all information, gives rise in itself to an opposite aspiration toward the new, harmonious world, through spheres and sphere classes. Such is the dialectics of transition from branch to sphere society in the epoch of globalization in our century from the point of view of tetrasociology.

Development states: social genetics

The fourth axis of the web of tetrasociological concepts is the social time of the kinds of historical scale of evolutionary social development. Social time combines three kinds of time: past, present, and future. It reflects the major historical stages/states of development of any social phenomenon on the basis of varying measures of sphere harmony. The measures of harmony can be pictured as the scale[8] presented here, denoting four main stages, or states: *prosperity (or flourishing*) - the biggest measure of spheres harmony; *deceleration* - the measure of spheres harmony bigger than average; *decline* - the measure of spheres harmony lower than average; and, finally, *dying* - the smallest (minimal) measure of spheres harmony, leading to disintegration, and social destruction. Actually, only the first measure can be considered harmony, while the three others are basically measures of disharmony. The conditions of harmony/disharmony are the most general results of an interaction and irregular development of spheres of social reproduction.

The fact is that historically, prosperity has seldom been achieved through a spontaneous harmony of society's spheres. As Bell aptly noted, in most cases it gets achieved only for a short time, through domination and violence. He wrote (1999: 372, Russian edition): "Almost all previous societies searched for enrichments in wars, robberies, expropriation, payoff of taxes or other forms of extortion". This enrichment and prosperity was transient and unsustained, and led to the fall of dozens of empires, without exception.

With this we are concluding our brief overview of tetrasociology, or the four parts of its ontology[9] - social statics, dynamics, structuratics, and genetics, - which explore the corresponding axes of coordinates of SST, encompassing the social world.

Result: a web the tetrasociological concepts as a platform for dialog

So, we created a solid web of 26 tetrasociological concepts. Let's recount them. Four *axes of coordinates*, each designated by four variable constants: *resources* (people, information, organizations, things), *processes* (production, distribution, exchange, consumption), *structures* (sociosphere, infosphere, organisphere, technosphere), *states* (prosperity, deceleration, decline, dying). Added to these are the concepts of *reproductive employment*, coinciding with the concept of the social, and the concept of four *sphere classes* of employment: socioclass, infoclass, organiclass, technoclass. And, additionally, yet another overarching notion: *social space-time*, identical with the notions of social world, society and the social. The rest of tetrasociological concepts derive from the 26 key concepts. Following are tetrasociology's key concepts in tabulated form.

Key Concepts of Tetrasociology

SOCIAL SPACE - TIME (SOCIAL WORLD, SOCIETY, THE SOCIAL)				
PROCESSES		RESOURCES	STRUCTURES	STATES
Production	R	People	Sociosphere	Prosperity

[8] For a more detailed description of this scale, and social genetics, see our earlier book (1999: 253-277)

[9] A more detailed statement of the tetrasociological ontology and its parts is given in our previous books

Distribution	-	Information/Culture	Infosphere	Deceleration
Exchange	E	Organization	Orgsphere	Decline
Consumption	M	Things	Technosphere	Dying
S P H E R E	P L O U M E N T	C L A S S E S OF THE P O P U L A T I O N		
SOCIO		CLASS (Teacher, doctors, social workers; not working ….)		
INFO		CLASS (Scientific, artists, journalists, engineers, programmers …)		
ORG		CLASS (Politics, lawyers, military men, managers, financiers …)		
TECHNO		CLASS (Working class, peasants / farmers)		

Note: R-employment of people coincides under the contents with the sphere classes, therefore, given concepts are identical and are considered as one concept. In total, in the table 26 key tetrasociology concepts are submitted. All others are either synonymous with them or derived from them.

All tetrasociological concepts reflect the general parameters (dimensions) of civilizations and cultures. Therefore, tetrasociology can be a common ideological platform for their dialog.

The next section of the book is comprised of 14 abstracts, which examine different theoretical and practical aspects of tetrasociology as applied to contemporary problems. The abstracts are an offspring of a tetrasociological imagination, furnished with historical references, empirical research, practical examples, and references to other authors. This writer is aware of the insufficiency of tetrasociology's empirical and evidentiary base; its broadening and strengthening is a matter for the future, requiring significant financing. The web of tetrasociological concepts is a systematic formulation of my response to contemporary problems, for the purpose of their interdisciplinary solution, through collective efforts. The most effective way to begin to tackle these problems is a multi-sided dialog.

References:

Bell, Daniel. (1999). *Coming Postindustrial Society*. Moscow (Russian)

Mills, C. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Parsons, T. (1964/1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.

Phillips, B. (2001). Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel: Reconstructing the Scientific Method. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Phillips, B, H. Kincaid, & T. J. Scheff, (eds).(2002). *Toward a Sociological Imagination: Bridging Specialized Fields*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Scheff, T. J. (1997). *Emotions, the Social Bond, and Human Reality: Part/Whole Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges.* St. Petersburg: Technical University.

_____. (2000). *Tetrasociology as Revolution of Social Thinking, the Way of Harmony and Prosperity*.St. Petersburg (Russian)

_____. (1999). *Sociology for Pragmatists. From Monism to Tetrism*. St. Petersburg: European house.(Russian)

_____. (1992). *Sphere Approach: Philosophy, Democracy, Market, Human*. St. Petersburg (Russian)

1.2. Globalization Spheres as Spheres of a Dialog among Civilizations

This section consists of 14 abstracts prepared by the author for the 36th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology (Beijing, China, July 7-11, 2004). Each abstract is limited to 500 words, as requested by Congress organizers. The number (where applicable) and title of the Congress session is indicated following the title of each abstract, and whether the abstract was accepted by the session manager. Ten of the 14 abstracts were submitted, and of these eight were accepted, i.e. 80%. (To compare: at the 15th World Congress of International Sociology Association, 2002, only 28% of the author's abstracts were accepted). The abstract titles are reduced to their key concept, are grouped into four spheres, and within each sphere according to priority. Several abstracts were cut in length to avoid repetition, although not always with success. Some abstracts are fragments of the author's book (2002), while others complement or essentially develop certain aspects of tetrasociology. The author proposes for future Congresses an additional session with the theme: 'Tetrasociology as a platform for multicultural dialog among civilizations in an age of globalization'

The general theme of the 2004 Congress: 'Social change in an age of globalization'. The author's main task: to show how tetrasociology can effectively respond to the challenges of modern social change, through its tetra-spheres as spheres of globalization that facilitate a dialog among civilizations. Every abstract proposes a special, 'tetrasociological' project and a theme (its formulation) of multicultural dialog among different worldviews, religions, and cultures.

The abstracts show several directions of application for tetrasociological theory. This applied section is a continuation of the first, exclusively theoretical, section of the book. The author apologizes for inevitable repetitions of some fundamental statements of tetrasociology, but without them the full meaning of the abstracts would be lost.

S0CIOSPHERE

(1) Spheres of Social Change

Plenary Session: Social Change in the Age Globalization.

To understand the complexity of social change in our age of globalization, it is essential to develop a "postpluralistic" theory. Globalization implies an interactive social world, where no social phenomenon can be completely separated from any other. Such an interactive approach to human complexity has recently been charted by Phillips (2001) and by Phillips, Kincaid & Scheff (2002). That approach and "tetrasociology" are "postpluralistic" in two senses. First, they depart from one-sided monism, and emphasise the necessity of multiple, but limited in number, factors, dimensions or «spheres» of a social space to explain human behaviour. Second, they are "postpluralist" in choosing to build on key elements from many theories, in contrast to simply tolerating multiple theories, which remain relatively isolated from one another.

There are many important postpluralistic theories that attempt to understand globalization through spheres of social space. For example, there is the work of Giddens (1990), who emphasises three spheres of social space (economy, politics, labour); Sklair (1991), with three spheres (economy, politics, culture); Robertson (1992), with four dimensions (individuals, nations, mankind, world) and (1995), with three spheres (economy, politics, culture); Appadurai (1996), with five spheres of the social landscape (etno, techno, finan, media, ideo); Beck (1998), with four spheres (politics, economy, ecology, culture); and Therborn (2000), with four dimensions/spheres (religion, economy, politics, culture).

"Tetrasociology" is a four-dimensional, postpluralistic theory of social space-time. It distinguishes four, equally necessary spheres of society, or social space: SOCIOSPHERE, INFOSPHERE, ORGSPHERE, TECHNOSPHERE. They are, simultaneously, spheres of the total population's employment (of «sphere» classes) and spheres that reproduce the social resources

necessary for society's existence, and which are therefore constantly consumed. These spheres are equally productive, providing an egalitarian and harmonious vision for all people throughout any society that recognizes this fact and moves further away from the traditional view of antagonistic classes and an inevitable class struggle. Within each sphere, however, there are hierarchical relationships, but equality among spheres points away from emphasising hierarchy.

Within each sphere, an appropriate type of resource is reproduced: PEOPLE within the SOCIOSPHERE, INFORMATION within the INFOSPHERE, ORGANIZATIONS (various social norms and institutions) within the ORGSPHERE, and THINGS within the TECHNOSPHERE.

Also, within each sphere there are two types of social change: routine (reproductive, constantly repeated), and innovative, which has begun to greatly increase and spread among societies. The problems of innovative change, which have enveloped many societies, have become a subject of great interest in global sociology. For the last two centuries, this is illustrated by studies of industrialization/modernization, globalization, and informatization/virtualization. A key innovative change in the study of social classes is the identification of new social communities - sphere classes of similarly employed population groups - as actors of social harmony and solidarity.

To understand the complex innovative changes involved within globalization, we require new, postpluralistic theories of social space.

(2) Sphere Classes

Plenary Session: Globalization and Social Transformation

In the sociology of the 20th century, we had two approaches to understanding class structure: an emphasis on the ownership of property (Marxism), and an emphasis on multiple criteria of social and economic stratification (Western sociology). "Tetrasociology" offers a third approach, with a focus on "reproductive employment" (or "r-employment"), that includes Marxist and Western orientations *per se*. R-employment includes all public and individual processes of societal reproduction. Its bearer and source is the entire population, and it is concerned with the life of the people from birth to death. Therefore, it is much broader than categories of work, economic employment, and related activity because it includes non-labour, non-economic, and non-active forms of employment. And we may view all r-employment as productive.

R-employment is divided according to four "spheres of reproduction" essential to society: the SOCIOSPHERE, made up of PEOPLE, the INFOSPHERE, centered on INFORMATION, the ORGSPHERE, including all ORGANIZATIONS, and the TECHNOSPHERE, focused on THINGS and the economy. Corresponding to these spheres are four productive sphere classes: 1. The SOCIOCLASS: employed in the sociosphere (includes healthcare, education, social security, sports, and the non-working population, such as pre-scholars, students, the unemployed, pensioners, etc.). 2. The INFOCLASS: employed in the infosphere, including workers in science, culture, communication, and information services. 3. The ORGCLASS: employed in orgsphere, including workers in politics, management, law, finance, defence, police, etc. 4. The TECHNOCLASS: employed in the technosphere, including the working class and peasants/farmers. Individuals can be simultaneously employed in several spheres, but primary employment, at any given time, is in only one.

The spheres of reproduction are equally necessary for a society. Realization of this equality promotes a balance and proportionality that provides the basis for social harmony. The sphere classes, employed in these spheres, are also equally necessary for a society. They are equal in employment, but differ in the quality of employment in each sphere. The equality and distinction of the sphere classes, and also their striving for balance, transforms them into harmonious and solidary classes. The spheres and sphere classes generally conform to a *"law of harmony,"* in contrast to classes based on property,

which generally conform to a *"law of disharmony."*

A Russian illustration: Russia's population is shown as the sum of four sphere classes. Their dynamics are expressed by the following numbers, in millions, in 1991, 1996 and 2000:

Russian Sphere Classes	1991	1996	2000
SOCIOCLASS	81.6	89.1	89.8
INFOCLASS	4.8	3.6	4.3
ORGCLASS	4.0	4.6	5.3
TECHNOCLASS	58.1	49.8	45.4
All Russian Population	148.5	147.1	144.8

Sphere classes exist in all countries, and in the world as a whole. Only sphere classes are capable of controlling the forces of disharmony, and of developing ways to ensure a gradual increase in harmony. Sphere classes have enormous capacity to achieve social harmony. Their ability to accomplish this is based on the degree of their self-consciousness and «sphere identity.» This sphere-based harmony can constructively meet the challenges of globalization and overcome its problems. The formation of sphere classes is a key to social transformation of the modern world.

(3) Children's Suffrage

Special Session: Children's Rights in the Age of Globalization (ACCEPTED)

The history of suffrage is extensive. Suffrage was at first obtained by men, then women, then youth 18 years or over. The "black hole" is children under 18 years, comprising 20 - 35 % of the population. With regard to children the discrimination continues. Although children are citizens from the moment of birth, they become voters only after 18 years.

This suffrage "black hole" becomes a "hole" of politics. Children do not exist politically because they are denied suffrage, and thus lose their potential power to defend their interests. Therefore, children remain the most marginal social group, and this contributes to social problems. Children are left on care families, parents, which opportunities are very limited. The result, for example, is that a great many children are deprived of high-grade care within society. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) is carried out only to a very limited extent. This deplorable situation dictates the necessity of granting children suffrage at least indirectly: EACH CHILD SHOULD HAVE A RIGHT TO VOTE, EXERCISED BY PARENTS OR TRUSTEES OF THE CHILD. Children have parents or trustees who understand their problems better than others, and who are capable of articulating their needs. It becomes a requirement of society in the age of globalization. From a "tetrasociological" point of view, movement of the global world toward social harmony, and overcoming the injustices of globalization, are impossible without taking into account children's interests.

But realistically, how can children's suffrage expand, given the fact of legal incapacity of children under 18 years? Although it would be difficult, a special UN Convention coupled with appropriate laws in the different countries could work toward giving parents the legal right to vote for their children. Such a mechanism, worked out in detail, could be an effective way to bring about children's suffrage. What social consequences might we expect to result?

1. Improved overall situation of children, including an increase in the quality of their socialization, care and education, balancing their rights with those of other groups, and lowering the level of children's criminality, drug addiction, homelessness, and alienation.

2. Increased political role of children and their families. This will increase their political activity, culture, and sense of political responsibility. Parents of young children will vote not only for

themselves but also for their children.

3. Strengthened family ties will increase the role and raise the esteem of the parents not only in society, but also in the eyes of their children, and it will increase the role and rights of women as mothers.

4. Strengthened democracy, as a result of expanding its social base.

5. Increased political role of the social sphere as a whole.

The problem of children's rights and the realization of an appropriate UN Convention will not be addressed until children's suffrage is recognised and instituted.

(4) Adequate Feminism

Session 6: Globalization and Women (ACCEPTED)

There is an important problem of attaining gender equality - or women's rights, on the same level as men's rights, in all of society spheres. Information from the " UN Fund Development for Women" indicates that over the last ten years only eight countries have enforced the International Conventions on observance of the sexual equality principle. Women continue to make up a majority of the poor, and do not have equivalent access to all resources. Despite many significant successes, discrimination has not ceased, and in some cases the status of women has decreased during this period.

Sociological theory is among the social reasons for gender inequality. In the history of sociology *almost all of its theories, with few exceptions, were created by men and for men*. The domination of men in all of society's spheres is reflected in sociological theory. Until recently, there were no sociological theories that had answered in the interests of women. Working against gender equality were: *political totalitarism, male chauvinism, religious fundamentalism, and theoretical monism*, which are all one, in effect. Our *hypothesis is: the monistic theories (for example, of Plato, Hegel, and Marx) answered to the interests of men, whereas, postpluralistic theories answer to the interests of men and women.* "Postpluralist" theories build on a limited number of key elements from many theories, in contrast to tolerating many theories that remain relatively isolated from one another. One postpluralist theory is "tetrasociology," developed at the end of the 20th century, pointing toward social harmony and equality, including gender equality.

Tetrasociology is one of the possible responses to the feminist challenge. For example, the *masculine potential for aggression and violence, exploited over past centuries, loses its social priority* in the information/network society toward which tetrasociology points. The foundation of modern civilization was built on masculine priority in the past, but female priority will give perfection and provide a new source of development in the future. *This priority is created by real female equality.* In the information society, accepting an ideal of social prosperity on the base of harmony and information, *the priority is to incorporate female harmony and a peaceful disposition.*

Recognizing female equality will open up the development of society and foster peaceful social relationships. Social harmony and prosperity require: a) *equal participation* of women in all of society's spheres, including government, b) *equal power for women throughout society***,** c) *suffrage for minors* exercised by their parents or trustees, giving new rights to mothers, and (d) recognition that domestic labour by women is *just as productive as labour by men, and it should be paid.*

Tetrasociology, affirming the necessity of equal participation of women in all spheres, including government, is *feminist theory that is adequate to the interests of both women and men* in the age of globalization.

(5) Alienation and Appropriation

Session 66: Alienation Theory and Research: New Directions (ACCEPTED)

Session 68: Alienated popular culture: the non-reflection of reality in culture (ACCEPTED)

In the capitalist system, Marx allocated three kinds of alienation of man: from the process of labour/production, from the product of labour, and from itself. It is **mutual alienation** of man and society. Marx saw private property as the total source of alienation. Marx thought that state ownership of socialism could overcome alienation. However, the practices of the former communist camp have shown us that state ownership produced alienation. Marx created the theory of alienation but did not create a theory of appropriation to overcome alienation. His ideas of state ownership, socialism and proletarian revolution did not prove the theory. The weakest part of his theory was the idea of a classless society. The refusal of a class concept excluded from the theory a recognition that any social actors are capable of overcoming alienation. A new theory is needed, of new classes, as new social actors who are capable of overcoming alienation.

One such theory is tetrasociology, as a four-dimensional postpluralistic conception of social space-time allocating new, sphere classes, not based on property or stratification criteria, but on reproductive employment (r-employment) of people. The r-employment of people exists in all public and individual processes of reproduction, in the lifecycle of people from birth to death. Therefore, it encompasses more than the categories of labor, economic employment, property, and related activity. Non-labour, non-economic, non-proprietary, non-active forms of r-employment exist. Any r-employment has a subject and a product, therefore it is always productive.

R-employment is divided according to four "spheres of reproduction," by the criterion of reproduction of one of four subjects/products. SOCIOSPHERE by the subject/product of reproduction of PEOPLE. INFOSPHERE - INFORMATION. ORGSPHERE - ORGANIZATIONS. TECHNOSPHERE (ECONOMY) - THINGS.

Corresponding to these spheres are four productive sphere classes: 1. The SOCIOCLASS: employed in the sociosphere (healthcare, education, etc.). 2. The INFOCLASS: employed in the infosphere (science, culture, etc.). 3. The ORGCLASS: employed in the orgsphere (politics, management, etc.). 4. The TECHNOCLASS: employed in the technosphere.

The spheres of reproduction are equally necessary for society, which results in a balance and proportionality that provides a basis for social harmony. The sphere classes, employed in these spheres, are also equally necessary for society. They are equal in importance, but differ in the quality of employment within each sphere. The equality and distinction of the sphere classes, and also their striving for balance, transforms them into harmonious and solidary classes. They generally conform to a "*law of harmony*"**,** by contrast with classes based on property, which generally conform to a "*law of disharmony*".

Alienation is overcome by *mutual appropriation* of man and society, through harmonious relations of the spheres and sphere classes. Conscious *change* by people in sphere employment, in the reproduction spheres, is capable of directing society and man toward mutual appropriation and toward overcoming alienation.

A vivid example of alienation is the abuse of modern, popular culture, which in the pursuit of profit often breaks down barriers to alienation, especially for youth. This misuse relies on the branch/bureaucratic ownership of property of the mass communications industry - and contributes to branch cultural disharmony, which departs from reality and causes alienation. Marx proposed that the ownership of private property is the entire cause of alienation.

From a tetrasociological point of view, the source of disharmony and alienation of popular culture is the branch organization of society, rather than state or private ownership of property. Only the harmony of spheres and sphere classes can overcome alienation, by *mutual appropriation* of human and society, so the way to cultural harmony and appropriation lies through harmony of the spheres and

sphere classes.

INFOSPHERE
(6) Social Harmony as the Key Value

Session 71: Social Values in the Age of Globalization (ACCEPTED)

The basis of social organization of an industrial society is produced by the branch of industry. The industrial branch/bureaucratic organization has affirmed a branch system of values: freedom, ownership of property, labor, legal equality, personal advantage, independence, enlightenment, pluralism, pragmatism and democracy. There are a pair of central values: property and freedom, the key to which is that freedom forms an axis for a branch system of values. On this basis such values as justice, love, brotherhood, tolerance, non-violence, peace, humanism, equality of opportunities and the harmony of man were declared, but in the bureaucratic reality of the 19th and 20th centuries they have been replaced by injustice, hatred, enmity, intolerance, violence, war, non-humanism, growing inequality and 'one-dimensional man' (Marcuse, 1964). The branch organization and system of values have been overturned by total branch/ bureaucratic disharmony.

In the age of globalization, the basis for social organization becomes a sphere of society. The sphere is a complex of branches, incorporated by one subject/product, and reproduces a necessary social resource. The many theorists of globalization allocate different numbers of spheres: Giddens (1990), Sklair(1991), and Robertson (1992) - three; Appadurai (1996) - five; Beck (1998) and Therborn (2000) - four spheres.

Tetrasociology, as a global sociological version, allocates four equally necessary and sufficient resources of society, reproduced in the appropriate spheres by appropriate sphere classes: SOCIOCLASS, INFOCLASS, ORGCLASS and TECHNOCLASS. The sphere classes differ not over property ownership, but on the basic reproductive employment in one of the spheres, and therefore they exclude class antagonism. A new sphere organization of society arises on the basis of spheres and sphere classes. If the branches submit to the *law of branch disharmony*, then the spheres and sphere classes submit to *the law of sphere harmony.* This law posits the tendency of an irregular development of spheres to the maximum of their balance, equilibrium and proportionality, which comprises social harmony.

A new system of universal values: social harmony, sphere employment, change of employment, justice, love, brotherhood, tolerance, non-violence, peace, humanism, equality of opportunities, and harmonious man is formed as the base of a sphere (postindustrial) organization. It is a sphere system of values in which the axis becomes a pair: social harmony-sphere employment. The key value is the value of social harmony. The priority of this value provides not only a formal but also a real statement of the other named values, which are identical to social harmony and comprise its different aspects.

Social harmony is pivotal because, of all universal values, it's the one that can save the world and man from self-destruction. Social harmony is eternal and the oldest humanitarian value, figuring in poems as old as Homer's, extensively developed by ancient culture and treasured during every period of human history. Aristotle understood it as the "golden mean" and "proportionality of parts of the whole," Leibniz, as "pre-established harmony," and the Renaissance, as "harmonious person," which became the symbol of humanism. "Beauty which will save the world" (Dostoevsky) is nothing other than social harmony. Tetrasociology understands it as a desire for balance among the spheres of society/man. Desire for the spheres' inner harmony, and harmony with society's spheres, is man's saving remedy. Desire for harmony of its spheres and for harmony with other societies' and civilizations' spheres is society's saving remedy. The saving remedy is not in harmony itself, because, being no more than an eternal ideal, it is unattainable, but in people's, societies' and civilizations' ever-lasting efforts to achieve

it. Social harmony has been waiting for millenniums for its self-aware actors, for social actors able to perpetually struggle for it. Social sciences, tetrasociology being first among them (although not the only one!), only now are approaching the task of defining and solving this problem, which is of paramount importance for the survival of man and humankind.

The actors of social harmony can only be the sphere classes. Their harmony is impossible without personal harmony. In the future, social and personal harmony will become the moral norm. All that is disharmonious, e. g., poverty, wealth, injustice, hatred, violence, war, etc., will be considered immoral.

The sphere system of universal values does not reject the branch system of values, as such, but includes itself, and reconstructs the branch system of values on the new bases of social harmony.

(7) Plurotheism Hypothesis

Session 16: Religion and Globalization (ACCEPTED)

A tendency for religions to unite began over a century ago, with the ecumenical movement and inter-confessional dialog, but it was not very successful. The reason was the absence of a common and equal social basis. *A common faith is a faith of equal people. Different faiths are faiths of unequal people.* Differences between the faiths foster, promote and sanctify world inequality, leading to clashes of civilizations, to religion-inspired wars, etc. The global world vitally needs a global common faith. In discovering **equal** sphere classes of the world population, tetrasociology discovered the *social* foundations for the unity of religions, whereas the Bahai faith discovered the *religious* foundations.

Tetrasociology allocates four equally necessary and sufficient resources of a society, reproduced in the appropriate spheres, by appropriate sphere classes of the population. These resources are PEOPLE, INFORMATION, ORGANIZATIONS, and THINGS. They are reproduced by the SOCIOSPHERE, INFOSPHERE, ORGSPHERE and TECHNOSPHERE (economy); and by sphere classes: SOCIOCLASS, INFOCLASS, ORGCLASS and TECHNOCLASS. The spheres of reproduction are equally necessary for society, and aim for a balance and proportionality that establish the basis for social harmony. The sphere classes, employed in these spheres, are also equally necessary for society. They are equal in the importance of their employment, but differ in the quality of employment within each sphere. Equality and distinction of the sphere classes in employment, and also their striving for balance, transforms them into harmonious and solidary classes of the world.

On this social basis, tetrasociology advances a hypothesis of PLUROTHEISM as a possible way of religious union at an intermediary platform of the Bahai belief. Plurotheism is presented as the union of many images of God in Shefer's (1996) 'paradigm of unity' of religions, which he found exemplified in the Bahai belief.

Plurotheism is not the polytheism of the past, any more than the monotheism of modern religions is; rather, it is an organic synthesis of the religions on the basis of equality. One of the ancient analogs of plurotheism is the recognition by ancient Romans of the gods of the countries seized by them. They placed these deities in the Pantheon for the purpose of extinguishing international conflicts, and to maintain unity in the Roman empire.

Principles of Plurotheism:

1. Equality of all religions as different images of one God. In the faith of anyone, His image is One Faith.
2. Equal rights in the life of all religions, recognizing one God for all.
3. All religions have in one God the basis of unity expressed by universal spiritual values.
4. There is a form in which universal values can be acceptable to all religions.
5. All religions have inalienable rights to the preservation of the originality of their beliefs, as part of

any union, according to Tillich's (1960) principle of religions *«supplementation,»* and according to «ecumenical» synthesis. See also: Siebert (1994) and Bachika (2002).

Plurotheism is a new statement of inter-confessional dialogue and religions tolerance. However, it is helpful not to branch classes but to sphere classes, as actors of social harmony.

(8) Studies of the Globalization Spheres

Plenary Session: Sociological Studies of Globalization

Globalization is multidimensional, but empirical studies of it generally are limited and non-comparable. Two basic reasons for this are (1) the use of traditional indices, which express some economic changes well, but others poorly, and (2) the absence of a general theoretical framework specifying the dimensions of globalization. One possible solution to these interconnected problems is «tetrasociology,» as a four-dimensional global theory of social space - time.

Tetrasociology offers a system of three fundamental dimensions of globalization space: resources, processes, and structures. These dimensions are named, accordingly: statics, dynamics, and structuratics. For each globalization dimension it allocates four very large units - spheres. Four spheres of resources: people, information, organizations, things. Four spheres of the reproduction processes: production, distribution, exchange, consumption. Four spheres of structures are: social, informational, organizational and technical/economic spheres of reproduction. These spheres superimpose innovative global changes on the existing, routine, or traditional changes. The structural spheres unite the process and resource spheres and include the entire population. They are equally productive, giving us an egalitarian and harmonious vision for all people throughout any society. Thus, twelve spatial globalization dimensions are assessed at all levels: country, region, and world.

For statistical expression of resources, tetrasociology enters matrixes of the sphere indices. A base matrix of sphere indices is size 4x4, and includes 16 special, aggregated indices expressing spheres, and are therefore named "sphere indices". They do not exclude traditional, economic and statistical indices. Rather, they unite and supplement them. But their differences from traditional analyses allow us to speak about special sociological statistics. In this way, we can analyse resources, processes, and structures within each sphere. This allows us to do essentially new empirical studies of globalization and to receive essentially new empirical information, which can deal with enormous complexity and also be comparable at different geographical levels for different societies. We might call such studies «tetraempirical» or «tetrasociological.» They do not exclude, but supplement and order traditional studies. Tetrasociological studies help us to distinguish global innovative changes from local and routine changes.

Here are some examples of tetrasociological studies that might be done:

A. Global changes in the social sphere

1. Changes in the population or size of this sphere over the last 20 years.
2. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for the world.
3. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for a given country.
4. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for a given region.

B. Global changes in the information sphere

5. Changes in information resources over the last 20 years.
6. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for the world.
7. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for a given country.
8. Changes in the three dimensions of this sphere for a given region.

Analogous studies for the other two spheres could be initiated. Of course, such studies would require significant financial resources.

(9) New Statistics and IT

Session 13: IT & Communication (NOT ACCEPTED)

Tetrasociology is a postpluralistic theory of four-dimensional social space-time, each coordinate axis of which (People, Information, Organizations, Things) is expressed by four variable constants. Tetrasociology is not limited by the theory. It develops into new informational technologies (IT). This new IT development has been used since 1980. It is called '*Sphere/sociological Informational-Statistical Technology' (SIST*). There are more than seventy examples of its application. Let's consider the steps of tetrasociology's transition from the theory to SIST.

1. *Sociological*. It is comprised of 16 variable constants of social space-time. Their measurement is reduced to measurements of resource constants: People(P), Information(I), Organizations(O), Things(T).

2. *Statistical*. It is made up of a system of sphere statistical indices expressing variable constants, adding economic branch indices, free of the usual scantiness of economic indices. This system is created on the basis of a 4x4 matrix of sphere indices. It has the following form:

P = P1 + P2 + P3 + P4, where P is population, and P1, P2, P3, P4 - its sphere classes,

I = I1 + I2 + I3 + I4, where I is the information, and I1, I2, I3, I4 - its complexes,

O = O1 + O2 + O3 + O4, where O is the organizations, and O1, O2, O3, O4 - their blocks,

T = T1 + T2 + T3 + T4, where T is things, and T1, T2, T3, T4 - their groups.

The base matrix creates a set of derivative matrixes for statistical expression of various social resources, processes, structures and states. They give some essentially new, unknown until now, information about social objects. The addition of branch indices to sphere indices is adequate for sociology, and the sphere indices are therefore sociological.

3. *Mathematical/algorithmic*. It is comprised of a system of algorithms of transformations of sphere/sociological indices, and also of appropriate statistical-mathematical models specified as kinds of products of SIST.

4. *Program.* It is made up of a set of Software products (SPs) forming a large family: 'Individual', 'Country', 'World Society', 'Environment', 'Sphere System of Classification and Search of Internet Resources', etc. SIST is combined with the traditional IT. The main difference consists of a transformation *of the content, but not the form* of social information. Its content is controlled by means of the new sphere indices, making SIST both unique and global. Similar technologies are not available elsewhere in the world .

SIST is used not only as IT but also as a new means of communication. The SIST language is universal, and usable for people of different cultures, religions, national languages, races, classes, etc. Therefore, it can become the basis for a new kind of communication among them. SIST can become an effective tool of information interchange, mutual understanding, dialogue, resolution of conflicts, and achievement of social harmony. SIST is offered as a project for international and interdisciplinary development, requiring a significant financial investment.

(10) Information Security

Session 79: Society and Security (ACCEPTED)

The complete unexpectedness of the terrorist acts in the USA on 9/11, 2001 and in Moscow 10/23-26, 2002, made it impossible, for even the most powerful intelligence services of the world, to see what was coming. These terrorist attacks obviously prove the absence of an adequate information mechanism for security.

In order to make the tracking of terrorist activities «informationally transparent,» it is necessary

to establish what resources, at what moment, and from what structures "disappear" and pass to terrorists. A universal informational and statistical instrument is needed to obtain this systematic information. Traditional economic statistics are insufficient for these purposes because they are «irregular,» with many internal gaps, that miss essential information.

A system of global information security is offered by tetrasociology, based on the new, sphere sociological statistics that it has developed.

In tetrasociology, a universal system of parameters of social space-time is created, expressed by a universal system of statistical matrixes of sphere indices, which can be used as indicators to predict deviances, including potentials for terrorism. On this basis, for any city, state or country, a " Sphere System of Information Security" (SSIS) can be constructed. The association of all SSIS, of the majority of the countries of the world, will create a Global SSIS. The sphere indices language will then be identical at all levels for global comparison.

On the basis of SSIS at any level, the base matrix of 4x4 sphere indices indicating a threat of terrorism, is as follows:

Pd = P1d+P2d+P3d+P4d, where Pd is human resources indicating a threat of terrorism, and P1d, P2d, P3d, P4d are their groups from different spheres of employment;

Id = I1d+I2d+I3d+I4d, where Id is information resources indicating a threat of terrorism, and I1d, I2d, I3d, I4d are its complexes from different spheres;

Od = O1d+O2d+O3d+O4d, where Od is organizational (including financial) resources indicating a threat of a terrorist attack, and O1d, O2d, O3d, O4d are its complexes from different spheres;

Td = T1d+T2d+T3d+T4d, where Td is material resources indicating a possible terrorist attack, and T1d, T2d, T3d, T4d are its sphere groups.

On the basis of a base matrix, a set of derivative matrixes are generated, expressing different resources, processes, and structures for different countries and regions. This system expresses an entire spectrum of the resource inputs and outputs of terrorism. The main goal of information surveillance in SSIS is the security of citizens and States, the prevention of attacks, and in the end, the complete neutralization of terrorism.

The single most powerful obstacle in the way of the creation of a global SSIS is the regime of commercial/State secrets. International terrorism has created a new global dilemma: global security or commercial/State secrets? More secrets - less security. The secrets have branch/bureaucratic meaning, whereas global security has meaning in human terms. Which is more important for the modern world? It is not an easy question. The cost of SSIS is great, but probably no greater than the cost of one nuclear bomb.

ORGSPHERE

(11) Global Democracy

Session 69: Democracy in the Global World (ACCEPTED)

A global world needs a global form of democracy that does not impinge on nations, cultures, traditions and political specificity. Modern forms of democracy cannot be a model for global democracy because they are based on branch classes and branch/bureaucratic organization of power. The branches and bureaucracy mutually reproduce each other and create elite/authoritarian domination, but they are non-relevant to globalization. Branch classes complement branch democracy. Global democracy requires a cardinal transformation to NON-branch bases of power. Global democracy should have global structural, social and organizational bases. Their variant in the form of «sphere democracy» is conceptualised in tetrasociology as a postpluralistic, four-dimensional theory of global social space - time.

The structural basis of global democracy is composed of four spheres of social reproduction, within which, their own subjects, products and technologies differ: 1. *Sociosphere*: its subject and product are people, who are socially reproduced by means of humanitarian technologies of education, health etc. 2. *Infosphere*: its subject and product are information reproduced by informational technologies (IT). 3. *Orgsphere*: its subject and product are the organizations (political, legal, etc.) that are reproduced by organizational technologies. 4. *Technosphere*: its subject and product are the things which are reproduced by industrial and agrarian technologies. The spheres unite the relevant branches and conform to the *law of harmony of spheres,* which overcomes the *law of branch disharmony*. The reproduction spheres are inherent to all societies, therefore they provide a structural basis for global democracy.

The social basis of global democracy is comprised of the productive sphere classes of the population, which differ with respect to reproductive employment in each of the spheres: 1. SOCIOCLASS: employed in the sociosphere, the workers in branches of healthcare, education etc., and also all non-working members of the population employed in reproduction itself; 2. INFOCLASS: employed in the infosphere, the workers in branches of science, culture, and communication, etc.; 3. ORGCLASS: employed in the orgsphere, the workers in branches of politics, finance, defence, etc.; 4. TECHNOCLASS: employed in the technosphere, the working class and peasants/farmers. Sphere classes are formed in the globalization epoch, together with the formation of their self-consciousness and identity. As sphere classes differ, not in relation to property, but in relation to reproductive employment, they are harmonious classes. They are inherent to all societies, therefore they provide the relevant social basis for global democracy.

The organizational basis of global democracy apportions an EQUAL distribution of State power among sphere classes, and not only among classes but also between men and women, and between the younger and older generations. Each child should have the right to vote, exercised by the parents or trustees of the child. Such democracy is "sphere," "tetrar," or "global." Its remote historical analog is the Tetrarchia of the ancient Greek and Roman empires. The democratic model of the European Union is the closest form of it today.

Let's formulate a plan for a *four-polar world order,* with conditions of global sphere democracy, for the 21st century. For conditions of sphere democracy, all of the world's countries will be ranked (nominated) on development priority in four spheres, resulting in creation of a dynamic, four-polar world order. It means all countries will be distributed in one of four groups, with a development priority of either sociosphere, infosphere, orgsphere, or technosphere, given one scale for comparison of levels of their development in each sphere.

(12) Social Harmony Policy

Plenary Session: Social Development and Social Policy

In the sociology of the 20th century we had two approaches to understanding class structure: an emphasis on the ownership of property (Marxism), and an emphasis on multiple criteria for stratification (Western sociology). A third approach is offered by "Tetrasociology," with a focus on "reproductive employment" (or "r-employment"), that includes Marxist and Western orientations.

R-employment includes all public and individual processes of reproduction. Its bearer and source is the entire population. R-employment is a lifecycle and life energy of people from birth to death. Therefore, it is much broader than the categories of work, economic employment, and related activity because it includes non-labour, non-economic and non-active forms of employment. R-employment is always productive, because it always has a result and an impact on society.

R-employment is divided according to four "spheres of social reproduction". There is the

SOCIOSPHERE, made up of PEOPLE, the INFOSPHERE, centring on INFORMATION, the ORGSPHERE, including all ORGANIZATIONS, and the TECHNOSPHERE, focusing on THINGS and the economy. Corresponding to these spheres are four productive sphere classes: 1. The SOCIOCLASS: employed in the sociosphere, including healthcare, education, social security, sports, and the non-working population, such as pre-scholars, students, the unemployed, pensioners, etc.; 2. The INFOCLASS: employed in the infosphere, including workers in science, culture, communication, and information services; 3. The ORGCLASS: employed in orgsphere, including workers in politics, management, law, finance, defence, etc.; and 4. The TECHNOCLASS: employed in the technosphere, including the working class and farmers/peasants. Individuals can be simultaneously employed in several spheres, but their main employment is counted only in one.

The spheres of reproduction are equally necessary for society, and they achieve a balance and proportionality that forms the basis for social harmony. The sphere classes, employed in these spheres, are also equally necessary for society. They are equal in employment, but differ in the quality of employment in each sphere. The equality and distinction of the sphere classes, and also their striving for balance, transforms them into harmonious and solidary classes. The spheres and sphere classes generally conform to a *"law of harmony"*.

On this basis it is possible to state a *hypothesis*: *the general direction for social policy in the globalization epoch will be social harmony of sphere classes.* This direction is multidimensional, and includes many aspects. First, formation of sphere classes is determined by growth of their self-consciousness and 'sphere identity' as harmonious actors. This helps to overcome aggression due to separate religious, linguistic, national, branch, and other disharmonious identities. Second, their must be growth of the middle classes to overcome the extremes of poverty and wealth. Third, a transition from a priority of economic policy to a priority of social policy. Fourth, a transition from branch/bureaucratic to sphere distribution of State power among the four sphere classes (creating a sphere democracy). Fifth, the introduction of children's suffrage, under 18 years of age, represented by their parents or trustees.

(13) Communist Multi-Party of China

Session 54: Modern China Studies in The Age of Globalization (ACCEPTED)

Globalization is accompanied by increasing democratization, yielding new forms of social structure. The countries of the former communist camp have changed their social structures dramatically. The severe problems associated with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) contributed to the collapse of the USSR, with replacement of a communist one-party system by a democratic multi-party system.

The Communist Party of China (CPC) has remained in power only because it has decided on economic liberalization, encouragement of private property, and change from a proletarian to a national Party. However, this is not enough. Democratization is required inside the CPC, as a rigid, one-party system threatens a more destructive collapse in China than it did in the USSR. Therefore, the following gradual (5 to 10 years) CPC transition to a communist multi-party can be a logical step for adaptation to a new world.

The communist multi-party system conception was developed by me in 1988 for CPSU, but it was rejected, and that rejection contributed to the destruction of the CPSU. It disintegrated to eight hostile parties. Also important, organizational resources were destroyed, which Russia could not restore until now. That conception was created within "tetrasociology" (then called the «sphere approach») as a multidimensional social theory that divides a society into four equally necessary spheres of reproduction: SOCIOSPHERE reproducing PEOPLE, INFOSPHERE - INFORMATION,

ORGSPHERE - ORGANIZATIONS and TECHNOSPHERE reproducing THINGS (the economy). This analysis builds on the ideas of Marx, Braudel, Parsons, Bourdieu and other sociologists.

According to these spheres, the country's population is divided into four sphere classes, by criterion of basic employment in one of the spheres. These classes are: 1. SOCIOCLASS: employed in the sociosphere (includes healthcare, education, social security, sports, and non-working population: children, pensioners, etc.). 2. INFOCLASS: employed in the infosphere, including workers in science, culture, communication. 3. ORGCLASS: employed in orgsphere, including workers in politics, management, finance, defence, etc. 4. TECHNOCLASS: employed in the technosphere, including the working class and peasants. As they are not divided on ownership of property or branch/employment, they are not antagonistic but solidary (friendly), labor, which excludes the disharmony of class struggle. Spheres and sphere classes generally conform to a *"law of harmony,"* in contrast to classes based on property, which generally conform to a *"law of disharmony"*.

With reference to China's sphere classes, the *CPC transformation into a union of four solidary, labor*, *communist parties is possible*. The process of transition to a communist multi-party system can begin with the creation inside the CPC of four equal-in-rights factions which then can be allocated to independent communist parties, with the CPC becoming the union of all four. CPC's multi-party system could give China a smooth and bloodless transformation within the framework of the existing State system, thus adapting to a democratic and multipolar world order. This multi-party CPC would win respect for China throughout the world, lower the intensity of conflict, and raise harmony in them. The author is ready to participate in development of this project, which can become a part of the «Chinese Project».

TECHNOSPHERE
(14) Ecological Harmony

Session 8: Globalization and Environmentalism. (NOT ACCEPTED)

The ecological crisis of the 20th century is beset by total branch/bureaucratic disharmony, by excessive and uncontrolled development of material production, and first of all by armaments. Total branch disharmony is a consequence of social system disharmony, which is reproduced by branch/bureaucratic industrial organization. Its basis was produced by the branches of industry, branches that are institutionally represented by firms, monopolies, transnational corporations and States. They are a source of total disharmony, including ecological crisis, which is insuperable for branch/bureaucratic disharmonious organization. The ecological harmony of nature and society is especially unattainable because of it. Ecological harmony essentially requires other harmonious social organizations.

In the globalization age, a basis for social organization of post industrial or information society becomes a sphere of reproduction as a sphere of society. The sphere is a complex of branches which is incorporated by one subject/product and reproduces a resource, necessary for society. Different theorists of globalization allocate a different number of spheres.

Tetrasociology, as a version of global sociology, allocates four equally necessary and sufficient resources of a society reproduced in the appropriate spheres by appropriate sphere classes of the population. These resources are PEOPLE, INFORMATION, ORGANIZATIONS and THINGS. They are reproduced by the SOCIOSPHERE, INFOSPHERE, ORGSPHERE and TECHNOSPHERE (economy); and by sphere classes: SOCIOCLASS, INFOCLASS, ORGCLASS and TECHNOCLASS. The sphere classes differ not over property, but on the basic reproductive employment in one of the spheres, and therefore they exclude class antagonism. A new sphere organization arises on the basis of spheres and sphere classes which conform to *the law of sphere harmony*. This law shows a tendency for

an irregular development of spheres towards the maximum of their balance, equilibrium, and proportionality, which constitute social harmony. It overcomes *the law of branch disharmony*.

Tetrasociology offers a transition from a disharmonious and catastrophic environmentalism to a harmonious one. From a tetrasociological position, the ecological harmony is reached by social harmony of the sphere classes and by harmonious organization of the society and State. Only their harmonious organization will ensure ecological harmony. The new information technology created on the basis of new, global statistics in tetrasociology is a means of harmonization of society and ecology. This technology includes economic statistics, but is much broader, and qualitatively different. A harmonious global ecology is not required for traditional branch actors, but it is necessary to sphere classes as promoters of harmony and sustainable development. However, this is difficult to hope for. The realization of technological harmony will not occur until after the self-identification and self-organisation of the sphere classes. Only they are capable of controlling technosphere influences on the environment and harmonization of them. Sustainable development from harmony of the social world with the natural environment can be the result only of global social harmony. In the globalization age, mankind can respond to the ecological challenge through social harmony of the sphere classes.

References:

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bachika, R. (ed). (2002). *Traditional Religion and Culture in a New Era*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Beck U. (1998). *Was ist Globalization?* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Marcuse, H. (1964). The One-dimensional Man. Moscow: REFL-book, 1994.

Phillips, B. (2001). *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel: Reconstructing the Scientific Method*. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Phillips, B., H. Kincaid, & T. Scheff (eds.) (2002). *Toward a Sociological Imagination: Bridging Specialized Fields* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Robertson R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.

Robertson R. (1995). "Globalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity," *Global modernities,* M.Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (eds.). London: Sage.

Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St. Petersburg, Russia: State Technical Univ. http://www.tetrasociology2002.spb.ru

Shefer, U. (1996). "Ending Religious Conflicts: Paradigm of Future Harmony" *Bahaullah's Paradigm of Unity*. Prague: Zero Palm.

Siebert, R. (1994). *From Critical Theory to Critical Political Theology. Personal Autonomy and Universal Solidarity*. New York:

Sklair L. (1991). *Sociology of the Global System*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Therborrn, G. (2000). "Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Wales, Regional Effects, Normative Governance" *International Sociology*, V. 15, No. 2.

Tillich, P. (1960). *Love, Power and Justice*. New York:

Toffler A. (1971). *Future Shock*. London: Pan Books.

PART 2. DIALOGS WITH TETRASOCIOLOGY

Toward a new Age of Enlightenment. Tetrasociology and Web Approach
Bernard Phillips, USA

Leo Semashko's theory (2002) opens up for contemporary sociologists a window that looks out onto ideals of the Enlightenment that not only persist, but are carried much further by this contemporary Russian sociologist. It is hard to imagine how these ideals can be extended as far as Semashko takes them, given his experiences of trying to keep them alive in a dictatorship for decades, and given the economic problems faced by academics in contemporary Russia. Yet there are parallels to this outside of Russia, for we might also wonder how Western sociologists like C. Wright Mills and Alvin Gouldner managed to stay with these same Enlightenment ideals, despite the horrors of the 20th century and the resulting pessimism and cynicism inside and outside the academic world.

Imagine, with Semashko, a world that is moving toward a new Age of Enlightenment where globalization, multiculturalism, and the internet are working to yield ever more harmony among all the peoples of the world. This is not a postmodern world, with a pessimistic view of the potential of the scientific method. Rather, it is a "postpluralistic" world, which follows postmodernism in its openness to complexity and change. It is optimistic about the possibilities of the scientific method to understand complexity and change by integrating elements of many theories, versus maintaining the isolation of diverse theories that fail to communicate with each other. Just as people in that world are learning to interact so as to pay full attention to others' ideas and ultimate worth--and even to create a "dialogue among civilizations"--so are social scientists learning to integrate the work of those who have preceded them so as to follow scientific ideals for a social science that cumulates rapidly (Phillips, 2001; Phillips, et al., 2002).

Semashko does not assume that such a world emerges by itself, for, like Auguste Comte (1875-1877), he sees a vision of sociologists working to bring it about by addressing modern problems in a highly effective manner. He coins the term "tetrasociology" to refer to the kind of sociology that can accomplish this, with a breadth similar to that which Mills called for in *The Sociological Imagination* (1959), along with the reflexivity that Gouldner called for in *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970). That breadth is based on Semashko's own background as a philosopher no less than a sociologist, including a metaphysical and epistemological stance along with his theoretical and applied orientations. And just as modern sociologists have emphasized the nature and extraordinary impact of language on shaping the individual and society, so does Semashko attempt to use that impact by introducing many new concepts such as "tetrasociology."

To illustrate Semashko's approach, his metaphysics is oriented to three dimensions of social space and one dimension of social time, corresponding to the three dimensions of physical space and one dimension of physical time. Further, just as Einstein related space and time, so Semashko sees the linkage between social space and social time as crucial. Before taking one step further into his ideas, we have gained fundamental insights from this metaphysical orientation, without calling it a kind of number magic following the mysticism of Pythagoras. Semashko alerts us to the importance of probing into our own metaphysical assumptions, whether or not they differ from his. What is our own worldview, or *Weltanschauung*? a concept that may appear to be outdated to modern sociological eyes. What impact does that worldview have on every stage of the research process? Why has almost every social science publication over the past century failed to assess that impact? Why don't we social scientists devote the attention to this topic that it deserves, instead of continuing to rule out metaphysics and philosophy from the realm of sociology?

As for the relationship between social space and social time, Semashko is telling us of the centrality of the latter if we hope to understand the former, and he is indirectly criticizing the relatively

static nature of the social sciences. This is arguably a frontier of our discipline. At the macro level this is illustrated by efforts of comparative-historical sociologists to face up to the complexity of history, carrying further the more simplistic orientations of figures such as Toynbee, Spencer and Sorokin. At the micro level it is illustrated by the work of symbolic interactionsts, ethnomethodologists and rational-choice theorists who attempt to probe deeply into the scene, capturing changes in emotions and speech from one moment to the next with audio-visual technology. Metaphorically, I'm reminded here of Edwin Abbott's *Flatland*, a science-fiction story written in the 1880s, where a three-dimensional sphere is able to see into all of Flatland's two-dimensional houses and inhabitants by hovering over them. Analogously, we require a four-dimensional perspective that includes social time to see into our own nature, probing into the history of the individual and society in order to understand present-day behavior. Here we have Semashko carrying further the long-term historical orientation illustrated by Marx, extending it to the momentary scene.

If we turn to Semashko's epistemology, we find - implicitly - a profound critique of our modern approach to the scientific method. His postpluralism calls for the ability of the social scientist to make good use of all of the relevant theoretical ideas from the past in investigating any given problem. Yet sociologists are divided into numerous specialized areas, and literally hundreds of subspecialties, and we generally fail to communicate across specialized and subspecialized boundaries. This is illustrated by the division of the American Sociological Association into no less than forty-two distinct Sections, each with their own organizations and immunity to outside ideas. By contrast, Semashko's ideas bridge many specialities, as called for in *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel* (Phillips, 2001) and *Toward a Sociological Imagination* (Phillips, et al., (2002).

In this way, Semashko challenges all of us, and puts forward his own response, as indicated in his book's subtitle, "Responses to Challenges." Granting the enormous difficulties of confronting our own epistemological assumptions and coming up with alternatives that follow our ideals for the scientific method, he calls for us to respond to that challenge. He is indirectly criticizing postmodernist critiques of the scientific method, critiques that are one-sided in their failure to construct alternative procedures. How should we take into account the impact of the researcher on the research process? How should we specialists reach out to the knowledge within other specialized areas? How should we proceed to pay attention to our metaphysical assumptions? What is the nature of a scientific method that follows scientific ideals? What kind of methodology would take into account the incredible dynamism and complexity of human behavior? He gives us hints with his own breadth of perspective, his understanding of the existence of the complexity and dynamism of human behavior, and his ideals for the possibilities of sociology and of every human being.

Semashko is no less concerned with theory than with metaphysics and epistemology. He departs from a Marxist emphasis on an inevitable conflict between social classes, emphasizing instead the potential harmony among peoples throughout the world based on shared values, along with the process of globalization and the potential of the internet. Yet he takes key elements from Marxist theory, just as his methodological orientation is to be selective from the full range of available social science theory. For example, the cultural value of equality, coupled with other humanistic values, are central to his thought, just as they are to the Enlightenment tradition. His historical perspective, central to Marxist theory, is carried into every single instance of human behavior. He divides all of society into four "spheres," and those within the spheres constitute four "sphere classes." He sees all people within society as productive, in contrast to Marx's focus on work and property, since everyone is essential to society's existence.

Thus, there is the "socioclass" within the "sociosphere," concerned with education (including students), health, social work, retired people, the unemployed and the nonworking population. The

"infoclass" within the "infosphere" includes those involved with science, the arts, communication, and information services. The "orgclass" within the "orgsphere" includes those in management, government, law, law enforcement, finance, and the armed forces. And there is also the "technoclass" within the "technosphere," which includes industrial workers along with those involved in agriculture. Semashko invokes a "law of harmony" in describing relationships among the sphere classes, by contrast with a "law of disharmony" characterizing relationships among social classes based on property. One is reminded here of Durkheim's *The Division of Labor* (1893), where he contrasts a "normal division of labor" with an "abnormal division of labor." In the former case, specialists are aware of their contribution to the economy as a whole, whereas in the latter case there is no such awareness, along with problems that this creates. In Semashko's view, everyone - not just workers -will become aware of their contribution, not just to the economy but to the "reproduction" of society. With this broad approach to "reproductive employment," he encompasses more than Marx's emphasis on the ownership of property, and more than the emphasis on multiple criteria of stratification within Western sociology.

Turning from theory to application, Semashko recognizes the existence and urgency of fundamental problems within modern society, although he does not subject them to systematic analysis in his book. To illustrate, he specifies an egalitarian orientation in discussing the roles of women and children in society. If, indeed, society requires the continuing existence of individuals in every sphere who view themselves as worthwhile, and if those spheres are equally important for the "reproduction" of society, then this calls for social changes which follow that egalitarian perspective. For example, he suggests the importance of recognizing domestic labor by women as just as productive as work by men, recognition that should be supported by pay for such work. And he also suggests the importance of equal participation by women in all of the spheres of society. As for children, he sees their lack of suffrage as a "black hole" within modern society, since children under 18 comprise a fifth to a third of any given society's population. More generally, a great many children are deprived of high-quality education and care within society. Semashko goes on to propose one partial remedy: granting every child a vote that is exercised by the child's parents or guardians. He sees this as potentially strengthening the family's and the individual's political involvement, and also working to fight crime, drug addiction, homelessness and alienation.

A key aspect of Semashko's applied orientation has to do with the role of social scientists, just as a great many contemporary sociologists see applied work as crucial, not only to give their discipline legitimacy but also to test the adequacy of their ideas. Given the complexity and dynamism of society, statistical measurements that take into account the full extent of that complexity and dynamism are required. An approach must be developed that is general enough to be applied to the entire world population, and also specific enough so that it can be relevant to addressing difficult problems. At present, the relatively sparse information that exists, and is being developed, is neither general enough nor specific enough, and it fails to take into account much that has been learned within the social sciences. Semashko sees computer analyses, with the aid of mathematical models, yielding powerful tools for social scientists. And he specifies the importance of developing statistics for macro as well as micro analysis of social structures: world, nations, regions, communities, families, and individuals. Overall, we need data no less than theory if that theory is to become useful in solving problems.

Semashko succeeds in reminding Western sociologists of ideals that most of us gave up years ago, although they probably still remain somewhere inside of us. This is particularly noteworthy for someone who has suffered for so many years under a totalitarian regime. His intellectual breadth reminds us of the breadth of the classical founders of our discipline, such as Marx, Durkheim, Weber and Simmel. His recognition of human complexity and dynamism is quite modern. His methodological direction, to develop a "postpluralist" theory, is a way to address that complexity and dynamism. Such

theories build on a limited number of elements from many theories, in contrast to simply tolerating the existence of relatively isolated theories. Yet, at the same time, he leaves unanswered many questions that require answers, if we are to follow his ideals. He leaves, for future research, explanations of the complex forces that stand in the way of solving fundamental social problems. Granted that he points toward important ideals, we sociologists have largely repressed those ideals because we have not learned how to move toward them. To what extent does Semashko give us the deep understanding of human behavior required for such movement? Of course, this is asking too much, yet his book tends to gloss over the need for such explanations, jumping too quickly to purported solutions to problems, without giving us sufficient understanding of the nature of those problems, or of the forces standing in our way.

There are many questions that Semashko's ideas raise, and perhaps this is one of his major contributions. Viewing tetrasociology from a theoretical and applied perspective, why does social stratification persist, in contrast to the cultural ideal of equality? For example, what are the forces that are presently yielding sexism, ageism, classism and ethnocentrism? Why is Durkheim's "normal division of labor," with the worker's awareness of her contribution and importance to society as a whole, in fact an "abnormal division of labor" or state of affairs? Is his discussion of spheres and sphere classes no more than an empty categorization? How would it be possible to promote a "sphere consciousness," emphasizing the importance of every individual in society, paralleling the difficulty Marx experienced in understanding what mechanisms would yield class consciousness throughout the world? If, as Semashko claims, stratification would still exist within each sphere, what would cause the experience of the individual to be much different from what it is now? How are we to understand what causes "the law of harmony" and "the law of disharmony" to operate? Given what we have experienced in the 20th and early 21st centuries, is a "new Age of Enlightenment" a realistic possibility? How will Semashko analyze particular social and theoretical problems in detail, and come up with insights beyond what we have learned from contemporary sociological literature? Given the censorship of Western sociological literature in the Soviet Union until 1990, it will take time for him to catch up with that literature.

If we view tetrasociology from a metaphysical and epistemological or methodological perspective, just what is the nature of its metaphysical assumptions about human behavior and society? What is the nature of Semashko's overall image of the future? How should present-day sociologists proceed with their approach to the scientific method? What is wrong with present-day methodological procedures? What is wrong with present-day sociological theory? If Semashko's approach to releasing the potential of language is inadequate, how might we open up that potential? One problem within Semashko's approach is symptomatic of American sociology in the 1950s, with its newfound emphasis on what was believed to be the great potential of quantitative procedures. Many of us have learned, through long experience, of the limitations of such tools, along with the importance of qualitative procedures. Many of us have also learned the importance of centring on a particular problem, in contrast to developing a theory for all problems. But it is the latter, and not the former, that appears to be Semashko's approach. We can applaud his emphasis on the importance of general theory and metaphysical assumptions, but we can wonder about the lack of more specific theory, which comes down from general theory to a particular problem.

Semashko comes out of modern Russia with ideas that are in some ways more revolutionary than those of Karl Marx. Just as Toynbee saw human history in terms of challenge and response, Semashko attempts to respond to the acceleration of modern problems by pointing toward the possibility of a new Age of Enlightenment. He suggests nothing less than changes in the metaphysical stance of modern society, based on the potential weight of language. And he goes back to what may

well prove to be the future of social science. He returns us to the ideals of the scientific method and the enormous breadth of the classical sociologists. Yet, like Moses, he may have brought us to the Promised Land unable to enter it himself, with tetrasociology. For he fails to demonstrate how his broad metaphysical, epistemological, theoretical and applied approach to social science yields deeper insights into any major social or theoretical problem. Perhaps if we, as contemporary sociologists, can learn from Semashko to rekindle the fire of ideals that gave rise to the Enlightenment, and to the origins of sociology, a fire that we desperately require in these times of troubles, then we may find a way to enter that Promised Land.

Before adding my own views, of how sociologists might take further steps toward what Mills called "the promise of sociology," I have begun by emphasizing Semashko's contributions. We need his optimism about human possibilities, especially in these times of accelerating world problems. If he is able to carry forward Comte's conviction of sociologists' capacity to confront such problems, despite the difficulties he experienced in the Soviet Union and in post-USSR Russia, then surely the rest of us can learn to recapture that conviction. Along with this belief should go a responsibility for moving our discipline toward the ideals sketched by Comte, Mills, Gouldner, Semashko, and many others: to bring about a sociology that pulls together the islands of ideas from the social sciences and elsewhere, as to the nature of human behavior, and to build a science that develops our understanding far more rapidly than ever before. If sociologists are not in the best position to do this, who is? If we do not take responsibility for this, who will? However, we need not follow Comte's belief that we should become Queen of the Sciences. Such stratification would sabotage our efforts. Rather, we can build a path toward understanding that works for us, demonstrating the possibility for others to build their paths, and we can all learn from one another's efforts.

I also have emphasized Semashko's breadth of perspective, including metaphysics, epistemology, theory and applications, paralleling Mills' vision of the "sociological imagination." It is an approach that raises questions about the adequacy of our beliefs within these four areas of knowledge. For example, if our metaphysical stance has yielded a sociology that fails to address the complexity and dynamism of human behavior, then we must change it. If our epistemological stance rests easy with our failures to communicate across specialties and subspecialties, then that too must change. And the same goes for our theoretical and applied achievements. Contemporary philosophers of social science have taught us that these four areas are connected within a web of belief (Kincaid, 1996). Sociologists can no longer afford to avoid paying attention to our metaphysical and epistemological assumptions, for they affect all of our efforts to develop and apply theories of human behavior. To illustrate, Semashko's orientation, of paying attention to social time within all of our studies, contradicts our present metaphysical stance. Yet this appears to be essential if we are adequately to address human complexity and dynamism.

Further, I have suggested that sociologists come up with alternatives to our present metaphysical and epistemological assumptions, alternatives that will help us to achieve the rapid cumulative development of our knowledge that we desire, and that is desperately needed in these times. My own recent work here, and that of several others, is spelled out in *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel* (2001) and in *Toward a Sociological Imagination* (2002). Such efforts are not isolated from theory and applications, for it is the theoretical and applied fruitfulness of a given metaphysical or epistemological stance that sheds light on the usefulness of that stance. In these books I have contrasted a "bureaucratic" epistemology with an "interactive" one, with the former corresponding to present-day research, and the latter to research that opens up to human complexity and dynamism. Yet the problem of shifting from one scientific paradigm to another is a most difficult one, as Thomas Kuhn has suggested in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1966). That problem is particularly difficult,

following the argument in my books, since our epistemological paradigm is nested within our metaphysical paradigm.

Yet the incredible potential of the scientific method for sociologists, emphasized by Semashko, can succeed in confronting even a problem as great as changing our metaphysical paradigm. If we approach such change from a bureaucratic perspective, we are doomed to failure, for it lacks a deep sense of the problem as well as the intellectual breadth that is required. An interactive perspective - consistent with that suggested by Semashko - sees the scientific method metaphorically as a pendulum that swings in ever-widening arcs. To the extent that we open up to the depth of our metaphysical problem by swinging the pendulum in that direction, we can gain momentum for swinging it in the opposite direction, where we can make progress in changing that paradigm. And to the extent that we achieve such change, we gain momentum for understanding and defining more fully the problems of changing our paradigm. Such metaphysical efforts should in turn open us up to the epistemological, theoretical and applied efforts that Semashko outlines. This interactive orientation follows the one-step-at-a-time philosophy of pragmatism developed by Peirce, James, Dewey, Mead and others (see, for example, *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*). It also follows Semashko's emphasis on the importance of a "dialogue among civilizations." Thus, Semashko's optimism about sociology's possibilities at this time in history may well turn out to be the most realistic approach we can take to understanding human behavior and confronting human problems.

References:

Durkheim, Emile. (1893/1951) *The Division of Labor*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press

Gouldner, Alvin. (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Book

Kincaid, Harold. (1996). *Philosophical Foundations of the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Kuhn, Thomas. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Mills, C. Wright. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Phillips, Bernard. (2001). *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel: Reconstructing the Scientific Method*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter

Phillips, et al., (2002). *Toward a Sociological Imagination: Bridging Specialized Fields*. Lanham, MD: Univ. Press of America

Peirce, Charles. (1955). *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. New York: Dover

Semashko, Leo. (2002) *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. Technical University, Russia, St. Petersburg

Bernard Phillips, Retired Professor of Sociology, Boston University, bernieflps@aol.com
Founder and Coordinator, Sociological Imagination Group
Founder and Co-Editor, "Sociological Imagination and Structural Change" book series, Aldine de Gruyter

Tetrasociology and Values

Reimon Bachika, Japan

A New Theory of Society

Tetrasociology, formulated by Leo Semashko (2002), is a remarkable sociological theory. It is a multidimensional, critical theory of individual and social life. Semashko proposes a new model of

society centering on its four basic resources: people, information, organization, and things/technology. In this respect, the theory is quite simple but it is rather complicated when it comes to societal coordination, which I will touch upon briefly in a moment. Tetrasociology is a theory with many political implications. It strives toward greater democratization. Its main political suggestion concerns a reformulation of the idea of stratified social classes based on property and social power into classes that are non-hierarchically ranked, based on the reproductive employment of people. In this sense, this theory is future-oriented. With an emphasis on values, it displays great moral concern for the well-being of all people everywhere. Further, it advocates the use of Esperanto as a common language to enhance world-wide multi-cultural communication. Beyond that, this theory recognizes the role of religion in society, and it advises religious leaders to unify their religious views in the manner of the Bahai religion, which offers a universalistic vision of all beliefs. Methodologically, this theory is both theoretical and practical. It offers a relatively new statistical methodology based on quantifiable indices as well as a cultural technology for effecting social harmony. With all of this, Tetrasociology is a systemic, holistic theory that touches on all the important aspects of individual and social being. As such, it indeed is a remarkable sociological endeavor.

Having only minimal knowledge of systems theory, I lack competence to review this work in that respect. So I will only comment on the perspective of values and belief, which have been central to my own study of the sociology of religion. But in order to discuss the value perspective, in this systems theory, I must touch briefly on its main features.

Apparently, the main focus of tetrasociology is society. Semashko, so to speak, casts his net on society itself, "the social" in his words, to catch its main components and to describe their varying appearances and functioning. Deriving from the four resources, the basic social components of society are: human, informational, organizational, and material. Further, the reproductive structures of society are described as spheres. These are: the social sphere; the information sphere; the organizational sphere; and the technical sphere. It is these spheres that Semashko would like to see as the basis for rethinking social classes, grouping people in their main occupation either in humanitarian, informational, organizational, or technical employment. Remarkably again, Semashko conceives of individual human existence in a similar fashion, and reformulates the concept of the human personality accordingly. He sees individual persons as microcosms, constituted by variants of the same components as the social macrocosm. In people these components take the form of needs and abilities: human, informational, organizational, and material needs and abilities. Semashko then describes the four dimensions of personality as follows: character as the human component; consciousness as the informational component; will as the organizational component; and the body in all its relations as the material component.

To repeat, people, information, organization, and things are the main social specimen that Semashko catches in his net. However, on opening the net, these specimen, as it were, spring forth in various transformations and categories of phenomena. The picture of society becomes complex. Resources are said to be static constants and their descriptions constitute "social statics." Societal structures are the structural constants and are treated as "social structuratics." Two other constants that Semashko elaborates are reproductive processes, described as "social dynamics," and states of development, as, "social genetics" - the latter two less important for present purposes. All four constants are said to be "coordinates" of society, which constitute "a four dimensional continuum" of social, human reality. It is the connections and relationships of the four constants and their various appearances that are the object of tetrasociological inquiry, which generates qualitative and quantitative descriptions.

Tetrasociology and the Value Perspective

Let us turn, now, to the value perspective in Semashko's work. I will begin with two pertinent quotes:

"Ignorance of sphere classes [non-hierarchical social classes] … led in the past to total social disharmony in all its manifestations: class struggle, exploitation, wars, crime on a mass scale, terrorism, clash of civilizations, conflicts between religions, unfair distribution of wealth and power, a predatory attitude to[ward] nature, [in a word to] 'one-dimensional man.'(H. Marcuse's term)" . . . "Total disharmony in the social world creates total disharmony in the traditional social actors: castes, estates, branch classes [hierarchically ranked social classes] . . . Sphere classes are new and harmonious social actors [that will realize] prosperity in the 21st century. (Semashko, 2002: 76, words in square brackets added). "The essence of a person's humanitarian needs and abilities . . . consists in love [for] people, including self . . . Love is the pivot of personality, the backbone of the individual's character . . . [Love] does not impoverish, but rather enriches each person both with regards to satisfaction of humanitarian needs and the development of humanitarian abilities . . . It is only in love that persons are not estranged (alienated) from each other . . . It is only [in] the state of love that [we find] ideal, harmonious, balanced relations between people; only the state of love ensures people's true prosperity, true equality between them, freedom, fraternity, justice, humanness. Without love, the supreme feelings and values constituting the individual's spirituality lose [their] authenticity and prove faulty and defective" (Semashko, 2002: 55, words in square brackets added).

These quotes amply testify to the importance that Semashko attributes to values and harmony. He particularly stresses the importance of the latter. According to him, it is social harmony that, of all universal values, can save the world from self-destruction. According to him, social harmony is the oldest humanitarian value that already appeared in Homer's poems, that was understood by Aristotle as "the golden mean" and "the proportionality of the parts in a totality. Leibniz thought about "pre-established harmony." "The harmonious person" became an important idea of humanism. In Dostoevsky one finds expressions like "the beauty that will rescue the world." Semashko himself understands social harmony as the desire for and aspiration to balance between the spheres of society and between people, an ideal that may not be attainable, but efforts to achieve it are nevertheless deemed to be of paramount importance for humankind.

Besides social harmony, Semashko discusses also the broader value system. He observes that industrial, bureaucratic society created a system of values including liberty, ownership of property, devotion to work, legal equality, personal advantage, independence, enlightenment, pluralism, pragmatism and democracy. He sees liberty and ownership of property as the pivotal pair of the system, and the value of liberty as the centre of its axis. On this basis, values such as justice, love, brotherhood, tolerance, non-violence, peace, humanism, equality of opportunities and the harmony of humankind were thought to develop. However, in the bureaucratic reality of the 19th and 20th centuries these values were overturned by injustice, hatred, enmity, intolerance, violence, war, lack of humanism, growing inequality and one-dimensionality.

Semashko's conclusion with respect to the value system is that bureaucratic organization, which was based on hierarchically ranked classes, was the main cause of social disharmony and negative values. If, in turn, societies could be organized based on sphere classes in accordance with the main employment of people as mentioned above, and if the political structure could be adapted following the same principle, social harmony would be greatly enhanced and positive values would follow in the wake of this social reorganization. Seen concretely, the four sphere classes would comprise people of different economic and social status but with similar expertise in various occupations and professions. Thus, not economic and social status but common employment in either the humanitarian, informational, organizational, or technical sphere would gradually create a new class consciousness.

This reconstruction, according to Semashko, would eliminate class antagonism. Ideas, in common, of contributing to society would grow more and more in people's consciousness, and lead to a more harmonious society, in place of benefiting from social organization through augmenting one's power and wealth. It is in this sense that Semashko speaks of "the law of sphere harmony" that would replace "the law of disharmony" that naturally resulted from "the branch organization" of earlier, industrial society.

Culture: Values and Symbolizations

The question that I will now focus on is: How do values fit into Semashko's systems theory? No doubt, moral concern, positive social values, and the ideal of social harmony are central emphases in Semashko's thought. How are these morally noble thoughts integrated into Semashko's sociological theory? That values are important to individuals is explained with respect to human character. Values are the humanitarian component of personality. The nature of values is not explained. As for social harmony, Semashko repeatedly mentions that it starts with harmony in the hearts of individuals (Semashko, 2002: 59, 88) but at the same time he stresses that people can develop good attitudes only when social harmony is being effected through "the sociocultural technology [engineering] of harmony," through the creation of "sphere democracy" (Semashko, 2002: 80-81). Thus, as is also indicated in Semashko's conclusion with respect to the value system, values in effect are explicitly seen as tied to social structure and social organization. Social harmony will follow naturally when the right reorganization of society is put in place. Individuals and associations/organizations are not discussed as agents of social change.

Evidently, the point of societal organizational is crucial. It is the organization of societies that determines who has the political power to implement social policies that, in turn, bear on people's lives. Political power and economic power are major bones of contention, and not just in capitalistic societies. Material fortune or misfortune befalls those who can manipulate these goods or fail to do so. Also, to a great extent it is involvement in organizations that determines what the individual's share will be. Semashko, therefore, is largely right in his insistence on the importance of the reorganization of social classes as central.

A question that arises, here, concerns the degree of significance of societal organizations with respect to social change. Structural change is not the only type of social change. Change takes on many faces. It may occur in various areas of society, not just in the political arena. There are both rapid and slower occurrences of change in all four of Semashko's spheres, depending on circumstances, historical conjunctions, the influence of specific social, political, and religious movements, new inventions in various fields, and eventually the propagation of new ideas and theories - including those of Semashko. Again, some events have great consequences, as for example, the student movement in the 1960s, the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, and the nine/eleven terrorist attack on the USA in 2001. However it occurs, change seems to be a built-in phenomena of society and culture, but it is not one-directional. For all of this, sociocultural processes of change are hard to understand. As far as most social agencies are concerned, the concern is to know what types of social change are most desirable, and most effectively brought about at a particular historical junction.

More importantly, there is our problem of values. I do not conceive of values as factors or variables in social life, nor as attitudes held by individuals that may result from social organization, as Semashko emphasizes. To me, values are cultural elements that must be discussed in a theory of culture that does not lose sight of human nature. A theory of culture, in my view, should be as important as a theory of society, because, as I argue below, culture is a reality *sui generis*, distinct from social reality. And recently we witnessed "a cultural turn" (Robertson, 1992), a considerable development of culture

itself, in the study of culture, of which cultural studies is only one variety. In advanced societies there has been enormous outgrowths of popular culture, which is mainly expressive in quality.

I have argued elsewhere that symbolizations and values constitute the core of culture (Bachika: 1999, 2000, 2002). The main point in my argument is that symbolizations and values are distinct core elements of culture, entailing distinct functioning, even though in reality these core elements are intertwined and therefore infrequently distinguished theoretically. Stated succinctly, symbolizations are cognitive devices, initially means of constructing new meaning. Seen theoretically they are *modes of being and behavior*. Values, in contrast, are *ideas of being and behavior*, that derive from behavior, and function as evaluations of meaning.

In a pre-theoretical understanding it is clear that a value is very different from a symbol. When discussing culture, many authors focus either on symbols or on values. In order to see how they relate to one another, it is important to see differences as well as similarities (Bachika: 2001). Both are means of meaning construction, but in a very different way. To repeat, symbolizations are mainly cognitive in mode. Values, or valuations, while also cognitive, are mainly evaluative in mode. A short description of Buddhism and Christianity will clarify what I mean.

Buddhism is the religion of the Law of all existence. The most important characteristics of the Law are interdependence of all existence (in Japanese *mujo*: non-constancy) and non-independence of human self (*muga*: no-self). These are complementary concepts. They imply that suffering is part of life, but also that liberation of suffering is possible. These are the four noble truths of Buddhism, which are symbolized by means of a wheel of a chariot. A wheel goes around and around and around. Ever the same rotation suggests, among other things, the unchangeable nature of the Law. (The idea of recurrence probably comes from the Indian view of reincarnation, a repetition of births). Christianity, on the other hand, has a very different system of symbolizations that probably developed out of very similar experiences within nature and reflections on the mystery of human existence, but developed within the worldview of Judaism. A primary element in the origin of the latter is the creation myth. A divine Being creates the first humans in its own image, but creation partly ends up in failure. The creatures rebel against their maker and sin becomes part of daily life, necessitating salvation. Christianity came to believe in Jesus as the redeemer, and the Cross became the core symbol of Christianity.

Both Buddhism and Christianity are cognitive belief systems that nevertheless have very different symbol systems. The core problems they focus on are suffering and sin, respectively. Amazingly, these religions are very similar in what they value most. Their main moral commandments are the same: prohibition of killing, stealing, sexual promiscuity, and lying. The nature of morality in Christianity and Buddhism is different, that is, as a cognitive system, but the underlying valuation is much the same.

Based on my view of culture, symbolizations and values - which I cannot explain here at any length - one can say that religious leaders need not unify their religious outlooks. On the contrary, it is culturally salutary that many different symbol/meaning systems enable people to marvel at the width and depth of the human mind. It is intellectually gratifying to continue to develop them. As diversity of biological species is a sign of the wonder of Life, so diversity of cultures, artefacts, scientific theories and so on are expressions of the wonder of the human mind. Let a thousand flowers bloom! On the other hand, it seems both easier and more useful for religious leaders to unify their moral outlooks and to rally behind common values that are already out there. The human heart is not as diverse and complicated as the human mind. A thousand flowers come only in a variety of blue, yellow, and red, the three main colors.

Why would a declaration of common core values be useful for the future of societies? Defined

as ideas about being and behavior, values are, as Semashko implies in his view of harmony, a matter of inspiration and enlightenment. These attitudes cannot be imposed. Values, social or spiritual, profane or religious, should not be seen as commandments or norms. Religious communities should be, of all things, spiritual and moral communities, inspiring people toward happy and peaceful lives. If religious bodies would get behind one set of core values, compatible with secular formulations, both religious and secular thought would become more plausible and respected.

A theoretical implication of this view is that values are not necessarily tied to any specific symbol/meaning system, nor to any form of social organization. Values belong to a distinct "sphere" of human reality: culture. Within social reality they represent its specific tone: morality. I maintain, in a similar fashion as Semashko, that morality and ideals of living must be upheld by society, but also by individual associations and organizations. It is these which should be the most rational existences in society. Certainly, there are many exceptionally virtuous individuals, but, judging from individual human nature, humans are naturally selfish, wishy-washy in their mind sets, and from birth, on, in need of mental orientation. And yet, however dependent one is on society and fellow humans, to live meaningfully one needs a sense of autonomy.

Toward a New Enlightenment

Semashko dreams of a new enlightenment and a new world order. Interestingly, these ideas seems to have reached a measure of maturity during his Marxist education, in the heydays of the Soviet Empire, although probably in the 'Marxian white nights' at St. Petersburg! I mean, influence from Marx seems considerable. Semashko critically focuses on the *Unterbau* of society and class structure. He criticizes the value of liberty that he sees as the focal point of the axis of the value system from which, like a Pandora box, many evils have escaped into society. He wants to improve on equality - without absolutizing this value - between the various classes, men and women, the younger and the older generation, giving voting rights to children. He even envisions a new, non-violent revolution to be realized through "a sociocultural technology [engineering] of harmony."

One particular image in Semashko's vision seems to be blurred, the image of culture. He appears to have conceptually neglected culture. Though much concerned with the cultural content in the "informational sphere" and "human character," culture as a term is not part of Semashko's conceptual scheme. Society is philosophically defined as "social space-time." I would add the dimension of culture to this core concept (making it four dimensional, too). No doubt, the study of culture was not central to Marx, and in a certain sense, neither to the other classical sociologists like Durkheim, Weber, and Parsons. The relations between individual and society, social solidarity, collective consciousness, rationality, social stability and the like were their central concepts. None of them developed a new theory of culture (Martindale, 1971; Guy, 1974). Present societies are less saddled with social than with cultural problems: family life, personal human relations, diversified life styles, an overdose of materialistic and hedonistic values, the new 'dogma' of postmodern uncertainty, the moral problems of biochemica/biological engineering, and so on. Transforming or improving societies is no sinecure. Among the many things one needs to be concerned about, attention to power relations and value systems is, no doubt, most crucial. But the enlightenment that present-day societies and people are most in need of is enlightenment of the human heart.

References:

Bachika, Reimon. (1999). "Differentiation of Culture and Religion," Bukkyo daigaky shakaigakubu ronso. 32: 47-64.

_____. (2000). "Values and Sociocultural Change" Paper presented at the Research Council Conference

of the International Sociological Association, University of Montreal, Canada.
_____. (2001). "Adoption of Universal Values: Creating an Ethos for community for the 21st Century" Paper presented at the International Conference organized by Research Committee 07 of the ISA (Futures Research) and the Palas Athena Institute, Sao Paulo, Brazil, September 17-19, 2001.
_____. (2002). *Religion as a Fundamental Category of Culture. Traditional Religion and Culture in a New Era.* Reimon Bachika Editor. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick (USA) and London (UK): 193-220.
Martingdale, D. (1971). "Max Weber on the Sociology and Theory of Civilization" in P.Hamilton (ed.) *Max Weber: Critical Assessments*, *II*. Routledge.
Robertson, Roland. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage
Rocher, Guy. (1974). *Talcott Parsons and American Sociology*, Nelson.
Semashko, Leo. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges.* Technical University, Russia, St. Petersburg.

Reimon Bachika, Professor, Dept of sociology, Bukkyo University, Kyoto, Japan. President ISA RC 07 Futures Research, International Sociological Association

Tetrasociology's prospects from the viewpoint of political psychology

Alexander Yuriev, Russia

This study examines tetrasociology's prospects from the standpoint of political psychology theory. Even an at-a-glance comparison between the Russian political psychology and tetrasociology (Semashko, 2002) shows a significant similarity between its theoretical underpinnings. Importantly, the two disciplines emerged in Russia independently from, and have had no influence on, each other. This fact is interesting in itself as a manifestation of the trend in Russian science to explore events systemically. And this trend is visible not only in the study of human social behaviour, but in natural science as well. For instance, chemistry has Mendeleev's periodic table of the elements, physiology, Pavlov's theory of higher neural activity, etc. It is likely that the systemic school created by the Russian researchers studying individuals and society will get the same kind of international recognition as the works of the chemist Mendeleev and the physiologist Pavlov. Especially since Russia's track record of socio-political cataclysms is almost without precedent in the world. Obviously, Russia provides such a wealth of study material for psychologists and sociologists, and the material is so diverse, that it can't be properly grasped and described without a systemic method.

For the analysis and evaluation of tetrasociology's key findings, the basic theses of political psychology theory, which are laid out in detail in our works (Yuriev, 1987, 1992, 2002) have been used. The subject of political psychology is bilateral interaction of political phenomena (war and peace, the conquest of space and workers' strikes, etc.) and psychological phenomena (political thinking, will, perception, etc.), woven into the global network of social and biological factors. Political psychology studies the "political" person, who acquires power in the process of social interaction. In politics and political psychology, the essential factor is the social system, whose societal life-support resources, processes, structures and states are explored by sociology. Only historical forms of political behavior and political psychology get changed in social space-time, while its psychological content does not. Political psychology can be adequately understood only through a systemic approach, which we interpret as the system of categories: "individual, subject, personality, individuality," and this system, in turn, parallels the system of notions: "political activity, political efforts, political work, and political operation." All this, taken together, forms what is called a person's political behavior.

Political psychology rests on the foundation of certain premises borrowed from biology, psychology, sociology, and political science. Political psychology sees individuals possessing such inalienable, mutually mediating qualities, properties, and resources as biologism, psychologism, sociality, and politicality. On the basis of psycho-political phenomena of individuals' political behavior, psycho-political phenomena get formed: socio-political movements, parties, and other mass phenomena.

The search for an instrument for systematizing diverse continua of political phenomena and political thought has led to the application of Masters (1977: 69-110) four-dimensional model, within four dimensions and extremes of which the totality of the diverse "field" of political theory can be accommodated. Independently of Masters, St.Petersburg state university professor Ganzen (1974) developed a similar four-dimensional model, based on the principles of harmony. At the foundation of Ganzen's model lies four philosophical bases, - space, time, information, energy, - out of which a desire for harmony emerges. In Russian political psychology, systemic analysis rests on four-dimensional (tetrary) basic models/matrices of Masters and Ganzen, which are kindred and which supplement each other. On the basis of combinations of Masters' and Ganzen's four-dimensional matrices, we, on the one hand, construct a classification of socio-political movements, and on the other, theorize four basic psychological categories (the basic categories of political psychology): subject, individual, personality, individuality, depending on what traits in a person's behavior are prevalent. These categories reflect the principle correlation of political phenomena and psychological phenomena in political psychology.

In accordance with the Masters/Ganzen models, political psychology posits four types of understanding: retrieval of destroyed information, reproduction of preceding information, anticipation of posterior information, and realization of presented information. Three criteria - emotional, empirical, and logical - get superimposed over each type of understanding, which creates a 12-dimensional psychological typology of understanding. This means that every political phenomenon has 12 types of understanding. Political psychology assumes that the structure of the human psyche determines the structure of a political subjects' activity. Ganzen's psychological scheme posits conscience as the psyche's supreme integrator, and factors it into attention and memory, which, in turn, are factored into perception, affect, will and thinking.

In political psychology, the structure of political activity corresponds to the individual's orientation of needs. Therefore, it's assumed that in this structure, political activity is determined by an individual's system of needs, which can be categorized in four groups, according to Knutson's scheme (Knutson. 1972). Orientational needs stand behind the political activity that serves these needs.

The above-mentioned models form the basis for the construction of models of the cycle of intellectual expansion in political activity (adequate and inadequate), of systemic-psychological analysis of political information, and of the influence of intellectual expansion on society's political stability, etc.

One of the most important hypotheses in political psychology posits parliamentary, and, generally, political, activity as one of the most essential and indispensable types of socially useful and productive work, which has its object, product, resources, technologies, consumer and exchange values, a certain content and character, and the main productive force of which is people involved in politics. This hypothesis helps understand the mechanics of politics' functioning in society's organism, and also the four possible versions of society's political "split-up." Another conclusion to be drawn from this is that there are four types of individual's life space: physical, economic, legal, and informational; and they correspond with the types of psychological space: emotional, practical, motivational, and humanitarian states. The linkings between them create 16 types of psychological states, which political psychology studies, and which can be measured in different population groups.

Political psychology theory forms the basis for the foundations of psycho-political strategic

planning, including the "Russian Project," and also contributes to new interpretations of political power in the era of globalization and network/informational society.

Such are the outlines of our vision of political psychology, from which standpoint we shall now discuss certain positive and negative aspects of tetrasociology.

One of tetrasociology's positive aspects is its multi-dimensionality, or, more precisely, four-dimensionality, which the Greek prefix "tetra" points to. Political psychology, in its basic Masters/Ganzen models and in the majority of its conclusions, is essentially four-dimensional too. The tetrar principle is the fundamental methodological principle in both theories, which makes them mutually complementary and creates a foundation for their constructive synthesis. What is noteworthy is that here we have different theories from different disciplines which have been developing independently from each other, and now there's a prospect for their interdisciplinary interaction and mutual enrichment. And the present circumstances seem to be as propitious as can be: political psychology needs a systemic multi-dimensional sociological platform, while sociology, if it is to go beyond purely technical sociological surveys on narrow topics of fleeting importance, needs a foothold in, and instruments of, psychology, in order to have an impact on real life. So the disciplines have a reciprocal interest in each other, and their union opens up unprecedented, "explosive" prospects for each. Thus, the parallels between political psychology and tetrasociology deserve a closer scrutiny: what are the advantages of each, and what are the drawbacks? It's a momentous question. We shall dwell on some aspects of it.

If political psychology posits four basic categories: space, time, information, energy, - tetrasociology elevates the first two categories to a level of high abstraction as "social space-time," which is identical with the social world and embraces all social phenomena. Similarly to physical space-time, social space-time is four-dimensional, but has specifically social dimensions (the axes of co-ordinates): resources, processes, structures, states. Of these, the first three are spatial dimensions (the axes of co-ordinates), while states are temporal ones. At the next, more specific level of abstraction, the premise is that there are four necessary and sufficient society resources: people, information, organization, things/energy. Thus, information and energy, which political psychology puts at one level with space and time, are regarded in tetrasociology as constants of only one of the spatial dimensions (Semashko. 2002: 32-46).

Another aspect of tetrasociology, important for political psychology, is its fundamental "sphere" category, which is used for denoting the largest, eternal, necessary, and sufficient components both of society (spheres of social reproduction, social life, employment, etc.) and individuals. These spheres, which have different objects, products and technologies, are shared by society and individuals. Given that four groups of resources are necessary and sufficient for society and individuals: people, information, organization, things, - individuals and society are assumed to have four corresponding spheres of resource reproduction and four corresponding sphere groups of needs and abilities. Semashko, following Toffler, thus defines these spheres for society: sociosphere reproducing people, infosphere reproducing information, organisphere reproducing organizations, and technosphere reproducing things/energy. For individuals, these spheres are designated as character: reproducing people (including self), conscience: reproducing information (including self-awareness), will: reproducing organizations (including self-organization), and body: reproducing things/energy (including its own body/energy). An individual's spheres are connected with society's spheres through corresponding needs (inlets) and abilities (outlets): humanitarian, informational, organizational, material/energetic.

Depending on their main reproductive employment, all populations can be categorized into four sphere classes, which doesn't preclude changes of their employment or class affiliation dimensions

(Semashko. 2002: 53-77). Though the terminology may seem to raise questions, the system of individual's and society's spheres, and of sphere employment and sphere classes, opens up unprecedented opportunities for political psychology. Based on this, we can theorize spheres in politics, political employment spheres, social political psychology spheres, individual political psychology spheres, sphere classes in psychology, etc.

One of tetrasociology's key notions is that of social harmony, which is the highest but unattainable measure of equilibrium, balance and proportionality to which spheres and sphere classes aspire. Spheres and sphere classes function in accordance with the innate rule of harmony, which counteracts the rule of disharmony in branches and branch-based, antagonistic classes. Similarly to this, in political psychology there is an equally perennial desire for psychological harmony at the level of political individuals and political society, and efforts are made to overcome branch-based psychic disharmony, which destroys or warps individual and social psychology. As we see it, tetrasociology theory's author deserves credit for discovering fundamental elements of social and psychological harmony in society's and individual's spheres, and in sphere classes, sphere needs, and sphere abilities. Whereas previous discussions of harmony usually didn't touch on the key issue of harmony components ("WHAT is it that's able to harmonize?"), tetrasociology brings this issue forward. So, the problem of social-psychological harmony, no longer utopian, becomes solvable in practical ways, albeit in the very long run. The world and individuals aren't ready yet for systemic advancement toward harmony, because we are still an industrial society, branch-based. However, we are gradually becoming network-based and sphere oriented, approaching a boundary beyond which a harmonious world is inevitable, having created many pre-conditions for harmony.

For political psychology, tetrasociology's thesis about a natural transition from branch-based to sphere, or "tetra," democracy (Semashko. 2002: 80-89, 123-125) is very important. The essence of this democracy is that its social basis is formed not by branch classes, traditional for industrial society, but sphere classes of the network society of the globalization era. Their essence lies not in property, but in employment. These new classes, due to their equal importance and their desire for harmony, create a new democratic state, where all sphere classes are equally represented in all branches of government. Global spheres and sphere classes make sphere democracy global, eliminating many drawbacks of traditional democracy. Certainly, this tetrasociological hypothesis can be viewed as somewhat utopian, too. Yes, sphere democracy today is utopian, but will it not become a necessity and reality in 10-20-30 years? Every new technology began with utopian visions: television, airplane, computer, etc. For political psychology, the ideas of social-political harmony and global sphere democracy are examples of very forward-looking, strategic, systemic political thinking, examples of which, unfortunately, are almost totally missing from our lives.

From a political psychology viewpoint, tetrasociology also has many weaknesses. We'll discuss what we see as the major ones.

First: it seems very strange to us that a theory having harmony as its supreme social-psychological ideal doesn't supply a detailed historical and logical description, as, for example, was done by Ganzen. (Ganzen's harmony theory can be added to tetrasociology's research tools, without any detriment to tetrasociology's content.) Certainly, the problem of harmony is very complex and needs a detailed exploration, whereas the author has set for himself a task of providing only "the most general" outline of his theory. However, the definition of social harmony as "equilibrium, proportion, balance" of spheres, sphere classes and sphere employment that Semashko provides in his book is obviously insufficient, and needs a more in-depth elaboration. In particular, the principles of harmony discovered by Ganzen can be applied - they fit very well into tetrasociology's society's and individual's spheres. We hope that the author will first of all try to do this.

Second: tetrasociology brings forward sphere classes as the key notion, positing them as the main producer (agent!) of social harmony. While proposing a satisfactory criterion of differentiation between the classes - sphere employment (i.e., an individual's main employment in one of the four social reproduction spheres), the author doesn't provide a convincing and detailed explanation of the mechanisms of class formation. What remains unaccounted for is the transformation (and even the possibility thereof) from a class "in itself," as a mechanical aggregate of professional (or non-professional) branch-based groups employed in a certain sphere, into a new community of the "sphere class." The author realizes that processes of self-identification, class self-awareness, and self-organization are at work, here, but he says nothing of their content and specifics at the beginning of the new century. Obviously, these processes are totally or nearly totally different from those occurring at the beginning of the 20th and 19th centuries in the West and in Russia. There and then, totally different, proprietor/proletarian classes were taking shape, while here and now, the author speaks of the formation of radically different classes. Whatever it is, this is a cardinally new and extremely complex question. It has been formulated. But there's no satisfactory scientific answer to it, and, in our opinion, an answer cannot be found within the confines of sociology, alone, without an application of political psychology, because this question is, first of all, a psychological one. Tetrasociology deserves credit for having approached political psychology, but it would have done better had it not stopped at the threshold. The opportunities offered by both theories should be synthetized in order to tackle the fundamental problem of the formation of new classes in the new era, which may lead to a major breakthrough in the whole system of social science in the 21st century.

Third: Semashko's work's obvious weakness, and the one he himself admits to, is that, except for the enumeration of Russia's population in sphere classes, there is practically no empirical data. It's obvious that the large-scale, empirical research effort that tetrasociology requires, based on its new methodology and new statistical indices, is effort-consuming, and requires significant financial backing. The author is aware of, and stresses, this weakness in order to find the financing needed. But, alas, he's not the only scholar who is searching for funding.

To conclude our dialog, in our opinion, these and other weaknesses of Semashko's work do not detract from his major accomplishments - recognizing and responding to new, fundamental, social-psychological problems in ways that open up cardinally new theoretical, practical, and also political prospects. This inspires and strengthens one's belief in social science, and provides guidelines for young researchers. The author, himself, emphasises that his book does little more than formulate new problems. However, as one is well aware, good formulation of a question contains half the answer.

References:

Ganzen, V. (1974). *Perception of Whole Objects*. Leningrad University. (Russian)
Knutson, J. (1972). *The Human Basis of the Polity: a Psychological Study of Political Men*. Chicago
Masters, R. (1977). "Human Nature and Political Thought," in *Human Nature in Politics*. New York.
Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St. Petersburg: Technical University.
Yuriev, Alexander. (1992). *Introduction to Political Psychology*. St. Petersburg University (Russian)
_____. (2002). "*Russian Project: Claims on the Future*", in *Bulletin of Political Psychology*. # 2 (Russian)
_____. (2002). "Globalization as the New Form of Political Power, Changing Man and the World Order," in *Russia: planetary processes*. St. Petersburg University (Russian)

Alexander Yuriev, Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor, Chair of Department of Political Psychology, St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, Russia

Power sharing of sphere classes as an alternative to armed conflict
Martha Ross DeWitt, USA

Three approaches to the study of human social behavior are integrated to suggest a combined approach to resolving global disputes equitably and peacefully.

1) From Phillip's web approach (2001), sociological concepts are selected that identify a progression of static and dynamic social settings in which conflicts may arise, involving individual participants according to their habits, self-images, and worldviews.

2) From research using my theories of social action and social change (DeWitt, 2000), cause/effect relationships in the formation of social behavior, behavior change, and power sharing in transition appear to identify circumstances in which positive outcomes of power sharing are likely to occur.

3) From Semashko's tetrasociology (2002), sphere classes are selected as conscious actors and equal partners in power sharing and conflict resolution.

Aspects of each approach are selected that, taken together, might improve our understanding of the origins and dynamics of conflict, and of ways to resolve conflicts without the win-lose 'survival of the fittest' mode that has dominated human history. Each approach is examined to determine what it contributes to the topic. What insights and understandings are suggested by each approach? What solutions or alternatives?

Introduction

For two centuries, social scientists in Europe and America have attempted to identify the cultural and social forces that shape societal functioning - for the survival and betterment of humankind (Hughes, 1958; Nisbet, 1966; Coser, 1977; Garner, 2000).

Sociologists and social psychologists have developed a myriad of concepts to describe these forces as they form the social settings in which we, as individuals, groups, and larger entities interact with one another, not just to meet our social obligations and the expectations of others, but also to satisfy our own needs and expectations for ourselves (Mead, 1934; Lewin, 1958; Giddens, 1971; Wrong, 1994).

A recent effort by Phillips (2001) and Phillips, et al. (2002) to codify these insights and draw them into a coherent whole has been called the web approach. I will begin by selecting concepts from this overall approach to identify settings in which conflict may occur.

A web of sociological concepts

At each level, links between cultural and social are mediated by the *'socialization'* not only of individual actors, but also of collectivities of actors. At the structural (macro) level, *values* manifested in *institutions* are perpetuated by groups identified with each strata of society, and are relatively stable. At the more dynamic (meso) level of social interaction, *'reinforcement'* of values may be disrupted by comparisons that engender a sense of '*relative deprivation*,' which may lead to feelings of *'alienation'* at the individual (micro) level.

When transitions become unbalanced by a sense of *relative deprivation* for a critical mass of actors in dynamic settings (e. g., legislators, labor union officials, religious leaders), or by feelings of *alienation* from society for a majority of its citizens, specific knowledge of inequities may trigger social conflict.

Forms of social conflict are determined at the macrolevel, by structures of a society and of its

relations with other societies. Codes of conduct are formalized by agents selected to represent the society, or at least a dominant faction, and are instituted within a bureaucracy established to carry out their collective decisions. Codes of conduct reflect *norms* of behavior, i.e., that are considered acceptable, including forms of protest, such as rallies and marches, that do not disrupt the rules, e.g., of a free society.

Expressions of social conflict may be initiated at the dynamic level of social interaction, by agents who represent citizen interests that may either *conform* or *deviate* from those of the society as a whole, or of its dominant faction. These include civil disobedience, e. g., interfering with government placement of nuclear waste, thought to be harmful to life and/or the environment.

Intensity of involvement in social conflict is determined at the microlevel by individual personalities, as reflected in their *self images* as powerless or powerful, but also by their *world views, habits or addictions,* and *feelings of alienation* from society. World views tends to be part of one's cultural heritage, and center either on an 'us vs. them' dichotomy of insiders vs. outsiders, or on 'we are all in this together,' the latter being less intense but more conducive to negotiation and compromise. Habits may be assessed as functional or dysfunctional as coping mechanisms, addictions being more intense than other habits, harder to change, and more resistant to rational thinking. These factors set the stage, not only for conflict, but for conflict resolution.

Theories and research by DeWitt (2000) describe causal sequences of social action formation and transformation, in which sources of conflict might be identified by protagonists, and addressed in a shared manner to mutual advantage.

Social action, social change, and power sharing in transition

Formation of social action is seen as a natural progression of cognitive responses to cultural, social, economic and personal/political stimuli. Ideas that are accepted are likely to be consistent with past imagery, reinforced within familiar social settings, found relevant in satisfying needs, and consistent with personal responsibilities within established spheres of influence (DeWitt, 2000: 5, Fig. A.).

Alteration of a response sequence may begin at any point in a progression where continuity is no longer possible, or where the usual response is no longer adequate. This can occur not only in developmental change, but also in adaptive or innovative changes due to changes in the setting. Responses to developmental change are often anticipated, and adaptative changes may require only minor substitutions. Innovative changes, however, often require the formation of entirely new response sequences, with uncertain outcomes that mark the beginning of social transformation. During transformations, individuals and groups may be exposed to new ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and interests, experience new goal choices and motivations, and accept new responsibilities and obligations, depending on the nature of changes in their cultural, social, economic, and personal/political settings.

As new settings grow in complexity, opportunities for conflict arise in which individuals and groups compete to control economic resources, and struggle to establish favorable spheres of influence. Culturally they look back for adequate rationales for their conduct, and forward for sources of new information. Socially they look to one another to confirm the legitimacy of their efforts.

From competition, alliances grow. *"If I'm not able to best my opponents, I will seek to influence them in my favor, either directly or through others."* This seems to be a major organizing principle of societal development, a natural consequence of increasing social complexity. Open conflict seems to be a consequence of failed alliances, or of an inability to form alliances. Conditions that favor power sharing may include: valuing potential allies, valuing an association with them, accepting their goals, trusting their intentions. While compatibilities hold, compromises are attempted to resolve differences

and minimize conflict. Although spheres of influence might overlap, societies of stable alliances are able to function.

In research on power sharing, in transition, applied to farm families, I found recent increases in innovative behavior in farming to be associated with high decision sharing when the wife's involvement in farm work was increasing, identifying the family as 'emerging, nontraditional', and a) her involvement in farm decisions was increasing, or b) she kept most of the farm records, or c) her husband was not entirely satisfied with the way they made decisions and resolved differences, or d) he saw her as a source of new ideas in farming. Using multiple regression statistical analysis, these results were found to be separate, positive effects, given either his commitment to continue in farming, or a high farm debt to farm income ratio (a 'willingness to risk' factor). Although specific to farm couples, this research demonstrated how to model theory applications to be able test my interlocking theories of social action and social change (DeWitt, 2000).

Phillip's web of sociological concepts helps to identify settings for conflict and conflict resolution. My theories of social action and social change help to identify processes in which individuals or their agents can, through power sharing, find ways to resolve social conflicts. But how are actors identified in these settings? Whose intentions can be trusted? And whose goals can be accepted to minimize societal contradictions and resolve social conflicts? Justice systems of courts and law enforcement provide basic services for conformance. Equality of influence through the election of representatives may be the closest that political systems have come to selecting agents to pass laws to regulate the behavior of their citizens.

Semashko (2002) suggests a new way to improve representation, so that every essential 'sphere' of society is represented, not just those 'branch' classes that happen to be more influential, due to monetary and other socioeconomic advantages and privileges.

Tetrasociology and sphere classes

Semashko offers a blueprint for achieving equity in place of failed equality in social relations. His theory proposes a new look at social data on under-represented population groups, to determine how power should be redistributed to balance their influence. Four sphere groups of population, unequal in size but equal in importance to the economic and social functioning of society, are identified whose interests should be represented equally in managing a society. This is a new concept of representation, suggesting a peaceful transition from competitive struggles to voluntary cooperation, based on a shared understanding of what is fair, right, and good for society as a whole as well as its individual members.

Using Russia's population as an example, Semashko has calculated numbers of people in sphere classes in millions for 1991, 1996, and 2000 (see table of sphere classes in section 1.2, above). Populations of sphere classes can be calculated for any country or nation-state. In Semashko's opinion, sphere classes have enormous capacity to achieve social harmony, to constructively overcome the challenges of globalization, and to provide the key to social transformation of the modern world.

A detailed methodology is developed to identify the four sphere classes of population, using readily available population data. In the methodology, all ages and occupational groups are represented, including populations that are not involved in paid work: students, homemakers, unemployed, and those who are retired or disabled. What is unique is the way in which the sphere classes are identified, not by status or standing, but by the way in which each reproduces essential, equally important resources of society. Semashko names this criterion "reproductive employment (r-employment)". Twenty sphere indices are developed in all, to represent the four sphere classes, differing on this criterion. In contrast, 20th century sociology offered status oriented interpretations of class structure, based either on ownership of property/relationship to the means of production (Marxian), or on multiple criteria for

social stratification, including occupation, income, and education (Western sociology). Property based classes, Semashko argues, are focused, first, on taking from a society, rather than on giving to it, consequently they are sources of conflict and disharmony. Sphere classes have the opposite priority. Property class priority is consumption, whereas the priority of sphere classes is production.

Reproductive employment is more inclusive than categories of work, economic employment, and economic activity, because it includes non-labour, non-economic and non-active forms of employment, all of which are viewed as productive. Sphere classes are viewed as equally necessary for a society, but different in the quality of employment in each sphere. Equality and distinction of the sphere classes, and also their striving for balance, makes them harmonious and solidary classes, in contrast with classes based on property, which tend to be competitive and disharmonious. Semashko does not consider inequalities of power and influence within sphere classes, but considers them to be of lesser importance to the harmonious functioning of society than inequalities between sphere classes. If the sphere class as a whole is adequately represented, then constituent parts are presumed to benefit.

Semashko's new definition of 'class structure' as all-inclusive and of 'class function' as reproductive creates new tools for understanding the past, for predicting the future, and for addressing many seemingly unresolvable, chronic problems of today. His theory of sphere classes is insightful in areas of common interest, and imaginative in areas not yet analyzed by other social theorists.

Taken together, these three imaginative approaches to sociological analysis suggest a comprehensive approach that takes into account setting, class identity, individual world views, and power sharing processes that might increase harmonious response to global challenges of the 21st century.

A research proposal to compare alternative ways of sharing power

Essentially, Semashko proposes that social policy in a democracy be determined by representatives of what he defines as sphere classes, rather than by representatives of branch/bureaucratic classes of elites. To test the efficacy of this proposition requires comparisons that are not readily available, since no societies of self-identified sphere classes exist.

An alternative is to artificially create representatives of sphere classes and branch elites, present them with scripted global conflicts, in scripted settings, (involving somewhat ambiguous descriptions of each external challenge or threat), and record their problem solving efforts. This can be done with relatively naive subjects as actors. Class identity is scripted to include each of four essential types, whether sphere class or elite, with selection of class identity by subjects somewhat voluntary within each experiment. A group of twelve subjects is selected for each experiment, and divided into three teams of four. One team of four decides on codes of conduct, acceptable ways in which the conflict might be resolved. Another team decides whether to conform or deviate from whatever codes of conduct they perceive as relevant, of those included in their script. The third team decides how far to go in pursuing any of the action alternatives suggested in their script.

Each team of four then selects a spokesperson to summarize their position in a joint session. Teams then reconvene separately to try to resolve differences. This process continues, back and forth, for a stated time interval, and the results are recorded, including rationales for decisions made. Individual responses are also recorded, to test related hypotheses. Each individual is part of 12 experiments. According to the theory, representatives of sphere classes (in the sphere class experiments) will increasingly resolve their differences with rationales that favor maximizing global harmony, *if most of the individual participants also have an interactive world view*. Representatives of elite classes (in the branch/elite class set of experiments) will increasingly resolve their differences with rationales that favor maximizing elite class advantages, *if most of the individual participants have a bureaucratic*

world view. A control set of experiments, without class identity scripts, will test an alternative hypothesis: that class identity (coded from individual questionnaires) is unrelated to changes in rationales given, in either direction, *regardless of world views of the participants*.

In subsequent rounds of experiments, each participant might experience the other two types of experiment, but with different scripts. This would test a 'transferability of class identity reinforced by world view' hypothesis. Such experiments might be part of a semester course for high school seniors, for extra units of credit in social studies or civics, or an elective Saturday class during the summer, with discussion of the results at the end of the course. Each experiment takes at least three hours, to include time for instruction at the start of each experiment, and time following each experiment for individual responses to written questionnaires.

The primary hypothesis tests a progressive, interactive effect of class identity and world view on the consequences (harmony or disharmony) of power sharing to resolve global conflicts. The outcome variable is multidimensional, a predicted quantitative change that varies qualitatively, as an increase either in potential harmony (balanced advantage) or potential disharmony (unequal advantage). A secondary outcome is alliance formation. For control groups this might be based on personal characteristics, since class is irrelevant. For test groups it might be based on class identity, and either reinforce or confound predicted outcomes. Random sampling techniques are used in the study design. Ideally, a stratified random sample is possible, to include a diverse population of school districts. A pre-study is used to test the adequacy of each of the conflict and setting scripts. Subjects from senior class student populations are selected who have completed a course in social studies, civics, or government with a passing grade and satisfactory attendance record. Quantitative statistics are applied to analyse the results. Ethical procedures are followed to protect confidentiality of information about individual subjects and individual school districts.

Ultimately, this research might provide the basics for a standard high school course in "Multicultural Dialog," that prepares students for community involvement and participation in government at all levels, applying principles from the three approaches summarized in this review.

References:

Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of sociological thought, Ideas in historical and social context,* 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich.

DeWitt, M. R. (2000). *Beyond equilibrium theory; Theories of social action and social change applied to a study of power sharing in transition.* New York: University Press of America.

Garner, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Social theory: Continuity and confrontation*. New York: Broadview Press.

Giddens, A. (1971). Fundamental concepts of sociology. In *Capitalism and modern social theory: An analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. A. Giddens, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Hughes, H. S. (1958). *Consciousness and society: The reorientation of European social thought, 1890-1930.* New York: Vintage Books.

Lewin, K. (1958). *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics: 1935-1946*. (G. W. Lewin, Ed.; first published in 1948). New York: Harper.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Nisbet, R. A. (1966). *The Sociological Tradition.* New York: Basic Books.

Phillips, B. (2001). *Beyond sociology's tower of Babel: Reconstructing the scientific method.* New York: Aldine.

Phillips, B. , et al. (Eds.). (2002). *Toward a sociological imagination; Bridging specialized fields.* New York: University Press of America.

Semashko, L. M. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to challenges*. St. Petersburg, Russia: St. Petersburg State Technical University Publishing House.
Wrong, D. (1994). *The problem of order: What unites and divides society*? New York: Free Press.

Martha Ross DeWitt, PhD, Sociology, Research consultant, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA. Email: mrossdewitt@msn.com

Tetrasociology and McLuhan's Communication Theory
Hilarie Roseman, Australia

In this review I will consider the basic premises of tetrasociology (Semashko, 2002) from the point of view of McLuhan's communication theory (1989). I will also refer to Berger's sociological understanding of transformation (1963: 94-147). He sees Weber emphasizing subjective meanings, intentions, and interpretations (1922). We trust that Semashko's intentions are good, but what of interpretation? McLuhan is able to help us, here, with his tetradic analysis. We are considering that our world institutions, and ordinary people, are being transformed on a global scale, with the old social stratifications and class systems changed into communicating spheres. Our everyday reality is constructed socially, and if our everyday lives are to be changed, they will be changed by people changing the system.

McLuhan viewed a tetradic way of thinking as a four fold pattern of transformation. He used the tetrad, including past, present and future, to anticipate what will happen with new technologies. We are all being transformed, as a civilization, into a global village, but the trick is to know that there is a four fold pattern of transformation. He details this exhaustively in his book, written with the help of Bruce Powers, *The Global Village, Transformations in world life and media in the 21st Century,* (1989: x-23). In the electronic age, he believes, we must address these issues:

(1) At electronic speeds, all forms are pushed to the limit of their potential. What actually occurs is that the sender is sent, minus a body, and all the old relationships of speaker and audience tend to be erased. Humans become discarnate.

(2) Instant information, as an environment, has the effect of pushing all other subliminal effects up into consciousness. When the environment of instant electronic information becomes the hidden ground of all perception, choice, and preference, the ground that underlies the world of precise and quantifiable scientific study is pushed aside or dissolved.

(3) When data become available at electronic speeds, pattern recognition tends to replace quantifiable information. Transformation of a person, or of a society, has always come from people. But here we see the extensions of man, his technologies, transforming us. We have become the data, but we live, not in our bodies, but in data banks, discarnate.

(4) Gestalt psychology, with its figure-ground paradigm, took a step away from visual space. However, and this is critical to an understanding of tetradic analysis, most psychologists still assume that both figure and ground are visual components, in visual situations. In fact, they form an iconic or tactile relationship, defined by the resonant interval between them. That is, there is no continuity or connection in the figure-ground relationship. Instead, there is a transforming kind of interface.

We are becoming an interfacing, resonating world community. McLuhan and Powers present a model for studying the structural impact of technologies on society. This model emerged from their discovery that all media and technologies have a fundamentally linguistic structure. Not only are they like language, but in their essential form they are language, having their origins in the ability of man to extend himself, through communication, into the environment. A tetradic structure of this

extension was discovered. All technologies (a) intensify something in a culture, while at the same time (b) obsolescing something else. They also (c) retrieve a phase or factor long ago pushed aside, and (d) undergo a modification (or reversal) when extended beyond the limits of their potential. The result is a four part metaphor of the transformation process.

McLuhan's tetradic understanding of the communication satellite is a working model of his theory. The satellite enlarges global information exchange, replaces language with images, retrieves a world view, and reverses into iconic fantasies. Each tetrad is the word or the logos of its subject. The tetrad constitutes a right-hemisphere-of-the-brain model of communication; it serves to bring up to date the ancient and medieval tradition of grammar-allied-to-rhetoric, in a way that is consonant with forms of awareness imposed on the 20th century by electronic technology. Acoustic space requires neither proof nor explanation, but is made manifest through its cultural (image-bearing) content. Building on this, I came to the conclusion that whoever controls our memory controls the world. Information may have brought down the old powers, but it is today forming a new world, with the cultural content of its entertainment. Even news has an entertainment component. Entertainment has become the electronic instrument of transformation.

When I researched the Catholic community in Melbourne in 1991 (Roseman, 2000), I found it to have accessed a vast amount of information from the mass media, and thereby been transformed. Catholics were forgetting their own Catholic language, and were changing their beliefs dramatically. They were moving to a pragmatic model of morality, and their belief in the Catholic Church and its sacraments was disappearing. I believe, as a result of these trends, that we need to raise our consciousness, using both hemispheres of our brains to operate in the electronic age.

Semashko is also asking us to raise our consciousness, to organize ourselves so that women and children, in particular, will have a balanced input into world affairs, especially since, at the present time, 'women's work' is not even counted as part of the Gross National Product. Women as homemakers are not recognized as producers. How can McLuhan illuminate Semashko? His tetrad performs the function of myth, in that it compresses past, present, and future into one, through the power of simultaneity. The tetrad illuminates the boundary between acoustic and visual space (between right and left hemispheres of the brain) as an arena of spiralling repetition and reply, both of input and feedback, interlace and interface, in the area of an imploded circle of rebirth and metamorphosis.

This is the complexity that we are moving into - and which so many sociologists are trying to understand. The tetrad helps us to see both the positive and the negative aspects of an artefact. I find it helpful to use tactile things, rather than words, to inspire deeper understanding. It's restful just to sculpt or paint. For my Diploma of Visual Arts (2002) I sculptured a *Wired-in Woman with a Broken Heart.* I wanted to feel, in wire, how it would be, to be discarnate. McLuhan says that, with the electronic media the human being is losing not only flesh, but some of their senses that go with the flesh. The woman has an antennae growing out of her brain, which she is now wearing outside of her skull. She is grasping, discarnately, for knowledge, which is all around her. Her nervous system is outside of her, and memory is part of the nervous system, so she is losing the memory of herself. Her interior communication system no longer works, because her heart is broken. While she is at one with the whole planet, she is alienated from herself. This alienation is a focus of Phillips', *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel* (2002). He sees alienation is one of the most important issues that individuals and sociologists have to grapple with in the third millennium.

Semashko's vision of harmony helps to overcome this alienation. He comes from a completely different direction to a tetradic way of thinking. He treads the path of the ancient philosophers, with their four dimensional ideas, and views humans as having four cognitive abilities: sense, knowledge,

opinion and sentiment. There are also four elements: earth, water, air and fire. As Anaxagoras (500-428 BC) says, the principle of mutual inclusion (interinclusion) of the foundation of the world is explained as «all in everything,» which Semashko says is the basic principle of tetrasociology.

Tetrasociology develops its own indices. The question, 'can sociology speak the language of mathematics?' was left unanswered. When it is not clear what exactly should be counted, what indices, no mathematical apparatus can help. Semashko believes that, so long as sociology does not have its own indices, it will never acquire a mathematical apparatus and become a technology.

The underlying assumption of tetrasociology is that we can achieve a harmonious world structure through scientific methods - methods that transform our understanding of the social into a technology. Scientific study can make us into a scientific people through the use of scientific methods. As I understand these methods, they require parameters and indices that measure the social space-time dimensions of the global world, so that sociologists will be able to make scientific analyses of sphere classes, the means by which social harmony will be achieved. By operating politically, in sphere classes, and achieving a common language and common belief, people can eradicate racism and violence and live in a democracy that is prosperous through harmony and shared information. I worry, at this point, that certain religions might be discriminated against. I am an ecumenist, and would always hope that religions can exist and function in freedom. But people can have a common belief in the fact that the world is one and that we need to make it harmonious. This is where I see Semashko's theory helping the world believe in itself, and working toward its survival.

Semashko's tetradic analysis is not based on language, although he has coined new words to describe it, but rather on the yearnings of philosophers and sociologists who have all, in various ways, defined tetradic foundations of society. Semashko introduces us to Social Space Time (SST), which constitutes tetrasociology's backbone and foundation. Social space time is society itself. It is a four dimensional, physical, space-time continuum, with three spatial and one temporal set of coordinates: Resources, Processes, Structures and States. Semashko tells us that four-dimensionality is not a Pythagorean mysticism, but an epistemological principle of social construction of multi-dimensional reality in multi-dimensional theory. And this theory operates within the relativity of social space-time.

Davies, a physicist, says that the word 'relativity' refers to the elementary fact that the appearance of the world about us depends on our state of motion; it is 'relative' (1995: 15-17). What Einstein discovered is that not only motion, but space and time are relative. Einstein restored time to its rightful place, at the heart of nature, as an integral part of the physical world. Indeed, Einstein's 'space-time' is in many ways just another field, to be set alongside the electro magnetic and nuclear force fields. But the 'time' that enters into physical theory, even Einstein's 'time,' bears only the vaguest resemblance to the subjective time of personal experience, the time that we know but cannot explain. Einstein's time has no arrow: it is blind to the distinction between past and future. McLuhan's understanding of the tetrad can help to resolve this problem, since his tetradic analysis encompasses past, present and future..

Semashko believes that society's resources are society's necessary components/parts, its permanent foundations, without which society cannot exist, and which it incessantly uses and reproduces. He distinguishes in each Social Space-Time (SST) co-ordinate four variable constants. Social statics consider society's resources (the relevant SST co-ordinate) and points out four classes - necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritized…people, information, organizations, and things - PIOT. When we see this drawn out on the back cover of Semashko's book *Tetrasociolgy: Responses to challenges,* we see a cross in the middle of a diamond square with a sphere on each ending of the cross. 'People' are placed at the top end of the cross. People, he says, rank the highest in priority

among resources, because only people produce all PIOT resources. 'Information' is to the left arm of the cross. 'Organizations' (political, law, financial, managerial, relevant norms) on the right of the cross (are they always to be right wing!). It is the fourth dimension in which I am most interested. The cross has to be grounded. It is grounded in 'THINGS.' Things would have to be material, and it is placed well into the ground. Are 'things' the ground of the figure? In other areas of tetrasociology we see the interaction of the grids. People are put into spheres according to their employment .. there is the humanitarian class, the information class, the organizational class and the technical class. Eventually there are four continuum's constructed (2002: 90). There is a grid showing each axis (of resources, processes, states and structures) interacting with each component of the social (human, information, organizational, and material). Semashko says that social space is multidimensional, having more than three dimensions. We live in the parameter of a cross! It looks to me as though we are reaching for the sky, arms open, but grounded, enclosed in the planet earth.

I do not see a center in any of the diagrams, in words or in the drawings. However, on examining the book more closely I do see something that can be put at the center. Semashko says that 'love' is the pivot of personality, the backbone of the individual's character. In love, as process, employment energy and relations between persons mix. Expending this mixture does not impoverish, but rather enriches each person. Without love, the supreme feelings and values constituting the individual's spirituality lose their authenticity, and prove faulty and defective. How can we not agree with these understandings? When we look at the drawings, again, we see love, consciousness, will, and body are all put up on the same cross. Love is at the top, consciousness to the left, will to the right, and body goes into the ground. We are, indeed, all grounded by our bodies, but the future is not absolute. We belong to the universe, now, and have started to explore it. What will be our 'ground' in a discarnate universe?

To try to mesh together the tetradic theories of McLuhan and Semashko, it occurred to me that Semashko is definitely putting forward an informational technology, an extension of man, by trying to study us as a social-scientific project, with indices to set definite parameters. So I will ask McLuhan's questions of tetrasociology:

(A) What does Tetrasociology enhance? It gives representation to sphere classes, sphere democracy, and new sociological statistics, information, and cultural technology. Among the spheres, which are equally necessary for societal reproduction, there is an indissoluble connection, communication, and interdependence. The law of sphere classes is an aspiration to balance, to harmony. In contrast, branch classes, such as business cartels, are seen as leading to disharmony and to domination.

(B) What does Tetrasociology make obsolete? Monism in general, Marx' economic materialism in particular, including Marxist classes, branch organizations, and branch social structures, along with the disharmony they produce. This is a very large transformation, and will have to be tried out in small experiments, to see if it is efficient. Perhaps young people of the world can be educated into this system. It is a constructed reality, that can live and grow if enough people see that it will help us to live in a world where we are accepted, and where we can hope for a future without war.

(C) What does Tetrasociology retrieve? It retrieves the hopes of the ancient philosophers, the principle of mutual inclusion (interinclusion of the whole and its parts) as the foundation of the world: «all in everything», which is also the basic, dialectical principle of tetrasociology, and of many other social theories that have visualized sociology as having a foundation of four, interconnected parts.

(D) What does Tetrasociology reverse into? A technology pushed far enough tends to reincorporate the user. What is dimmed down? Surely a sense of geographic place. In a world

composed of sphere classes, world leaders will be able to put the whole world first, ahead of any of its parts. Will resources, processes, structures and states be able to support spinning spheres that communicate so much that they will intermesh? Will individual identity be lost? This would not be intended, but might become an unintended consequence.

McLuhan tells us that the trick in transformation is to recognize the four fold pattern of transformation before it is completed, so that reversals may be anticipated as potential problems.

The human being needs to be accepted, and to live in peace with others. In this era of vast number of refugees, begging us to help them survive, politically and economically, it is good for us to consider how to transform the social life of the world. Each society produces the ideas it needs, and maybe the global society needs Semashko's ideas now. His intentions are good. How are we to interpret his theories? Can we help him put into action his plan for a harmonious and peaceful world? Will we change the world with him?

A final word about business. In further work by Semashko, in his abstracts for the 36th World Congress of the International Institution of Sociology in China, we find a continuation of his thought. In Abstract 8 he says «the sphere is a complex of branches which is incorporated by one subject/product and reproduces a resource necessary for a society.» I was hoping that business would, in Abstract 12, be included in «a global world needs a global form of united democracy, that does not impinge on nations, cultures, traditions and political specificity.» What will this mean to business? Semashko replied that «Yes, each sphere is a complex of branches. The list of branches of each sphere I give in the tables on pages 61-68 of my book 2002. Each branch includes a business as private/free enterprise. Yes, the business is not always good, it frequently is greedy, does not know a measure. Therefore it requires the control and public restrictions. The reasonable and harmonious restrictions for business (and also for branches) can be established only by sphere organization of the social reproduction and the sphere organization of a power and State. WHAT restrictions? I do not know (this is concrete needs of the future, but in different countries and cultures they will be different. They will be relevant to the harmony, traditions and specificity.» I then dialogued with my husband, who has written a book, *The Spirituality of Earthy Things* (Roseman, 1997: 45-48, 71-72). He agreed with Semashko. While profit is good, unreasonable mark-ups and sophisticated sales techniques can deceive people. From motivations of greed and dishonesty there comes exploitation. Starvation is an abomination. The problem is one of distribution, tied up with economical conditions, politics, subsidies and power. He, like Semashko, has a vision of transformation. We must not passively accept the status quo. We must act to bring about change. Food should be as cheap as possible. This could mean subsidies for the growers, stores and distributors. These subsidies would be paid by taxes.

Is transformation of the world possible? Semashko sees all human beings as capable of producing something for society, no matter what their status or monetary position. We can support him, and dialog with him, and share his vision of a harmonious world.

References:

Berger, P. L. (1963). *Invitation to sociology, A humanistic perspective*. Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Davies, P. (1995). *About time.* London: Penguin.

McLuhan, M. & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The global village, Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillips, B. (2002). *Beyond sociology's Tower of Babel: Reconstructing the scientific method*. New York: Aldine.

Roseman, H. (2000). Catholic access of mass media messages on sex. M. A. thesis, Communication.

Melbourne, Australia: RMIT.
Roseman, J. B. (1997). *The spirituality of earthly things*. Australia: Spectrum Publications.
Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges.* Technical University, Russia, St. Petersburg
Weber, M. (1922). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft.* Tubingen: J.C.B Mohr (P. Siebeck).

Hilarie Roseman, M. A. Communications research (2000). Diploma of Visual Arts (2002).
30 Metung Road, Metung, 3904 Victoria, Australia. E-mail roseman@net-tech.com.au

Tetrasociology and socionics: Foundations for harmonious teams of dialog

Valerie Isaev, Russia

Tetrasociology (Semashko, 2002) and socionics (Augustinaviciutes, 1998) share much in common. One idea in common is the harmonization of individuals and the formation of harmonious managerial teams, from government-level management to the management of particular projects or processes (Isaev, 2002: 32-56, 146-149, 200-212), involving dialog in non-conflict as well as conflict situations. A successful dialog requires successful negotiating teams (participators in the dialog) whose members are well-attuned to one another, who are able, through harmonization of their internal resources, psychic and intellectual, to achieve optimal results in the dialog, and who are able to minimize the risks of disruption of the dialog with its negative consequences. Ideally, a dialog is successful if a solution is found for a dispute or conflict that is harmonious for all parties involved. Certainly, harmonious teams are not the only condition necessary for success, but it is an indispensable one. With this in mind, we analyze and evaluate, from the viewpoint of socionics, the opportunities afforded by tetrasociology, and compare these two theories. But first, we'll recap the basics of socionics.

Socionics, an applied science founded by Lithuanian sociologist and psychologist Ausros Augustinaviciutes in the 1970's, is based on Karl Jung's personalities typology (1995). Jung's typology, in turn, is based on two very important ideas, which "divorced" his theory from Freud's, a fact aptly noted by Sokolov (1998). First: for Jung, the main problem of personality was not the rationalization of psyche, as Freud believed following the classics of European Enlightenment, but rather, harmonization of the conscious and the unconscious. Second: for Jung, the rational isn't important by itself. The significance of rational knowledge, beliefs and theories is conditioned by differences in the value different people assign to them. Thus, conflicts between ideologies and theories are, first of all, psychological conflicts, requiring a psychological solution (although not exclusively) through harmonization of a person's psychological powers and spheres (1998: 130-131, 190-197). Based on this, Jung created a typology of eight psychological types/characters as various deviations from a person's psychological harmony, through domination of various psychological functions and spheres. First: he posits two major psychological personality types: extroverts and introverts. In the former, the stream of psychological energy is directed mainly at the outside world and its transformation, while in the latter, at the inner world and its transformation. Second: in Jung's vision, each of these types/characters has four subtypes, depending on the prevalence (priority, domination or degree of development) in them of one of the four psychic functions: thinking (*Logics*), *Intuition*, sensitivity (sensations, *Sensorics*) and supreme feelings and values, *Ethics*. Most people have only two functions developed: the main one and an accessory; talented persons have three developed; and only geniuses have four developed. However, every person has all four of the functions dormant in the unconscious. The division of labor and of social functions leads to the division of psychic functions, to a one-sided, disharmonious development, which conflicts with the monolithic, harmonious human psyche (Sokolov, 1998: 196).

Socionics approaches psychological functions as types of informational resources and of informational supplies (or metabolism, exchange), which are developed differently in different persons. Socionics distinguishes several levels of informational balance or harmony. The elementary level of harmony/balance is "dyad" ("dual"), formed by a pair of people whose respective types of informational exchange complement each other. The next level of harmony/balance is "quadra," formed by two mutually complementary and reciprocally activated dyads. The third level of harmony/balance is "socion," formed by four unconflicted, mutually complementary, and reciprocally activated quadras. Socion comprises all 16 types of psychological functions, which complement one another and represent the smallest unit of harmonious humankind, or a miniature model of harmonious society.

Socionics posits four levels, or channels, differing by the strength of the psychological functions' informational impact. The channels are designated by numbers, in the order of regression of psychological functions' informational interaction, their impact on individuals: from the strongest to the weakest. The channels represent a classification of psychological functions by their strength. Every person has one psychological function that is stronger than all others. Below we recap the channels' psychological characteristics.

1. *The first channel* is the strongest and steadiest. It determines, to a much greater degree than other channels, a person's psychological type and character, because it demonstrates which of the psychic functions prevails in the psyche. Within this function, the individual is at the top of his/her self-confidence, gets his/her bearings easily, takes in stride criticisms and jokes addressed to him/her. Through this channel the person receives the fullest and most objective information about the world. His/her thoughts and actions, and often his/her profession as well, are conditioned by the psychological function active in his/her first channel, i. e., the strongest function. This channel directs and controls the person.

II. *The second channel* is weaker and less active than the first, but stronger than the rest. It conditions the accessory function. The second channel can be roughly described as "productive" or "creative." A person's creative abilities are primarily controlled by the function active in this channel. But this function is less balanced and autonomous, and more superficial, than the function active in the first channel. The second channel is primarily evaluative.

III. *The third channel* has a weak creative energy, and, in addition, is a destabilizing force. The psychic function located in this channel appears very vulnerable. This is why the third informational channel is designated as "the point of weakest resistance." If there is an intimately related person at hand, with a complementary psyche, control over this function automatically shifts to him/her. One begins to feel secure, then. One can act relying on the other, and partially slacken their attention. But even so, this channel is still the locus of the greatest doubts and anxieties, it is most conservative and viscid in its manifestations, wherein lies the source of conflictedness in all relationships of the person. Will is needed to activate the third channel (the appropriate function). Neither the first nor the second channel can operate properly without the third and the fourth ones operating properly.

IV. The fourth, and weakest, channel is usually called "suggestive," because it is through this channel that the person is most suggestible/impressionable. The psychic function in this channel is not only the weakest, but it is also unstable for the person, so that she/he needs external guidance and orientation in it. At the conscious level, the person is almost indifferent to information in this channel and is slow to perceive it. She/he gladly shoves on to others the things that she/he cannot or doesn't want to know. He/she accepts guidance and control in this function by others as a given; without it, he/she feels insecure, unwanted, unloved, restless.

Intercommunication between channels is effected through like functions: logics can interact with logics, intuition with intuition, etc. Interaction between persons and their psychological functions,

located in different channels, forms a system of inter-typal relations, or the interaction mechanism. For lack of space, here, we cannot explore the complicated inter-typal relations system in its totality, so we'll proceed to the result and define, on the basis of this system, the psychological types and harmonious dyads and quadras they form.

Augustinaviciutes' socionics, following Jung, theorizes for every personality type a pair of psychic functions (the main = first channel, and accessory = second channel) in the same modalities: extroverts (extratimity) and introverts (intratimity). On this basis, socionics builds a taxonomy of 16 personality types. We briefly characterize each below: eight extratim types first, then eight introtim types, illustrated with references to famous personalities.

EXTRATIMS:
1st type: Logical-Sensory Extratim: Shtirlitz. Administrator.
2nd type: Logical-Intuitive Extratim: Jack London. Entrepreneur.
3rd type: Ethical-Sensory Extratim: Hugo. Enthusiast.
4th type: Ethical-Intuitive Extratim: Hamlet. Mentor.
5th type: Sensory-Logical Extratim: Zhukov. Marshal.
6th type: Sensory-Ethical Extratim: Napoleon. Politician.
7th type: Intuitive-Logical Extratim: Don Quixote. Searcher.
8th type: Intuitive-Ethical Extratim: Huxley. Adviser.

INTROTIMS:
9th type: Logical-Sensory Introtim: Maxim Gorky. Inspector.
10th type: Logical-Intuitive Introtim: Robespierre. Analytic.
11th type: Ethical-Sensory Introtim: Dreiser. Guardian.
12th type: Ethical-Intuitive Introtim: Dostoevsky. Humanist.
13th type: Sensory-Logical Introtim: Gabin. Craftsman.
14th type: Sensory-Ethical Introtim: Dumas. Intermediary.
15th type: Intuitive-Logical Introtim: Balzac. Critic.
16th type: Intuitive-Ethical Introtim: Yesenin. Lyric.

A person's psyche is inherently asymmetric, and so needs to be supplemented by and connected with other personality types. Based on the complementarity principle, the 16 types form eight dual relations (duals, dyads), and from them four socionic quadras get formed, each uniting four personalities, each of whom carries in the first channel one of the four functions different from the others. Quadra is a foursome of the most compatible (inter-complementary) types, with dual and activatory relations, usually making a perfect team. There is a law of quadras succession: the evolution of every idea/project, or sociocultural undertaking, from its inception to degeneration, decline and collapse, consists of four successive stages. The stages correspond to the mechanism of succession of socionic quadras - *"Alpha," "Beta," "Gamma," "Delta"*. This mechanism becomes visible if we look at how the roles of quadra groups replace one another as ideas and movements - for instance, social revolutions and concomitant transformations of society - unfold in time. Every project begins as an idea, which evolves as a concept until efforts are made to put it into practice. This first stage is usually realized by "Alpha" quadra.

Because a comprehensive realization of the idea isn't effected by "Alpha" quadra, the second stage begins - transformation of the theory, its adjustment to reality with inevitable, big simplifications and distortion. The concept formulated by the first quadra gets materialized, but by such methods that the result bears little resemblance to the initial plan. The result is achieved by "Beta" quadra, and only very little from "Alpha"'s proposals gets selected and materialized. This leads to deviations from the

initial design.

The results get re-examined. In the third stage, "Gamma" quadra joins in. "Gamma" criticizes and rejects the results achieved by "Beta" and gets back to "Alfa"'s initial ideas. At this stage, the ideas get realized more fully AND meet the demands of reality.

In the fourth stage, the previous quadra's achievements get realized to the maximum extent possible. "Delta" quadra is in charge of this stage. The ideas don't get changed, but are wrought to as much perfection as is permitted by the circumstances, and sometimes become a paradigm. Finally, having existed long enough unchanged, the ideas degenerate and start to check the growth. And it is under the rule of this paradigm that a new fermentation, initiated by "Alpha," begins. Figuratively speaking, "Alpha" conceives the idea, "Beta" creates a design, "Gamma" builds the factory, and "Delta" manufactures mass-market products. Such is the general outline of the mechanism operating inside the loops of social progress. To understand the role of quadras, it is important to have an idea of their values system and mentality.

"Alpha" quadra consists of the following types:

1. Intuitive-Logical Extratim: Don Quixote
2. Logical-Intuitive Introtim: Robespierre
3. Sensory-Ethical Introtim: Dumas
4. Ethical-Sensory Extratim: Hugo

Characteristic of "Alpha" is a feeling of harmoniousness and orderliness in the world, and the richness of emotion and aesthetic sensations. It is not by chance that "Alpha" personalities often emphasize their unity with the world around, and some of them sense cosmic harmony. One can even say that "Alfa," while regarding the world as more perfect than it really is, has an outlook and mentality that is somewhat out of touch with reality. For this reason, "Alfa" is revolutionary-minded: seeing imperfections of the real world, "Alfa" persons want to change it. These ideas get partially realized mainly by "Beta" quadra.

"Beta" quadra consists of the following types:

1. Logical-Sensory Introtim: Maxim Gorky
2. Ethical-Intuitive Extratim: Hamlet
3. Sensory-Logical Extratim: Zhukov
4. Intuitive-Ethical Introtim: Yesenin

The world of "Beta" is secluded, limited, rational and, being single-mindedly practical, "Beta" efficiently suppresses any deviation from the objective set. The "Beta" mentality is oriented toward practical work. Because of a change in the aesthetic perception of the world harmony, and because it operates in a harsh, linearly developing world, requiring a strong will, sense of time, dramatic emotions, and practical logic, "Beta"'s mentality greatly differs from "Alfa"'s. Historically, the rule of "Beta" is characterized by the emergence of centralized, sometimes dictatorial, despotic regimes, subject to a single goal, where persons are not free individuals and their selfhood is not valued. "Beta"'s attitudes are pessimistic and interlaced with pragmatic aspirations.

"Gamma" is a quadra of "storm and stress," consisting of the following types:

1. Logical-Intuitive Extratim: Jack London
2. Ethical-Sensory Introtim: Dreiser
3. Sensory-Ethical Extratim: Napoleon
4. Intuitive-Logical Introtim: Balzac

Strong-willed, sensory driven, combined with extrovert emotions, mobile logic, and a sense of timing, forms a cluster of a fairly dynamic, irrepressible temperament combined with action. In any society, the "Gamma" personalities' ascent to power sets in motion powerful dynamics and quick

evolution, which rejuvenates the society and shakes it free from stagnation and many negative things. Typical of this quadra is a vigorous striving for goals set, and a critical attitude to results achieved. "Gamma"'s deeds pave the way for the "Delta" quadra, with its optimistic practical workers. In the field of harmony and arts, of perception of people's qualities, "Gamma"'s attitudes are very similar to "Alfa"'s.

"Delta" quadra consists of the following types:

1. Logical-Sensory Extratim: Shtirlitz
2. Ethical-Intuitive Introtim: Dostoevsky
3. Intuitive-Ethical Extratim: Huxley
4. Sensory-Logical Introtim: Gabin

Friendliness, altruism, zeal to invent, along with practicality, prevail in "Delta". "Delta" assimilates "Alfa"'s ideas, but handles them as "Gamma"'s successor, putting them into practice and perfecting them until their latent potential is realized to the fullest.

The socionic personalities typology allows the optimal, most harmonious team to form for every societal function, including dialog as a process for solving various conflicts. (The formation of harmonious dialog teams requires a special methodology, for which there is no space to talk about it, here.) Such are the socionics' basics and practical aspects. Below we compare it with tetrasociology, and analyze and evaluate tetrasociology's potential from socionics standpoint. The positive aspects that tetrasociology shares with socionics are as follows:

First: the initial, multi-dimensionality of tetrasociology and socionics, namely, their four-dimensionality, tetrariness. Tetrasociology's foundation is the four dimensions (or axes of co-ordinates) of social space-time. Each dimension is posited to have four constants (Semashko, 2002: 32-48), so the overall number is 16. Socionics, too, theorizes 16 basic and constant personality types, which constitute "socion" - the model embracing the whole range of personality types. Tetrasociology posits four basic spheres/components in individuals and society, which are analogs to the four psychic functions of Jung and Augustinaviciutes. Tetrasociology posits four states of evolutionary development, or life-cycle stages of social phenomena, which are nearly analogs to those in socionics. Tetrasociology creates a model of harmonious societies and harmonious persons on the basis of harmonious, inter-complementary and balanced development of its four spheres. Socionics, likewise, forms harmonious teams and crews based, on the one hand, on four psychic functions and four channels, and on the other, on four quadras. There are many other tetrary similarities in tetrasociology and socionics, which, for lack of space, I'll not mention.

Second: one of tetrasociology's key conclusions is the idea that the whole of population consists of four equally necessary, inter-complementary, but differently prioritized sphere classes (Semashko: 59-77), which differ not by property, but by main employment in one of the four social production spheres. Obviously, each of these classes, like a particular socio-psychological personality type, can be described in socionics terms, and this opens up for socionics wide prospects of sociocultural application, and extends the limits for its practical usage.

Third: tetrasociology proposes the idea of a state based on "sphere" or "tetrary" democracy (Semashko: 80-88, 123-125), where power in all the branches is shared equally by sphere class representatives, to ensure the government's harmonization, which, in turn, would greatly boost the society's and individual's harmonization. As a macrosociology, tetrasociology leaves out micro-psychosocial relations, explored by socionics, which is an applied social science and a microsociology branch. Tetrasociology discovers a social base for a harmoniously-run government, while socionics discovers a microsociological basis for forming harmonious teams of governmental organs in all power branches and at all levels. The amalgamation of tetrasociology and socionics is open for integration

with other social sciences: political psychology, economics, political science, synergetics, sociocybernetics, etc. This synthesis of social sciences overcomes interdisciplinary barriers between them, and turn them into powerful instruments for a sociocultural technology of harmonization of all social institutions, government first of all.

Fourth: tetrasociology introduces radically novel, macrosociological statistics (Semashko: 48-53) as a system of special, aggregated indices of consolidated sphere resources. These statistics, rather than substituting for current, economic and branch-based statistics, supplement them and overarch them. "Sphere" statistics allow for a smooth transition to a cardinally novel informational (empirical) base and technology with wide ranging applicability, from individuals to the world economy. Sphere statistics can be used to quantitatively describe socionic types, dyads and quadras, and this, too, would make the two disciplines mutually enriching, and open prospects for transforming sociohumanitarian knowledge into a hard science, comparable to the natural sciences.

Having mentioned the points of agreement and mutually enriching supplementality between tetrasociology and socionics, let's talk about their differences.

Socionics theorizes that logics, ethics, sensorics, and intuition are the channels of informational exchange between individuals and the environment; they get superimposed over such general categories as space, time, information, and energy. In our view, a single social space-time that tetrasociology explores is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for socium's existence. For socium to exist, information and energy are needed besides space and time. Both arguments, pro and con, can be made concerning each of these two foundational theses. Tetrasociology will become more convincing if it is enhanced with the notions of information and energy. In this case, the four dimensions, or four axes of co-ordinates in tetrasociology - resources, processes, structures, and states - can describe any reality of the observed world. So one doesn't need to dichotomize social time into "short" (processes, dynamics) and "long" (developmental stages, genetics), as tetrasociology does.

To conclude, let's compare socionics' four psychic functions (logics, intuition, sensorics, ethics) with the four individual's spheres of tetrasociology. These spheres are character, conscience, will, and body, and they correlate with the appropriate social reproduction spheres, forming integrated sociopsychological spheres, aspiring for balance and harmony. Socium spheres are an objectification (materialization and estrangement) of the appropriate individual spheres. Individual spheres are these: Character, reproducing people (including the individual); Conscience, reproducing information (including self-awareness); Will, reproducing organizations (including individual's self-organization); Body, reproducing material resources (including its organic body). These individual spheres unite corresponding needs ("inlets," introvert disposition) and abilities ("outlets," extravert disposition) (Semashko, 2002: 53-59). All terminological differences notwithstanding, we can see the following similarities between socionics' psychic functions and tetrasociology's individual spheres: logics corresponds to conscience, intuition corresponds to will, body corresponds to sensorics, and ethics corresponds to character. Certainly, we have not only terminological, but substantive differences, as well. However, one cannot fail to see behind them certain fundamental similarities, which stimulate socionics' and tetrasociology's mutual development, their enhancement, and their synthesis for practical purposes. But this subject is very comprehensive, and we don't have enough space to talk about it in an overview, which is intended to compare socionics and tetrasociology as inter-complementary theories for forming harmonious teams for dialog.

In a brief overview, simply formulating a task is enough. Whether we've done it well is up to our readers to judge. Anyway, it's obvious that parallels between these novel trends in science are useful, not only for their further development, but also for solving some important practical problems, one of which is the pressing need for harmonious teams to dialog at all levels in our conflict-ridden world.

References:
Augustinaviciutes, A. (1998). *Socionics*. Introduction. St. Petersburg
Isaev, V. (2001). *Organization of work of a project team*. St. Petersburg
Jung, K. (1995). *Psychological types*. Moscow
Sokolov, E. (1998). *Introduction in Psychoanalysis*. St. Petersburg
Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St. Petersburg: Technical University

Valerie Isaev, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor of International Business, Management, and Tourism Department, St. Petersburg State University of Water Communications.

Tetrasociology and Esperanto

Anne Butkevich, Boris Kondratiev & Valeria Cvetkova, Russia

This review examines and evaluates tetrasociology from the standpoint of Esperanto, developed as an international language almost 100 years ago. Tetrasociology (Semashko, 2002) is the only modern sociological theory that attempts to discover social foundations for developing the use of Esperanto, and argues for its usefulness in the globalization era. There are quite a few studies devoted to cultural, linguistic, moral, spiritual and human-rights (linguistic human rights) significance of Esperanto[10]. But there has been no sociological analysis of Esperanto. So, Semashko's book is of special interest in this regard, even though he devotes just a little more than two pages to Esperanto as such (Semashko. 2002: 115-117). However, in essence, the book's overall content is a theoretical argument in favor of Esperanto. The book is all the more important because there are very few theoretical studies devoted to Esperanto (a fact that weakens Esperanto's positions and ideological influence). To explore and evaluate tetrasociology from an Esperantist viewpoint, we will first review the major ideological forces that brought Esperanto to life.

Zamenhof (1859-1917), the creator of Esperanto, saw in it not just another linguistic instrument, but a means of uniting people, a way to introduce and spread a common world religion, "homaranism"[11], in a neutral language for a dialog between different cultures, which would preserve the diversity of languages and cultures of the world. Zamenhof (1887) created Esperanto inspired by these supremely humanistic goals, which are united by an "internal idea" that includes such values as peace, tolerance, solidarity, camaraderie, mutual understanding, and communication. Zamenhof was thinking

[10] Gudskov, N.L. *Esperanto primer*. Moscow: Impeto, (2000); Melnikov, A.S. *Portrait of an Idea Against the Background of Eccentrics, or the Language of Dr.Hopeful*. Rostov-na-Donu, (1997). These books tell about numerous instances when Esperanto proved viable, useful, and necessary, and about the instances of decline and increase of interest in Esperanto in different countries in the 20th century; they explore major arguments "pro" and "con" Esperanto, and argue that the various myths about Esperanto are groundless. One of the important conclusions is this: The English language "will never become the sole and truly democratic vehicle of international communication"; it is inadequate. At the same time, the French Academy of Science characterizes Esperanto as the "masterpiece of logic and simplicity." Hungary has had experience using Esperanto for people's personal improvement. UNESCO in 1985 suggested governments include Esperanto in educational curricular. See Melnikov A.S. Op.cit., p.15-16, 46, 89, 90. The book also draws interesting, revealing parallels between the activities of different Esperanto organizations in different countries, including the USSR. Op.cit., p.98-102. M.S.Abolskaya's "Under the Sign of Lyre and Green Star" (St. Petersburg, 1999) tells about the tempestuous life of and persecutions suffered by a famous Russian actor and Esperantist Nikolay Rytkov (1913-1973). The most comprehensive study of persecutions suffered by Esperanto, in different countires, from the moment of its inception thru 1985, is U. Lins' "The Dangerous Language. A Story of Esperanto Persecutions." Moscow, IMPETO, (1999).

[11] "Homaranism is a religious unification of humankind on the basis of universal moral principles and the ecumenical idea of Yoga." See Gudskov, N.L., Op.cit., p.11.

on a grand scale. In keeping with spiritual hopes of the late 19th, early 20th century, which were inspired by Marxist utopias, he hoped that Esperanto would bring together the working class. He wrote: "Perhaps, there are no other people in the world for whom our democratic language is so important as it is to workers, and I hope that sooner or later the working class will become the strongest support base for our cause"[12]. However, as became clear in the 20th century, the hopes Zamenhof cherished for the working class proved futile. Workers didn't espouse Esperanto. Moreover, it was on their behalf that Joseph Stalin, "the greatest leader of the international working class," relentlessly persecuted Esperanto and Esperantists, and was as cruel in that as another tyrant, Adolf Hitler. No one knows how many Esperantists they shot: Stalin executed them as "Trotskyites and spies," and Hitler, as "communists and Jews"[13]. It is not the working class or any other antagonistic class that needs Esperanto, but non-antagonistic classes, cohesive and harmonious, which are yet unknown and which tetrasociology only hypothesizes (see below).

The Esperanto Declaration, adopted at the first Congress of Esperantists in1905, says that "Esperantism is the endeavour to spread throughout the entire world the use of this neutral language which...(is)... in no way aiming to replace existing national languages, would give to people of different nations the ability to understand each other, and would be able to serve as a conciliatory language" for warring nations. It is also noteworthy that this Declaration formulated another theoretical thesis, the one which today, almost 100 years later, seems if not erroneous and harmful, then severely crippling to the project of implanting Esperanto. It is that: "theoretical debate (about Esperanto) leads to nothing, and the aim can be attained ONLY (italics are the authors) by practical work." A century of practical efforts to spread Esperanto has shown very convincingly that these efforts, much as we regret to admit it, have FAILED to attain the goal. For all the rises (and ebbs) of public interest in Esperanto, it has failed to become a universally accepted language of international communication. The biggest question here is WHY? An answer can be found only in theory, and not in practice, which is powerless, here. However, no theoretically sound answer has been provided to this cardinally important question. (For this reason, any theoretical works attempting an answer deserve the closest attention from Esperantists, lest they become like ostriches who, faced with a danger, bury their heads in the sand.) Without a theoretical base, purely practical efforts at spreading Esperanto, as the practical experience shows, wither, weaken and shrink as shagreen leather. Therefore, we should return to Esperanto's ideological-theoretical roots and modernize them.

We believe that Esperanto's ideological-theoretical foundations were best illuminated in the first issues of "Espero" magazine, launched by Bitner in 1908 in St.Petersburg. His editorials, and other articles that he published, are worth the Esperantists' attention precisely because of their theoretical slant, of ideas that have preserved their topicality to this day. Here is what the magazine wrote in 1908 - we quote only the most typical passages:

"Esperanto's goal is a cultural unity of all nations of the world, based on an awareness of kinship and on aspiration of progress for all of humankind." "A radical change in the civilized nations' understanding of the international significance of Esperanto" is to occur when "the readers en masse lend Esperanto their spiritual support." Esperanto helps "to publicize ideas of peace, to culturally unite the nations, and to elevate each nation's spiritual level to such a height where the existing enmities between them would die away by themselves..., and would be replaced by an awareness of universal

---

[12] Quoted from Kolker, B.G. "Esperanto manual. The basics." Moscow: Nauka, (1992), p.4

[13] The Esperanto movement has almost never and nowhere enjoyed a significant state support. Soviet Esperantists, if asked about what the government gave them, could have answered, 'Free tickets to GULAG." See Gudskov, N.L. Op.cit., p.20. In the USSR, Esperantists' activity has always been controlled by the party and state security service, and some Esperanto organizations were banned for more than 50 years. Op. cit., p.24-25

fellowship on the basis of a true democracy."

This issue of the magazine also carried a summary of an article by Professor Baudouin de Courtenay, of St. Petersburg University, defending Esperanto and responding to a tract by two German scholars who disapproved of artificial universal languages. Courtenay pointed to the following advantages of Esperanto: a) the language is real, b) it's not an exclusively Romanic language, c) its artificiality is relative, because it was created on the basis of a living language, d) it's the best among existing artificial languages, e) Esperanto is the most wide-spread among accessory languages. "This language can form a basis for the future cultural unification of humankind, on altruistic foundations... of the great idea of brotherly unification of nations." Esperanto is an agent of "cultural and brotherly unification" (Bitner, 1908. #1: 40-41).

Back then, Bitner realized already the major problems of Esperantism. He wrote: "Esperantists are committed people, who... are anxious about the inertia in the society, which doesn't understand the usefulness of studying Esperanto and doesn't want to do a thing to materialize the sublime idea of an international language" (Bitner. 1908. #2: 49). He raised questions which seem pertinent today: "Why are there still so few Esperantists, ...why are the ideas of Esperanto so slow to catch on? … The society is hardly to blame for this…, since Esperantists themselves DON'T KNOW HOW (italics are the authors) to make the society aware of their activity and willing to support it... Still, things aren't moving... The cause of the failure runs much deeper than inactivity..." Why then are things not moving? What are the "deep" causes? He explains: "Studying Esperanto is regarded, not as a means for realizing sublime universal ideals, but as a goal in itself. GIVEN SUCH A STANCE, THE ESPERANTISTS ARE DOOMED TO FAIL PERMANENTLY..." (Bitner. 1908. #2: 50-51). (italics are the authors). What a wise conclusion!

He continues: "We're locked in a logical circle: people don't want to study Esperanto because they can see no practical benefit of it; meanwhile, the benefits materialize only when the new language is sufficiently widespread... Esperanto is not the end, but a means... for realizing the idea of universal brotherhood of nations, the idea which rejects any armed conflicts and affirms the principle of universal peace. (One of its functions is) mutual understanding, possible only through the introduction of a universal international language. But this is clearly too little, because wars are waged even between nations that understand each other, not to mention the never-ceasing class struggle which determines the policies of governments. (*This is the root of it! This is the ultimate cause! - authors*). The objective of Esperantism as the idea of universal brotherhood of nations is to spread the kind of education that is foreign to ideas of national superiority and is based on the principle of people's welfare and... true democracy"(Bitner, 1908. #2: 51-52).

So, the conceptual framework of Esperanto ideology embraces the following system of ideas: universal brotherhood of nations, peace across the world, true democracy, cultural unification of nations based on their awareness of brotherhood, humankind's progress, every nation's spiritual level, altruistic motives, mutual understanding, etc. With regard to these ideals, Esperanto is a means, one of the instruments to realize them[14]. Esperanto isn't a goal in itself. Insightfully, Bitner says that what obstructs the progress of Esperanto is society's inertia, never-ending wars, class struggle and the Esperantists' narrow-minded concentration on spreading the language as an end in itself. The Esperantists should start dealing with global social problems. And the latter cannot be formulated without an adequate social theory. If nations, religions, cultures, and classes are hostile to one another, rather than friendly, can they be expected to adopt Esperanto as a language of universal brotherhood and spiritual affinity?

[14] "Editorial note," *Espero,* 1908, N. 1, p.3-4. It should be noted that the emblem of Esperanto is a green (the colour of hope) pentagonal star, symbolizing the hopes for peace cherished across the five continents.

These insights, however, haven't been theoretically explored[15]. Presently, from the position of traditional theories, one doesn't see a social basis for brotherhood and, therefore, for Esperanto. Tetrasociology is the only social theory to conceptually explain the separation of humankind and to try to find social grounds for brotherhood, and therefore, for cultivating Esperanto in the new century. Let's explore this fundamental concept of tetrasociology, and evaluate it from the ideological positions of Esperanto.

From a tetrasociological viewpoint, society consists of four equally important, but different in object and product, spheres of social reproduction. They are eternal and constant, because they constantly reproduce resources that society needs and can't live without. These resources are PEOPLE, INFORMATION, ORGANIZATION, THINGS. They are reproduced in the corresponding spheres: SOCIOSPHERE, INFOSPHERE, ORGANISPHERE, TECHNOSPHERE, which correspond with SPHERE classes employed in these spheres: SOCIOCLASS (people working in education, healthcare, sports, social welfare, and also non-working persons engaged in reproduction of themselves), INFOCLASS (academics, artists, designers, journalists, etc.), ORGANICLASS (politicians, lawyers, managers, financiers, servicemen, etc.), and TECHNOCLASS (industry workers, peasants/farmers). Spheres, and sphere classes employed in them, are equally important for society and aspire to achieve balance, and this constitutes the basis of social harmony and makes the classes harmonious, cohesive, equal, and therefore, BROTHERLY. (In Semashko's view, the "awareness of brotherhood" that Bitner wrote about can exist only in sphere classes, as classes that are equal and which, rather than by property, differ by major employment in one of the spheres, this employment requiring balance and harmony from them instead of antagonism.)

However, historically, and especially during the last centuries, within industrial society, societies have become BRANCH-BASED, with a large number of branches within each sphere. Branch-based, industrial organization of society led to the formation of branch-based classes, differing by property and branch employment. Branches and branch-based classes strive for supremacy over one another and, consequently, are ruled by the law of disharmony, which engenders class antagonism, constant struggle, and hostility among them. Branch-based society and branch classes can exist only in a state of permanent war ("hot" or "cold"), which precludes peace and brotherhood of nations. Thus, branch-based and disharmonious classes, warring nations, and the religions that serve them, don't need a language of international communication. Instead, languages of nations that dominate the world economically and politically are thrust on people.

Beginning in the last quarter of the 20th century, with the onset of globalization, which involved the rise of an informational/network society, rapid growth of international organizations, and the transformation of economies into a single world market, branch-based organization of society has begun to decompose. Meanwhile, what is becoming central is a tendency to dialog and harmonize, to overcome the antagonisms between branch classes and nations (which have put the world on the brink of total mutual destruction by accumulated weapons of mass destruction), on the basis of new, global

[15] The ideas mentioned above are akin to "finvictism", an Esperanto word meaning "aspiration for the final victory," i.e., for the establishment of this language as the world's major auxiliary language. For fairness sake, we should mention that there is a group in the contemporary Esperanto movement that holds a cardinally different view on Esperanto's role in society and its prospects, a trend known as "raumism." The word derives from Rauma, the name of a Finnish city where this group first adopted a manifesto. Raumists consider Esperanto as a self-sufficient, quasi-ethnic language, and a distinctive culture, able to exist independently and autonomously from all other cultures and languages. Exploration of this complicated philosophical argument would call for a separate study, and lies beyond the scope of our brief overview. These trends show that the Esperanto movement is split, and is looking for various ways to survive. The first group argues for an expansion, a quantitative amplification of Esperanto, while the second group stakes on the internal quality of Esperanto culture as such.

and harmonious human communities - sphere classes, brotherly in their very essence (Semashko, 2002: 32-48, 59-88, 105-110, 113-117, etc). Hence, the author of tetrasociology draws this major conclusion regarding Esperanto: Esperanto, as a single, global language of international dialog, is necessary, not to traditional branch groups, but to sphere classes as agents of harmony. But, until sphere classes "self-identify and self-organize, emergence of a single language is unlikely. It is difficult to hope for a single language without it." (Semashko. 2002:117)

Based on this thesis, Semashko builds his entire argument in favor of Esperanto, and his criticism of Esperanto's opponents. First: he sees the social significance of globalization in the formation of new global and harmonious social communities - sphere classes, which are the only social groups common to all humankind, who need Esperanto as a universal, neutral, accessory, brotherly, and peace-making language. Second: the English language, which is presently very widespread, cannot efficiently function as an international language, because it isn't neutral, and it projects Anglophonic nations' supremacy, instead of equality and brotherhood of all nations. Besides, English exists in a multitude of versions, which hampers international communication. Third: the need for Esperanto arises from the global economy, global communications, global informational technologies, and the internet most of all. The rise of an international language of electronic hypertext, HTML, breaks ground and creates the need for a solid, international language, a nomination for which Esperanto is the best contender. Fourth: Esperanto is bound to enhance the potential of technologies, work, culture and education, and to become an adequate response to the global linguistic challenge. Semashko proposes to fellow sociologists to adopt Esperanto as the official language of the International Sociological Association, a move that should help Esperanto take root (Semashko. 2002:117).

All the arguments that tetrasociology makes, to affirm Esperanto's value for society, seem to us convincing and deserving public attention and further development. These arguments specify and elaborate the ideas of Zamenhof, Bitner, and other personalities who helped launch Esperantism. If we project their ideas - which seem fair to us - that Esperanto isn't an end in itself but a means, Esperantism today should be oriented toward the formation of new, sphere classes, should help to raise their consciousness, and publicize theories that boost their growth. Only then will Esperantism gain a specific social support base in the modern world. Only then will Esperantism overcome what Bitner called its "fate of perennial failure." In order to join the ranks of those "fated to always WIN," Esperantists should coordinate their efforts to implant the language with the affirmation of new, sphere classes, which are the only groups who need the language and can adopt it. To this end, Esperantism should go beyond its narrow, branch-based limits, become open to sphere contacts, and begin to foster and develop relevant social theories, social movements, and organizations.

Semashko proposes an "International Publishing Project," which is very important for expansion of Esperanto's zone of influence: the plan is to publish books of multicultural dialog (dialog among religions, cultures, languages, ideologies, and theories) in three or four languages, including Esperanto. This project will allow readers to compare different languages and to see the advantages of Esperanto, and for this reason it deserves full support from Esperantists.

All significance for spreading Esperanto notwithstanding, tetrasociological arguments (2002) have several major weaknesses. First of all, the terseness and complexity of Semashko's argumentation hamper the ordinary reader's understanding. True, Semashko notes that he limited himself to the most general theses, aimed at professional sociologists. (Semashko's book, translated into English, was intended for participants of the 15th World Congress of Sociology in Australia, in July, 2002, where it was presented.) One hopes that the author will write a special book or article, maybe in partnership with an Esperanto theoretician, presenting a circumstantial and more accessible argumentation. That there are no sociological studies to substantiate the author's conclusions is another big drawback. As he

explains it, what accounts for this was that his objective was to succinctly introduce tetrasociology to the International Sociological Association, and also that such studies are very labor- and cost-intensive. But the author has no objections to, and is willing to conduct, such studies with adequate funding. Despite these drawbacks, we believe that this and other, less significant weaknesses of tetrasociology do not detract from its importance as a fundamental theory for developing and implanting Esperanto in the world today.

References:
Bitner, V. *Espero*. (1908). #1
Bitner, V. *Espero*. (1908). #2
Dr Esperanto. (1887) *The international language. The foreword and complete textbook*. Por Rusoj. Warsaw
Semashko, L. M. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St. Petersburg: Technical University.

Anne Butkevich, President of "Espero" society since 1992, Esperantist 20 years;
Boris Kondratiev, expert in the Esperanto's lexicography, developed the Large Esperanto-Russian, Russian-Esperanto dictionary, Esperantist 30 years; and
Valeria Cvetkova, Esperantist 48 years.

Tetrasociology and sociocybernetics: towards a comparison of the key concepts

Bernd Hornung, Germany; Bernard Scott, UK; Leo Semashko, Russia

Sociocybernetics and tetrasociology are interdisciplinary and multi-dimensional sociological theories rooted in several humanitarian disciplines: philosophy, sociology, psychology, political science, etc. Tetrasociology and sociocybernetics have a common theoretical platform -- the systems approach and sociological theory. Based on these, we shall tackle the question of a comparison of sociocybernetics and tetrasociology with the purpose of development and mutual enrichment of these disciplines within the framework of theoretical sociology. Interdisciplinary comparison and research are some of the most important trends in the development of general sociological theory, to which any of its sub-fields can make a contribution. In our brief review we limit ourselves to the two sub-fields mentioned, which differ both in their theoretical foundations and by how long each of them has been around. However, both approaches were brought to life in the context of the informational revolution and globalization, as a response to modern challenges. Now a brief definition of these disciplines is due.

Tetrasociology, or a sociology approaching society and individuals as four-dimensional systems, has been elaborated, using some ideas derived from Western sociology, by L.M.Semashko in Russia in the course of 25 years. However, it was not before 2002 that tetrasociology had come to the attention of Western scholars, when a book about it was first published in English [1] and presented at the XVth World Congress of Sociology, which took place in Australia in July, 2002.

Sociocybernetics and its direct predecessors, in contrast to tetrasociology, have been developed by Western academics over the past 50 years, enjoying a high renown and having spawned hundreds of scholarly works. In order to compare tetrasociology and sociocybernetics, we will briefly overview their respective systems of concepts and chart methods for drawing the parallels.

Sociocybernetics is closely connected with systems approach. But historically, Systems Theory and Cybernetics developed in different contexts. Wiener (1948) first distinguished Cybernetics as a new discipline, the science of control and communication in the animal and the

machine, following the successes of mathematicians, engineers and biologists who, in an interdisciplinary exchange, shed light on the nature of purposive, goal-seeking behaviour in natural and man-made complex systems. The phenomenon of negative feedback, involving a circularity of causation, was recognised as a universal feature of such systems, found in the workings of the humble thermostat and in the complex homeostatic processes that maintain the fabric and stability of living systems.

A general theory of systems was independently proposed by Von Bertalanffy (1950). As a Biologist, Von Bertalanffy and others (notably Weiss) emphasised the »holistic" nature of the organisation of living systems, captured in the Aristotellian aphorism that »the whole is more than the sum of its parts". Von Bertalanffy is responsible for the distinction between »open" and »closed" systems. In his original definition, the distinction made was in terms of the exchange of matter and energy between the system and its environment. An open system persists as an organisation whilst engaging in such exchanges. A closed system is adiabatically sealed from its environment. In its isolation, it is subject to the second law of thermodynamics: over time its order (organisation) decreases and its disorder (entropy) increases. According to this definition, a candle flame and a living organism are open systems.

The contribution of Cybernetics was to make a clear distinction between matter and energy, on the one hand, and information and control on the other. A candle flame and a living organism are indeed both energetically open systems but the latter has the additional property of defining its own boundaries. It is self-organising. From the outset, key thinkers recognised that, underlying the relative differences in emphasis, there is a fundamental unity of interest between Cybernetics and Systems Theory. As Ashby (1956) phrased it, both are primarily concerned with systems that are "open to energy and closed to information and controls". An "informationally closed" system adapts to environmental disturbances. In doing so, it can be said to become more informed of its environment. From the perspective of an external observer, certain of its matter-energy exchange may be seen as carriers of information. The system may be coupled by information exchange with other systems. In this restricted sense, the system, as part of a larger system, is informationally open. What remains intrinsic to it, despite changes due to adaptation, learning, maturation and evolution, is the basic circularity of its organisation: it consists of processes that produce structures that embody those processes.

For the moment, it is sufficient to note that in such a system, the whole is indeed greater than the sum of its parts. A disturbance in a part of the system will necessarily affect all other parts of the system. From this brief discussion, it should be clear that "Systems Theory" and "Cybernetics" may be used interchangeably as labels for the emerging science that studies the organisation of complex systems. We have a preference for the term Cybernetics because of its historic connection with the need to understand cognition and purpose. Ashby [2], for example, is always at pains to make clear the role played by the observer's own purposes and interests in determining how a system is to be defined, described and explained [3].

Sociocybernetics defined. We define sociocybernetics as «Systems Science in Sociology». Systems science, because sociocybernetics is not limited to theory but also includes application, empirical research, methodology, and axiology (i.e. ethics and value research) [4]. In sociology, as it deals with sociological theory proper, thus excluding in a first approach the other social sciences like psychology, anthropology, political science, etc. However, it is certainly expandable to the other social sciences. Furthermore, in an attempt to look at sociology from basic concepts, the present discussion focuses on First Order Cybernetics rather than on the further complications of Second Order Cybernetics.

Systems Science, or more precisely First Order Cybernetics, can be understood according to Wiener´s definition [5] as the science of «steering and control in the animal and the machine», including human beings and natural «machines». The construction of sociology from cybernetics can be based on the fundamental idea elaborated elsewhere [6] that the world consists at an elementary level of events or processes which are of two kinds, i.e. energetical/material and informational, an idea found (without theoretical justification though) already in the simulation studies of Jay W. Forrester.

Basic concepts of First Order Cybernetics. On this background a series of basic cybernetic or systems theoretical concepts is relevant, starting with feedback or circular causality as the basic cybernetic process. The closing of a causal chain provides the basic mechanism for positive (deviation amplification) and negative (deviation reduction) feedback loops. This both at the level of matter/energy, and at the level of information flows or combinations of both. If some kind of measuring device, a so-called comparator (which can be a mechanical device like the flyer in an old steam engine), is added to a negative feedback loop, controlled feedback becomes possible keeping a process close to an average or ideal state. It is control (or feedBACK), if the deviation to be reduced is measured after the event, it becomes steering (or feedFORWARD) if the deviation is anticipated and counter-action induced already before the event (like in driving a car around a curve). More complex set-ups of circular causality are reflexivity, self-reference, self-organization, and autopoiesis.

Regular patterns of such (and other) basic processes can be interpreted as structures, because they are stable over time. In particular so-called micro-processes, in the natural sciences as well as in social systems according to Herbert Simon [7], often constitute structures at a higher level. Dynamic systems consequently can be conceived as consisting of a combination of processes and structures. If these are functionally interdependent, functionally cooperating, and, at least to some extent, closed off from the environment by a boundary, such a conglomeration of components, i.e. structures and processes, can be considered a system, i.e. «A system is a whole consisting of interdependent parts» [8].

A system, according to Laszlo [9], is characterized by four key properties: (1) Wholeness implying a system boundary, (2) positive feedback loops, (3) negative feedback loops, and (4) a systems hierarchy, i.e. usually a system can be considered as a subsystem of a higher level system (supra-system) and as being composed in its turn of sub-systems and sub-sub-systems etc., as far as the research purpose requires such a differentiation. These basic characteristics of systems according to Laszlo, include two process and two structural properties. The most simple and general functional model of such an open system is the input-output model consisting of an input mechanism, a transducer transforming inputs into outputs and an output mechanism. At the information level the basic scheme is the same, but the transducer is usually called the processor and a memory is added. The input mechanism is called a perceptor and the output mechanism an effector. Looking at the basic modelling components of the early simulation models of Forrester [10], we might as well add a «memory» or rather a storage unit for «stocks» to the basic material-level input-output model.

Hence with the same basic building blocks it is possible to conceptualize both matter/energy systems (material systems) and information resp. information processing systems (IPS) [11], whereby information processing systems are in fact always combinations of material processes and structures and information processes and structures. The latter are not possible without a material substrate, a «medium», although it is in many cases possible to abstract from the material basis. Thus it is possible to construct theoretically a coherent cybernetic world of systems and information processing systems which might after all be used to model and analyze even information society.

On the side of sociology proper concepts of sociology and sociocybernetics, the “socio-” part of sociocybernetics, the situation is much less clear, as so far sociology is characterized by a pluralism of more or less partial and incomplete theories [12] along with a number of, more or less historical,

attempts at «grand theory» covering the whole. The most recent one of the latter is doubtlessly the work of Niklas Luhmann [13]. Nonetheless, looking at the field of sociology at large, few efforts are visible towards what might be called a «systematic sociology» [14].

A kind of empirical attempt in this direction was presented by Korte and his collaborators who published a series of four books in German intending to cover the field of sociology as introductory texts. The first volume presents a series of basic concepts of sociology which are «empirical» in the sense that the authors looked at the body of literature of sociology, and in particular at the «classics», to identify the basic concepts of sociology.

Both in the case of sociology and in the case of sociocybernetics «basic» or «main» concepts are not concepts on which most or even all sociologists respectively sociocyberneticians would agree upon, but just concepts being considered as main concepts by the respective authors on the basis of their knowledge of literature and on the basis of their own theoretical frameworks. This may be somewhat different in the case of tetrasociology, as the author who developed this theoretical approach speaks for himself in the present paper.

According to Korte and his collaborators there are 28 main concepts of sociology [15]. The table below catalogs the concepts of sociology, sociocybernetics, and tetrasociology, respectively.

Table 1: Main Concepts of Sociology, Sociocybernetics, and Tetrasociology

Main Concepts of Sociology According to Korte et al.	Concepts of Sociocybernetics (in comparison with 1st column)	Concepts of Tetrasociology[16] (in comparison with 1st column)
1) Sociology	1) Sociocybernetics	1) Tetrasociology
2) Social Action	2) Social Action, Interaction, Communication	2) Reproductive Employment of the People
3) Norms	3) Orientors, Norms, Basic Orientors, Values	3) Information, Culture
4) Values	-- see 3)	--- see 3)
5) Meaning	4) Meaning, Knowledge	--- see 3)
6) Socialization	5) Socialization, Education, Learning	4) Social Sphere, People Reproduction
7) Person	6) Psychological System, Personality	5) People, Individual, Person
8) Individual	7) Individual, Actor System	--- see 5)
9) Identity	8) (Ego-)Identity	6) Sphere Identity
10) Habitus	--	---
11) Sex/Gender	--	--- see 5)
12) Deviant Behavior	--	---
13) Social Group	9) Social Group	7) Sphere Classes and Groups
14) Institution	10) Institution	8) Organization, Orgsphere, Order
15) Organization	11) Organization	--- see 8)
16) Power	12) Power, Force/Violence	--- see 8)
17) Force/Violence	-- see 12)	--- see 8)
18) (Legitimate) Rule	13) (Legitimate) Rule	--- see 8)
19) Social Constraints	14) Social Constraints	--- see 8)
20) Social Inequality	--	9) Social Inequality
21) Caste	-- see 15)	---
22) Estate	-- see 15)	---
23) Class	-- see 15)	7) Sphere Classes and Groups

24) Social Stratification and Status	15) Social Stratification/ Status, Class, Estate, Caste	10) Social Stratification
25) Mobility	16) Mobility	11) Mobility
26) Culture	17) Culture	--- see 3)
27) Development	18) Development & Evolution, Social Change	12) Development, Social Genetics
28) Social Structure	19) Social Structure & Process	13) Sphere Structure

Not all «main concepts» of sociology have correspondences among the main concepts of sociocybernetics and the main concepts of tetrasociology. There remain empty categories. On the other hand, both sociocybernetics and tetrasociology include a number of main concepts which are not to be found among the concepts of sociology. Therefore complete lists of the main concepts both of sociocybernetics and of tetrasociology are presented before continuing on some more aspects of comparison.

Table 2: Main Concepts of Sociocybernetics Grouped

The first concept in each line is the «main concept» followed in some cases by variations or closely related concepts. The numbering is sequential, the numbers behind some of the concepts refer to the respective number in the previous table.

Science:
- I Epistemology, Philosophy of Science, Meta-Level
- II Theory
- III Axiology
- IV Methodology
- V Empirical Research
- VI Application

I Meta-Concepts
1) Sociocybernetics (1)
2) Events
3) Process, Flows (18)
4) Structure (19)
5) Relations
6) Causality (circular)
7) Function, Purpose
8) Matter/Energy
9) Information (incl. data)
10) Indeterminism
11) Wholism

II Theory and Axiology

Cultural and Psychological Concepts - Information Structure
12) Culture (17)
13) Symbols, Symbol Systems
14) Orientors, Norms, Basic Orientors, Values (3)
15) Meaning, Knowledge (4)
16) Institution (10)
17) Socialization, Education (5)

18) Legitimation
19) (Ego-)Identity (8)
20) Psychological System, Personality, Individual, Subject (6)
21) Lifestyle, Habitus

Information Processing Concepts - Information Process

22) Emotional System, Feelings
23) Cognition, Perception, Cognitive System
24) Learning
25) Decision-making, incl. Evaluation

Action Concepts - Process

26) Action, Interaction, Behavior (2)
27) Communication, Message
28) Mobility (16)
29) Cooperation, Consensus, Consent
30) Conflict

Social Units - Structural Components

31) Social System, Controlled System, Uncontrolled System (Eco-System Type)
32) Actor System
33) Roles
34) Individual (7)
35) Interaction System
36) Group (9)
37) Organization (11)
38) Collectivity
39) Societal System, Society

Forces and Power - Process

40) Steering and Control
41) Power, Force/Violence, Attractor (12)
42) (Legitimate) Rule (13)
43) Resources

Social (Macro-) Structure and Dynamics - Structure & Process

44) Social Structure and Social Process (19)
45) Constraints (14)
46) Stratification, Status, Class, Estate, Caste (15)
47) Hierarchization, System Hierarchy, Control Hierarchy, Micro-, Meso-, Macro-Level
48) Segmentation
49) Functional Differentiation and Subsystems, Social Spheres
50) Development, Evolution, Social Change (18)

Specific Sociocybernetic Concepts - Structure and Process

51) Boundary/border
52) Environment
53) Input/Transformation/Output
54) Feedback/Feedforward (pos./neg.)
55) Openness/Closure
56) Requisite Variety
57) Self-Organization, Autopoiesis, Self-Reference

58) Observation, Observer
59) Reflexivity
60) Complexity
61) Emergence, Synergy
62) Stabilization, Homeostasis/Morphostasis/Morphogenesis
63) Adaptation
64) Sustainability

Table 3: Main Concepts of Tetrasociology Grouped

Meta-Concepts:
1) Tetrasociology (1)
2) Postpluralism
3) Pluralism
4) Monism

Generic Concepts:
5) Reproductive Employment (2), Sphere Classes of Population (7), Social Energy
6) Social Resources (Resources of Reproduction)
7) Social Processes (Processes of Reproduction)
8) Social Structures (Structures of Reproduction, Spheres of Reproduction and Employment) (13)
9) Social States, Development, Evolution (States of Reproduction) (12)
10) Social Space-Time, Social World, Society, The Social

Specific Concepts:

Resources:
11) People, Individual, Person (5)
12) Information, Culture (3)
13) Organization, Orgsphere, Order (8)
14) Things (Social Matter)

Processes:
15) Production
16) Distribution
17) Exchange
18) Consumption

Structures:
19) Social (Humanitarian) Sphere of Reproduction (Sociosphere)
20) Informational (Cultural, Spiritual) Sphere of Reproduction (Infosphere)
21) Organizational (Political, Managerial) Sphere of Reproduction (Orgsphere)
22) Technical (Material, Economical) Sphere of Reproduction (Technosphere)

States:
23) Prosperity (12)
24) Deceleration (12)
25) Decline (12)
26) Dying (12)

Sphere Classes:
27) Social (Humanitarian) Class of Population (Socioclass)
28) Informational Class of Population (Infoclass)
29) Organizational Class of Population (Orgclass)

30) Technical Class of Population (Technoclass)

Table 3.1: Main Concepts of Tetrasociology Grouped

SOCIAL SPACE - TIME (SOCIAL WORLD, SOCIETY, THE SOCIAL)				
PROCESSES		RESOURCES	STRUCTURES	STATES
Production	R - E M P L O U M E N T	People	Sociosphere	Prosperity
Distribution		Information/Culture	Infosphere	Deceleration
Exchange		Organization	Orgsphere	Decline
Consumption		Things	Technosphere	Dying
S P H E R E		C L A S S E S OF THE P O P U L A T I O N		
SOCIO		CLASS (Teacher, doctors, social workers; not working ….)		
INFO		CLASS (Scientific, artists, journalists, engineers, programmers …)		
ORG		CLASS (Politics, lawyers, military men, managers, financiers …)		
TECHNO		CLASS (Working class, peasants / farmers)		

Note: Reproductive employment of the people coincides with the contents of the sphere classes. Therefore the given concepts are identical and considered as one concept, though they differ as a subject (sphere classes) and its intrinsic quality (reproductive employment), which is not separated from it. In total the 26 main tetrasociology's concepts are reflected in the table, except for meta-concepts. All other tetrasociological concepts are derived from them.

Table 4: Main Concepts of Sociology Grouped
(according to Korte et al.)

Meta-Concepts
- 1) Sociology

Action Concepts
- 2) Social action
- 10) Habitus (or Culture)
- 12) Deviant behavior

Cultural Concepts
- 3) Norms
- 4) Values
- 5) Meaning
- 6) Socialization
- 26) Culture

Person-Related Concepts
- 7) Person
- 8) Individual
- 9) Identity

Social Units
- 13) Social Group
- 14) Institution
- 15) Organization

Forces and Power
- 16) Power

17) Force/violence
18) (Legitimate) Rule

Collectivities/(Macro-)Categories

11) Sex/Gender
21) Caste
22) Estate
23) Class
24) Social stratification and status

Social (Macro-) Structures and Processes

19) Social constraints
20) Social inequality
25) Mobility
27) Development
28) Social structure

A brief review like this one is not intended for a detailed comparison of the conceptual frameworks of sociology, sociocybernetics, and tetrasociology. The purpose of this overview is limited to demonstrating the very complex, interdisciplinary problem of comparison of the concepts systems to provide a first idea of how sociological, sociocybernetic, and Tetrasociological concepts and theories relate to each other. Cataloging and grouping the main concepts of these different theoretical approaches, we create the preconditions necessary for more thorough and detailed comparisons. In the following will point to certain aspects of interdisciplinary analysis of the problem of drawing parallels between the concepts analyzed will be pointed out.

First, the theories appear to share some concepts, their meaning being nearly identical: individuum/personality, culture/information, organization/institution, social structure, groups/classes, action/process, development. Each of the theories considers these concepts as pivotal. The three theoretical approaches investigated seem to have a core of similar key concepts. Other concepts, either diverging or intersecting, form the distinctive character of each approach. Thus, the main problem in drawing parallels is to determine which concepts are common or shared. This is the corner-stone of such comparisons. If there are no common concepts, then there is not much point in a comparison.

Second, sociology and sociocybernetics, as disciplines with a long history, are approached from standpoints of those scholars who are being quoted. This means that other authors may have a different interpretation of these disciplines. As for tetrasociology, because it is new, it is presented in the version of its founder, which does not rule out the possibility of different interpretations in the future.

Third, sociology, as the older and more fundamental discipline, serves as the common ground for comparing sociocybernetics and tetrasociology as particular theoretical approaches and new trends developing in sociology, albeit with integrationist, interdisciplinary and systemic ambitions.

Fourth, such a term as "main concept" turns out to be very dubious and vague. What are the criteria to determine what concepts are to be considered "main" in an academic discipline? There can be a multitude of such criteria. Every discipline identifies its own set of "main" concepts, and they are different in psychology, economics, philosophy, etc. Moreover, what is considered to be «main» by an author also depends to some extent on the kinds of problems he is interested in and which he wants to deal with by using theoretical concepts. The problem influences which concepts are most useful and which ones are irrelevant. Also, the "main" concepts of a discipline can be identified with regard to different levels of abstraction (e.g. systems or people) or different levels of aggregation (e.g. individual or society). The existence of a large number of the criteria for identifying "main" concepts makes the task difficult. In our context, the "main" concepts are identified from the viewpoints of some authors

representing the respective approaches and as a result of their self-evaluation and self-examination.

Fifth, the grouping of concepts, too, proceeds along different lines and on different foundations. The problem of comparing tetrasociology and sociocybernetics with regard to groups of concepts calls for an extensive separate analysis. In most general terms, the main distinction between sociocybernetics and tetrasociology lies in the following concepts:In sociocybernetics, the central concepts are structure, process, information, organization,feedforward and feedback.

Tetrasociology's central concepts are resources, processes and spheres of reproduction, reproductive employment (employment sphere classes).

Determining to what degree these concepts are (in)compatible is one of the major issues of this comparative analysis.

Sixth, it is obvious that each system of concepts is limited. Hence they complement each other to some extent. But the question of how, to what degree, and in what respect this is the case is very complex and calls for a separate study.

To conclude, sociocybernetics and tetrasociology have many common theoretical foundations: Sociology, systems approach, multi-dimensionality, interdisciplinarity, etc. However, they also have conspicuous differences. These differences, while conducive to mutual enrichment in some instances, in others give rise to contradictions. Contradictions are normal in any science's evolution, including the social sciences. They are a big stimulus for the progress both of sociocybernetics and tetrasociology, including a possible future synthesis generating a new paradigm. Comparing scientific approaches and disciplines is a very difficult task, but formulating and tackling this problem, although being but one step in the development of social sciences, is conducive to a rise of new, productive ideas.

Dr Bernd R.Hornung
Philipps-University Marburg, Germany
President, Research Committee 51
(on Sociocybernetics) of the International Sociological Association

Dr Bernard Scott,
Cranfield University, Royal Military College of Science, UK
Board Member, Research Committee 51
(on Sociocybernetics) of the International Sociological Association

---

1) Semashko, Leo. *Tetrasociology, Responses to Challenges*, Technical University, St. Petersburg, 2002.
2) Ashby, W.R.. *Introduction to Cybernetics,* New York: Wiley, 1956
3) Scott, Bernard. (2000). "Cybernetic explanation and development", *Kybernetes*, 29, 7/8, pp. 966-994
4) Cf. GEYER, Felix; VAN DIJKUM, Cor (eds.): Newsletter 7, ISA - International Sociological Association, Research Committee 51 on Sociocybernetics (RC 51), in: Journal of Sociocybernetics, vol. 4, no. 1 January 1999, contributions pp. 11-28; available at http://www.unizar.es/sociocybernetics.
5) WIENER, Norbert: Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. 1994.
6) Cf. HORNUNG, Bernd R.: Sociocultural Evolution, Towards the Merging of Material and Informational Evolution, in: ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE CYBERNETIQUE (AIC) (ed.): 14th International Congress on Cybernetics, Namur (Belgium), August 21st-25th 1995, Proceedings, pp. 867-872, AIC, Namur 1995; HORNUNG, Bernd R.: Towards a Sociology of Process and Information, Information, Communication, Knowledge, and Action in a Constructivist Approach, Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Sociocybernetics, Leon, Mexico, June 24th - July 1st, 2001, unpublished conference paper, 2001; HORNUNG, Bernd R.: EMERGENCE - A Key Concept for Sociocybernetic Theory of Information Society, Paper presented at the 15th World Congress of Sociology, Brisbane, July 8-13, 2002, RC51 on Sociocybernetics, Session 13, unpublished conference paper, 2002.

7) SIMON, Herbert A.: La science des systèmes, Science de l'artificiel, Orig.: The Sciences of the Artificial, Epi s.a. éditeurs, Paris 1974.
8) A description of the entire systems *paradigm* is given in HORNUNG, Bernd R.: Grundlagen einer problemfunktionalistischen Systemtheorie gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung, (Foundations of a Problem-functionalist Systems Theory of Development), Verlag Peter Lang, Bern, Frankfurt/M., New York, Paris, Wien 1988, pp. 33-39; HORNUNG, Bernd R.: Sociocultural Evolution, op. cit.
9) LASZLO, Ervin: Introduction to Systems Philosophy, Toward a New Paradigm of Contemporary Thought, Harper & Row, New York, London 1973, pp. 36-47.
10) FORRESTER, Jay W.: Grundsätze einer Systemtheorie, Orig.: Principles of Systems, Th. Gabler, (Wright Allen Press), Wiesbaden, (Cambridge Mass.) 1972 (1968).
11) Cf. MILLER, James G.: Living Systems, McGraw Hill, New York 1978.
12 Scott, B. (2001). "Cybernetics and the Social Sciences", Systems Research, 18, pp. 411-420.
13) E.g. LUHMANN, Niklas: Social Systems, Stanford University Press, Stanford 1995.
14) One of these is SIEBEL, Wiegand: Einführung in die systematische Soziologie, (Introduction to Systematic Sociology), Verlag C.H. Beck, München 1984.
15) KORTE, Hermann; SCHÄFERS, Bernhard (eds.): Einführung in Hauptbegriffe der Soziologie, (Introduction to Main Concepts of Sociology), Einführungskurs Soziologie, Bd. I, 5. Aufl., UTB, Bd., 8063, Leske + Budrich, Leverkusen, Opladen 2000, pp. 7, 9.
16) A similar system of 26 sociological concepts in the form of a web was created by Bernard Phillips in the framework of his Web Approach: PHILLIPS, Bernard: Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel, Reconstructing the Scientific Method, Aldine de Gruyter, Hawthorne, NY, 2001, p. 27, figures 1-3, p. 24. The inclusion of this in the present comparison of systems of sociological concepts would be very interesting and productive for further development of the respective theories but it would require a much more encompassing analysis.

Do we need «a grand theory» for sociology?

Vladimir Kavtorin, Russia

This question arises spontaneously on first reading of Semashko's new work (2002), because the book is an attempt to introduce to the Russian and international sociological community (the book was published simultaneously in Russian and English) just this kind of theory. So, first of all: do we need it?

"A picture of the world, a picture of life is totally missing. Meanwhile, no one forbids academics to deliver, first of all, to themselves, and then to people, to their country, a picture of what is happening in the world. Presently, in our country there is no scholarly picture of the world... This is, first of all, social science - philosophy, psychology, sociology, political science. This is "our onerous obligation," I believe. We should take it upon ourselves to deliver a scholarly picture of the world, the way we demand from other people to deliver the product of their work. Presently there is no product of scholarly work" (Yuriev, 2002: 5)

This admission, which, pronounced by an academic, sounds very bitter, was made by Professor A.Yuriev just recently, in November 2002, at a roundtable at the "Rosbalt" agency. However, far from creating a sensation, it didn't even provoke objections, i.e., it was received as yet another statement of the well-known. Indeed, we find similar comments in almost any serious article focused on the problems of modern Russia and its social science.

"The traditional notions of social structure have proved insufficient for economic, political and ideological analysis and prognoses, presenting a distorted picture of public life," writes, for instance, a famous St. Petersburg philosopher, G.Tulchinski (2002: 372). "Meanwhile, the operating social forces have been ignored by the academics, as if non-existent. So, the progress and the result of the 'revolutionary transformations' came as a surprise to a majority of analytics using the traditional categories. The schemas employed had nothing to offer for prognoses and tentative solutions.

Sociology, limiting itself as it does to intellectual games, proved unequipped, unable to grasp reality."

For lack of space, I will not quote similar comments by professional sociologists - everyone knows it. Meanwhile, although this scepticism regarding contemporary sociology flourishes, the science is hardly in decline: the number of institution-sponsored studies and publications incessantly grows, and most of them are obviously in demand with business managers, politicians, and the public. However, in the absence of a general sociological theory, lacking an understanding of the overall sense and purpose of the course of events, our social vision turns into a dragon-fly's vision: we see a lot of fragments of our public existence, sense rapid changes in it, but fail to grasp the big picture.

However, the desire for a general social theory, which the academic community and general public undoubtedly have, doesn't translate immediately into a vigorous quest for and energetic efforts to develop it. On the contrary, such a "desire," which has arisen more than once in the course of history of human thought, is usually accompanied by scepticism regarding the possibility of such a theory, and by a deep distrust with which every attempt at such a theory is greeted. In our case, this scepticism is augmented by the unhappy recent experience of having lived with an official, mandatory-for-all sociological theory (Marxism), although this experience alone doesn't account for the scepticism. Nor can this scepticism be interpreted only in terms of postmodern "deconstructivism," with its rejection of "the tyranny of the whole," of "the Babel towers" of global sociological paradigms (Derrida). A comment by English professor of sociology B.Scott, who edited the English version of Semashko's book, is very telling in this respect: «Initially, I was not attracted by the content. My impression was that Semashko's 'Tetrasociology' is a grand 'theory of everything,' closed to alternative formulations.» (Semashko, 2002: 11). His attitude changed only when he understood: « that Semashko is quite clear that he wishes his ideas to be judged alongside others, that he actively seeks collaborations, and that he is prepared to accept that much of what Tetrasociology has to offer, as theory, methodology and application to 'real world' problems, is embryonic, and in need of much further development» (Semashko, 2002: 11).

Scott's concerns are very understandable: in any science, the role of any comprehensive theory, "theory of everything" is always double-edged. It can serve as a powerful catalyst of progress while the science is being developed and strives for recognition; on the other hand, it can also become a big drag if it gets the status of a truth "known to everyone" and "nearly mandatory." We should add that it is "general theories" that most often become an object of pseudo-scientific speculations and amateurish exercises.

However, if we recognize the necessity, or at least the desirability, of a general sociological theory (and the academic community seems unanimous on this point), then every attempt at it should be greeted not just with scepticism, but also with interest and hope, as well. And, so, the next question about Semashko's book should be this: can his theory of "four-dimensional social-space time" seriously lay claim to the hallowed nomination of a "big theory" in sociology?

To answer this, I think, several considerations should be taken into account.

First: in our country, Semashko's is nearly the only attempt at a global theory of society's functioning. Anyway, it's the most circumstantial, substantiated and, naturally, the most ambitious theory.

Second: Semashko, based on his theory, wrote and sent to the 15th World Congress of Sociology, 32 abstracts "as possible versions of responses to the challenges of the 21st century," and nine were accepted by different panels of the Congress. Twenty eight per cent is very good evidence of recognition of a new theory's claims to validity.

Third: not a single thesis of Semashko's theory has been refuted so far. Rutkevich's attempt at a refutation (2002) cannot be deemed successful, or at least authoritative, because Rutkevich too

frivolously interprets the author he criticizes. Rutkevich's major objection is against "attempts to apply in sociology the notion of four-dimensional space borrowed from physics," and one can agree with this. However, neither in the article quoted nor in other Semashko works have I noticed a slightest attempt at such borrowing. Semashko makes analogies, and speaks about "a certain similarity," but analogies and parallels are entirely different from a direct "transfer" of notions, and so Rutkevich's further argumentation appears preposterous.

Undeniably, Semashko's theory, set forth as it is somewhat ponderously, raises a lot of questions, beginning with "why the four dimensions are the solution chosen, and why they are necessary for such a sociological approach instead of something else" (2002: 9, from Dr. B. Hornung, president of the International Sociological Association's Committee on Sociocybernetics, who wrote the third international foreword to Semashko's book). What seems telling to me, finally, is having non-Russian academics recognize the legitimacy of a four-dimensional model of social space-time by not only asking these questions but also providing their own arguments in its favor: Dr.Scott refers to A.N.Whitehead, who theorizes that "every event" (Semashko's "social phenomenon") has four aspects: «extension», «duration», «idea» and «intention» (Semashko, 2002: 12). Dr.Hornung notes that, epistemologically, four-dimensionality can by justified since « human thinking is considered intrinsically dichotomic, ...(and since)… A combination of two dichotomies in a cross-tabulation evidently results in a fourfold structure»(Semashko, 2002: 9). A valuable argument!

So, is fair to say that Semashko's model of social space-time has a solid philosophical foundation, and that it is able to produce results deemed valid by an international sociological community. This seems to me sufficient to say that the theory deserves to be treated seriously and critiqued earnestly. However, I cannot disagree with Semenkov (2002: 46-48), either, who, after casually (in half a paragraph) recapped several theses of Semashko, argues that "one has no objections against it, and there is no point in making any anyway. What matters is that all this work can translate into empirics." Verily so! This is the key problem in evaluating Semashko's theory of social space-time. It can be solved only through a serious discussion of his work by professional sociologists. Not belonging to this venerable community, I would rather not pass a judgement, although, in general philosophical terms, Semashko's social space-time model seems to me both interesting and fertile.

Alas, Semenkov, too, evaded answering the question he himself declared the key one, and chose instead to fashion his review after the time-honored Soviet pattern, whereas a theory one dislikes doesn't get a substantive critique, but rather is accused of something evil, most often of serving the interests of forces that are hostile or at least unfriendly to us. Having recounted two projects described in Semashko's book under review - «Plurotheism - synthesis of religions» and «Peaceful Jerusalem», where the peace-making mission of Bahai belief is mentioned, Semenkov concludes that "Semashko is attached to this religious movement," and even alleges that "this attachment is not exclusively ideological."

I would rather not comment on that kind of criticism, because it does not meet even the least standards of scholarly debate. I will only note that what I see in Semashko's "projects" (Semashko says they are tentative, though) is something different, although my opinion is probably not very flattering to Semashko's self-esteem either: the projects show, first of all, Semashko's very superficial knowledge of the history of religions and naivete of his notions of the psychology of religious believers (thus, his high hopes for Bahai belief are founded only on the fact that Bahai recognizes «all religions as different insights into God and facets of the same truth» (Semashko, 2002: 95). Overall, I believe that some of the projects outlined in the book not so much speak of the "projective" character of Semashko's theory, as they are meant to provoke discussion. Presenting to colleagues more than original viewpoints on a number of problems, the author kind of "teases" them and «intentionally makes a fool of himself." As a

method of publicizing a serious theory, this seems to me counterproductive.

Thus, the fact is that countrymen of the theory's author haven't yet heeded Hornung's invitation «to face tetrasociology and to accept the dialog.» (Semashko, 2002: 9). And it's regrettable! Because even if a serious professional discussion of Semashko's SST model reveals any natural flaws in it, the debate still would be highly useful as a stimulant for elaboration of a new "general theory" of sociology, which is so acutely needed, not only by sociologists (many of whom, in fact, live much more comfortably without it), but by the whole of society as well, who want to understand what is going on in it.

References:

Rutkevich, M. (2002). "Natural sciences and sociology. About legitimacy in the compilation of concepts." *Sociological studies*. # 3

Semashko, L. (2002). *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St. Petersburg: Technical University.

Semenkov, V. (2002). "Leo Semashko's Tetrasociology: a New Song on Old Manner." *Telescope*, 2002, # 5

Tulchinsky, G. (2002). *Posthuman Personalogy*. St. Petersburg.

Yuriev, A. (2002). *Rush hour*. # 47 (253)

Vladimir Kavtorin, writer, St. Petersburg, Russia

Criticism of the tetrasociology's philosophical foundations

Michael Lebedinsky, Russia

Before I proceed with my critique of tetrasociology, I feel it appropriate to mention that the author, Semashko, and I have been like-minded since we were introduced in 1993, and have been conducting a dialog for ten year. The most important thing that our respective theories have in common is rejection of any coercive methods of implanting them. Our theories share a pluralistic, or more precisely, tetrary, i.e., four-dimensional, ontological core and, in several aspects, complement each other. However, without contradicting the shared tetra-pluralistic outlook, our theoretical models have certain philosophical disagreements. The latter determine our ideological debate within pluralism, or, more precisely, within tetrism, i.e., within the pluralistic trend that posits four equally important elements in nature, in society, and in individuals. My critique of tetrasociology's philosophical foundations is but one aspect of the ten-year theoretical dialog between our different tetrary concepts. They differ not by number of primary bases - in this they are identical, - but by quality, definition, and evaluation of the significance of these bases. Such disagreements are natural between any viable schools of thought.

Readers will see the differences between Semashko's and my tetrary theories is they compare the key theses of tetrasociology (Semashko. 2002) with those of my theory, detailed in my work, "Tetrarum", which I summarize below.

My tetrary concept's basic premise is that emergence of a Unitary philosophy16 of humankind is inevitable, because humans, faced with modern global problems that can be solved only through joint efforts, have to unite. I regard as global these problems: 1. Environmental crisis, 2. Unfair distribution of wealth around the world (6% of the population owns 80% of the wealth). 3. Replacement of monistic ideologies, and 4. Social consequences of revolutions in science and technology (and also information).

Tetrary ontology is created as a response to global problems and to humankind's need for unification and for a unitary philosophy. The ontology's main argument is that all natural objects and

phenomena have four equally important and interdependent qualities: 1) Material, 2) Existential (spiritual), 3) Organizational, and 4) Informational. Tetrary epistemology and anthropology are created from tetrary philosophical origins. Tetrary anthropology approaches the individual's tetrary essence as an individual case of natural objects. Tetrary sociology is created on the basis of tetrary philosophical origins and epistemology. It defines individual's and society's primary needs, and resources for their fulfilment. The following functions are theorized: first: the production of consumption objects for replenishing the energy persons expend while performing their vital functions; second: the reproduction of humans, themselves, by giving birth and rearing conscientious members of society. It is for performing these two functions (Material and Spiritual) that humans organize themselves into societies. For harmonious, joint performance of these two functions, society is organized in a certain way, and, therefore, alongside these two functions, there has to be a third: - Organizational. And because, while performing their vital functions, people interact through information streams, there is need for a fourth: - an Informational function of human society. The four mentioned functions16 are performed within certain structures of human society, which can be called SPHERES, of the same names. Thus, the largest, over-all structure of human society consists of four equally important and interdependent spheres:

1. Material, performing the functions of production of objects of consumption.
2. Spiritual, performing the functions of production of conscientious society members.
3. Organizational, performing the functions of organizing society.
4. Informational, performing the functions of society members' informational interaction.

The sociology of tetrarum develops the theory of a new social class - workers of science/engineering/technology (WSETs)16. A global rise of this new stratum is the most important social result of the revolution in science and technology (RST), which began in the middle of the 20th century. The WSETs' emergence is connected with the RST's most important result - the invention of a fourth, cybernetic and controlling, section of the working machine. The growing cybernation of industrial production has led to a massive estrangement of those employed in predominantly manual types of work (working class and peasantry) from the direct participation in industrial processes, and to the massive replacement of them by (and their re-training into) predominantly mental workers (WSETs). WSETs are the developers and adjusters of the controlling section's programs.

Based on these premises of my theory, here are my criticisms of the philosophical and ideological tenets of Semashko's tetrasociology:

1. There is no analysis of tetrasociology's sociological function and, consequently, the theory's vital significance for humankind today and in the future is missing.

2. Tetrasociology's right to exist is proved on a precedental, instead of a logical, basis, because a) the logical proof of tetrary ideology's right to exist is missing, and therefore, b) there is no circumstantial tetrary philosophical origin.

3. Replacement of the notion of "Spirituality" with the notions of "Information" and "Existence" is unwarranted.

4. The schema of society's states as its stages of development is wrong.

5. The schema of stages of resources production that Semashko uses is dated.

6. The notion of "Organization," and the dimensions of organizational resources are insufficiently fleshed out.

7. Sphere classes are regarded as virtual.

Below we elaborate on these points.

1. Semashko's work only states things. A big weakness of his fairly interesting tracts is the absence of a clearly articulated goal of putting tetrasociology, as a new model for structuring human

society, into practice. The articulation of a goal would have led to a new understanding of tetrasociology's ideological function. His recent book, as well as his previous ones, suggests that "ingrafting" tetrasociology will lead to the formation of tetrary conscience and tetrary self-organization of sphere classes, i.e., to their transformation from spontaneous classes "in themselves" into self-governing, consciously acting classes "for themselves," i.e., into "actors." Sphere class activity leads to harmonization of social production spheres and processes, and to government's harmonization, which would cure society from total branch-based disharmony and make it consciously move toward social harmony. The movement to social harmony will result in qualitative, harmonious changes in society and individuals, and also in people's well-being and living standards. However, this ultimate goal of tetrasociology - social harmony at all levels, from personal to societal - is presented too sketchily, and gets lost, somehow. In my opinion, the reason for this is that tetra-ontology has been insufficiently detailed, and the analysis of its ideological function ignored.

2. Semashko's work provides a comprehensive precedental proof of tetrasociology's right to exist (i.e., supported with references to numerous studies). However, a multitude of precedents doesn't warrant a conclusion that tetrasociology discovers society's fundamental structure, of which people have been unaware only due to the supremacy of economics and its branch-based structure being regarded as the only option available. In Semashko's work, the plethora of precedents substitutes for a logical proof of tetrary ideology's right to exist, and as a result, a detailed tetrary ontology16 is missing. To make up for this, Semashko refers in his books (1999, 2002) to the "Ontology" chapter in my work "Tetrarum" (1998).

3. Analyzing contemporary sources on existentialism16, I re-affirmed my belief that the reduction of "spiritual sphere" to "existential" or "informational" spheres is unwarranted. The nearly 3000-year-old problem of relation between matter and spirit shows that spirit is something more elevated than just psychological or social information. Information reflects a somewhat different ontological element than spirit. On the other hand, the essence of existence is smaller than spiritual essence. The former cannot replace the latter in the composition of the four elements of being.

4. Speaking of his "social genetics," Semashko theorizes the following stages of society's development: 1) Prosperity, 2) Deceleration, 3) Decline and 4) Dying (Semashko. 2002: 45-46; 1999: 253-277). I suggest different stages: 1) Ascent, 2) Prosperity, 3) Precursors, and 4) Decline. I think that this gradation is closer to the natural gradation of the stages of a person's life: 1) Childhood, 2) Youth, 3) Maturity, and 4) Old age. Semashko's classification, in fact, takes into account only two stages: 1) Prosperity and 2) Decline, because his stages 2, 3 and 4 refer to the "decline" stage.

5. Semashko's "social dynamics" (Semashko. 2002: 41-43; 1999: 201-225), approaching SOCIETY REPRODUCTION PROCESSES as one of the dimensions in the system of coordinates of SST, theorizes their four equally necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritized classes: PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, EXCHANGE, CONSUMPTION (PDEC). I think that this sequence of society reproduction processes is wrong. It is borrowed from Adam Smith's work, written at the end of the 18th century, a time of "spontaneous and wild" capitalism. Industry was regulated, then, by a spontaneous market, in the form of "exchange." But it was precisely a spontaneous market that regularly led the capitalist economy to severe over-production crises, which often threatened to sweep away capitalism altogether. After the 1917 revolution, and the 1929 economic crash, modern capitalism has had a tightly regulated industry with a powerful organizational mechanism, which is missing from Adam Smith's formulations. Smith's four reproduction stages only seem tetrary. In fact, they describe only two processes of society's life: production, and the process of fulfilment of society members' needs. If priority is given to the interests of the population, the reproductive process should look like this: In the Spiritual sphere, PEOPLE, to prolong their existence in time, start having NEEDS. The

organs of the Informational sphere collect this information and pass it on to the Organizational sphere, where, after processing the information, a method and a plan are worked out for ORGANIZING the production of a necessary amount of THINGS to fulfil society's NEEDS. The organizational plan, through organs of the Informational sphere, gets forwarded to the Material sphere, which PRODUCES the necessary things and forwards them to the Spiritual sphere for DISTRIBUTION among the population in accordance with Consumer demand. New, secondary needs are generated, and the cycle repeats. Thus, the production cycle can be roughly summed up like this: CONSUMPTION, ORGANIZATION, PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION (COPD)16. An economic system with feedback (synergetic system) takes place. This thesis underlies the "Sociology" chapter in my work "Tetrarum".

6. Semashko introduces the notion of an "Organization" resource (Semashko. 2002: 39-41, 44-45, 65-67, etc.), reproduced by an Organizational sphere. He assumes that every sphere has to produce a resource. The "Organization" resource's content and unit of measurement seem unclear. In my opinion, this problem will be solved if we interpret "organization" as "Managerial information." Then we can measure organization the way we do information - in bytes, taking into account the coefficient of importance and substantiality of the managerial (or organizational) decisions worked out.

7. Semashko talks at length about his discovery of so-called sphere classes (Semashko. 2002: 69-77, etc.; 1992: 48-51, 94-100, etc.), and to a certain degree substitutes them for traditional social groups (tiers of society, classes, strata). The differentiation criterion he proposes for sphere classes is very novel - reproductive employment, and it differs in its mobility both from Plato's tiers (which are differentiated by natural qualities of human souls) and from Marx's classes (differentiated by relation to property). In the future, as production processes become increasingly cybernated, people will become more independent of their workplaces, and will be able to switch from one useful occupation to another. But sphere classes turn then into statistical indices, intended to answer the question: "How many people at each particular moment are occupied in a particular sphere?". This makes sphere classes virtual, hard to grasp and differentiate.

To conclude, we'll point to the major strengths of tetrasociology and of a tetra-outlook in general:

1. They promote unification of humankind, because only when they are united can humans avert the dangers of ecological and other global crises.

2. They help to make the ongoing process of globalization fairer and more harmonious for humankind.

3. They overcome the crisis of monistic sociologies and ideologies, and also of traditional, "boundless" pluralism, synthesizing their strengths in qualitatively new paradigms.

4. They insure a transition of governmental management from the dated, branch-based and bureaucratic structure to a spheres-based on serving the interests of the majority of people.

5. They can form the basis for an ideology of new social classes (sphere classes in tetrasociology, or WSETs in my concept) in the 21st century.

Michael Lebedinsky, Independent philosopher, economist and sociologist. Moscow

Tetrasociology: comparison of social philosophies

Leo Semashko, Russia

Tetrasociology encompasses social reality at all levels, from micro to macro. Tetrasociology spawns a distinctive social philosophy, with a specific social ontology, dialectics, epistemology, and axiology. An appropriate name for this philosophy would be tetrary social philosophy or social

tetraphilosophy or tetrasociophilosophy. Its degree of generalization places it between tetrary philosophy and tetrasociology. Tetrasociophilosophy and tetrasociology are inter-inclusive, part of each other. But this is a vast subject, deserving a separate research. This brief article, meanwhile, is an attempt to compare, in a table, *tetrasociophilosophy* (Semashko, 1992, 1999, 2002) with several other Russia's social philosophy trends, which are explored in the books of Barulin (1999), Momdzhian (1997), Pigrov (1998) and Reznik (1999). Comparing different trends of Russia's social philosophy is tantamount to initiating a dialog among them, identifying their strengths and weaknesses, selecting the maturest trend, and synthesizing, on the basis of the one selected, the other trends' strengths.

The social philosophies are being compared within the frameworks of their major sections: ontology, dialectics, epistemology, and axiology. In every section, various parameters are identified. This comparative effort is not laying claim to completeness or exhaustiveness. It is limited to several major parameters and the most general characteristics. The results of the social philosophies comparison are summarized in the following table:

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHIES

SECTIONS AND PARAMETERS	Tetrasociophilosophy	V.S.Barulin	K.H.Momdzhian	K.S.Pigrov	Yu.M.Reznik
ONTOLOGY					
Type of ontology	Postpluralism16	Monism Materialism	Monism Idealism	Undefined (Amorphism)16	Dualism of matter and spirit (161,23-37)
Social reality	Tetrary (four-dimensional)	Uni-dimensional (material)	Uni-dimensional (spiritual)	Undefined	Undefined16 (Amorphism)
Reality's primordial components	Four: Resources, Processes, Structures, States	One: Social matter	One: Conscience (214)	Undefined	Ideal and real (physical) existence (1,23-37)
Priority16 components of reality	Resources: People, Information, Organization, Things	Things	Conscience	Undefined	Individuality, culture, social organization (2, 206)
Priority resource	PEOPLE	Things	Conscience (information)	Undefined	Undefined
Priority employment of people	Self-reproduction	Undefined	Undefined	Undefined	Undefined
The unity of social reality (social substance)	People's reproductive employment from birth to death	Material production (social matter)	People's purposeful, self-conscious activity (177, 38116)	Undefined	Undefined
The spheres of reality	Four: Socio, Info, Organi, Techno	Four: Material-productive, Social, Political, Spiritual	Four spheres of activity: Spiritual, Material, Organizational, Social (319)	Undefined	Three spheres, or three Worlds: Systemic, Civic, Vital (1, 342,437-476)
Spheres of production	Four: Socio, Info, Organi, Techno	One: Material-productive	Four: Spiritual, Organizational, Social, Material (348)	Undefined	Three Material, Spiritual, Vital (1,45,324)16

Object/product of the spheres of production or activity	Four: People, Information, Organization, Things	One: Things	Four elements: Subjects, Things, Signs, Connections or organizations (324-329)	Undefined	Undefined (Amorphism)
Social	Four-dimensional, defined through people's reproductive employment	Undefined	Antithetical to nature, people's joint, conscious activity, uni-dimensional (83)	Undefined	Undefined (Amorphism)
Components of the social	Humanitarian Info Organi Material	Undefined	Undefined	Undefined	Individuality, culture, social organization (2, 206)
Social space-time	Four-dimensional Axes of coordinates: Resources, Processes, Structures, States	No	No	No	Postulated (p.200-202) (Amorphism)
Sections of ontology	Statics Dynamics Structuratics Genetics	Three levels: Spheres of society, Laws of society, Society in its entirety	Three levels: Global, Historical, Individual society (111)	Undefined	Three levels: General, Medium, Individual societies (1,13-14)
Social classes	Four sphere classes of population: Socioclass, Infoclass, Organiclass, Technoclass	Two: exploiters and the exploited. Productive and non-productive; in one sphere	Two: proprietors and the working class, and these two encompass ALL spheres (359-365)	Two: The propertied and the oppressed (88)	Four classes-strata (1,473) (Amorphism)
The criterion for class identification	Major reproductive employment in one of the spheres	Ownership of the means of production	Property (356)	Property (79-80)	Property (1,473)
Class struggle as the driving force of history	Rejected, but recognized as a temporary phenomenon, produced by branch-based and antagonistic classes	Recognized as a driving force, but its «absolutization and apologetics» are criticized. Class cooperation is recognized16	Undefined	Undefined	Undefined
Government	Sphere, or tetra democracy as the equal distribution of power among sphere classes	The dictatorship of proletariat, but not as the only possible form of transition to communism (332)	Undefined	Undefined	Undefined
DIALECTICS					

The foundations of dialectics	Interinclusion of whole/part, necessary/sufficient, equality/difference, prioritization	Interconnection and interaction of spheres and classes of society	Interconnection of whole/parts, primordiality of the whole, compositional intersections (175,249,250)	Substance and attributes, single and multiple, individual and generic, relations and activity (51-58)	Systemic and vital worlds of society (1,342)
The source of growth and change	Unity and harmony of opposites	Struggle of opposites	Undefined	Undefined	Strugge of worlds-spheres (1,342) (Amorphism)
The ultimate goal of social development	Sphere society as the harmony of sphere classes, as continuous aspiration for harmony	Communism, classless society	Undefined	Undefined	Self-programmable or pluralistic society (1,342, 424-426)
Sociocultural technology of non-coercive development	Technology of harmonization of society and individual spheres	No	No	No	Social engineering (2, 204-207) (Amorphism)
EPISTEMOLOGY					
The key question of social philosophy	Relations between harmony and disharmony of society's and individual's four spheres	Relation between social/public existence and social/public conscience	Relation between matter and conscience, the primordiality of conscience (252)	Undefined	Undefined
Cognition at the levels of statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics	Sphere statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics	No	Social statics (310-315); Physiology (367)	Four models of social reality (p. 58-71)	Cognition at the levels of social dynamics and structures (2,97,144)
Relation to pluralism	Positive	Negative	Negative16	Neutral16	Positive, fragmentary (1,403)
Unitary philosophy	Impossible, although a temporary priority for one of them is possible	Possible	Possible (69)	Undefined	Possible as a «universal social science» (2,73,205-207)
Social verity	Pluralism of social verities	Single social verity	Single social verity (69)	Undefined	Undefined
Sociological statistics	Sphere statistics	No	No	No	No
AXIOLOGY					
Supreme value	Social harmony of society's and individual's spheres	Communism as a classless society	Undefined	Two values: Happiness, Heroism (91)	Undefined
Struggle, domination, but in a «mild format»	Dialog, tolerance, supplementality, equality		Undefined	Happiness or heroism (91)	Undefined

The comparative table lays the foundation for a systematic dialog among different social philosophies,

which can and should be continued in the book-dialogs series. Dialogs of social philosophies are an important and significant component of multicultural dialog.

References

Barulin V.S. *Social philosophy*. Moscow, 1999.
Momdzhian K.H. *Introduction to social philosophy*. Moscow, 1997.
Pigrov K.S. *Essays on social philosophy*. St.-Petersburg, 1998.
Reznik Yu.M. *Introduction to social philosophy. Social ontology*. Moscow, 1999
Reznik Yu.M. *Introduction to social theory. Social epistemology*. Moscow, 1999. We will denote Reznik's first book as "1", and the second "2" in the Table
Semashko L.M. *Sociology for pragmatists*. St.-Petersburg, 1999;
Semashko L.M. *Sphere approach*. St.-Petersburg, 1992.
Semashko L.M. *Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges*. St.-Petersburg., 2002

"Dialog among civilisations. The key to a safe future"

Press release of the International Conference. 23-26 April, 2003, Warsaw

An international conference on "Dialog among civilisations. The key to a safe future" was held in the "Gromada" Hotel and Congress Centre in Warsaw from April 23 to 26, 2003. This was the third international conference in Poland devoted to these problems, and the largest in terms of attendance.

The conference was organised by the Polish Asia and Pacific Council, the Centre for Studies on East Asia of the Institute of Political Studies at the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Polish UNESCO Committee, and the Centre of Studies on East Asia and the Pacific at Trier University .

Opening the conference, the Polish Prime Minister (who took over sponsorship of the conference) said that Poland aspires to become a centre for international dialog between civilisations, and that Warsaw could serve as a Davos-type site in this respect. He also underscored the role played over the centuries in the development of Europe and Poland by cultures from other parts of the world.

The conference was attended by more than 600 prominent personalities from several dozen countries, representing the world's largest civilisations and cultures.

Members of the Honorary Committee were received by Polish President *Aleksander Kwaśniewski* and the Polish Foreign Minister *Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz*.

The conference focussed on dialog among cultures and civilisations, and on its part in generating new instruments of international policy, facilitating international co-operation, and strengthening the world's peaceful development. The conference met in plenary session for two days, and 22 workshops were held to discuss specific economic, political, social, psychological, philosophical and religious issues as well as problems of education, communication and the role of the arts in promoting dialog.

Conference materials will be published in a separate volume.

The scientific debate was accompanied by a wide range of cultural events connected with the main topic of the conference.

A *"Music of Dialog"* concert was performed after the ceremony by foreign students of the Frederic Chopin Academy of Music in Warsaw.

The *"Colours of the Sun"* Film Review was another event accompanying the conference, for four evenings at the Warsaw "WARS" cinema. It began with the presentation for the conference participants of "Pan Tadeusz" (a Polish film with English subtitles by Andrzej Wajda, based on a famous epic poem by Poland's Romantic poet, Adam Mickiewicz). Other films shown to the open public were: "Hideous kinky», "Range-e Khoda (The Colour of Paradise) and "Monsoon Wedding".

A Multicultural Evening was held on the third day of the conference in the "Gromada" Centre. Conference participants and guests partook in an evening of joint singing and dancing. Taking part were

also the Song and Dance Ensemble of the Warsaw Technical University, as well as members of the Greek, Romany and Vietnamese communities living in Poland.

In a separate development, but connected with the conference, an *International Academy of Dialog between Cultures and Civilisations for 'Education for Dialog"* was inaugurated on 27 April 2003. The Academy has been set up at the initiative of the Polish Asia and Pacific Council for the pursuit of education and scientific research, aimed at deepening inter-cultural dialogue. The inaugural lecture was delivered by *Ahmad Jalali PhD*, the President of the General UNESCO Conference (Paris).

Marek Pawłowski, Director of the Conference Office

PROLOG FOR THE FUTURE

The International Publishing Project: Multicultural dialog of languages, communications, beliefs, and worldviews (LCBW). Conception

Leo Semashko, Russia

The need for multicultural dialog in a new age of Enlightenment

The past century has witnessed an enormous accumulation of theoretical and cultural riches, inaccessible for easy review, scattered among the social and humanitarian sciences, in many nations and regions, representing different religions, languages, and worldviews. A new age of globalization requires selection of the most perceptive elements of this vast and diverse theoretical and cultural heritage. It requires a search for new ways of their synthesis, to facilitate the construction of global patterns of language, worldview, belief and communication. These patterns should be clear, accessible, and acceptable to all or most of the people and nations of the world. They should be simultaneously new and integrative, uniting the spiritual purposes of all, yet retaining cultural diversity. In short, global patterns of language, communication, belief, and worldview, should be multicultural, as should the processes and technology of their social construction.

This twofold multicultural task of globalization with diversity is implemented by a broad cultural and informational exchange, by means of the Internet, information technologies, and the mass media. It marks the coming of new age of Enlightenment. Globalization is inevitable in the age of a new Enlightenment, which will assume, during the coming decades, the task of constructing multicultural/global patterns of language, worldview, belief and communications. The construction of these patterns is not possible using coercive military, legal, religious, ideological or psychological strategies initiated by the state, party, church, local leaders, etc. The construction of these patterns, in the new age of Enlightenment, is possible only through interactive methods of multicultural dialog, the recurrence of which creates a “polylog.” (This methodology is developed in Govorov's dialog, in Part 3.) The new age of Enlightenment requires a dialog/polylog of different languages, religions, communications, and worldviews. Hence, it is an inter-disciplinary, inter-linguistic, inter-ideological dialog that is also multicultural. Each language and worldview, each religion and community, should be given equal rights of participation in multicultural dialog. Equal rights neither exclude activity and initiative, nor suppress claims on issues of priority, *thereby* promoting consideration of *all* priorities in the face of constructive competition. Multicultural dialog can be generated only by such initiatives.

At present we see processes of multicultural dialog respond to pre-existing sources of initiative, and only pretend to allow equality in selecting issues of priority.

It would seem that among the world religions, only the Bahai Faith - the youngest (approximately 1.5 centuries) but conceptually the most progressive and democratic - enunciates

religious unity, yet preserves the variety and originality of all religions.

The Esperanto language, on a par with the English language, has a number of advantages, proven by more than a century of practice as a language of international discourse that does not reject national languages.

Communications such as the Internet, the press, and TV complement each other.

From a worldview perspective, the most adequate orientation is a pluralistic/interactive worldview, consistent with Mills' "sociological imagination," which is also supported by the authors of this project. In our opinion, the most helpful social worldviews of the globalization age will be formed from this orientation.

The International Publishing Project will seek to be one of the elements of a multicultural dialog, and to be one of the new forms of communication contributing to a new age of Enlightenment. This assumes an expansion into the Internet and TV. We hope that our project will find support from other social scientists, and from artists, organized religions, national and international organizations, and others who are interested in similar dialog, consider it timely and necessary, and are ready to become participants.

Our project, as well as the new age of Enlightenment, is targeted, as a first priority, toward children and youth, to enhance and revitalize cultural and spiritual values for the new century. Children and youth are the key force for this in the future, and will become the new public actors of social harmony and solidarity.

Future plans of the project

The International Publishing Project has been created to publish low cost editions of books of dialogs in volumes of 150-350 pages, written in 3 or 4 languages under one cover, in editions of 3 to 10 thousand copies. It is committed to the discovery of new ways of communicating ideas across cultures, and to developing worldviews and beliefs that are sensitive to the humanitarian-moral requirements of the new century. A current subject of interest to the project is the preparation of similar editions of books of dialogs for world-wide distribution. We are currently a non profit enterprise that relies entirely on sales and contributions.

Aims of the project

This publishing project has multiple aims. It is organized within a social science framework, of global information, means, languages, and methods of communication, from a global perspective:

1. To promote mutual understanding, cooperation, peace, nonviolence, tolerance, and harmony of people and cultures.
2. To further humanitarianism, justice, and harmonization of globalization processes, while preserving and strengthening multiculturalism.
3. To develop a global/multicultural social imagination in nations, within the framework of social science.
4. To strengthen interdisciplinary communications among the various social sciences, to overcome their isolation, fragmentation, narrowness of perspective, bureaucratic character, and alienation from the problems of globalization and the problems of everyday life.
5. To form comprehensive, interactive worldviews, on which to base harmonious decisions about global and individual problems.
6. To collaborate in the formulation of worldwide communications, for a non-professional audience in general, and for students in particular.

Name of the Project

The International Publishing Project title: "Global social imagination: Toward a dialog of multicultural languages of communication, belief and worldview (LCBW) ", or briefly "Multicultural dialog of LCBW", reflects its basic aims, source and direction. The source of all the innovative means/languages/methods is a global social imagination. This social imagination is an expansion of C. Wright Mills (1959) concept " The Sociological imagination ". The expansion of this concept is connected to a synthesis of social sciences, which by necessity develops from the conception of I. Wallerstein (2000). The concept "global" expresses a connection of social imagination with the process of globalization. The social imagination is global, is inherent for all nations and persons, is not limited by the separate groups and continents, and stands beyond the framework of elitism, bureaucracy, and hierarchy.

The term "multicultural languages" expresses a pluralism of the languages of dialog and information exchange among different cultures in various spheres. These languages are capable of serving a significant number of cultures in the world. Languages of the humanitarian and social sciences, English, Esperanto and information languages are all of concern to them. In this sense, "multicultural" may be read as "global". Languages are constructed by social imagination as different mirrors within different cultures. Language is understood as a varied means for communication of information and scientific methods.

The term " languages of communication, belief and worldview " outlines four basic areas of culture - language, communication, belief and worldview (LCBW) - which limits the project and dialog. The worldview is represented by the different philosophical, sociological, etc. theories. The project is not connected with the spheres of economy and politics. It allocates only areas of language, communication, worldview and belief, which makes a nucleus of the humanitarian and informational-cultural spheres. In these areas are formed the humanitarian-moral values and the priorities of modernity. The most general and daily environment is language: in language and through language communications of worldviews and beliefs are accomplished. There are many languages, both national and specific, being peculiar to the various forms of communications. The age of globalization and the increasing challenges that come with it require new, adequate languages for communications, worldviews and beliefs that are capable of enabling effective decisions within a framework of cooperation, peace, nonviolence, tolerance, justice and humanitarianism.

Features of the project

The features of the International Publishing Project of LCBW consists of its contents, structure, and the form of its editions (books-dialogs) to personify globalism, multiculturalism and pluralism. This will be achieved by the following means:

1. The editions (books-dialogs) will be published in 3 or 4 languages as one: in English, in Esperanto and in 1 or 2 national languages. The multi-linguistic approach embodies a spirit of multiculturalism, and provides a dialog of different cultures, languages, worldviews, and beliefs.
2. The dialogic groups of co-authors, of 4 to 10 scientists, are selected on the initiative of the Editorial Council, or on the basis of personal initiative, which will be encouraged. Such groups will stimulate interdisciplinary and intercultural communications.
3. The books-dialogs have a unified structure that includes basic and dialogic parts. The basic part is a brief (25-35 page) statement of the primary author's approach, worldview, or beliefs based on previous publications. The second part includes (3 to 10) brief (3 to 6 page) "review-dialogs" of other, contributing authors, holding different approaches, worldviews, or beliefs. Each review-dialog includes a brief statement of an approach, worldview, or belief of the contributor and a

critical comparison with the views of the primary author.

Such structuration of the books-dialogs will allow the reader not only to get acquainted simultaneously with 4 to 6 approaches, worldviews, or beliefs, but also to compare them, to understand their constructive - critical mutual relations, and to join in discussion, debate (or narrative) between them. Each reader will have a right to join in the dialog, to write their own review, and to direct it to the consideration of the Editorial staff. The most substantial of these, together with the replies from the original authors, will be published in new book-dialogs. The number of such book-dialogs will be decided by demand. Over time there will be a natural selection of the best, most effective languages, worldviews and beliefs. Various international and national organizations, parties, and governments can choose the most effective languages for solving of their civic problems. With the help of these languages, universal priorities and humanitarian-moral values of the globalization age will be constructed.

Ideology of the project

The Project initially is based on C.W.Mills' conception of sociological imagination as a basic source of all valuable spiritual and informational innovations, stated in "The Sociological imagination" (1959), and until now an authority primarily among other professionals, who have named this book second in importance among sociological works of the last century. Other theoretical bases of the Project are:

M. McLuhan's (1967, 1968) conception of global communication.

B. Phillips' (2001, 2002) conception of interactive, dialogic and web worldview, based on C. W. Mills' theory and idea of transition from a narrow, bureaucratic worldview to a broad, interdisciplinary worldview, and appropriate scientific method.

I.Wallerstein's (2000) conception of unity of the social sciences

R.Siebert's (1985, 2001) conception (Critical Theory) about unity and tolerance of different religions.

M. Ross DeWitt's (2000) theory of interactive social action and social transformation.

Bahai Faith's conception about unity of religions of the world.

The conception of Esperanto as a language of international dialog, not excluding, but supplementing national languages.

B.Hornung's (1997, German sociologist) and B.Scott's (2001, English sociologist) Sociocybernetics as an interdisciplinary social science.

R. Bachika's (2000, Japanese sociologist) theory of spiritual values.

H. Roseman's (1985, Australian sociologist) theory of the cultural communications.

A.I.Yuriev's (1992, Russian psychologist) conception of social - political psychology.

N.S.Govorov's (1998, Russian psychologist) conception of a scientific-social polylog.

M.M.Reshetnikov's (2002, Russian psychologist) conception of a humanitarian-moral strategy.

L.M.Semashko's (1992, 2002, Russian sociologist) conception of tetrasociology developing an idea of social harmony, and one of the variants of synthesis of social sciences on the basis of the theory of social space - time.

Organization and financing of the project

The International Publishing Project can be really global and successful only under the aegis of UNESCO. The initiators of the Project see their own mission in preparing the necessary documents and arguments for entering them in UNESCO. The major argument offered by the Project is its support from various cultural, international, and national organizations. However, at an early stage in its formation, this Project can be under the aegis of the American and/or International Sociological

Associations, or The International Monetary Fund, World Bank, etc.

The International Publishing Project of LCBW is headed by the International Editorial Board (Council)), which includes managers, editors from the countries of various national languages, and publishers in those countries. Preliminary staff of the Board:

Bernard Phillips, USA,
Immanuel Wallerstein, USA,
Rudolf Siebert, USA,
Martha Ross DeWitt, USA,
Jonathan Turner, USA,
Jon Alexander, Canada,
Martin Albrow , UK,
Bernard Scott, UK,
Max Travers, UK,
Bernd Hornung, Germany,
Reimon Bachika, Japan,
Hilarie Roseman, Australia,
Alexander Urjev, Russia,
Vladimir Kavtorin, Russia,
Vladimir Zaharov, Russia,
Nicholas Gudskov, Russia,
Elena Pavlova, Russia,
Henry Skvortcov, Russia,
Alexander Ivanov, Russia
Dimity Baranov, Russia
Tatiana Potashevsky, Russia
Leo Semashko, Russia,
……

The staff of the Board will be considerably extended. It is hoped that, with their consent, representatives of the Bahai Faith and other beliefs, the international organization of Esperanto, international associations of sociologists, philosophers, linguists, psychologists, etc. will also be included.

The Board decides all organizational and financial questions: asserts the Charter of the International Publishing Project, chooses the President, Honorable President and Chief Editor, the Executive and Financial directors, organizes a publishing and trade network, defines basic publishing houses in the various countries, creates an International Advisory Board, provides the financing of the Project from different sources, defines publishing policy, creates regional departments in continents etc. The Board is headquartered in the USA.

It is supposed that financing of the Project will be carried out at the expense of various American funds: Social Science Research Council (President is Prof. Craig Calhoun), Fulbright, Ford, Carnegie, MacArthur, etc.; by funds from UNESCO, and donations of this or that the billionaire, for example, Bill Gates; or any TNC, for example, "McDonalds." Further, as a result of wide advertising of the books-dialogs and their mass sale, part of the Project can be self funding. It is unlikely that this project will become self supporting, although such an opportunity is not seen to be excluded under especially favorable conditions (taxes, customs etc.), or effective advertising in the MASS-MEDIA and in national /international social journals, etc. The question of financing requires additional study.

I.Wallerstein and C.Calhoun (the SSRC President) or other well known scientific, public or

financial figures could become the Project's Honorary President and President, who would be responsible only for financing the Project, for communication with UNESCO, Banks, Funding bodies, TNCs and Governments.

The organizational and personnel basis of the Project can become the separate Research Committees (with their consent) of the American Sociological Association and International Sociological Association (for example, RC07 - Futures Research, RC25 - Sociolinguistics, RC51 - Sociocybernetics and others), and also a group of American sociologists (about 50) members of the "Sociological Imagination" group founded and coordinated by Bernard Phillips, and an International group of sociologists, "The Future of Religion," organized by Rudolf Siebert. One of basic points of the Project is the theoretical seminar of Vladimir Zaharov in St.-Petersburg, uniting a group of social scientists, which, during almost three years studied the activity of the dialog/polylog of various worldviews and social theories within the framework of the Russian spectrum.

This given, the preliminary conception variant of the International Publishing Project of LCBW, after it's correction by the initiative group (joined by all interested organizations and persons), will be dispatched as the official document to the possible participants and to other interested international and national organizations, in particular, the International and American Sociological Associations, the International Association of Esperanto, the House of Justice of Bahai Faith, the International Parliament of Churches, the International Philosophical Society, the International Association of Publishers, etc.

It will be expected from each organization that accepts the Project: (1) remarks and amendments to the Project's conception, (2) letter of a managing body with expressions of support for the Project, readiness to participate in it and recognition of its importance both for the given organization, and for the statement of global multicultural dialog. These letters will provide a basis for legal registration of the International Publishing Project, and for representation in UNESCO.

Leo Semashko
2003