

12. Tetrasociology: theory of social harmony and harmonious peace

L.M.SEMASHKO

TETRASOCIOLOGY: RESPONSES TO CHALLENGES

THE TRANSITION OF PLURALISM FROM THEORY TO TECHNOLOGY, FROM RACISM TO RESISTANCE, FROM POSTMODERNISM TO POSTPLURALISM

**St.Petersburg
Published by Technical University
2002**

**DEDICATED TO THE ISA XVth World Congress of Sociology,
Brisbane, Australia, 7-13 July, 2002**

With Belief in humanism and the effectiveness of POSTPLURALISM, in its salvatory mission when confronted with rising challenges.

With Hope that sociologists will not only record rising challenges but will also find responses to them in sociocultural projects and the technologies.

With Love to the sphere classes, to the young, women, middle class and intellectuals as key actors in the social harmony of the XXIst century, who are capable of ensuring resistance to racism and of prosperity through harmony and information.

ISBN 5-7422-0263-4

Leo Semashko, PhD is A/Professor in the Department of Political Science, St. Petersburg State University of Low Temperature Technologies.

Abstract

TetraSociology (tetrism) is global multidimensional model of the social world, allocating in its 24 base parameters in the four-dimensional spatial-temporary metrics. This is a pluralistic, four-dimensional -- tetramerous (tetra - four) -- sociological theory of social space-time, of its four coordinates / dimensions: Resources / Statics, Processes / Dynamics, Structures / Structuratics, States / Genetics. Five global social discoveries follow from this: 1. Sphere classes of the world population as actors of social harmony; 2. Sphere democracy as political tool of equal distribution of power and other resources between sphere classes; 3. Sphere sociological statistics; 4. Sphere information-statistical technology; 5. Sociocultural technology of prosperity through harmony and information. These discoveries cast a new light on modern challenges, as well as possible responses to them. The author has been working on the theory in Russia for more than 25 years.

concerned to ensure that we shall have a harmonious world in the XXIst Century quite unlike the bloody and murderous XXth. It suggests a new age of Enlightenment.

Professor Semashko does not claim to have done the empirical work which Tetrasociology will call for, but he has been writing about it for some 25 years in the inhospitable climate of Soviet Russia. What he asks for is that his colleagues in the International Sociological Association should work within some of the present Committees and Working Groups as well as setting up new ones to carry out the sort of research programme which he suggests.

There will of course be others who have doubts about Professor Semashko's optimism and his belief in science. There will still be other types of sociology. But in a pluralistic environment such as that which the International Sociological Association seeks to foster this kind of thinking with its strong suggestions for a programme of work will surely find a place.

Foreword by Dr Bernd Hornung.

Leo M. Semashko's «TetraSociology - Responses to Challenges» is in the first place a response from Russia to the challenges of contemporary sociological theory. In the present small book the author gives for the first time an encompassing view of his theories in English, challenging in his turn the worldwide community of sociologists, and in particular sociological theorists, which is strongly dominated by its «Western», i.e. Western European and North American, members. Therefore the present publication of Leo M. Semashko deserves all the more attention, as it is an attempt at «grand theory» coming from a different part of the world, which in future, hopefully, will take once more an important place in the development of science and culture in our meanwhile global world.

Certainly, among many social scientists «grand theory» has become suspect and out of fashion. And yet, if we limit ourselves to details and «medium range» theories only, we shall never manage to get an adequate picture of the whole, of the intricate networks of modern societies, the global world, and the highly interrelated flows of goods, people, information, culture, etc. In a way, systems theory and sociocybernetics, the latter for the particular field of the social sciences, are inherently aiming at looking at the whole, in particular at the whole complexity, although with a strategy somewhat different from traditional «grand theory» and different also from Semashko's approach. Sociocybernetics insists, e.g., much more on establishing different levels of abstraction. What has been evident both in systems theory and sociocybernetics, however, is precisely a lack of systematic and coherent theory at a meso-level, in between highly abstract «systems» and concrete empirical research, but connecting to both.

This is where TetraSociology fits in. Of course, in a way all those pessimists are right who tell us, one man alone cannot explain society and that previous attempts have failed. Nonetheless, Semashko is not quite alone, as he draws on the rich wealth of sociological and philosophical thinking which numerous generations have produced before. This is well demonstrated in the present text. Moreover, the present book was written precisely with the intention to break isolation and to submit this result of decades of scientific thinking to the public discourse of worldwide sociology.

In this sense the reader should not expect, like in the great tradition, a complete and finished «system» of sociological theory. Rather it is a provocative attempt, a courageous draft, well developed in some parts, less well developed in others, with missing pieces in still others. The author himself is well aware of this. The scientific discourse hopefully to be initiated by the present book, will certainly help to improve on many of these aspects.

With his TetraSociology Leo M. Semashko presents and tremendous amount of intellectual work with the admirable ambition of providing a synthesis of sociological theory, and not only theory. After all, it is a synthesis of sociological history, including also the technological and empirical levels, although sometimes at the expense of the theoretical rigor of TetraSociology itself.

He tries to give shape to and to systematize a pluralistic, multidimensional scene, aiming at a new kind of social and sociological rationalism. This requires us to formulate and specify appropriate terminological, conceptual, and theoretical tools as a pre-condition to be able to talk about all of this in a systematic and theoretically coherent way. Yet such an endeavour seems to be very difficult. This is possibly also because TetraSociology is a translation from Russian language and from an entirely different scientific

and institutional background. The latter, however, should all the more be a challenge to Western social scientists to face TetraSociology and to accept the dialogue.

In the present English translation, TetraSociology certainly needs to sharpen both terminology and concepts, which sometimes should be used more rigorously and more consistently. Avoiding synonyms should contribute to more clarity of the theoretical structure and the apparent re-fusion of concepts which before were carefully developed and distinguished. This problem may also be at the root of the impression the reader may get, that Semashko presents, or rather postulates, a theory of harmony. In certain statements, however, this is clearly relativized by the author, and he shows that he does not see social life as quite so simple. Nevertheless it is an issue which would require more argument and more elaboration.

One of the merits of TetraSociology is to provide a differentiated view of the complexity of social systems along four different dimensions and to specify appropriate categories and concepts. It is not enough, however, to demonstrate a lot of historical examples of fourfold thinking and theorizing, as is done in the first part of the book. Rather more arguments need to be developed in the context of TetraSociological theory itself, why the four dimensions are the solution chosen and why they are necessary for such a sociological approach instead of something else. It seems to remain open, after all, whether the four-dimensionality is indeed an epistemic principle of TetraSociology, e.g. in the Kantian sense, or whether it is just a theoretical principle of this particular kind of sociology. An epistemic foundation beyond the examples quoted would not be too far-fetched, as human thinking is considered intrinsically dichotomic, both by the basic Aristotelian logic and by contemporary theories of distinctions. A combination of two dichotomies in a cross-tabulation evidently results in a fourfold structure.

A central weakness in the theory of TetraSociology seems to be the core concept of the «social». On the one hand, there are very clearly the efforts to clarify, to define, and to differentiate, on the other hand, however, there seems to be, at least in the present text, a reductionism of social reality to time and costs but also to a concept called «employment» or «reproductive employment». At first glance this seems to be an economic category, but at a careful reading it turns out to be a catch-all category covering virtually every activity. It might even be identified with concepts like self-organization, autopoiesis or life. Closely related to this and problematic in a quite similar way seems to be the concept of resources.

In the more empirical parts Semashko stresses justly the necessity of requisite variety in social and political life. Nonetheless, the views expressed about the role of the «old men» seem to be somewhat onesided or perhaps too strongly shaped by the gerontocratic experience of the former Soviet Union. A correlation of age with skills, experience, and knowledge can hardly be denied, at least not up to the point where senility starts. This raises questions which require further theoretical and empirical research. Are age groups really social actors, or is age just a correlate of other factors? Are these groups, as well as the other "sphere" groups and classes, just classificatory units of otherwise unrelated individuals, do they have functional importance or are they really actors actively steering and controlling society?

More research and elaboration is necessary also with regard to the political scheme proposed, which is based on parliamentary (or maybe rather presidential) democracy.

These latter topics, however, are clearly far beyond the scope of the short introduction and overview this short book wants to present.

Contrary to many sociologists the author takes serious the famous word of Wittgenstein² "What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence." But instead of keeping silence in resignation, he tries to develop an appropriate theoretical language and terminology. In this he may not always have been successful. However, in the attempt to specify a limited number of dimensions, to classify aspects of society and social systems in a systematic way, and to develop an overall framework reaching from the Kantian apriori categories of time and space to empirical indicators, statistics, and even applied technology, Semashko clearly presents material to work on and science in use although not a flawless final solution, whereas many others simply tend to use undefined concepts and terminologies often disregarding and neglecting a wider theoretical and empirical context.

² Wittgenstein, Ludwig: *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Translated by D.F. Pears & B.F. McGuinness, with the Introduction by Bertrand Russell, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1961, paragraph 7.

Dr Bernd R.Hornung
 Philipps-University Marburg, Germany
 President, Research Committee 51
 (on Sociocybernetics) of the International Sociological Association
 April 2002

Editor's Introduction by Dr Bernard Scott

Professor Leo Semashko approached me just recently and asked if I would help him by doing some editorial work for his book "Tetrasociology: Responses to Challenges". I was sympathetic to his needs as a Russian sociologist wishing to communicate his ideas to a Western, mainly English speaking audience. On a cursory examination, I saw that some of Semashko's colleagues had already done much to improve his original text and essentially what I undertook was to make additional stylistic changes, such as the correct use of the definite article ("the"), the avoidance of abbreviations, such as "isn't", and occasional change of terms, for example, substituting "the individual", "humanity" or "mankind" for the term "the man". It turned out that I needed to make many hundreds of such changes, working to a publisher's deadline. Because of the limited time, I have concentrated most of my effort on the main text (the first fifty pages or so). My feeling is that if the reader has made it that far he or she should be able to make reasonable sense of the remainder (chiefly appended material that includes the thirty two abstracts submitted by Semashko to various research committees and working groups of the International Sociological Association for presentation at the ISA's World Congress, Brisbane, July 7th – 13th, 2002).

I was acquainted with some of the abstracts in my position as programme coordinator for Research Committee 51 on Sociocybernetics. 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. On reading the text of the book, alongside my editing chores, I discovered this was not so, 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. With this understanding I found myself engaging with the text more sympathetically and with greater interest and came to the conclusion that, at least in general form, I am very much in accord with the aims of Semashko's research programme, finding them very much aligned to those pursued by myself and colleagues within the Sociocybernetics community. On that basis, I have accepted Professor Semashko's invitation to make some "editor's introductory comments".

As noted earlier, I have only had time to attend to some relatively minor stylistic changes. My reading shows me that the text could be much improved in other ways, chiefly in terms of organisation to improve the didactics of how the ideas are communicated. It should also be noted that the text, though relatively short, is a very condensed presentation of ideas that could well be fleshed out to make two or even three book length documents. In this short text, we find a summary of the history of sociological thought, a presentation of the theoretical ideas in Tetrasociology (centred around the concept of the "tetra" (four-fold) structure of "social space-time"), a treatise on "tetra" methodology (a new "social statistics" of indicators applied to a "tetra" classification of "social spheres") and a discussion of how Tetrasociology might be applied to address a number of social problems, grouped under the heading of "the new racism", by which Semashko means the several forms of discrimination and prejudice that (in his view) typify the global, social world of the twenty first century. In order to facilitate the reader's access to the text, I will briefly summarise what I see to be some of the key ideas.

In developing his theory, Semashko characterises it as a "post-pluralist" sociological theory, to be contrasted with earlier "pluralist" and "monist" positions. The pluralist/monist distinction follows the usage of Sorokin to distinguish between theories that are predicated on just one primordial aspect or dimension (monist theories) and theories based on two or more aspects or dimensions (pluralist theories). In monist theories, the primordial aspect is typically something like "matter/energy", "spirit", "organisation" or "existence". Pluralist theories typically treat two or more of these as "equally-primordial" (necessary).

Semashko asserts that pluralist theories are typical of the postmodern era and that, indeed, we now have a “plurality of pluralist” theories (my phrase) that from the perspective of a “postmodernist”, relativistic epistemology may all have some claim to validity. In Semashko’s terms, a post-pluralistic theory is a “new-old” theory: it is old in that counterparts can be found in the work of earlier theorists; it is new in that it declares that for a sociological theory to be truly “scientific” it must be based firmly on non-relativistic foundations. In other words, an explicitly formulated and agreed metaphysical framework is required, one which, on careful consideration, has to be inescapably “tetra” or fourfold in form.

It is from this point of view that Semashko can declare that (his) Tetrasociology is but one of many possible post-pluralist sociologies, although he would contend that any theory adequate to the job of being a theory of the social world must also be a “tetra” sociology, one that includes four equally primordial aspects, dimensions or coordinates. In his own Tetrasociology, these are termed “resources”, “structures”, “processes” and “states” (genetics, historical development). In his review of the history of sociological thought from classical times onwards, Semashko’s notes many monist and pluralist theories, including several of the latter which indeed have a fourfold, “tetra” form.

The idea that there is an underlying metaphysical justification for the “tetra” form is not developed until to the paragraph 2.6. Didactically, this could perhaps come earlier in the presentation. Curiously, I noted that, although there is a reference to Plato, there is no explicit reference to Aristotle and his “four causes” (“material cause”, “necessary cause”, “formal cause” and “final cause”). I suggest here to Professor Semashko that this is a reference that many Western scholars would be familiar with, particularly those with a background in Biology, where Aristotle is routinely invoked in discussions of “teleology” and “purposive behaviour”.

Indeed, these very topics are some of those at the cornerstone of the development of the interdisciplinary thinking that gave birth to Cybernetics. Further, it is perhaps here where we can note that the research programme of Sociocybernetics is essentially post-pluralist (i.e., scientific) and tetra (i.e., grounded in Aristotelian metaphysics) in orientation. Another useful reference point for many Western readers would be the “process metaphysics” of A.N. Whitehead^{3,4}, who updates Aristotle’s terminology in his assertion that every “occasion” (one of Semashko’s “social phenomena”) has the four aspects: “extension”, “duration”, “idea” and “intention”. Other explicitly “tetra” thinkers in recent times are Korzybski⁵ (with his General Semantics – an Aristotelian metaphysics that leads to a “non-Aristotelian logic”) and Gregory Bateson⁶ (e.g. the formula “Information is a difference that makes a difference”), both of whom are acknowledged by Heinz von Foerster⁷ as being forerunners of his own distinction between a first and second order cybernetics, where the latter is about “observers in communication”, i.e., social phenomena.

Finally, by way of introduction, I wish to alert the reader to the significance of Semashko’s idea that the structure of “social space-time” implies the “interpenetration” and “interinclusiveness” of all social phenomena. I see this as capturing the idea of the social world being a “polycontexture” (Gotthard Gunther⁸) or “multiverse” (Humberto⁹) (i.e. many-dimensional and faceted) but also in a sense holographic or “organisationally closed”, each part – each social phenomenon – having within it an aspect of the whole. Semashko uses the Russian word “matryoshka” for this idea of “interinclusiveness” of wholes and parts.

There are many more ideas and themes that I could address, particularly to draw parallels with other work in Sociocybernetics, not least the emphasis Semashko puts on the importance of the structures and

³ Whitehead, A.N. (1979). *Process and Reality*, Collier Mac, New York.

⁴ Demarus, E. von (1967) The logical structure of mind, (with an introduction by W.S. McCulloch) in *Communication: Theory and Research*, L.O. Thayer (ed.), Chas. C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois.

⁵ Korzybski, A. (1958). *Science and Sanity*, 4th Edition, International Non-Aristotelian Library, Lakeville, Connecticut.

⁶ Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, Paladin, New York.

⁷ Foerster, H. von (1980) Epistemology of Communication, in Woodward, K. (ed.) *The Myths of Information: Technology and Postindustrial Culture*, Routledge, London.

⁸ Gunther, G. (1971). Life as Polycontextuality, in *Collected Works of the Biological Computer Laboratory*, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

⁹ Maturana, H. and Varela, F.J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Holland.

processes that reproduce the social world, the world of social phenomena, which puts one in mind of Luhmann's theory of "autopoietic social systems": self-reproducing, organisationally closed systems of "communications"^{10,11}. I could also indicate areas where I am less sympathetic, for example, Semashko's unashamedly utopian visions of a harmonious world and proposals for how to get there, which, as a Christian, I find – as is often the case with scientists who wish to rationally resolve the "problems" of religion – somewhat simplistic. Having said that, I certainly have no quarrel with him for wishing to see more love in the world!

I wish him all success at the ISA Brisbane Congress - and beyond - in persuading the Sociology community to engage with his ideas and to help him refine them and apply them in pursuit of his noble aims.

Dr Bernard Scott,
Cranfield University
Royal Military College of Science, UK
Board Member, Research Committee 51
(on Sociocybernetics) of the International Sociological Association
May 1, 2002.

Author's Foreword: The Goals of the Book and Motives.

The book is dedicated to the XVth World Congress of Sociology (WCS). Its general theme: "The Social World in the Twenty First Century: Ambivalent Legacies and Rising Challenges". The sociological community worldwide is looking for adequate responses to challenges of the new century. TetraSociology (which up until 1998 was called the "Systems-Sphere Approach") is **one of such** responses. The author has been working on it since 1975. However, TetraSociology is practically **unknown** because of problems with finding publishing outlets. Besides, it was confined to Russia. Now it is going to step out of the confines. Global scale is more appropriate for TetraSociology. So the book's key goal is to raise TetraSociology to an international level and **to make sociologists worldwide aware of its general outline, main ideas, discoveries and practical implications**. Its ideas and conclusions are practically unknown, although they have been worked on for more than 25 years. The reasons behind this are quite simple. Up to 1992 it was impossible to publish on the subject in Marxist Russia, let alone in another country, although we managed to publish some works, when we served the ideas in a Marxist guise. Only 12 small-scale works were published prior to 1992. After the collapse of the USSR and the Marxism the situation in publishing got better, although not much, because most editors were left over from the previous period. (For the ideas, the author has undergone from communists **many persecutions**, not only tens of refusals to publish but also work related and defence doctor's. Actually, the persecutions are still happening, though in a less frank, veiled form. This is no accident as, my research shows that **more than 80%** of Russian social scientists remain in positions of monism and Marxism, rejecting pluralism.)

Since 1992, I have been able to publish 22 works, including 3 monographs that came out with sponsors help. **I have not been able to publish a single work abroad**, except the abstracts prepared for the last (1998) and the forthcoming World Congress of Sociology. In general terms the result of my 25-years work is little satisfying: only 34 works are published, **while 400 are not**. Such statistics are probably quite typical for any new scientific theory. However, no matter how "crazy" it is each new theory has the right to life. Sociology needs original theories as much as physics does. The World Congress is INTENDED for acquaintance with new sociological ideas and is INTERESTED in them, in order to know and evaluate them. Such is the main goal and driving force behind the book's publication and its dedication to the XVth WCS.

Second goal. Providing an outline of the pragmatic and empirical potential of TetraSociology as they are realized in sociocultural projects and technologies.

¹⁰ Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

¹¹ Scott, B. (2001). Cybernetics and the Social Sciences, *Systems Research*, 18, pp. 411-420.

Third goal. Recruiting interested specialists for the development and realization of sociocultural projects and technologies of TetraSociology.

Fourth goal. Getting feedback about the theoretical basis and practical implications of TetraSociology, as well as answers to the questionnaire attached.

Fifth goal. To enquire the International Sociological Association about establishing in it, or as part of Research Committee 51 on Sociocybernetics, a new working group "TetraSociology".

The structure of the book accommodates these goals. It has three parts. The first part consists of two articles briefly outlining the main theoretical ideas and conceptual conclusions of TetraSociology. The second part goes over projects of information and sociocultural technologies of TetraSociology in the form of more or less detailed abstracts, which were submitted to 32 sessions of the XVth WCS. The third part, "Appendices", includes supplementary material -- mainly the results of the polls regarding attitudes to TetraSociology.

Here is the philosophical and pragmatic credo of TetraSociology outlined in the book. In the XXI century mankind cannot transform itself and the social world and ensure harmony and prosperity **if it does not have a pluralistic, multi-dimensional method of social thinking**, if it does not know or theoretically create a system of **general parameters** (dimensions, coordinates, constants, indices) which it shares with the world. This system includes: 1. An integrated, emergent and global model of mankind and the world in the form of 4 universal **coordinates** of indivisible social space-time, 2. Necessary and sufficient dimensions of the coordinates in the form of **variable constants**, 3. Cause-effect and structural-functional interlinks of the variable constants in the form of laws of social statics, dynamics, structuratics and genetics, 4. General quantitative gauges in the form of a system of aggregated, sociological, **sphere indices**. 5. New information and sociocultural **technologies of harmony** as nonviolence and adequate instruments for achieving the ultimate goal of mankind's and the world's prosperity. All this makes TetraSociology a new constructive form of pluralism, which might be called "postpluralism." If pluralism is identical with multi-dimensionalism, the main feature of **postpluralism is a definite number of dimensions** involved, i.e. the distinguishing of a **limited number of equally necessary parameters** (foundations, basics) of the social world. (If you do not like the term "postpluralism," you can replace it with, for instance, such terms as "neoconstructivism" or "constructivism".)

Postpluralism is replacing postmodernism. Not only monism, but also the traditional, "dimensionless" pluralism in the form of postmodernism has proved inadequate for the new, informational civilization and the processes of globalization, which call for transition to postpluralism, to a definite-dimensionality. TetraSociology is **one of many** forms of postpluralism. TetraSociological method of thinking and social construction does not exclude other methods, it is not the only one or the "absolute," but rather it is more efficient than many others. The future will show if this is so. TetraSociology is not flawless. It has several drawbacks in content and terminology because it is still evolving from an embryo to a full-fledged theory. Its recognition and wide application are a matter for the future.

TetraSociology is a "new old" paradigm. It is "old" because "four-dimensional" and kindred ideas had been elaborated, in one or another form, by Pythagoras, Plato, Montesquieu, Kant, Marx, Comte, Danilevsky, Weber, Jaspers, Sorokin, Parsons, Braudel, Toffler, Rozhin, Bourdieu, Alexander, Giddens, Barulin, Toshchenko, Sztompka, Hornung, Castells and others. In this respect, it "stands on the shoulders of giants." But it is "new" because within the framework of its four-dimensional continuum we attempt a synthesis of the best qualities of very different sociological theories, which have seemed incompatible heretofore. What are the driving forces - the motives - behind TetraSociology and the projects deriving from it?

First, the XXth century is over -- the bloodiest century in history. Hence the question is -- will the new century witness a modification of the last century's nightmares, such as, for instance, international terrorism, or will it bring a peaceful and harmonious renovation of life, culture, politics, economy and their prosperity? Is there a hope for prosperity through harmony? How can it be achieved? In the long run, the last century did not present us examples of prosperity. A deficit of ideas and concepts on prosperity and harmony is strongly felt. By the force of inertia the XX-century-style catastrophic, apocalyptic theories are

proliferating where people, religions and civilizations are doomed to conflict and perpetual clash¹² which can lead only to mutual destruction. In contradistinction to the "clash" scenario, TetraSociological projects offer a different strategy -- that of peaceful coexistence and prosperity through harmony. The search for such a strategy is very difficult. The XXth century has shown that killing one another is simpler than looking for a common language. But this is a path to global destruction. For survival, let alone for harmony and prosperity, other paths should be sought out, no matter how difficult such a search could be. Our projects are the attempt of the quest. As long as they are looking for paths to peace and harmony, people will stay alive. This is the main driving force.

Second, the book is dedicated to the XVth World Congress of Sociology, which will take place 7 - 13 July, 2002 in Brisbane, Australia. Global projects can be implemented only through worldwide intellectual and practical efforts. Due to the nature of their research, of all the professional groups it is sociologists who are the closest to comprehending general problems of social world and to bringing forward global projects. A testimony to this is the Congress's slogan -- The Social World in the XXIst Century: Ambivalent Legacies and Rising Challenges. However, in the topic the accent is shifted toward pointing to rising challenges of the new century, **and not on seeking responses to them**. Pointing to challenges is necessary, but it is only half of what has needed. The other part of the task -- the most complicated and urgent one -- consists **in seeking responses to challenges** of modernity in the form of appropriate projects and in introducing them to such representatives of the worldwide community as international organizations. Our projects contribute to achieving the common goal of formulating responses to the challenges of the new century. What is a "response to challenge"? This is a general theory realized through an adequate global sociocultural project.

Features of the projects suggested.

1. They are international research and applied programs. International in subject, in financial investment, in organizational structure.

2. They are "projects of projects," i.e. they are drafts and blueprints but not an accomplished thing. They are hypotheses in need of empirical substantiation, which are intended to stimulate the quest for alternatives should a substantiation fail to materialize or they be found inopportune.

3. They give only a general outline of the programs.

4. They are based on the principle of supplementation, not exclusivity.

5. Their inner structure is based on the principles of necessity and sufficiency of tetrism.

6. Although the goal of all the projects is fostering prosperity through harmony, each one has a specific strategy.

The International Sociological Association, as well as its separate Committees, if should they become interested, can take charge of further elaboration and verification of these projects.

The book's **main drawback is its limited empiricism**. There are two reasons behind this. First, a full-fledged empirical basis would turn a thin book into a hefty volume, and this is not the author's intention since he is interested in compiling only a general outline of TetraSociology, to be its **first** world presentation. Second, TetraSociology, while not rejecting traditional empiricism, creates a principally new, sociologo-statistical empiricism, called "tetraempiricism," which turns into an adequate information technology -- a very effort-consuming and voluminous one (see below). This kind of empiricism, examples of which are only touched upon in the book, **calls for a separate book**.

The author wishes to express enormous gratitude to V.V.Kavtorin and V.V.Isayev -- for their help in editing the book; to his son Andrey -- for help with design; to the painter G.N.Sosin -- for the painting on the bookcover. The author is grateful to his departmental colleagues -- A.V.Lebedev and I.V.Maruseva; to the friends -- M.Yu.Lebedinsky, D.A.Ivashintsov, B.V.Drozдов, N.G.Korolenko -- for helpful and good-natured comments. Special thanks go to my students, who discussed, with gusto and interest, separate chapters of the book.

The author thanks his foreign colleagues for invaluable advice, criticism, comments, support: Dr. B.Hornung, President of the RC 51 on Sociocybernetics of the International Sociological Association (ISA)

¹² Huntington S. The Clash of Civilization? // Foreign Affairs, Summer 1993

Here is the positive side of the XXth century.

First, a subsequent collapse of the empires -- first, autocratic empires, then fascist empires, then colonialist empires, then communist empires. True, the collapse has not been complete: remnants of the empires, especially of the communist one, still hold, but their days are numbered.

The second positive feature is an irreparable collapse, in the wake of the empires' collapse, of the kindred racist ideologies and monistic sociologies, on the tombstone for which history wrote "Monism and racism are dead," although its remnants persist in modified forms. The tree of monism withered but has not disappeared from culture -- this tree is not without its merits. Each of its branches has a "rational grain," "a modicum of truth." The branches are being preserved as a construction material for synthesizing new pluralistic paradigms of the XXI century. Different sociologists, from P.Sorokin to J.Alexander, I.Wallerstein, P. Sztompka and many other modern social thinkers have used them for constructing new pluralistic, integrative, synthetic, emergent models.

Third, the accomplishments of scientific-technological revolution, such as radio, TV, atomic energy, space exploration, computers, informational, genetic, and biological technologies, Internet, and many others. It is the totality of these accomplishments that represent a main cause of the collapse of the XXth century empires, monism and racism, and of the rise of pluralism.

Fourth, a global-scale, with several exceptions, establishment, by the end of the century, of real pluralism in all the spheres of social life: pluralism of equal nations and classes in the social sphere; pluralism of different cultures and religions the spiritual sphere; pluralism of parties and branches of power in the political sphere; pluralism of the forms of ownership and markets in the economic sphere. The accelerating process of globalization, as a modern form of the humankind's unification, has pluralism as its basis. Globalization runs along the lines not of a clash of monisms leading to destruction, but of supplementarity and mutual support, characteristic of pluralism.

Fifth, blazing the trail for ideas and social conditions necessary for the qualitative renovation of pluralistic social sciences (philosophy, sociology, political science, economics, culturology, anthropology, etc.) and for pluralistic social thinking, the renovation, consisting in the transition from the erstwhile extensive and "dimensionless", and therefore lacking in efficiency, pluralistic rationalism, to a new, definite-dimensional, intensive and much more constructive rationalism that can be defined as "postpluralism." The ground for the pluralistic revolution in sociology was broken by Montesquieu; it was begun in the XXth century by Sorokin and continued by Parsons, Braudel, Toffler, Habermas, Bourdieu, Giddens, Castells and many others, and this revolution is logically consummated in postpluralism at the beginning of the XXI century. There are sufficient grounds for the following hypothesis: it is **only with postpluralism that sociology as a science adequate to the new century and its subject begins**. Prior to that, sociology was a non-science, pre-science, and it is only now that it is becoming a science, rising to the level of a qualitatively **new rationality** of multi-dimensional social thinking, which can embrace its subject – the social world -- as a whole, rather than in a fragmented way; a thinking which overcomes the parochialism of theory and gets realized, like any true science, in information and sociocultural technologies.

Sixth, and this is the most important point, a proof of the inextricable link between democracy and pluralism on one side and prosperity on the other. Those countries that had been long developing along the lines of democracy and pluralism were the first to achieve prosperity. For those countries that adopted this track after a collapse of totalitarian regimes, such as Germany, Japan and Spain, it took 2 - 3 decades to achieve prosperity. The countries that firmly rejected totalitarianism and all kinds of its monistic ideologies and have been developing along the lines of pluralism -- they survived, gained strength and achieved prosperity in the harsh XXth century. D.Bell summed up the key achievement of pluralistic societies that achieved prosperity: they "managed to figure out a secret which had escaped all the preceding social systems -- how to peacefully ensure a stable growth of wealth and increase in living standard. Nearly all preceding societies were seeking to enrich themselves through wars, plunder, expropriation, farming of revenues and other forms of extortion"¹³. It is only with pluralism and its development that social harmony and prosperity are

¹³ Bell D. Future Postindustrial Society. Moscow, 1999, p. 372

possible. **The victory of pluralism over monism is the principal spiritual achievement of the XXth century. The war against pluralism resulted in the death of monism.**

Ambivalence of the century's results is predicated on its legacy's ambivalence. On the one hand, the century witnessed indisputable achievements in technology, communications, informatization, globalization, democratization, culture, and economy. On the other hand, challenges stemming from both the negative and the positive consequences are rising. The first kind of challenges includes the increasing danger of global ecological catastrophe; international terrorism; fundamentalism; new forms of racism; economic, religious and linguistic inequality; discrimination against women and the young; elitism and other shortcomings of democracy. (Agreeing with I.Wallerstein¹⁴, we will define the new racism, as different from the traditional one, as ideology and symbols of supremacy based not only on race, but also on nation, state, culture, religion, language, politics, economics, as well as the double standards stemming from it.)

The second kind of challenges includes the increasing danger of globalization-engendered unfairness, information and psychological overloads caused by computerization, disharmonious development of an individual, crisis of the traditional (monistic, authoritarian, unequal in rights, disharmonious) forms of family, religion, healthcare, education, sports, leisure.

Such is the global sociological fact of the last century -- the fact of ambivalence of its legacy and challenges stemming from it. In the light of this, what is sociology's task?

The main task of sociology is following the line of pluralism, the latter's effectiveness for social world and sociological rationalism being unsurpassable, which was proved by the experience of the XXth century. However, there are different ways to guide this development. One way is to adopt the track of the extensive multiplication of particular models, "deconstructionism" and the radical rejection of the "tyranny of the whole" and of global sociological paradigms as "Babel towers" (J.Derrida); another way consists in intensive the development of both particular and global models, in their synthesis, not confrontation. The latter way can be called "postpluralism." This second way is a more adequate one not only because postmodernism proved to be akin to Marxism, a kind of pathological and irrelevant "coupling" of the Marxist revolutionary idea and the Freud's libidinous idea¹⁵, but first of all because the social world is becoming more global, its parts increasingly interconnected.

The transition from a fragmented world to global society requires a new social thinking, new global social philosophy and sociological pluralistic models identically global in scope. There have been already examples of creating various models of "global sociology"¹⁶. It is only monistic, not pluralistic, models that prove today destined to extinction, and therefore inept and useless "Babylon towers." Monistic models do not meet the modern needs of democratization, equality, informatization, technologization, globalization, while pluralistic models do. Postmodernism rejected any global models at all, showing its impotence, which demonstrated its pathologic character and lead to its collapse.

However, postmodernism is only one of the branches of sociology, and a withered one at that, which is being replaced by postpluralism. Thus, the contemporary sociology's most urgent task is a multi-dimensional transition from a fragmented sociology to a global one, from traditional to the new social philosophy, from pure theory to technologies, from the outdated to new empiricism, from racism to resistance, etc. This problem of multi-dimensional transition can be formulated as a problem of transition from monism and postmodernism to postpluralism, TetraSociology being a form of it. So now we're going over to a brief outline of TetraSociology as a natural consequence of the last century and a necessity of the

¹⁴ Wallerstein I. Albatross of the Racism: Social Science, Iorg Haider and Resistance // Sociological Studies, Moscow, 2001, № 10, p.36-46.

¹⁵ Davidoff Y.N. Patology of "Condition of the Postmodernism" // Sociological Studies, 2001, № 11, p.3-12. The brilliant analysis of the Postmodernism in specified article completely perceived by us, exempts us from necessity of its consideration for our transition from postmodernism to postpluralism.

¹⁶ Cohen, Robin and Kennedy, Paul. Global Sociology. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000; Therborn G. Globalizations are Plural. Introduction. From the Universal to the Global // International Sociology, 2000, 15(2)); Wallerstein I. The Modern World System. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1976; Castells M. Materials for an exploratory theory of network society. - The British Journal of Sociology, 2000, N 51,1; Moore W. Global Sociology: The World as a Singular System // American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 71, 5.

new century. If the social world and world order are in a state of transition, sociology, in order to keep pace with them, has to adopt the track of a similar multi-dimensional transition, which it has in fact already begun to adopt.

2. TetraSociology: pluralism's transition from theory to technology, from postmodernism to postpluralism, from racism to resistance.

TetraSociology (tetrism) is a pluralistic, four-dimensional sociological theory which places social phenomena ranging from the individual to world society in the four-dimensional continuum of social space-time. Its four coordinates are Resources, Processes, Structures, States. Each coordinate is characterized through four variable constants, which are linked together by four components of the social. The coordinates are explored in the appropriate four sections of TetraSociology: Statics, Dynamics, Structuratics, Genetics. This theory distinguishes 24 invariants and modifications of social space-time in four-dimensional rhythmicity. Four-dimensionality is not a Pythagorean mysticism, but an epistemological principle of social construction of multi-dimensional reality in multi-dimensional theory. TetraSociology is approached as one of several possible responses to the increasing challenges -- a response which consists in pluralism's transition from theory to information and sociocultural technologies, from racism to resistance, from postmodernism to postpluralism.

2.1. Historical background

We will start outlining TetraSociology with its historical roots. Historically, TetraSociology dates back to ancient times. In general terms, it can be summed up as a list of the social thinkers and their four-dimensional ideas (tetraideas) or motives reflecting a quaternion of particular qualities or facets of society.

1. PYTHAGORAS (6 BC). "Quaternion is an inexhaustible source of life"¹⁷. The Roman commentator Hierocles (4 AD), a Pythagorean, thus explains this pronouncement by Pythagoras. Quaternion is "a depository of eternal world order; it is the same thing as god the creator." In Pythagorean philosophy, god is the number of numbers. The ten comprehends all the numbers, while "the ten's capacity is a quaternion ... because adding the numbers from one to four we get ten ... Quaternion is also the mean of one and seven ... Quaternion has volume. It contains an outline of a simple form of a pyramid ... Also, live creatures have four cognitive abilities: sense, knowledge, opinion, sentiment ... Overall, quaternion comprehends all things existent: the number of elements (earth, water, air, fire -- L.S.), seasons, ages, estates; and there is no evidence that anything exists that does not depend on quaternion as the root and the beginning. Quaternion is ... the creator and the cause of everything; it is god fathomable by sense; it is the cause of ... god"¹⁸.

2. EMPEDOCLES (490-430 BC) Four elements, the foundations of the world and society: earth, water, air, fire.

3. ANAXAGORAS (500-428 BC). The principle of mutual inclusion (interinclusion) of the foundations of the world: "all in everything," which is the basic principle of TetraSociology.

4. PLATO (427-347 BC). Four virtues of mankind (wisdom, fairness, courage, restraint); four types of state / society to be found in real world: timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, tyranny; four estates: workers (the material estate); guards (the military, organizational estate); philosophers (the spiritual, informational estate); plus tutors, educators (the humanitarian estate dealing with bringing up individuals). The last ones were not mentioned by Plato, but the existence of this estate logically ensues from his concept, where tutoring and bringing up are one of the most important functions of society.

5. MONTESQUIEU (1689-1755). Theory stating that society has many factors: this is the earliest pluralistic approach to be found in sociology. Montesquieu is the founder of pluralism in sociology. It is his works that laid the foundations for the trend in sociology of transition from monism to pluralism -- the trend that became especially pronounced in the XXth century. Before Montesquieu, pluralistic strands of sociology were woven into monism, monism being the reigning kind of thinking in philosophy and sociology. It is due to Montesquieu that pluralism began to distance itself from monism.

¹⁷ Pythagorean gold verses. Moscow, 1995, p.30.

¹⁸ Ibid. p.96-98.

6. KANT (1724-1804). Dualism fraught with epistemological tetrism: four questions and sections of philosophy (three "Critiques" plus "Anthropology"), four physical sciences (phoronomics, dynamics, mechanics, phenomenology), four types of judgement, four antinomies, four triads of categories, four sections of anthropology, four temperaments, four characters, etc. Kant is the first "postpluralist," the founder of postpluralism. It was Kant who started the powerful trend of transition from dimensionless pluralism to a definite-dimensional one, the one with a known number of dimensions -- the trend which leads nowadays to postpluralism, to new qualities of pluralism. This trend has been gaining strength for over two centuries and has become the most important one for the XXI century. It is within this trend that TetraSociology emerged and has been evolving. Historically, another of Kant's accomplishment is defining the practices of monism as amoral egoism -- this characterization proved true over the course of two centuries following that of Kant --, and characterizing the practices of pluralism¹⁹ (democracy, civil society) as moral -- this characterization is becoming to be appreciated as correct worldwide.

7. COMTE (1798-1875). Four physical and at the same time social laws. He offered a definition of sociology; he was the first to distinguish, in social mechanics, "social statics" and "social dynamics" as equally important dimensions.

8. MARX (1818-1883). Four kinds of community production: "material," "production of forms of communication," "spiritual," "production of the individual himself," as well as four related spheres of social life: economic, political, spiritual, social. This is the first tetramerous macrosociological idea, which "classical," mature Marx reduced to economism and to materialistic monism.

9. SPENCER (1820-1903). Four systems of the organs of society as organism: external -- army, internal -- industrial, distributive -- trade, regulatory -- government.

10. V.PARETO (1848-1923). Four classes of "illogical derivations" of society's foundations.

11. M.WEBER (1864-1920). Four kinds of social action and motives, four spheres of societal activity: economics, politics, religion, education, as well as four relevant social groups, four forms of power and its legitimacy.

12. R.PARK (1864-1944). Four components of the socio-ecological complex: Population, Organization, Environment, Technologies (POET).

13. F.ZNANIECKI (1882-1958). Four classes of social phenomena: actions, relationships, personalities, groups.

14. K.JASPERS (1883-1969). Four levels of existence of the "I": material, rational, spiritual, existential.

15. P.SOROKIN (1889-1968). He was the first among sociologists worldwide to: 1. Distinguish monists from pluralists among sociologists, 2. Provide a definition of "sociological pluralism," 3. Propose the notion of "consistent sociological pluralism," as different from "all monistic theories," 4. Call for rejection by sociologists of the "ill-fitted idea of monism," this idea being "false, erroneous, incorrect, harmful," 5. Foretell, by a stroke of genius, a collapse of monism and to speak about the correctness of pluralism, not monism, for sociology, 6. Elaborate such sociological concepts as "social space" and "social time." TetraSociology is developing these ideas of Sorokin and sees in them a major breakthrough in the XXth century sociology, similar to the discovery by Copernicus in science.

16. T.PARSONS (1902-1979). Four fundamental functions and societal subsystems of the socium: economic (adaptation), political (goals), social (integration), values-related / cultural (latency) (AGIL paradigm). These functions try to achieve equilibrium. The first fundamental and global sociological theory of the tetramerous paradigm. The distinguishing of structural and functional (processual) coordinates of social space-time.

17. F.BRAUDEL (1902-1985). Four "set of set" or sectors of society: economics, social hierarchy, politics, culture.

¹⁹ Kant I. Anthropology from the Pragmatical Point of View // Compositions in 6 volumes. Vol. 6, Moscow, 1966, p.360.

18. D.BELL (b.1919). Four characteristics of the modern technological revolution: electronics, miniaturization, the digital information, programming. Four "vertical" social groups: scientific, technical, administrative, cultural.

20. A.TOFFLER (b.1928). Four spheres of society: sociosphere, the infosphere, cratosphere, technosphere. Four basic elements of society as products of appropriate spheres: people, ideas, organizations, things. The distinguishing of resource and structural coordinates of social space-time.

20. J.HABERMAS (b.1929). Four types of social action: strategic, normative, dramaturgical, communicative. Four organizational principles of communication.

21. P.BERGER (b.1929) and Th.LUCKMANN. Four levels of legitimation of knowledge: pre-theoretical, theoretical, obviously theoretical, symbolical universums.

22. P.BOURDIEU (b.1930). Four fields of social space and four types of social capital (and appropriate resources) in a society: economic, cultural, social, symbolical / political. The distinguishing of resource, structural, and functional coordinates of social space.

23. A.GIDDENS (b.1931). Four types of stratified systems: slavery, castes, estates, classes; four kinds of exploitation -- class-based, military, ethnic, gender; four modern classes: upper, middle, workers, peasants. The distinguishing of the structural coordinate of social space in the "theory of structuration."

25. E.WEIZSACKER and others. The "four factor" -- a quadruple increase in productivity of the society's contemporary resources.

25. P.SZTOMPKA. Four ideas as the groundwork for the concept of social structure: relatedness, conformity to natural laws, dimension, determination. Four intertwined dimensions of social structure: normative, ideal, interaction, vital. These dimensions make up the social structure's "four-dimensional model," which is an alternative to one-dimensional, monistic models, these being characterized as "ill-suited." Four processes of the formation of structures: institutionalization, articulation, expansion, crystallization. The social structure model correlates with a four-dimensional model of personality²⁰. Recognition of space and time as "universal context of social life," four types of social processes. Absolutization of social dynamics and rejection of social statics²¹. The distinguishing of structural and functional coordinates of social space and time.

26. M.CASTELLS (b.1942). Four components of society as social structure: production / consumption (economics), experience (social sphere), power, culture; these are being interlaced with the fifth component -- technology. The distinguishing of resource, functional and structural coordinates of social space-time. Rejection of monism and adherence to pluralism: "I do not share the traditional approach to society as consisting of two strata laid one over another, with technology and economics in the "basement," power in the "attic," culture in the "penthouse" ... The (modern) multi-cultural, interdependent world ... can be understood and changed only (my italics -- L.S.) if we approach it from a pluralistic perspective"²². The distinguishing of resource, structural and functional coordinates of social space-time.

Within the framework of the Marxist school of Soviet sociology we should mention N.I.BUKHARIN, N.D.KONDRATIEV, V.P.ROZHIN, V.S.BARULIN, A.K.ULEDOV, J.T.TOSHCHENKO and others who have made a significant contribution to the development of sociological

²⁰ Sztompka P. Concept of social structure: attempt of generalisation // Sociological studies, 2001, № 9, p.3-12.

²¹ Sztompka, P. The Sociology of Social Alterations. Moscow, 1996, p.67, 28-31. Refusal of the author of a social statics on the ground that " all social reality represents simply (?) dynamics, the flow of changes " (there, c.26) is unpersuasive, as ignores **objects** of changes, question that changes, which is a question of a statics as social anatomy. A social statics, abstracting from changes, determining objects of changes, if it not absolutes, is so necessary for theoretical sociology, as well as social dynamics, that is proved by us further. Attempt to neglect one for the benefit of another, as " only correct ", it absolutization there is a break from principles of the pluralism and return to rejected by Sztompka the one-dimensional, monistic approaches. His refusal from the theory of development, "developmentalism" (there, c.25) for the benefit of dynamics is so unpersuasive also on those to the bases. However, the recognition by him of four-dimensional social structures is an example of transition from traditional pluralism to postpluralism.

²² Castells M. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Moscow, 2000, p.48.

tetraideas²³. One can also refer to dozens of other theoreticians who have been elaborating "four-dimensional" and kindred sociological ideas. This shows that tetrast thought is not something alien to sociology; more than that, it is one of sociology's basic schools of thinking. It can rightly claim a position of prominence in theoretical sociology of the new century.

This trend is being formed inside pluralistic thinking, which prior to Montesquieu existed inside monism. The relations between monist and pluralism are asymmetric. Monism always totally rejected pluralism and treated it as a second-rate and eclectic school of thought. Pluralism, on the contrary, in its rejection of absolutization of one or another social invariant characteristic of monism and the latter's claims to absolute truth, has tried to preserve and synthesize monism's invariants in new paradigms. Now let us briefly outline monism and pluralism in sociology.

The key issue of sociological theories is the issue of the number and quality of necessary and sufficient RESOURCES, these being vital for societies and individuals. Based on this criterion, two groups of theories can be distinguished, the two representing two main domains (fields) of sociological thinking. **One domain is sociological monism or monistic sociology**, which recognizes only ONE, PRIMORDIAL, necessary and sufficient resource of society, this resource engendering all other societal phenomena as secondary ones.

Another domain of sociological thinking is sociological pluralism, or pluralistic sociology, which recognizes SEVERAL -- two and more -- EQUALLY necessary and sufficient resources of society, to which all the other social phenomena come down to.

The principal difference between pluralism and monism consists in that the latter makes a clear-cut distinction between the PRIMORDIAL resource and SECONDARY resources derived from it; pluralism, meanwhile, considers all the resources it recognizes to be OBJECTIVELY EQUAL IN THEIR NECESSITY, although accords them different priorities, and the "primordial - secondary" kind of relation between them is RULED OUT. TetraSociology draws a distinctive line between the relation of priority and that of primordiality. **It recognizes the former while rejects the latter.**

Monism, recognizing one definitive resource, in essence proves one-dimensional. Monism is identical with one-dimensionality and one-sidedness, which precludes us from seeing the world's multi-dimensionality and multi-facets. Pluralism, on the contrary, recognizing several equally necessary resources, proves multi-dimensional. Pluralism is identical with multi-dimensionality and multi-facets, which corresponds with multi-facets of the world.

The quality of resources makes distinguishable in the sociology's two fields four essential, spread worldwide trends and basic paradigms. Most of the macrosociological theories come down to one of these paradigms or a combination thereof.

Sociological monism distinguishes:

1. IDEALISM (idealistic sociology), which reduces society to a single, spiritual (informational) resource in any form -- absolute, objective, heavenly, collective, individual, communicative, etc: Plato, M.Weber, E.Durkheim, G.Simmel, V.Pareto, A.Schutz, N.Luhmann and many others. **Of course, here as elsewhere, it is a little bit by a stretch that the thinkers are lined up -- this is because there is no such thing as a "pure, single-meaning" concept.**

2. MATERIALISM (materialistic sociology), which reduces society to a single, material resource in any form -- material, economic, productional, industrial, agrarian, corporal, physiological, biological, unconscious, etc: Marx and his numerous followers, neo-Marxism of L.Goldman and the Frankfurt school; Freudism, Freudo-Marxism, behaviorism and others.

3. ORGANICISM (organicist sociology), which reduces society to a single, organizational resource in any form -- e.g., organizations, social relations, connections, regulations, structures, systems, institutions, hierarchies, regulators, norms. Such is the sociology of A.Comte, Spencer, Lilienfeld, Gumplowicz, Levi-Strauss, Shils and others.

²³ In more detail about background of a TetraSociology, is especial in the Soviet period see my book: sociology for the pragmatists. Vol. 1, St-Petersburg, 1999, chapter 2.

4. EXISTENTIALISM (existential sociology), which reduces society to a single, existential resource, variously unique: people, individuals, groups, nations, races; in various forms of existence -- spiritual (rational, artistic, religious, cultural, national), corporal (racial, genetic), will-based, characterologic: Nietzsche, Jaspers, Sartre, Camus, Tiryakian and others.

(It is possible to distinguish trends in monism based not on resources, but on processes, structures, states.)

Monistic trends are false, insofar they affirm the primordality and absoluteness of a single one of society's resource, but they are also correct, insofar as they recognize these resources as necessary for society's existence. Herein is historical parochialism as well as the significance of monistic trends.

Sociological pluralism, which began with Montesquieu's theory of factors (it was the mother theory of all pluralistic trends), distinguishes:

1. DUALISM (dualistic sociology), which reduces society to two equally important resources, usually spirit and matter in various forms: M.Scheler, P.B.Struve, K.Mannheim and others.

2. TRIALISM (trialistic sociology), which reduces society to three equally important resources, usually to spirit, matter, and organization in various forms: A.Weber, P.Sorokin, L.Althusser, J.Habermas and others.

4. TETRISM (tetrism sociology), which reduces society to four equally important resources, usually spirit, matter, organization, people. To some extent, Marx's early ideas about four types of production and four spheres of social life can be considered as belonging to tetrism, as well as T.Parson's ideas about four societal functions and subsystems; F.Braudel's about four plenitudes of society; A.Toffler's about four spheres of society -- socio-, info-, crato-, techno-; P.Bourdieu's about four social capitals and four fields of social space; etc. TetraSociology is one of the variants of tetrism.

4. PENTALISM (pentalist sociology), which reduces society to five equally important resources (S.Mikhailov and others). There are theories which point to more than five resources of society, but such theories are few, so we will subsume them under pentalism.

Historically, TetraSociology is, on the one hand, a SYNTHESIS OF THE BEST QUALITIES of the four world trends of monistic sociology -- the trends that have been emphasizing for centuries such necessary resources / foundations of society as **people, information, organization, things**; on the other hand, TetraSociology is a continuation and development of the tetrism trend of the pluralistic social thinking within the framework of the generalization of ideas of social space-time. In this respect, TetraSociology has nothing new in it, except a special synthesis and development of the ideas already known. This is why it can be considered a "new old" theory.

Main periods in the pre-history of TetraSociology. Its immediate source and beginning -- the **first** in sociology's history form of pluralism -- is the Montesquieu's theory of factors. It is with Montesquieu that the history of pluralism in sociology began.

Second period -- I.Kant's dualism, carrying an embryo of tetrism sociological epistemology, the tradition to which tetrists consider themselves to belong: Parsons, etc.

Third period -- the idea of four spheres of social production, formulated by young Marx in "German Ideology" (1844). This idea was later developed by him in a monistic, materialistic vein. If we disregard the extremes of economism, it can be considered as the first theoretical expression of TetraSociology. At that period, too, A.Comte distinguished two dimensions of sociology: social statics and dynamics, which were incorporated into TetraSociology.

Fourth period -- for the first time in sociology's history, P.Sorokin proposed the category of "sociological pluralism" -- a brilliant prediction of the collapse of monism -- and introduced the notions of social space and time. These ideas by Sorokin serve as the basis for the TetraSociology's pluralistic outlook. Sorokin proposed the notion of the "social genetics," which TetraSociology incorporated too.

Fifth period -- the evolution of the ideas of four spheres (subsystems, sectors, fields, and capitals) of society and social space and time. These ideas have been laid out by non-Marxist thinkers -- Braudel, Parsons, Toffler, Bourdieu, Castells, etc. --, as well as by the Marxist ones -- Bukharin, Rozhin, Barulin, Toshchenko, etc. These thinkers elaborated the notion of "social structures" (structuratics), which TetraSociology incorporated.

Sixth period. The history of TetraSociology as such began in 1976, with sociocultural leisure activities at the young workers and students club "Demiurge" and the adoption by it of the program of harmonious development of individuals. The first part of the brochure deals with the theoretical premises of the period.

The list of tetraideas and tetramotives in sociology's history and an analysis of the relation between monism and tetrism reveal a naturally determined tendency -- TetraSociology emerged not as a chance offshoot, but as a **natural development in sociology**, as a natural result of sociology's transition from the priority of monism to the priority of pluralism, from dimensionless to definite-dimensional pluralism or postpluralism married with technologies. **The course of sociology's history engendered all the theoretical premises for TetraSociology, which has been incorporated into it.**

2.2. Brief review of the ideas of social space-time.

TetraSociology²⁴ is a variant of the multidimensional, pluralistic model of the social world based on the theory of social space-time. This is a global model of society in construction of social space-time (SST). It poses a complicated epistemology problem. However, solving it, one will be enabled to socially construct²⁵ qualitatively new global models of society, one of which -- TetraSociology -- is outlined below.

Usually, SST gets reduced to physical, natural space-time or substituted with it. Certainly, SST includes the physical one and is based on it, but can not be reduced to it. When A.Giddens discusses the virtues of four spatial zones/distances suggested by E.Hall, which arise in interpersonal communication, or peculiarities of spatial-temporal zoning in urban architecture and planning²⁶, he speaks about physical space-time within the framework of socium and not about social. However elsewhere he says it is necessary to "integrate time into social theory"²⁷.

SST is not just a form of society's existence -- it is society itself. As Castells argues, social space is not a reflection or a photograph of society -- "it is society itself"²⁸. The same is true about social time. Construction of SST is a simultaneous modelling of the social world on all levels, from world-systems down to the micro-individual. Let us review some ideas about SST.

One of the first sociologists to raise the question of SST was G.Simmel (1858-1918). He reduced society to the interaction of individuals, and interaction, to space and time as pure "social forms" in the Kantian sense. Purity of these forms means that they are only necessary conditions, but not at all agents of interaction. Thus, detaching the "form of space and time" from social content Simmel in fact reduced it to a physical characteristic and didn't go beyond raising the question of a truly social space and time. In some cases, however, he does treat spatial phenomena as having a specific social characteristic. For instance, writing about borders between states and communities he defined them as "sociological facts having a spatial form"²⁹.

I.Wallerstein argues that the traditional sociological culture of Durkheim, Marx and Weber was blind to the problem of social time (and space, we would add -- L.S.) and posited its perpetuity, as in Newton's mechanics, or a simple sequence of events. This culture recognised, on one hand, an eternal time, on the other, an episodic one. However, neither is social time, i.e. time conditioned and created by society.

²⁴ TetraSociology (till 1998 it named 'Sphere approach') , it ground and more 70 examples of it application during 25 years are represented in dozens of publications, including three monographs of the author:

- Sphere Approach: Philosophy, Democracy, Market, Human. St.-Petersburg, 1992, 368 pages.
- Sociology for Pragmatics. From Monism to Tetrism. Part 1, St.-Petersburg, 1999, 376 pages.
- TetraSociology is the Revolution of Social Thinking, the Way of Harmonization and Prosperity. St.-Petersburg, 2000, 168 pages.

- Last common article for the first time published in the central sociological journal: TetraSociology - sociology of four measurements. To statement of a problem // Sociological studies, 2001, № 9, c.20-28.

²⁵ Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. Social Construction of Reality. Moscow, 1995, Academia-Center.

²⁶ Giddens A. Sociology. M., 1999, p.108-113, 525-526.

²⁷ Giddens A. Central Problems in Social Theory. London: Macmillan, 1979, p.198.

²⁸ Castells, M. Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Moscow, 2000, p.385.

²⁹ Simmel G. Lebensanschauung: Vier metaphysische Kapatel. Munchen; Leipzig, 1918, 687-698.

F. Braudel's concept fundamentally challenged this culture, suggesting a social reality that occurs in two kinds of social time: in structural time, which is long but not eternal, and medium cyclical time within the structures. Both kinds of time are grounded in systemic analysis of society. Both are social facts. Braudel is a pioneer of the notion of the social construction of time. This sort of time had been basically ignored by historians and sociologists. Braudel's concept is a protest against ignoring social time³⁰.

P. Sorokin and R. Merton were probably the first to explore specifically social time in a sociocultural form. They formulated a fundamental dependence of social time on social structures: "system of time varies along with social structure," while the reference points of social time are defined by socially significant events. Their social time has social roots and cultural content³¹.

P. Sorokin contributed a lot to the theory of social space as well. He distinguished social space from geometrical space and reduced it to the human population of the Earth and to the system of social relations between individuals, groups and populations, which constitute the space's coordinates. If Euclidean space is three-dimensional, then social space is multidimensional, having more than three dimensions. Sorokin distinguished in it horizontal and vertical (stratified) parameters³².

P. Bourdieu creates a fundamental model of social space. He approaches society as multidimensional space, sociology being "a social topology." Sociology "can represent the social world as a multidimensional space." The structure of social space consists of the "ensemble" of four "fields" of practice: economic, social, cultural, and political, which determines its multidimensionality. The fields are connected by "habitus." The struggle for social space and for power over it is centred around four appropriate resources as "capitals": economic, social, cultural, political or "symbolical." "The structure of social space is determined ... by the structure of distribution of capital and profits specific for each particular field"³³.

P. Sztompka argues that "time, as space, is a universal context of social life." He approaches time as a constituent of any social change. He distinguishes two types of time: "quantitative," i.e. physical -- hours and calendars --, and "qualitative," social, which is regulated by society. He distinguishes six functions of social time, which are determined by society's activity. Time has the form of a resource which can be consumed, skimmed, distributed³⁴.

The need in specifically social spatial-temporal generalisation is realised most fully in M. Castells' concept of the network/ information society. This concept identifies society with social structure and reduces to three very general components: space, time, technology³⁵. New society's space is built upon streams of capitals, information, technologies, organisational interactions, with these streams forming a network. The space of resources streams is the prevailing spatial form of network society, this form being built over the physical space of places³⁶.

Network society creates new temporality, which Castells calls "timeless time" engendered by information networks' attempts to annihilate time. Streams space changes the time's shape. "Timeless time, as I called our society's prevailing temporality, emerges when network society's characteristics create systematic perturbation in the sequence of things... Abolishment of sequence creates undifferentiated time identical with eternity... Momentary transactions of capital, flexible enterprise, varied working time of life, erosion of life cycle... are fundamental phenomena characterised of network society... In fact, most people and most places in our world live in a different temporality"³⁷. With all the due credit given to Castells'

³⁰ Wallerstein I. The Heritage of Sociology, the Promise of Social Science // Current Sociology, 1999, Vol. 47 No. 1, p.12-15.

³¹ Sorokin P., Merton R. Social time. A methodological and functional analysis // American Journal of Sociology, 1937, 42, 5, p.615-629.

³² Sorokin, P. Man. Civilization. Society. Moscow, 1992, p.298-302.

³³ Bourdieu, P. Sociology of Policy. Moscow, 1993, p.36-37.

³⁴ Sztompka, P. Sociology of Social Alterations. Moscow, 1996, p.67-83.

³⁵ Castells, M. Power of Identity // A New Postindustrial Wave on West: Anthology. Moscow, 1999, p.302.

³⁶ Castells, M. Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Moscow, 2000, p.384-394. Castells, M. Materials for an Exploratory Theory of Network Society. - The British Journal of Sociology, 2000, 51 (1), p.5, 10-11.

³⁷ Castells, M. Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Moscow, 2000, p.402-433. Castells, M. Materials for an Exploratory Theory of Network Society. - The British Journal of Sociology, 2000, 51 (1), p.14.

concept of time, it has, first, a certain fantastic and utopian quality, and second, it lacks constructive parameters of network society's SST.

The general conclusion of this brief review is that SST is not just a physical place or a sequence of events in eternal time. Social space and time are fundamental social facts, parameters and dimensions of society, which constitute it as a whole, supplementing physical space-time, incorporating it and are incorporated into it. TetraSociology elaborates these topological ideas integrating them in a **new, postpluralistic theory of SST** as four-dimensional social topology and chronology.

2.3. SST coordinates.

The theory of SST is TetraSociology's backbone and basis. TetraSociological theory of SST is a multidimensional, global model of social world free of one-sidedness of monistic models. SST theory can be constructed **only axiomatically** and then verified by practice, empirically and by technologies. Let us formulate the axioms and construct the system of SST parameters-invariants. We will distinguish among SST parameters: a) coordinates, b) the social, c) constants, d) indices.

Coordinates are the most common SST parameters. They determine SST's architecture, which correlates with nature's spatial-temporal architecture because society is the part of it. Based on this we will formulate the first, synthetic axiom of SST's theory: **being a continuum of three spatial and one temporal coordinates, SST is as four-dimensional as physical space-time.**

If in Einstein's relativity theory physical space-time is determined by the invariants of mass and bodies' kinetic energy, then SST is determined by social invariants. As J.Turner wrote, social world "displays certain timeless, universal and invariant properties; the sociological theory's objective consists in discovering these universal properties and understanding how they act". Only thus probably "to understand how the social world works"³⁸.

Sharing this opinion, we will formulate the following analytical axiom of SST theory: **Resources, Processes, Structures are social space's coordinates (invariants), while States of society's development are the social time's coordinate. RPSS** is the abbreviation. Let us explore their characteristics.

SST's coordinates are independent/dependent. They are **independent** insofar as they express the widest possible qualitative differences of society, each one irreducible to another. They are **dependent** insofar as they are inseparable, variably dependent and interinclusive.

SST's coordinates are necessary and sufficient. They are **necessary** because with at least one of them missing society cannot exist. The social world cannot exist without resources, processes, structures, states. Its equal dependence on each of the coordinates makes them **equally necessary** and **rules out relations of primogeniture/primordiality**, while the difference in the coordinates' influence on society makes them **different** in priority. Taken together they are **sufficient** for society's existence in TetraSociological sense. Let us briefly explore each coordinate.

Society's **resources** are society's necessary components/parts, its permanent **foundations**, without which society cannot exist, and which it incessantly uses and reproduces. Society cannot live without resources as its parts/components it incessantly consumes and reproduces. Resources are indispensable for the social world. They make resource wholeness of society. The criterion distinguishing resources is its incessant use and consumption by society. Society's resources are social. They supplement natural resources and are produced from them but not identical with them. Resources coincide with people's **previous** reproductive employment and are identical with their **past social time**, which gets materialised and estranged in resources. Resources determine society's processes, structures and states and therefore have priority over the latter, although they are not primordial because they cannot exist without those three.

Society's **processes** are the necessary **changes** in resources and society's permanent **reproductive functions** of resources. Society's constant consumption of its resources requires their constant reproduction, which makes out of social world an integrated "machine" reproducing its resources. Processes represent society's reproductive integrity. **They coincide with the totality of people's current reproductive employment (occupation) in resources reproduction.** Without reproductive processes, resources

³⁸ Turner, J. Analytical Theorizing. // Theory of Society. Moscow, 1999, 103-104, 152.

reconstruction and society's existence are impossible; these processes, therefore, are as necessary to society as resources. The criteria distinguishing processes consists in changes, functions and modifications of resources. Coinciding with people's **current employment**, processes are identical with people's **current social time**, which remains qualitatively unchanged. It is a "small, quantitative" time. Resources diversity and differentiation determine diversity and differentiation among the processes of resources' reproduction.

Society's **structures** are the **necessary links, relations and connections between resources and society's reproductive processes**. They constitute society's structural integrity. Integrating resources and processes, structures represent an **amalgamation of people's previous and current employment and social time's past and present**. The **unity** of resources and the processes of its reproduction represents the **criterion** for distinguishing structures. Resources and processes can exist only as a whole, therefore structures are as necessary for the social world as resources and processes. Resources' and processes' differentiation and diversity determine structures' differentiation and diversity. Reproductive structures are society's structural-functional components and parts, but not resource components/parts.

Society's **states** are the necessary **phases, cycles, periods** of society's evolutionary development from its inception/inchoation to its fall/destruction. States are phases of the evolution of the social world and all its parts, these phases replacing one another, coming, going and returning. States constitute the social world's evolutionary/genetic wholeness. (This is "big, qualitative," or historical time.) States express the social world's (and its parts') finiteness and temporal limitations. **They are the results of the totality of people's past and current reproductive employment** over big stretches of social (historical) time of society. The social world's states are determined by the states of its constituent societies. Each society, during its lifetime, passes through a number of states of development, these states' distinctive features being determined by the measure of equilibrium, proportionality and balance between society's fundamental reproductive structures. Thus, the criterion distinguishing states consists in a fairly long time-period of society's existence characterised by a particular measure of equilibrium between its structures.

General properties of RPSS coordinates consist of the following. The coordinates are **universal**; between them exist the relation of **variable interinclusion** as part to the whole; they are **axes of the system of coordinates of the SST's four-dimensional continuum**. They provide cognition of the social world in four-dimensional rhythmicities. The coordinates of resources, processes and structures represent spatial, mainly **synchronic** totalities, while states represent mainly **diachronic** totalities. (On space-time dialectics, see below.) Resources constitute social **statics**, processes - social **dynamics**, and structures - social **structuratics**. Spatial coordinates of resources, processes, structures constitute social **morphology**; states, social **genetics**. Therefore, the social world and any of its phenomena can be considered as having: statics (resources), dynamics (processes), structuratics (structures), genetics (states of development). These dimensions of the social world, and its SST's coordinates are matched by analogous **social theories: statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics**. Such theories are not something new in sociology. The first two were suggested very long ago -- by A.Comte; the third one, by Giddens (as "theory of structuration"); the fourth one, by Sorokin and others. These theories constitute the **sections** of TetraSociology; the latter incorporates them into the global model of social world.

The SST coordinates that we have outlined allow for an explanation of the different examples of the **classification** of sociological theories and the theories' differentiation into monistic and pluralistic, morphologic and genetic, static and dynamic, structural and functional, etc. Thus, **P.Sorokin was the first** to suggest and explore, in 1920, the sociologies differentiation into monistic and pluralistic³⁹ based on the criteria of their reliance on a single, primary resource or on several (two and more) equally important resources ruling primordiality out. P.Sztompka elaborates a dynamic (functional, processual) approach, which he contrasts with a static one. A.Giddens' and others' structural approach rests on the priority of the structure coordinate. T.Parson's and R.Merton's structural-functional approach rests on the recognition of two coordinates -- processes and structures. The morphological approach recognises the priority of three spatial coordinates. The genetic **approach** and genetic sociology recognise the priority of the time

³⁹ Sorokin P. Popular Textbook of Sociology. Moscow, 1994, p.184-189.

coordinate/social genetics. The morphogenetic approach, pursued by M.Archer⁴⁰, recognises all four SST coordinates. A comparative analysis of similar classifications on the basis of the outlined SST coordinates needs a separate study.

2.4. The social.

The category of "the social" (sociality), which expresses the subject of sociology, is one of sociology's most general and most complex categories. The social is not reducible only to society's social sphere or to any part of the social world. The social coincides with the social world and society in general. It separates social phenomena (henceforth -- the neologism "co-phenomena") from non-social, and the social world from the natural one: it is the borderline between them. What does turn things natural into things social? --The answer is **people's reproductive employment. The social, realised in the social world, stretches over to the same borders as people's vital, reproductive employment and their limbs** (see the cover painting). A product of the totality of people's past and current employment, **the social is identical with it.** (Here and below we speak about **people's vital, reproductive employment as embracing their total lifetime, and not about their work employment, which is only a small part of it.**) Thus, the **social, SST, SST coordinates, and all the other SST parameters are the products of people's employment.** The social coincides with the human, because the human coincides with employment, and employment, with people's lifetime. **People's lifetime is social time and vice versa. It is the social.** The human constitutes the social's first and major component, although not the only one, since the social is multidimensional. We will call the human component of the social "humanitarian." Through the humanitarian component of the social get expressed all the other components of the social.

The specific quality of the social's humanitarian component consists in its identity with people's lifetime and the **vital ENERGY of their reproductive employment.** Everything in society bears the stamp of people's current or past employment. All things social are artefacts/facts of people's employment. Without the stamp of the people's employment, any object remains pristine. **All the social are humanity, and all humanity are the social.** There is no social without humanity, and no humanity without the social. These are two indissociable and equal sides of one medal. So, the extremes of sociocentrism (Durkheim, Marx, etc.) and anthropocentrism (Weber, etc.) are equally one-sided. They are constructive only in synthesis and in their equal necessity one for another, which rules any "centralism" out.

Time is a measure for employment and people's life energy. Time, meanwhile, is measurable in hours, days, months, years, decades, centuries, etc. So **all the social are measurable by the time of people's life/employment.** This time is invested into the social and expended on it. Thus, **human time is identical with the social and vice versa.** Living people are carriers of live, real social time, while the time of past generations (past social time) has been realised in resources preserved and vanished. **The volume of the social is identical with the number of social time as the sum of the years of all people past and present.** The social as time can be without restriction summed up and divided by people's actions and interactions. However, the social is not reducible to a simple, mechanical interaction of people with objects or with one another. Each action and interaction of people is an expenditure of their lifetime and an employment of a certain duration. The humanitarian component of the social, as employment time, sets a stamp on all people's interactions, rendering interactions and its objects social ones.

The social's humanitarian component is simultaneously social and individual time, as well as social and individual resource. **Time is resource for all resources.** Time is both the individual's and society's **chief resource** convertible in all resources without exception, including people, and **producing all resources, including itself. Producing people, time reproduces individual and social time.** Time as the number of years of people's life is both social and individual. It is social inasmuch as the individual's time as his lifetime absorbs many other people's time, in the form of a multitude of co-phenomena. It is individual inasmuch as for all its sociality, it is unique in every individual's case with regards to amount, quality (content, filling), beginning and end. An individual's time is ambivalent: it is revealed both in external behaviour and employment and in internal states, changes, employment. An individual's external and internal times are not only parallel, but also conditioned by one another and get realised in co-phenomena.

⁴⁰ Archer M. Realism and Morfogenes. // Theory of Society. Moscow, 1999, 157-187.

Any co-phenomenon, wholesome or harmful, good or bad is an object and product of the individual's time and employment. This time is the common denominator and integrator for them. The social world and the social are one not in a sole, exclusive aspect -- ideality, materiality, existentiality, structurality, etc, but in human time -- the time of people's life / employment, which is being spent and invested into world in its entirety.

The social's humanitarian component expresses the individual's activity, the time of his life and employment. **It creates the social.** All other components of the social are passive and exist only through the individual's activity. Therefore, the humanitarian component has a **priority** over the social's other components. However, this component does not create the social alone, but only with the help and by the use of other components, they being its necessary preconditions and instruments, indispensable for its existence.

The humanitarian component is impossible without the second necessary component of the social -- **the informational**, which expresses the presence in each co-phenomenon of an aspect of social knowledge. (We do not differentiate here between social knowledge and social information -- we consider them identical in the bulk of their content and differing only in the emphasis made on each one's particular aspects.) Through people's employment, a specific social knowledge reaches all the objects of the employment; this knowledge is reflected in the objects constituting the social's informational component. **There is no social without information.** Each co-phenomenon contains a dose of social information, injected into it by the individual. The informational component is a necessary component of the social.

The humanitarian component is impossible without the social's third component -- **organisational**. The latter expresses the presence in any co-phenomenon of a specific mode of social relations, and conformity with specific sociocultural norms. Through people's employment, specific qualities of social and individual modes of being, of its norms get reflected in the object, constituting its organisational component. **There is no social without organisation**; all the social are organised in one or another way. The organisational component is a necessary component of the social.

The humanitarian component is impossible without the social's fourth component -- **material**. It expresses the presence in any co-phenomenon of a specific material carrier. There are no incorporeal co-phenomena devoid of substance and energy. It is not from itself but from nature that the individual draws the substance for matter and energy. This substance, however, having passed through people's employment and received a stamp of its energy, information and organisation, absorbing them, turns from a natural material into a social **thing**. **There is no social without material things.** The material component is a necessary component of the social.

The four outlined components of the social, abbreviated as **HIOM**, are **necessary and sufficient** for the social's existence. They are **equally necessary** insofar that lacking at least one of them the social cannot exist. This rules out the relation of primordality (primogeniture, supremacy) between them. In other respects, meanwhile, they are **differently prioritised**: having a specific role, each one is irreducible to another and has a variable significance and weight in different co-phenomena and at different times.

So, the principal difference of social resources, processes, structures and states from the natural ones consists in a presence of the social -- HIOM components. The social permeates all the SST coordinates and integrates them into **one indivisible continuum**.

The multidimensionality of the social, the impossibility of expressing it adequately in monistic sociologies created the postmodern myth about the "death" of both the social and sociology⁴¹. However, postmodernism's inability to express the social, as well as disappearance of monistic sociology are not at all identical with the "death" of the social in reality or in theory.

2.5. TetraSociology's methods.

The issue of sociology's theoretical method arises as soon as some parameters/invariants of the social world get pointed out. The pointing out of SST coordinates and the social's components makes it necessary to theoretically construct relations between them. Initially, methods of theoretical construction

⁴¹Baudrillard J. Simulations. N.Y.: Semiotexte, 1983, p.3.

rested on principles of action and interaction. Elaborating the notion of social interaction, T.Parsons formulated the principle of phenomena's interpenetration⁴². TetraSociology accepts this principle while adding a requirement of approaching all social connections not only as interpenetrative but also as totally **interinclusive**. Each social interaction represents a multidimensional inclusion of every one of its element, as a part, into every other, as a whole. **Interinclusion is based on the "whole-part" relation** -- the principle of "matryoshka". Interinclusion is universal and applies to all the co-phenomena, parameters and coordinates of the social world and all the social's components. This is the only way to understand their indissolubility, the impossibility of them existing separately and outside each other. Because they all are forms of people's reproductive employment and social time, their indissolubility rests on the interinclusion of time of employment and people's life: the life of modern people, in some aspects, incorporates the results of past generations' life, while in other aspects, it is incorporated into them. Parents' life/time incorporates children's life/time and vice versa. Interinclusion of the equally necessary invariant parameters of the social world excludes the "primal/secondary" relation between them: this is why interinclusion is perceivable only by a pluralistic sociology, and not by a monistic one, which does not go further than simple interaction.

Interinclusions are not only universal: they also **vary** with regards to priority ranking, shifts in "whole-part" roles of the social's different components, different SST coordinates and different co-phenomena. Thus, TetraSociological method is the **method of variable interinclusion** of the social's components, all co-phenomena and all their parameters. It has several systemic qualities exploring which goes beyond this book's scope: it is pluralistic, dialectical, hierarchic, reversible, emergent, continual. It requires recognition of **supplementation, and not exclusivity**, of the social world's phenomena: **interinclusion is supplemental, not exclusive**.

Variable interinclusion is a theoretical method. It is a means of getting theoretical information -- the means adequate to TetraSociology's pluralistic content. In TetraSociology, empirical methods providing empirical information consist in a new, sociological macrostatistics of sphere indices, as well as new information technology based on it which are explored below. The SST parameters in TetraSociology (coordinates, constants, components of the social, sphere indices) are global-scale **empirical variables**, which presence or absence in each case can be empirically established and measured. TetraSociology's empirical methods include empirical sociology's traditional methods: observation, polls, etc. Both new methods and the traditional ones, transformed by TetraSociology, create a special form of empirical sociology, which can be called "**tetraempiric**". They lay the foundation for postpluralism's "**neoempirism**". **Tetraempirism is defined by four dimensions of the sociology's empirical variables: statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics**. Thus, TetraSociology represents a methodological **synthesis** of theoretical and empirical sociologies resting on postpluralistic multidimensional foundation. The synthesis of methods transforms both. It creates pre-conditions for turning TetraSociological theory into an **experiment-based and exact science** and empirical studies into a single empirical basis for theory, overcoming their lack of significance, parochialism and disconnection.

2.6. SST's constants.

The next step in building SST theory, which constitutes TetraSociology's backbone and foundation, is that of defining the **constants** for each of the SST's four coordinates. In conformity with the tetrism principle stating that **to describe the social world and its phenomena, pointing out four components is necessary and sufficient**, let us distinguish in each SST coordinate **four variable constants -- equally important, sufficient if taken together, but ranking differently in functional priority. The constants are qualitatively permanent and quantitatively variable**. They are defined in appropriate theories of social statics, dynamics, structuratics, and genetics, which constitute parts of the SST theory as the base of TetraSociology.

Social statics, considers society's **resources** (the relevant SST coordinate) and points out four classes - necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritised - PEOPLE, INFORMATION, ORGANIZATIONS (political, law, financial, managerial, relevant norms, order and forms of social relations), THINGS. The

⁴² Parsons T. The Social System. N.Y., 1964 (1st ed. 1951), p. 15-17.

abbreviation is PIOT. These classes of resources constitute appropriate **resource variable constants**. All resources are reproduced and consumed by society, so they all are both society's products and components. With at least one PIOT resource missing, the social world cannot exist (make an imaginary test: reduce to zero at least one of the resources). **People rank the highest in priority** among resources, because only people produce all the PIOT resources; it is only through people's employment time that all social resources, processes, structures and society's states come into being; it is only through people that a quality of the social, its HIOM components get carried over to all the coordinates. In PIOT resources, HIOM components come to life: in each resource, a relevant component of the social, as a whole, exists having priority, while three others exist as parts subordinate to it. Toffler pointed to similar PIOT resources as "basic elements," and Bourdieu, as appropriate "capitals." Social statics considers PIOT resources as the past, as frozen social time, as products of **finished** employment immune to all changes and processes and, in this sense, as static, unchangeable. Social statics reveals the resource "anatomy" of the social world, pointing out, in the framework, PIOT resource constants. The resource anatomy is matched by various kinds of static, "anatomical" approaches in sociology.

Four world-wide trends in monistic sociology provide the major argument for PIOT resources. **Idealism** (Plato, Weber, etc) distinguished such resource as **information**; **materialism** (Marx, etc) -- **things**; **organicism** (Comte, Spencer, etc) -- **organisations** (order); **existentialism** (Jaspers, etc) -- **people**, their existence. The virtue of each of the world-wide monistic trends consisted in that each had been proving for centuries, and not without reason, the necessity of the appropriate resource for society. TetraSociology integrates the virtues of the monisms and recognises the four appropriate resources, while freeing them from monistic absolutization, from the "defining, primal, primogenital" role, and considering them EQUALLY necessary for the social world's existence. TetraSociology integrates monists' ideas with the pluralists': Montesquieu, Kant, Sorokin, Parsons and many others.

TetraSociological synthesis is kindred to the "different sociological school's synthesis" rehabilitated "over the last decade" in the works of Giddens, Habermas, Luhmann, Bourdieu and the author of this phrase -- J.Alexander⁴³. J.Coenen-Huther spoke in the same vein: "We should know how to gather the classics' ideas. It does not matter whose ideas are those -- Marx's or Tocqueville's, Durkheim's or Weber's, Malinowski's or Sorokin's"⁴⁴. TetraSociological synthesis makes TetraSociology a "new old" paradigm. It is "old" insofar as "four-dimensional" and similar ideas have been elaborated, in different forms, by Pythagoras, Plato, Montesquieu, Kant, Marx, Comte, Danilevsky, Weber, Jaspers, Sorokin, Parsons, Braudel, Toffler, Rozhin, Bourdieu, Alexander, Giddens, Barulin, Toshchenko, Sztompka, Hornung, Castells, etc. But it is "new" insofar as, within the framework of its four-dimensional continuum, there has been attempted a synthesis of the virtues of the most diverse sociological theories that seemed incompatible theretofore.

Another, philosophical argument for the four fundamental resources of the social world is provided by tetraphilosophy or tetramentality. Tetraphilosophy pointed out not just any number of, but FOUR foundations as universal, necessary and sufficient parameters of any existence. In tetraphilosophy, ontological foundations of being are EXISTENCE -- a phenomenon's **measure of singleness and uniqueness**; INFORMATION – a **measure of diversity**, which, according to Ashby and Wiener, every phenomenon in the world without exception possesses; ORGANISATION – a **measure of orderliness** inherent, from a synergetics viewpoint, to every phenomenon in the world; MATTER – a **measure of energy**, and universal substance-and-energy carrier of existence, information, organisation, which does not exist without and outside the three, and vice versa. Taken together, the resources constitute a continuous and indissoluble reality of existence. **The four necessary and sufficient world-wide resources lying at the foundation of the universe**. This is the tetramentality's key formula: **all phenomena of reality, natural as well as social, have four equally necessary, interinclusive, but differently prioritised qualities (foundations, spheres, dimensions, bases): existential, informational, organisational, material (EIOM)**. Tetramentality draws a clear line between the relation of **primordality** (where one of the foundations is

⁴³ Sociology on threshold of the XX1st century: new directions of researches. Moscow, 1998, c.157-158, 159.

⁴⁴ Ibid. c.17.

primogenital) and **priority** (one of many equal foundations having a functionally leading role). Tetramentality rejects the monistic "primal-secondary" kind of relation; it recognises only the pluralistic "different priorities" relations. The four PIOT resources are a social construction of world resources and dimensions.

Social dynamics, considers society's **reproductive processes** (the relevant SST coordinate) and points out four necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritised classes: PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, EXCHANGE, CONSUMPTION (PDEC). Reproductive processes are identical with social processes. As P.Sorokin put it, a social process is "understood as any kind of motion,... any change ... of social object ... of its quantitative or qualitative characteristics"⁴⁵. The classes of processes/ changes have pointed out represent relevant **processual variable constants**. Neither resources nor the social world can exist without these processes. It is only through these processes that all PIOT social resources, and therefore society itself, are reproduced. With at least one of these reproductive processes missing, social world cannot exist. Before becoming consumable, resources have first to become products of production and then to get distributed and exchanged for the other ones. The processes outlined have been analysed by many social thinkers and sociologists: Plato, Smith, Marx, Sorokin, Habermas, Luhmann, Giddens, Touraine, Bell, etc.

Ranking higher in priority are processes of the reproduction of people as the source of the social. To define this source, TetraSociology introduces into social dynamics a **radically new sociological category of people's reproductive or vital employment (r-employment or simply employment)**. Employment, in TetraSociology, is a process embracing all PDEC processes of the reproduction of PIOT resources that occur over people's lifetime. R-employment is the source of all social resources, processes, structures, states. It determines social and individual time, people's integral way of life, which is qualitatively different from the mode of life of other society resources. Creating, transforming, constructing all the social world's parameters, r-employment expresses people's supreme reproductive priority. R-employment's volume is identical with the category of "life," "lifetime." While other resources possess life too, r-employment is a feature of the individual alone, embracing all his life from start to finish. **The totality of the individual's life, his whole lifetime is an employment involved with the reproduction of society's different resources, including and first of all himself.** R-employment is identical with the totality of the individual's life practices, including individual (reproduction of himself as a resource) and social (reproduction of other resources) employment. R-employment is **broader than activity**, because the individual can be inactively employed: sleeping, illness, inactivity, passive. It is **much broader than work**, since the individual can be in a non-work employment: consumption, leisure, transportation, etc. It is r-employment that determines people's supreme functional and resource priority. Let us consider it in more details.

R-employment is TetraSociology's **chief category**, which denotes the single substance of all SST coordinates and constants and all the social's components, combining them into a multi-dimensional whole. R-employment is as multi-dimensional as the social world. **The social world is identical to r-employment because r-employment derives from it alone.** Employment is the **very beginning** of the social world and the individual. R-employment's multi-dimensionality has the same parameters (coordinates, constants, indices) as SST. We will distinguish among employment's parameters **forms, characteristics, kinds**. **Kinds** of employment are differentiated by object and product, creating a vast array of the kinds of branch employment, which are grouped into employment spheres and charted in the spheres tables below. This is the staple of our analysis. **Forms** of employment are differentiated by the main types of employment's relation to an individual and society. Based on this, two main types of relation are designated: **helpful and harmful**. Further, employment is divided into socially helpful and individually helpful, and socially harmful and individually harmful. **The employment that creates and/or maintains harmony of social resources, processes and structures is considered helpful (positive, constructive). The employment that destroys and/or restricts harmony of social resources, processes, and structures is considered harmful (negative, destructive).** It includes employment in wars, violence (except self-defence), crime, drugs, terrorism, wrecking, environmental pollution and destruction, etc. (We define harmony as the optimal proportion of sphere components; we talk about it further.)

⁴⁵ Sorokin, Pitirim. Social and Cultural Dynamics, vols. 1-4, N.Y. 1937: American Book Company, v.1, p.153

Discrimination between helpful and harmful employments is fairly provisional and tentative: an employment socially and individually helpful in one circumstances and at one period of time can become harmful in different circumstances and at a different period of time. An employment that is socially helpful can be individually harmful, and vice versa. Here we have **conflicts of employments**. Each kind of employment has inherent aspects of harm and help: everything depends on the degree, proportion, and priority. For maintaining the socially necessary proportion and for limiting harmful employment we will designate the third form of employment: **prophylactic**, aimed at the prophylactics (prevention, restraint) of destructive employment and at ensuring individual's and society's safety. There are as many dangers of destruction and harm as there are kinds of employment. There are just as many kinds of safety and employment in safety (prophylactic employment). They are differentiated by spheres and branches and into the social and the individual. We can mention the following kinds of safety: social, informational, political, state-related, economic, environmental, internal, external, personal, family-related, corporate, property-related, copyright-related, etc.

Over a set of kinds and forms of employment a set of its **characteristics** is superimposed, among which we will mention only the major ones: productivity/unproductivity, effectiveness/ineffectiveness. The table below charts the multi-dimensionality of people's r-employment.

Table. Multi-dimensionality of people's employment.

Employment characteristics Employment forms	Productivity	Unproductivity	Effectiveness	Ineffectiveness
Socially helpful	yes	not	yes	yes
Individually helpful	yes	not	yes	yes
Socially harmful	not	yes	yes	yes
Individually harmful	not	yes	yes	yes
Socially prophylactic	yes	not	yes	yes
Individually prophylactic	yes	not	yes	yes

"Yes," "No" denote the presence or lack of a certain characteristic in a particular employment form. Importantly, the table is not intended to cover the full extent of employment's multi-dimensionality or to provide definite conclusions: they necessitate a more detailed and verifiable substantiation. To achieve this, the table below needs to be superimposed over the spheres table (further in the text), and calculations need to be made using appropriate indices.

Social dynamics considers PDEC processes as the **present** social time, as **current** employment which includes all the changes in all social resources. Social dynamics reveals social world's "physiology," pointing out its functional/processual PDEC constants. Social dynamics correlates with various functional approaches in sociology. The notion of social dynamics, introduced by Comte, has been widely utilised by Sorokin, Sztompka, Therborn, Hornung, and many others.

Social structuratics, considers society's **structures** (the relevant SST coordinate) and points out four necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritised social reproduction spheres: SOCIAL (humanitarian), INFORMATIONAL (cultural), ORGANIZATIONAL (managerial), TECHNICAL (material, economic) (SIOT). The abbreviations for these spheres are: **sociosphere, infosphere, orgsphere, technosphere**. Spheres are the most powerful, the broadest possible and, therefore, the social world's **societal structural components**. The spheres **unite** resources and processes and are expressed by relevant **structural variable constants**. The social world does not exist without spheres, any more than it does without resources and processes, which, in turn, do not exist separately, but only within various SIOT structural combinations. It is only within these structures that appropriate PIOT social resources get reproduced. With people as their object and product, the sociosphere reproduces them. With information as its object and product, the infosphere reproduces it. Similarly, the orgsphere reproduces organisations, and the technosphere, things. With at least one of the spheres missing, the social world cannot exist (make an imaginary test: reduce any sphere to zero.) Braudel spoke of these structures as society's "systems/sectors"; Toffler, as "society's

spheres"; Parsons, as "societal subsystems"; Bourdieu, as "fields" of the social space of practices. Bell explores spheres too, fusing, however, two of them into one; Castells also explores them, though names them differently.

Reproducing the top-priority resource -- people, **the sociosphere ranks higher in priority** among spheres. Each sphere has a **specific production mode, specific work and specific sphere classes of the employed: humanitarian class (P1), informational class (P2), organisational class (P3), technical class (P4)**, embracing the entire population. These classes are not antagonists but partners. They are different from Marx's economic classes, and from Giddens' stratified ones too, but, supplementing and incorporating them, sphere classes intersect with them. Sphere classes represent **society's sphere social structure**. The classes of **sphere needs and abilities** of both the individual and society are categorised according to spheres.

Social structuratics considers sphere and sphere components as a **union of the past (resources) and present (processes) social times, as an amalgamation of people's past and present employments**. Pointing out SIOT structural constants in the social world, structuratics reveals its "morphology". "Morphology" is a form of amalgamation of resources and processes at all the social world's levels, it is unity of statics and dynamics. It corresponds with a variety of morphological, as well as systemic, sociocybernetic, structural, structural-functional, etc. approaches in sociology.

Let us review briefly the sociocybernetic approach, elaborated by B.Hornung and others, which is fairly closed to TetraSociology. Its authors identify the approach with the macrosociological one. It constructs multilevel and multidimensional social space, with four levels of empirical systems: macro-, meso-, micro-, individual levels; three analytical dimensions: aggregational, functional, problem; six theoretical levels: philosophical, general system, sociocybernetic or macrosociological, mesosociological (societal subsystems), microsociological (social action), psychological (behaviour and information). The aggregated dimension has three "basic components of empirical systems" with "structures, processes, and relations between them". Their "substance is either matter/energy or information or some combination of both". The functional subsystems are social, economic, political, and psycho-cultural systems. The basic components, together with their substance, constitute the "empirical world's mechanisms"⁴⁶.

Comparing this approach with TetraSociological, we find in Sociocybernetics three spatial coordinates and some constants pointed out: resources (matter/energy, information), processes, structures, which we understand as amalgamation of or "relation" between resources and processes. Both theories recognise that "Dynamic systems are constituted by structures and processes, which form a particular ensemble in space-time"⁴⁷. To these two coordinates is added the third one -- resources as matter/energy and information. Although Hornung does not call them such, what are they if are not resources?

Within the framework of processes and structures, Hornung points out the four functional subsystems, which we regard as constituting structures (SIOT), and which include components of the environment. As comparison shows, TetraSociology is not alone in pointing out the mentioned SST parameters. To a considerable degree, these parameters are present in Hornung's sociocybernetic/sociological analysis. While in Hornung's analysis the social time coordinate, as well as some constants, are absent, certain add-ons make up for it. An important concurrence should be stressed: TetraSociology and Sociocybernetics practically **simultaneously** and, most important, **independently** have constructed a largely identical system of social space's parameters and their classification. This points to a possible synthesis, supplementarity of TetraSociology and Sociocybernetics.

Social genetics, considers the **states of the evolutionary development** of society (the appropriate SST coordinate) as qualitative changes in it, points out among the states four necessary, sufficient, but differently prioritised classes: PROSPERITY, DECELERATION, DECLINE, DYING (PDDD). These states of the social world and its different parts: societies, civilisations, formations, cultures, countries, branches, plants, cities, families, individual -- constitute appropriate **genetic/historical variable constants**.

⁴⁶ Hornung, Bernd and Adilova, Fatima. Conceptual modelling for technology assessment of IT systems - smart cards and health information systems // *Kybernetes. The International Journal of Systems & Cybernetics*. V26, N6/7, 1997, p. 796 -798. Sociocybernetic theory of Hornung is one more example of transition from pluralism to postpluralism

⁴⁷ Hornung, Bernd. *Constructing Sociocybernetic Society*. Montreal, 1998, p.5.

In different forms, under different names, in different numbers and sequences, these states have been analysed by Danilevsky, Sorokin, Spengler, Toynbee and many others. Society's states are not unilinear, but reversible and cyclical. The object of social evolution consists in the **spheres** of social reproduction, in the appropriate sphere components, **which develop unevenly**, but being interdeterminable, they **always strive for the highest possible degree of equilibrium**, as the optimal state for them. States of PDDD development are interpreted on the scale (from 100% to 0%) as **different degrees** of spheres' equilibrium. The difference between the degrees largely determines the difference between the states of society. **The state of society's prosperity as harmony of its spheres has top priority. Social harmony is defined as the utmost degree of spheres' equilibrium, as the optimum proportion of sphere components, ensuring prosperity and accompanied by a priority of social sphere.** Only spheres and sphere components are capable of deriving social harmony, rather than branches and branch components which are capable **only** of reproducing **disharmony**. Social harmony of branches cannot be achieved, because it is too much them; they are too partial and narrow. Therefore social harmony can **only** be achieved at **the level of spheres**.

The social world's and its parts' immanent teleological quality consists in their aspiration for a higher degree of spheres' balance, namely -- to harmony, ensuring prosperity to a society and priority to the social sphere. For history to reach a priority of the social sphere, with harmony and prosperity, it needs consistently to pass through change of stages of disharmony and priorities of material, organizational, information spheres. Social genetics has many approaches to a history, to change of disharmony states in it. The most famous among them -- civilizational and formational, which, for all their difference, supplement each other to some extent.

Social genetics considers society's states as an **amalgamation of big stretches of the past, current and future social times, as a unity of big chunks of people's past, current and future employments**. Big qualitative changes in society, expressed in different society's developmental states, occur over these stretches of time. Big stretches of employment processes turn into employment states, into social world's genetics. The latter is explored in theoretical genetics, which demonstrates the change of developmental states in historical, temporal PDDD constants. Theoretical genetics correlates with various genetic, historical, prognostic and futurological approaches in sociology, which explore the origin, development, and collapse of the social world or its parts in the past, present, and future. Exploring not only the past and present, but the future as well, sociology inevitably acquires an utopian quality, which cannot be erased. Thus, any sociology is more or less utopian: time determines to what degree. There are more than enough examples of this: from Plato to Marx, Comte, Parsons, Toffler, Castells, etc. **TetraSociology is utopian too**; however, it minimises this quality with its technologies and tetraempiricism (see below).

2.7. Space-time dialectics.

To conclude the analysis of SST coordinates and constants, let us review the **dialectics** of space and time as their interinclusion in different aspects, using the appropriate TetraSociological method. The first aspect is space's inclusion into time, space's and its coordinates temporality. In the spatial coordinates (resources, processes, structures), which are different from time, **time is present** as people's past and current life time, as their past and present r-employment's time. As we stated above, employment is identical with social time. Social time coincides with the human resource P, with the social's humanitarian component, which is incorporated into all social world's resources, processes and structures, permeating and linking all the topological parameters. In this respect, social space (resources, processes, structures) is a part of social time. This dialectics attests to **time's priority over space**. Indeed, if society's time is people's r-employment time, which is the source of all the social, then it is the source for social space as well and has priority in it. **Social space is a form of time**. Space is space, first, of past r-employment, incorporated into PIOT resources, second, of functional employment, incorporated into PDEC processes, third, structural-functional employment, incorporated into SIOT structures. All social space's coordinates, and their constants, are social time's modifications. Social space is delimited by past and present times, while social time incorporates, besides them, future time as well. So, social space is incorporated into social time, is lodged inside it, derives from it. Social time, employment creates both itself and space: drawing into its orbit all new natural resources, it expands social space, the space of the social. Social space's expansion is a

necessary condition for the expansion of employment itself and social time. Arguably, **social time (people's employment) creates social space (resources, processes, structures) in all its qualitative and quantitative dimensions.**

From this aspect of space-time dialectics ensues a very important pragmatic conclusion. It says the following. If social time (employment time) is incorporated into all spatial coordinates and constants, if it is a resource for all PIOT resources, then it is their **common denominator and gauge**. All PIOT resources are reducible to time people expend on them. **Time, in its turn, is reducible to cost and price.** This enables us to **gauge and count all social resources, and through them -- processes, structures, and states, using the single sociological indices of time and cost.** It is based on this that TetraSociology **discovers** sociological statistics as a system of specific, aggregated, sphere indices, and of algorithms for their transformation, which are explored below.

The second aspect of space-time dialectics is time's inclusion into space, social time's and its constants' spatial limitedness. Social time is people's employment, which, taken alone and in a pristine form, is impossible -- it needs social and natural resources, due to which it exists. For employment to get realised and become productive (for social time to "get turned on"), it needs such preconditions as PIOT resources, SIOT structures, in order to get incorporated into PDEC processes, to merge with them. However, resources, structures, and the processes they determine are spatially limited, which limits employment and incorporates social time into social space. In this respect social time (people's employment) is incorporated into social space, is lodged in it and delimited by it. Social space determines the limits of social time's existence. Here, space is the whole, and time is its part. Therefore, **social time is arguably a part of social space; social space delimits social time and determines all its qualitative and quantitative parameters.** Social time is actually connected with only one resource -- the human one -- and in this respect it is a part of the resources space.

Of these two aspects of space-time dialectics, the **first is creative, the second is confining.** The individual binds the two together; people exist both in employment's creative form, identical with social time, and as the confining resource, determining social limits of employment's space, which are social world's spatial limits. Such is the dialectics of society's space-time interinclusion. This dialectics posits space and time as equally necessary dimensions of the social world and any of its parts, but as differently prioritised.

The space-time dialectics amounts to more than the aspects explored here. It comes into action not only at the level of space-time's 4 coordinates, but also at the level of the 16 variable constants and the 4 components of the social. From the variable interinclusion method's viewpoint, each of these 20 parameters INCORPORATES all the rest; each has the stamp of all the rest; each provides information about each one of the rest. (This is why, with odd objects as the base, archaeologists can picture a whole epoch or civilisation.) However, a dialectics of social space-time with so many (20! Dimensions) is very effort-consuming and voluminous; it requires a kind of investigation that cannot be done in this book. Such is TetraSociological **philosophy of social space-time.**

2.8. Discovery of sociological statistics

In social time, in people's employment, SST dialectics finds the basis for the transition from a qualitative description of the social world to a quantitative expression of its variable constants within an indices system. This basis is the source of TetraSociology's **discovery of new, sociological statistics**, which do not have analogues. No other sociological theory, to our knowledge, has or has tried to create a system of its **own, sociological**, statistical indices. Sociology still does not have indices, which prohibits its from becoming a full-fledged, independent science. If sociology utilises statistics, then it is only traditional economic statistics. This significantly curtails sociology's abilities and limits its pragmatic potential, making out of it a double of economics' of little use. The creation of a radically new system of statistics and statistical indices was attempted 20 years ago within the framework of TetraSociology (then known as "The Sphere Approach"). The following is a general outline of the statistics.

First, the basis for qualitatively new, sociological indices is formed by the 16 SST constants; the indices denote the constants' variable quantitative values. SST constants being macrosociological, the

indices designating them are also macrosociological; the set of the indices forms a **sociological macrostatistics called tetrar, or TMS**. This statistics is not economic, but sociological, because it is based on SST's sociological constants, on **their common denominator and gauge -- people's employment time**. This gauge can be expressed in natural, cost-based and temporal units; we do not discuss here the question of the relation between them, because it is very complex and comprehensive. TMS is the sum of a multitude of specific indices, called "**sphere indices**," which are discussed below.

Second, sphere indices are based on the expression of the four PIOT resources. The people resource is designated with the index "P"; the information resource with the index "I"; the organisation resource with the index "O"; the things resource with the index "T." Because each resource gets reproduced by a relevant sphere to be used in all the four spheres, it is differentiated by SIOT spheres, each of which gets an index number: 1, 2, 3, 4. The indices denoting PIOT resources' sphere differentiation are **called sphere indices**. **They are designated by numbers and letters, e.g.: P1, I21, O341, T4123**, etc. So, sphere indices are specific statistical indices of a sociological class, denoting different states and intervals of SST's variable constants through PIOT resources' differentiated indices.

The major form of existence for sphere indices is not separate indices, although they are not entirely absent, but their interlinked clusters in the form of matrices. The sphere indices' basic, initial matrix, denoting the distribution of 4 resources by 4 spheres -- totalling 4x4 -- looks like this:

$P = P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4$, where P is population, and P1, P2, P3, P4 -- their sphere classes,

$I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4$, where I is information, and I1, I2, I3, I4 -- its clusters

$O = O_1 + O_2 + O_3 + O_4$, where O is organisations, and O1, O2, O3, O4 -- their blocks,

$T = T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4$, where T is things, material goods, and T1, T2, T3, T4 -- their groups

The matrix's lines denote the appropriate spheres' "outputs," i.e. production in them of appropriate products, while the columns denote appropriate spheres' "inputs," a utilisation of appropriate resources in them. Let us explain. The P line indices denote reproduction of the entire population in the 1st, social sphere, while the index numbers by the letter P designate the classes of people reproduced for appropriate spheres: P1 -- for social, P2 -- for informational, P3 -- for organisational, P4 -- for technical. (These are sphere classes of the population: humanitarian, informational, organisational, material, engaged in appropriate spheres of reproduction; they are explored below.) The I line indices denote reproduction of all information in the 2nd, informational sphere, while the index numbers by the "I" designates the clusters of information reproduced for appropriate spheres from the 1st to the 4th. The same applies to the other indices' lines.

Third, based on the basic matrix, a hierarchical system of matrices is created totaling 4x1/4, 4x1, 4x4, 4x16, 4x64, 4x256, etc. The depth of this system (the number of levels) is limited only by pragmatic considerations and technical possibilities.

Fourth, quantitative changes in the three constants -- processes, structures, states -- are denoted with PIOT resources' sphere indices. The basic matrix forms the foundation for the matrices of the indices of **processes** of production, distribution, exchange, consumption, and aspects thereof: growth, increase, growth rate, efficiency, productivity, etc. The basic matrix forms the foundation for the matrices of indices of **structures** (spheres, branches of economy, regions, countries), and aspects thereof: intersphere, interbranch, interregional balances, proportions, growth rate, etc. The basic matrix forms the foundation for the matrices of the indices of the social world's (its parts') developmental **states** and its aspects: harmony/disharmony, balance/imbalance, stability/instability, progress/regress, cyclicity/rhythm, etc. For each of the four spheres, intersphere balances are presented as the "output/expenditures" tables in four quadrants.

Fifth, each sphere index is formed through summation/aggregation of the appropriate active statistical indices: industrial and regional, economic and social, national and international. Experts' evaluations make up for an absence or limitedness of active indices. So, tetrar macrosociological statistics does not cancel traditional economic statistics, but supplements it and is built over it. Sphere indices integrate and develop the international statistical systems indices, first of all those of the National Accountancy System (NAS) and "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS). The sphere statistical indices system produces qualitatively **new substantive information** about social resources, processes,

structures, states. precisely **sociological information**, as the most comprehensive information about them. This kind of information - sociological, or to put it more precisely, sociology-statistical, opens up qualitatively new opportunities for the development of both social thinking and information technologies.

Tetar macrostatistics includes several algorithms for sphere indices formation and transformation. The set of algorithms is distilled down to four blocks.

First block. A system of algorithms for the selection of operative indices subsets, necessary for the formation of each sphere/sociological index of any level, from the individual to branch, country, world. It is "Algorithm 1" block.

Second block. A system of algorithms for the aggregation and formation, out of operative indices subsets, of sphere indices. It is "Algorithm 2" block.

Third block. A system of algorithms for the calculation of sphere indices, their matrices, balances, and other models. It is "Algorithm 3" block. This algorithm's calculations/transformations results are denoted with sphere indices. It is the first output of the results of calculations of sphere indices, their matrices and balances.

Fourth block. A system of algorithms of sphere indices for conversion into operative ones (industrial, regional, national, etc.). This block, "Algorithm 4," is the opposite of Algorithm 2. The result of sphere indices calculation is presented in operative indices. It is the second output of sphere indices calculations.

Examples of sphere indices matrices and their numerous uses over 20 years are listed in the appropriate listing in the Appendix. The sphere indices matrix for Russia in 1991 and 1996 is provided in our 1999 book. One of the book's fragments, on Russia's sphere classes, is quoted below. Sphere, sociological statistics reflects a specific, sphere, or aggregated, discreteness of the social world. This statistics constitutes the product of TetraSociology, its exclusive feature.

2.9. Information technology

The creation of SST's systemic parameterisation and the discovery of appropriate sociological statistics enable TetraSociological pluralism to switch from theory to technology, from rationalism to practice. TetraSociology has practical application in **two kinds of technology: informational and sociocultural**; the first is part of the latter. Let us review them briefly.

Today, as Castells showed, information technologies (IT) have become the most efficient instruments for the modern social world's development. Only when sociological theory gets realised through IT, will it have practical application in the world. Sociology has long been looking for an appropriate mathematic-algorithmic apparatus, which alone can promote sociology's technologization and its juncture with IT. However, the problem of sociology's mathematization, posed by Comte, has not been solved yet. The question "Can sociology speak the language of mathematics?" is still unanswered⁴⁸. And not by chance. When it is not clear **what** exactly should be counted up, **what** indices, no mathematical apparatus can help. Therefore, **so long as sociology does not have its own indices, it will never acquire a mathematical apparatus and become a technology**. There have been attempts to introduce mathematics into sociology, in particular through social space's definite-dimensionality⁴⁹. There are attempts of technologizing sociology through economic indices. However, these attempts reduce sociology to econometrics⁵⁰.

Those examples of sociology's technologization have the brightest prospects which define sociology-specific, substantive quanta of information (indices) based on any classification or parameterisation. TetraSociology is one such example. Another one -- Hornung's Sociocybernetic theory. It provides a social world's multidimensional, substantive classification outlined above, which EU and

⁴⁸ Tolstova J.N. Can "to talk" the Sociology in Language of Mathematics? // Sociological studies, 2000, № 5, p.113.

⁴⁹ Mostovay I.V., Ugolnitski G.A. Social Space: Heuristics of Mathematical Modelling // Sociological studies, 1999, № 3, p.21-26. However, hardly it is possible to agree with that statement of the authors, that the social space " represents usual numerical space " (p.26), as last does not express just social feature first, which can be expressed only by adequate parameters, instead of it is simple by numbers.

⁵⁰ Davudov A.A., Churakov A.N. The modular analysis and modelling of socium. Moscow. 2000

Germany use as the foundation for IT security systems⁵¹. It is only on the basis of a multidimensional (pluralistic!) classification that sociocybernetic/sociological theory turns into a technology.

The sphere indices system allows us to overcome the mentioned drawbacks. It ensures TetraSociology's technologization. This technologization rests on four bases, incorporates them.

The first basis is **sociological**. It is represented by SST's 20 variable constants explored above: PIOT, PDEC, SIOT, PDDD, HIOM.

The second basis is **statistical**. It is represented by the system of sphere/sociological statistical indices, denoting variable constants of resources, processes, structures, states. The sphere indices system is explored above too.

The third basis is **mathematical/algorithmic**. It is represented by the blocks of algorithms of sphere indices transformation, listed above, which are adapted for various programming tasks: 1.For programming tasks of social statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics. Hence the appropriate programming blocks. 2.For applied programming tasks. Hence the appropriate "programming products" (PP) or "packages of applied programs" (PAP).

The fourth basis is **programming**. It is represented by a set of programming blocks and PPs, constituting a new information technology, known as **Sphere/Sociological Informational-Statistic Technology (SIST)**. SIST is a statistical technology for forming, transforming and utilising sphere/sociological indices system. SIST is no less than TetraSociology's programming level. It is presented in programs written in machine languages and computer-"readable." Programming products are presented on magnet carriers: disks, diskettes, etc. SIST is a family of various PPs. Let us mention its chief groups.

1.PP SIST "Individual" is intended for the harmonisation of an individual's development and his general employment through time indices with defined resources levels and for different ages.

2.PP SIST "Family" is intended for the harmonisation of family development, the family's general employment, family relationships, way and the level of family life through the indices of time and cost.

3.PP SIST "Specialist" is intended for different professionals dealing with various kinds of social information.

4. Other possible SIST PPs: "Office" (Governmental, Corporate, International), "Country," "World society," "Environment," etc. It should be emphasised that SIST has an immense potential for the development of **principle new Internet search systems on the basis of the qualitatively new classification of Internet resources**. (In 1980-1988 years the sphere technology SIST was inculcated by me in " Automated System of Planned Accounts " municipal economies, into its such subsystems as: " Standard of living of city population ", " Public health Services ", " Culture ", " Paid services in city ", " Manufacture of the consumer goods " and others. For the more detailed list of its applications since 1980, see in Appendices.)

What is the SIST's main difference? Traditional ITs in use today, such as Microsoft, Netscape, Norton, etc., although indisputably important, can transform **only forms of information**, its carriers, storage and transmission vehicles, etc. SIST is qualitatively different because it transforms **the content** of social information **and controls it** owing to a combination in the sphere indices of universal qualitative/sociological and quantitative/statistical parameters, which makes SIST **unique as well as global**. Traditional technologies deal with only quantitative and limited information: they do not control the content of it. SIST allows us to systematise, compress, select, classify, evaluate, compare, and control **the content** of any social information, with regards to any co-phenomenon, from an individual to world society. Such a technology is unmatched.

New empirical and pragmatic results can be obtained with TetraSociological statistics and technology. Sphere indices and the appropriate technology (SIST), enabling us to express many co-phenomena of different levels in new indices and calculation formulas, create a **qualitatively new empirical basis** for TetraSociology, a basis, which is adequate to the scale of sociology and overcomes limitedness of sociology's economic and polling empiricism. This **neoempiricism**, adequate to sociology, does not cancel the economic statistics' and sociological polls' traditional empiricism, but is built over and supplements it.

⁵¹ Hornung, Bernd and Adilova, Fatima. Ibid.

TetraSociology's neoempiricism allows for the integration of macro- and micro-research approaches to studying the entirety of socium on all its levels. New sociological indices and new technology **prevent TetraSociology from turning into a "purely intellectual game."** They provide TetraSociology with empirical substantiation, and practical relevance. In the TetraSociological system of coordinates and constants, as it seems, we can theoretically investigate many phenomena from the individual to the social world, while their description with SIST sphere indices provides a **new quantitative and empirical information** about them. Arguably, TetraSociology's information technology exemplifies also sociology's **new, technological pragmatism**, which is adequate for a new, information society. In 5-7 years from now, this technology, which produces radically new information, **may create thousands of new jobs and a new programming products world market with billions of dollars of turnover.** Certainly, this is but a **hypothesis**, but it is not groundless. The transition from information to sociocultural technology lies through description of the model of the individual and society spheres, and through pointing out sphere classes as actors of social harmony.

2.10. The individual's and personality's Tetramodel.

The individual's and person's (personality's) TetraSociological model (tetramodel) is similar to the social world's model, just as microcosm is similar to macrocosm. Therefore, all SST parameters explored above apply to the individual and person; on the individual level they acquire a specific quality.

A personality is an atomic social subject, an individual carrier of people's reproductive employment's energy, a unique system of needs and abilities, which manifests itself in a person's employment, in the entirety of her social relations, in her behaviour's roles and statuses, thus forming personality as a single multidimensional complex. Personality is connected with the social world through a system of her needs and abilities, through the use of which it is described. Needs and abilities are social "inlets" and "outlets" of a personality's relations and her employment, through which she is permanently connected with society and "tethered" to it from birth to death. Through needs and abilities, all biological predisposition and foundations of a person are socially framed. Personality constitutes the social aspect of the individual as a biosocial being. These aspects are inextricably linked; this is why the individual's and personality's tetramodel approaches them as a whole. They can be investigated through four SST coordinates: resources, processes, structures, developmental states, and appropriate TetraSociological dimensions: **statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics**, which, taken together, constitute the individual's and personality's **universal sociological model**. The resource/static model is the basic one; we will limit this study to exploring it alone.

The social world's four necessary and sufficient resources and spheres correlate with the four blocks of the individual's and personality's model; four classes of personality's needs and abilities; four types of personality's employment, time, activity, work, property, relations, behaviour, statuses, roles. Needs represent a necessity, a shortage, a man's lack of a resource without which he cannot live. Needs constitute the personality's resource "**inlet**." Abilities represent creative work, creative employment, the individual's productive activity, his skills and expertise in creating resources. Abilities constitute personality's resource "**outlet**."

The first block of the individual's and personality's tetramodel under construction is **character** as an individual's attitude to people (including himself), as entire "MY I". It embraces values, supreme feelings (love, belief, hope, freedom, justice, conscience, guilt, etc.), direction, **all expressed in appropriate person's needs and abilities, which are called humanitarian.** Humanitarian needs are person's needs in herself and other people: parents, children, relatives, friends, colleagues, compatriots, etc., as well as in humanitarian benefits and services, and in **humanitarian property and employment.** Humanitarian property consists in MY parents, children, wife, friends, etc., MY feelings and attitudes to them, MY values, MY humanity.

The basis for humanitarian property consists in a person having more rights to ownership and use of herself and her relatives, friends, to their help, support, humanitarian services, than to other people and their services. Humanitarian benefits/services or resources consist in people and relations between them: humanness (love of mankind), attention, caring, help, politeness, tenderness, caress, etc. Humanitarian

employment consists in a person's employment aimed at satisfaction of her humanitarian needs (consumption of humanitarian benefits/services) and the realisation of her humanitarian abilities. Humanitarian abilities are a person's abilities to reproduce humanitarian benefits/services, and through them, herself and other people, first of all her own children. A person's humanitarian needs and abilities are linked by character, constitute her humanitarian resource and include specific needs and abilities: axiological (moral, religious, existential), pedagogical, etc, related to the development of one's own personality, as well as to that of others.

The essence of a person's humanitarian needs and abilities, of her humanitarian property and employment consists **in love of people** (including himself), the love's quality and measure. In the dispute between two classical definitions of a personality's essence as "love" (Feuerbach) and as "the ensemble of social relations" (Marx), Feuerbach's wins, although Marx's is not totally dismissed either, being preserved as an important definition of a personality, though not of her essence. Love is the pivot of personality, the backbone of the individual's character. All humanitarian qualities of a person (needs, abilities, relations, employment, roles, property) centre around love or non-love (hatred). From the viewpoint of TetraSociological, it is both **the process and state of personal harmony**. As process, it links together the consumption and production of each personality being in love relationships and employed in love. As a love object, a person causes an aspiration to possess the object (consume it), as well as to serve it, to further its development (to produce it). The same personality as love subject aspires to be possessed and to be served. In love as process, employment energy and relations between persons mix, and expending this mixture **does not impoverish, but rather enriches each person** both with regards to satisfaction of humanitarian needs and to the development of humanitarian abilities, which makes love the highest value and the persons' supreme harmony. It is only love that harmonises people both externally and internally. The love is harmony and vice versa.

Having lasted for long, the process of love transforms into a state of love, which is tantamount to people's happiness as the best possible state, as prosperity in the fullest sense of the word. It is only in love that persons are not estranged (alienated) from each another, but appropriate for oneself and the other. It is only the state of love that is the ideal, harmonious, balanced relation between people; only 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 its authenticity and prove faulty and defective. It has been long established that if a child does not get love from parents and educators starting from the first years of his life, a child's personality becomes pathogenic/pathological. Thus, love is a social norm and the personality's essence, while love missing or curtailed is a social pathology, a source of crime and negative deviance.

The second block of the individual's and personality's tetramodel is **consciousness** as the individual's relation to information, as the total of "MY CONSCIOUSNESS." It includes mind and reason, thinking and cognitive senses, intellect and imagination, knowledge and perceptions, the essence of which consists in information and which are **expressed in appropriate needs and abilities, called informational**. Informational needs are a personality's needs in the most diverse information, informational resources, benefits/service, informational property and employment. Informational (intellectual) property consists in MY knowledge and perceptions, MY mind and reason, MY information, which I produced. Informational resources represent benefits and resources connected with information, its production, distribution, exchange (reception) and utilisation, consumption. Informational employment is a person's employment aimed at the satisfaction of her informational needs (consumption of informational resources) and realisation of her informational abilities. Informational abilities consist in a person's ability to reproduce informational benefits/services. A person's informational needs and abilities are connected by consciousness and constitute a person's informational resource and include special needs and abilities: scientific, philosophical, artistic, etc, corresponding with different kinds of information.


The third block of the individual's and personality's tetramodel consists in **will** as the individual's attitude to organisation/order, as an entirety, "MY WILL". Will includes consistency, orderliness, persistence, purposefulness, pertinacity, diligence, industry, accuracy -- the qualities whose backbone is organisation as internal or external self-organisation and which are **expressed in appropriate needs and**

abilities, called organizational. Organisation embraces several types of norms and orders: political, law, managerial, financial, moral; it also includes customs, traditions, habits. Organisational needs consist in a personality's needs for external and internal order, consistency, organisational resources, benefits/services, organisational property and employment. Organisational property consists in MY order and consistency, MY money and financial savings, which I produced and own. Money, and financial resources in general, being an equivalent and the means of exchange for all resources, are therefore an important instrument for organising and putting in order resources, so they cannot be regarded as material resources. Organisational benefits/services are resources related to organisation, its production, distribution, exchange (reception) and consumption/utilisation. Organisational employment is a person's employment aimed at the satisfaction of personal organizational needs (the consumption of organizational resources) and the realisation of personal organizational abilities. Organizational abilities consist in a person's abilities to reproduce organizational benefits/services. A person's organizational needs and abilities are connected through will; they constitute will's organizational resource and include specific needs and abilities: political, law, managerial (including self-government), financial, etc., related to different kinds of organisation and order.

The fourth block of the individual's and personality's tetramodel consists in **the body** as the individual's relation to things, as a totality, "MY BODY". The body includes organism, physiology, gender, physical constitution, anatomy, health, temperament, the unconscious, which are **expressed in appropriate needs and abilities, called material.** Material needs are a person's needs in material resources, benefits/services, material property and employment, which ensure the body's reproduction. Material property includes MY things (apartment, furniture, clothes, footgear, foods, car, dacha, etc.) which I own. Material benefits/services are those resources that are necessary for the satisfaction of material needs and the manifestation of material abilities. Material employment is a person's employment aimed at the satisfaction of personal material needs (consumption of material resources) and the realisation of personal material abilities. Material abilities consist in a person's ability to reproduce material resources. A person's material needs and abilities are linked through the body; they constitute a person's material resource and include specific needs and abilities: industrial, agricultural, construction-related, transportation, sexual, etc., corresponding with different kinds of material benefits. Sexual needs and abilities are ambivalent: physiologically, they are bestial, biological, and therefore material; in the context of love, however, being an aspect of it, they are raised to the level of the supreme humanitarian needs and abilities, the highest humanitarian benefits and the most significant values.

The four blocks of the individual and personality model are expressed in its four components. The components correlate with PIOT sphere resources and SIOT spheres of its reproduction, and integrate many different facets: this is why they are called "**sphere**" ones. Sphere components are equally necessary to the individual and the personality, sufficient if taken together, each one prioritised differently; they cannot exist separately, but only as parts of a whole, interinclusive and in mutual service. With at least one of the individual's and personality's components missing, the individual/personality cannot exist. These components are interinclusive, which creates in a personality a multitude of co-subordinations between them, the leading one being subordination to character, a person's "I," which includes consciousness, will, body. Absolutization of any single sphere component of a personality in its specificity of one or another kind creates a host of monistic personality theories, while recognition of two, three or four components in one or another specificity creates a host of versions of pluralistic personality theories. (We do not explore here the dialectics of a person's individual and social production and self-production, her needs and abilities in appropriate forms of her employment.) The proposed model, as we emphasised, is TetraSociological one. The following chart demonstrates the interdependence and dialectics between the model's blocks.

Chart-1. The individual's and person/personality's tetramodel



Informational needs and abilities.

Organizational needs and abilities.

4.BODY. "MY BODY"
Material needs and abilities.

The sphere components serve as the basis for a personalities typology, which points out eight personality types: four classes of consumerist personalities, or "consumers," in whom one of the sphere needs takes priority, and four classes of productive personalities, or "creators," in whom one of the sphere abilities takes priority. If we juxtapose over the personalities sphere typology the two types of accentuatedness (mini/max) proposed by K.Leonhard, or C.Jung's two direction types (extraverts/introverts), we will get 16 more personality types in appropriate classifications. Each personality has present in her the set of all the sphere needs and abilities, but each has them in a specific quality, volume, and priority ranking, which creates an infinite variety of a personality's individual manifestations. The measure of the development of the needs and abilities can be indefinitely various. Here they are grouped in three levels: upper, middle, low.

Each class of a personality's sphere needs and abilities is a product of the appropriate kind of personal socialisation: humanitarian, informational, organizational, material, and of the appropriate kinds of personal development and self-development, rearing and self-rearing, training and education: humanitarian, informational, organizational, material (technical).

Each sphere need and ability has four parts in it, corresponding with each PIOT resource's composition, and can be quantitatively expressed through appropriate sphere indices. Therefore, to quantitatively describe a personality and the development of her needs/abilities, the basic matrix of sphere indices 4x4 is used, in two forms: one for needs, another for abilities. Thus, 32 sphere indices are used to quantitatively describe a personality. This opens up possibilities for "calculating" a personality, "projecting," through sphere indices, different scenarios and strategies of her development.

Out of the many variants of a person's development, the most optimal and favourable one, for the person and society alike, seems to be the harmonious development of all a person's needs and abilities, which we will call **a personality's tetraharmonious development**. It is this kind of development that ensures a person's prosperity, richness of life, love, the highest social efficiency, and society's humanness and is the foremost precondition for society's harmony and prosperity. A person's tetraharmonious development is a proportional and balanced development of her sphere needs and abilities, equilibrated with her inner and external resources and her inner and external environment. Society's harmony and prosperity start with the harmony and prosperity of persons engaged in different spheres. A person's tetraharmonious development is life, first of all, for itself, for the completeness, so and for others, for their completeness. Opposite, unilateral, the person's professional life is narrow a life for others. It is life for the narrow party others and very little for itself. In branch disharmonious society there cannot be tetraharmonious, sphere development of the individual, i.e. the harmonious development of his sphere needs and abilities. The required sphere organization of a society is considered below.

The development of each class of personal sphere needs and abilities has a generalised expression. The development of material needs and abilities is expressed in **living standards**; informational needs and abilities, in **meaning of life**; organizational needs and abilities, in **way of life**; humanitarian needs and abilities, in the **value of a person's life**. On the whole, their development determines **a person's quality**, which is completely reduced to the quality of her employment.


A person's sphere needs and abilities are incorporated into relevant SIOT spheres of social production and integrated into appropriate classes of **social needs, relations, production forces**, roles and statuses of a person's behaviour in society. The connection between the individual (personal) and the social is sketched out in the SIOT societal spheres tables.

2.11. Societal spheres tables

TetraSociology's structuratics points out four basic, constant structures of the social world and any society: **SIOT societal spheres** (see above). They are called **societal** because they are the largest possible,

fundamental, necessary and sufficient macro-structures, whose indissoluble unity constitute the social world. Spheres as macro-structures embrace all the social world's levels from macro- (humankind) to micro- (individual) and permeate them. Each sphere is explored in its **statics, dynamics, structuratics and genetics**. In conformity with them, the model for each sphere is created: static (spheres' products and PIOT resources), dynamic (spheres' PDEC processes), structural (spheres' institutions) and genetic (spheres' PDDD states). Each sphere is universal sociological model is presented as the amalgamation of four models mentioned. Below is a sketch of the model.

Chart-2. Universal sociological model of a sphere.



Because of the volume of these spheres' models, we will limit ourselves to exploring only the static models in the most compact form -- a table. The tables of spheres, or sphere's tables are the blueprint for charting spheres of a single village, city, state, country, as well as world society. Therefore, the tables do not have empirical and statistical material, compiling which would go beyond this study's scope. Let us define briefly the sphere's tables structure.

First, the tables have two major levels, or sectors of spheres: 1.The level of people's social employment in the spheres' appropriate branches: "Social sector." 2.The level of people's individual employment in family, and of self-production, by the individual, of her needs and abilities: "Individual sector"

Second, the tables have the following columns for the following spheres' parameters: 1.Objects/Products, 2.Resources. **Spheres' objects and products serve as the criteria for attributing a branch of employment or work to the appropriate sphere.** Because spheres reproduce their products according to the principle of "**similar from similar**", **spheres' objects and products coincide**. The only difference is in quantity and quality. For instance, Things are the technosphere's object and product, but Things-products differ from Things-objects both in quantity and in quality. Because dynamics deals with differences between the products and the objects, the static model does not distinguish between them and puts them in the same category. Resources express the sets of PIOT resources necessary for the production of the sphere product. PIOT spheres' interconnection and indissociability consist in that **product "outputs"** of some are **resource "inputs"** for the others.

Let us chart, in the tables of their statics, the permanent composition and content of each of society's four spheres: sociosphere, infosphere, orgsphere, and technosphere (economic sphere).

TABLE-1. Statics of the social sphere.

SOCIOSPHERE	Sphere's Objects/ products: $P=P1+P2$ $P3+P4$	Resources P1 Employed in the sphere = SOCIOCLASS	Resources I1 Sphere's information	Resources O1 Spheres' organizations	Resources T1 Things. Sphere's material-technical basis (MTB)
SOCIAL Sector: Branches					
Education	People (P)	Educators, etc.	Pedagogical	Educational	Education's MTB
Healthcare	People (P)	Doctors, etc.	Medical	Medical	Branch's MTB
Sport, tourism	People (P)	Coaches, etc.	Sporting	Sporting	Branch's MTB
Social	People (P)	Social workers...	Related to social	Related to social	Branch's MTB

maintenance			maintenance	maintenance	
Emergencies Ministry	People (P)	Rescuers	Corresponding	Rescue	Branch's MTB
Trade unions	People (P)	Trade union officials	Trade unionist	Trade unionist	Trade unions' MTB
Philanthropy	People (P)	Philanthropists	Philanthropic	Philanthropic	Branch's MTB
Church	People (P)	The clergy...	Religious	Church	Church's MTB
INDIVIDUAL SECTOR					
Family, humanitarian employment	People (P)	Parents, children, family members	Family humanitarian	Organization of humanitarian employment	MTB of family's humanitarian employment
The individual; humanitarian employment	Person Person	Humanitarian needs/abilities	Individual humanitarian	Humanitarian self-organization	MTB of individual's humanitarian employment
IN TOTO SPHERE INDICES	Product P = the sum of all lines	P1= the sum of all lines	I1=the sum of all lines	O1=the sum of all lines	T1=the sum of all lines

Table notes.

1. People/population (P) are the product of the reproduction of the sociosphere. Population are reproduced for all the four society's spheres, therefore $P=P_1+P_2+P_3+P_4$, where P1 designates those employed in the sociosphere, who constitute **sphere humanitarian class of the employed**; P2, those employed in the infosphere, who constitute **sphere informational class of the employed**; P3, those employed in the orgsphere, who constitute **sphere organizational class of the employed**; P4, those employed in the technosphere, who constitute **sphere material (technical) class of the employed**. An example of these classes in Russia is cited below.
2. Those employed in the sociosphere (P1), i.e. humanitarian class consists of two groups: those holding jobs in the sphere's branches (P1j), and all those who are non-working (P1n) and employed in self-production in individual sector (pre-schoolers, students, home-makers, non-working invalids and pensioners, the unemployed, etc.). A Russian P1 example is cited below.
3. Each sphere class correlates with a type of **socially useful labour**. P1j are engaged in humanitarian labour; P2, in informational labour; P3, organizational labour; P4, material labour.
4. The sociosphere's products P1, P2, P3, P4 represent its **outputs**, while its resources P1, I1, O1, T1, designated with appropriate sphere indices, represent its **inputs**. Products turn into resources; outputs, into inputs. Inside spheres, it is the other way round: resources turn into products; inputs, into outputs. However, these transitions make a subject not statics and dynamics characteristic not only for the sociosphere **but also for other spheres**. The interaction between spheres as an exchange of products/resources between them along the channels of their outputs/inputs is the basis for interinclusion of TetraSociology and Sociocybernetics.
5. The numerical values of the sociosphere's sphere indices, which are the sum of the branch indices of the table's lines, enable us to use SIST informational technology for calculating the sociosphere, and to obtain a **qualitatively new empirical/statistical information** about it. The methods of indices summation in **everyone** columns of **each** table are various. They depend on sphere, branch, sector, chosen units of measurements and other factors which do this procedure extremely complex and labour-consuming.
6. Satisfaction of humanitarian needs and manifestations of humanitarian abilities of family members constitute family's humanitarian employment.
7. In the sociosphere's social sector, its branches and institutions can be divided into governmental and non-governmental, commercial and non-profit, joint-stock and non-joint-stock, and according as well to other criteria.
8. The table for the sociosphere can be used for expressing the sociosphere's qualitative composition and quantitative parameters at the most different levels, from a small village to big cities, countries, world society (each level will have a different set of branches); this enables us to compare the sociosphere's

development in different cities, countries, regions. Such information serves as the basis for solving social problems in their entirety.

9. The table demonstrates that the criterion for attributing a branch or type of employment to the sociosphere consists in a common object-product, which is made up of people; each branch has a specific impact on them, leading to a variety of transformations in them. People represent different objects and different products for the sociosphere's branches.
10. The sociosphere's a subject of **societal sociology** (the sociology of societal or sphere level), which, in conformity with the sphere's object and product, can be called **humanitarian** sociology. Besides social statics, humanitarian sociology includes, as segments of its theory, the sociosphere's dynamics, structuratics, and genetics. The static table serves as the basis for dynamic, structural (institutional), and genetic tables and matrices of the sociosphere indices.

Table-2. Statics of information sphere.

INFOSPHERE Sector: SOCIAL Branches	Sphere's objects/products: I = I1 + I2 + I3 + I4	Resources P2 Employed in the sphere INFOCLASS =	Resources I2 Sphere's information	Resources O2 Spheres' organizations	Resources T2 Things. Sphere's material- technical basis (MTB)
Culture	Information (I)	Workers	Museum etc.	Culture	Branch's MTB
Science	Information (I)	Scientists etc.	Scientific	Science	Branch's MTB
Philosophy	Information (I)	Philosophers	Philosophical	Philosophy	Branch's MTB
Divinity	Information (I)	Theologians	Theological	Divinity	Branch's MTB
Art	Information (I)	Artists etc.	Art	Art	Branch's MTB
MMC	Information (I)	Journalists ...	Journalistic ...	MMC	Branch's MTB
Designing	Information (I)	Designers	Design	Designing	Branch's MTB
Publishing houses	Information (I)	Publishers etc.	Publishing	Publishing houses	Branch's MTB
Advertising	Information (I)	Reclamers	Advertising	Advertising	Branch's MTB
Communication	Information (I)	Signalmen etc.	Communicational	Communicational	Branch's MTB
Soft programs	Information (I)	Programmers etc.	Appropriate	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
Nation creativity (spiritual)	Information (I)	Self-actors	Appropriate	Amateur	Branch's MTB
INDIVIDUAL SECTOR					
Family, infoemployment	Information (I)	Family members, them infoemployment	Family information	Organisation of family infoemployment	MTB of family infoemployment
The individual, infoemployment	Information (I)	Person, her info needs/abilities	Individual information	Selforganization of infoemployment	MTB of the individual infoemployment
IN TOTO SPHERE INDICES	Product I = the sum of all lines	P2 = the sum of all lines	I2 = the sum of all lines	O2 = the sum of all lines	T2 = the sum of all lines

Table notes.

1. The set of social information (I) for all the four society's spheres is a product of the reproduction of the infosphere. Therefore: $I = I1 + I2 + I3 + I4$, where I1 - **humanitarian** information is necessary for the reproduction of the people; I2 - information is necessary for the reproduction of information, which we shall name **instrumental**; I3 - **organizational** information is necessary for the reproduction of organisations; I4 - **technical** information is necessary for the reproduction of things, material boons. These classes of the information constitute spheres of the information or information spheres.
2. The infosphere's products I1, I2, I3, I4 represent its **outputs**, while its resources P2, I2, O2, T2, designated with appropriate sphere indices, represent its **inputs**. Products turn into resources; outputs, into inputs. Inside spheres, it is the other way round: resources turn into products; inputs, into outputs.
3. The numerical values of the infosphere's sphere indices, which are the sum of the branch indices of the table's lines, enable us to use SIST information technology for calculating the infosphere, and to obtain a **qualitatively new empirical/statistical information** about it.

4. Satisfaction of information needs and manifestations of information abilities of family members constitute family's information employment.
5. In the infosphere's social sector, its branches and institutions can be divided into governmental and non-governmental, commercial and non-profit, joint-stock and non-joint-stock, and according to other criteria as well.
6. The table for the infosphere can be used for expressing the infosphere's qualitative composition and quantitative parameters at the most different levels, from a small village to big cities, countries, world society (each level will have a different set of branches); this enables us to compare the infosphere's development in different cities, countries, regions. Such information serves as the basis for solving information and cultural problems in their entirety.
7. The table demonstrates that the criterion for attributing a branch or type of employment to the infosphere consists in a common object-product, which is made up of information. Information represent different objects and different products for the infosphere's branches.
8. The infosphere's a subject of **societal sociology** (the sociology of societal or sphere level), which, in conformity with the sphere's object and product, can be called **information** sociology. Besides social statics, information sociology includes, as segments of its theory, the infosphere's dynamics, structuratics, and genetics. The static table serves as the basis for dynamic, structural (institutional), and genetic tables and matrices of infosphere indices.

Table -3. Statics of organizational sphere.

ORGSPHERE	Sphere's objects/ products: $O = O1 + O2 + O3 + O4$	Resources P3 Employed in the sphere = ORGCLASS	Resources I3 Sphere's information	Resources O3 Spheres' organizations	Resources T3 Things. Sphere's material-technical basis (MTB)
SOCIAL Sector: Branches	Organization (O)	Political figures, etc.	Political	Political	Branch's MTB
Policy	Organization (O)	Lawyers etc.	Legal	Legal	Branch's MTB
Justice	Organization (O)	The military men	Military	Military	Branch's MTB
Army	Organization (O)	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
State security	Organization (O)	Policemen	Police	Police	Branch's MTB
Police	Organization (O)	Appropriate	Tax	Tax	Branch's MTB
Tax Inspection	Organization (O)	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
Other power and security branches	Organization (O)	Managers	Administrative	Administrative	Branch's MTB
Management	Organization (O)	Bankers etc.	Financial	Financial	Branch's MTB
Banks and finance	Organization (O)	Appropriate	Self-governing	Self-governing	Branch's MTB
Local government	Organization (O)	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
Community organisation					
INDIVIDUAL SECTOR					
Family, organizational employment	Organization (O)	Family members, them organizational employment	Organizational information of family	Organization of family employment	MTB of organizational family employment
The individual, organizational employment	Organization (O)	Individual, his organizational needs/abilities	Organizational information of the individual	Selforganization of the individual employment	MTB of the individual organizational employment
IN TOTO SPHERE INDICES	Product $O =$ the sum of all lines	$P3 =$ the sum of all lines	$I3 =$ the sum of all lines	$O3 =$ the sum of all lines	$T3 =$ the sum of all lines

Table notes.

1. The set of social organisations (O) - institutes, orders, norms - for all the four society's spheres is a product of the reproduction of the orgsphere. Therefore: $O = O1 + O2 + O3 + O4$, where $O1$ - **humanitarian** organizations (schools, hospitals etc.) are necessary for the reproduction of the people; $O2$ - **information** organizations are necessary for the reproduction of information; $O3$ - **administrative**

organisations are necessary for the reproduction of organisations in which role all organisations act, when they are engaged self-organisation or creation of other organisations; O4 - **technical** organizations are necessary for the reproduction of things, material boons. These classes of the organizations constitute spheres of the organizations or organizational spheres. Each class of organizations unites 4 kinds of organizations: **political, legal, financial, management**. To each sphere of a society corresponds there organizational sphere of policy, right, finance, management. To each sphere corresponds there kind of such organizational tools as money: **social, information, political / administrative and industrial money**, formation and which features detailed are considered by Y.A.Vasilchuk⁵².

- The orgsphere's products O1, O2, O3, O4 represent its **outputs**, while its resources P3, I3, O3, T3 designated with appropriate sphere indices, represent its **inputs**. Products turn into resources; outputs, into inputs. Inside spheres, it is the other way round: resources turn into products; inputs, into outputs.
- The numerical values of the orgsphere's sphere indices, which are the sum of the branch indices of the table's lines, enable us to use SIST information technology for calculating the orgsphere, and to obtain a **qualitatively new empirical/statistical information** about it.
- Satisfaction of organisational needs and manifestations of organisational abilities of family members constitute family's organisational employment.
- In the orgsphere's social sector, its branches and institutions (banks, finance, insurance, crediting etc.) can be divided into governmental and non-governmental, commercial and non-profit, joint-stock and non-joint-stock, and according to other criteria as well.
- The table for the orgsphere can be used for expressing the orgsphere's qualitative composition and quantitative parameters at the most different levels, from a small village to big cities, countries, world society (each level will have a different set of branches); this enables us to compare the orgsphere's development in different cities, countries, regions. Such information serves as the basis for solving organisational (political, legal, financial, management) problems in their entirety.
- The table demonstrates that the criterion for attributing a branch or type of employment to the orgsphere consists in a common object-product, which is made up of organisation. Organisations represent different objects and different products for the orgsphere's branches.
- The orgsphere's a subject of **societal sociology** (the sociology of societal or sphere level), which, in conformity with the sphere's object and product, can be called **organisational** sociology. Besides social statics, organisational sociology includes, as segments of its theory, the orgsphere's dynamics, structuratics, and genetics. The static table serves as the basis for dynamic, structural (institutional), and genetic tables and matrices of orgsphere indices.

Table-4. Statics of technical (economic) sphere.

TECHNOSPHERE	Sphere's objects/ products T = T1 + T2 + T3 + T4	Resources P4 Employed in the sphere = TECHNOKLASS	Resources I4 Sphere's information	Resources O4 Spheres' organizations	Resources T4 Things. Sphere's material-technical basis (MTB)
SOCIAL Sector: Branches	Things (T)	Workers	Technical	Industrial	Branch's MTB
Industry	Things (T)	Peasants	Agricultural	Village	Branch's MTB
Agriculture	Things (T)	Builders	Building	Building	Branch's MTB
Construction	Things (T)	Transport workers	Transport	Transport	Branch's MTB
Transport	Things (T)	Sellers etc.	Trade	Trade	Branch's MTB
Trade/ Public nutrition	Things (T)	Workers	Storing	Storing	Branch's MTB
State purchases	Things (T)	Storekeepers	Marketing	Marketing	Branch's MTB
Supply	Things (T)	Repairmen	Housing	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
Housing and communal services	Things (T)	Repairers	Repair	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
Household service	Things (T)	Fishermen	Fishing	Fishing	Branch's MTB
Fishing industry	Things (T)	Workers,	Ecological	Ecological	Branch's MTB
Environment care	Things (T)				

⁵² Vasilchuk Y.A. Social development of the individual in XX century. The factor of money // Public sciences and modernity. Moscow, 2001, 4, p.5-29.

		ecologists			
Wood industry	Things (T)	Woodmen	Forestry	Forestry	Branch's MTB
Domestic industry	Things (T)	Masters	Handicraft	Appropriate	Branch's MTB
INDIVIDUAL SECTOR					
Family, material employment	Things (T)	Family members, them material employment	Family technical information	Organization of family material employment	MTB of family material employment
The individual, material employment	Things (T)	Individual, his material needs/abilities	Technical information of the individual	Selforganization of the individual material employment	MTB of the individual material employment
IN TOTO SPHERE INDICES	Product T = the Sum of all lines	P4 = the sum of all lines	I4 = the sum of all lines	O4 = the sum of all lines	T4 = the sum of all lines

Table notes.

1. The set of social things (T), material boons (including material services) for all the four society's spheres is a product of the reproduction of the technosphere. Therefore: $T = T1 + T2 + T3 + T4$, where T1 - **humanitarian** things (habitation, foodstuffs etc.) are necessary for the reproduction of the people; T2 - **information** things (books, TV sets, computers etc.) are necessary for the reproduction of the information; T3 - **organizational** things (office equipment, office buildings etc.) are necessary for the reproduction of organisations; T4 - **technical** things (means of material production) are necessary for the reproduction of things, material boons. These classes of the things constitute spheres of the things, economy or economic spheres.
2. The technosphere's products T1, T2, T3, T4 represent its **outputs**, while its resources P4, I4, O4, T4, designated with appropriate sphere indices, represent its **inputs**. Products turn into resources; outputs, into inputs. Inside spheres, it is the other way round: resources turn into products; inputs, into outputs.
3. The numerical values of the technosphere's sphere indices, which are the sum of the branch indices of the table's lines, enable us to use SIST information technology for calculating the technosphere, and to obtain a **qualitatively new empirical/statistical information** about it.
4. Satisfaction of material needs and manifestations of material abilities of family members constitute family's material employment.
5. In the technosphere's social sector, its branches and institutions can be divided into governmental and non-governmental, commercial and non-profit, joint-stock and non-joint-stock, and according to other criteria as well.
6. The table for the technosphere can be used for expressing the technosphere's qualitative composition and quantitative parameters at the most different levels, from a small village to big cities, countries, world society (each level will have a different set of branches); this enables us to compare the technosphere's development in different cities, countries, regions. Such information serves as the basis for solving economic problems in their entirety.
7. The table demonstrates that the criterion for attributing a branch or type of employment to the technosphere consists in a common object-product, which is made up of things. Things represent different objects and different products for the technosphere's branches.
8. The technosphere's a subject of **societal sociology** (sociology of societal or sphere level), which, in conformity with the sphere's object and product, can be called **economic** sociology. Besides social statics, economic sociology includes, as segments of its theory, the technosphere's dynamics, structuratics, and genetics. The static table serves as the basis for dynamic, structural (institutional), and genetic tables and matrices of technosphere indices.

The static tables of the social world's and the individual's spheres **here cover the full extent of social employment (social and individual alike, both useful and harmful, with sign both 'plus' and 'minus') at all levels**, from the individual to world society, **the social in its entirety**. The tables enable us not only to conceptually model social world, but also to quantitative calculate it along all its coordinates (resources, processes, structures, states) and on all levels with the help of new information technology SIST on the basis of TetraSociology's unique sociological statistics. The TetraSociological tables' features make it

adequate to social world. This places sociology at the level of real science relevant to object. Now let us review TetraSociology's ideas regarding new social actors, capable of producing constructive harmonious responses to the century's challenges and of realising these responses in a new sociocultural technology.

2.12. Discovery of sphere classes as actors of the social harmony

As a social world's global model, the system of SST coordinates and constants system enables us **to see in a new light** society's social structure, its traditional communities and groups. Pointing out four necessary and sufficient PIOT resources of society, appropriate SIOT spheres of resources reproduction, and appropriate, reproductive employment of people in these spheres enables one **to discover in the social world a qualitatively new social structure -- sphere structure, and in it, qualitatively new classes -- sphere classes, whose nature of employment is harmonious.** The sphere social structure of society is a division of the entire population into four sphere classes, employed in appropriate spheres of social reproduction, which are charted in the tables above. **Sphere classes represent four big groups of people** comprehending the entire population of the world, region, country, city, village, the entire staff of plants and offices, **which are differentiated according to spheres of their reproductive employment. The equal social necessity for their employment makes them fundamentally harmonious, cooperative, fraternal, and eliminates all antagonism. Sphere classes are equally necessary for society, sufficient together, but, according to the stratified criteria, they are not equal inside and between themselves.** Such is the general definition of sphere classes. Now let us define each of them.

1. **The Humanitarian class** is the class of people, engaged in the reproduction of people, i.e. employed in the sociosphere, the object and product of which is the individual/people. Sphere index P1 denotes the humanitarian class. For brevity sake, we will call it the "**Socioclass**". (TetraSociological neologisms are provisional, there is room for a more adequate term.)

2. **The informational class** is the class of people, employed in information reproduction, i.e. employed in the infosphere, the object and product of which is information. Sphere index P2 denotes informational class. For brevity sake, we will call it "**Infoclass**".

3. **The organizational class** is the class of people, employed in organisations reproduction, i.e. in the orgsphere, the object and product of which is organisations. Sphere index P3 denotes organizational class. For brevity sake, we will call it "**Orgclass**".

4. **The technical class** is the class of people, employed in the reproduction of things/material benefits, i.e. employed in the technosphere, the object and product of which are things. Sphere index P4 denotes technical class. For brevity sake, we will call it "**Technoclass**".

We will designate three forms of theoretical and statistical representation of sphere classes: 1. Status-based -- by the major employment, work position/job employment. 2. Non-status-based -- by people's employment in off-hours (non-working time). 3. Real or factual -- by the sum of the status-based and non-status-based employments. **Accordingly, three forms of sphere classes are designated. Status-based sphere classes include people according to their major, job employment, or absence thereof,** with the presence of self-production employment in case of non-able-bodied (more precisely -- non-job-employed, i.e. not employed in work) population. There are groups of population who are engaged in public work and categorised according to work spheres (work positions, professions), and there are groups of population who are not employed in public work, belonging to the non-working faction of humanitarian class and employed in self-production: children, students, non-working retirees, etc. **Non-status-based sphere classes include status-based, but with an addition of people who are employed in different spheres during their non-working hours. Real or factual sphere classes include non-status-based, but with an addition of people who are employed in different spheres of self-production.** Therefore, non-status classes refer to clarifying the employment of job-employed groups of population, while real classes add to non-status classes clarifications regarding the groups employed in self-production (i.e. not engaged in public work). Theoretically, the most precise form of expressing sphere classes is the third one. With the current state of statistics, however, we can calculate sphere classes only in status form. So, henceforth we will be speaking only about status sphere classes.

As an example, let us explore sphere classes in Russia in 1991 and 1996. The number of Russia's population -- P -- equals the sum of the employed in the sociosphere -- **socioclass** P1, plus employed in the infosphere -- **infoclass** P2, plus employed in the orgsphere -- **orgclass** P3, plus in the technosphere -- **technoclass** P4.

P1, the socioclass, is composed, first, of those employed in humanitarian work in the sociosphere's social sector and its branches: we will denote this group P1j; second, of the groups of population who do not work and are engaged in self-reproduction, i.e. engaged in the sphere's individual sector -- we will denote them P1n. Thus, $P1 = P1j + P1n$. The number of P1j is composed of the numbers of those employed in the sphere's branches, in millions of people. Let us lay out the numbers of sphere classes in tables.

TABLE 1. Number of P1j, Russian **socioclass** in millions people

Engaged in branches of the sociosphere	1 9 9 1	1 9 9 6
1. Public health services, social maintenance, physical culture and sports	4,3	4,6
2 Education (teacher)	2,5	2,5
3. The priests	-	-
IN TOTAL P1j	6,8	7,1

TABLE 2. Number of P1n, Russian **socioclass** in millions people

Groups not working (free in social sector)	1 9 9 1	1 9 9 6
1. Pensioners, invalids	33,8	37,1
2. Pupil, students	25,5	26,6
3. Pre-scholars, home-makers	11,8	11,5
4. Unemployed	3,6	6,8
IN TOTAL P1n	74,8	82,0
IN TOTAL P1 (P1j + P1n), number of Russian socioclass	81,6	89,1

TABLE 3. Number of P2, Russian **infoclass** in millions people

Employed in the infosphere's branches:	1 9 9 1	1 9 9 6
1. Science and scientific service	2,8	1,6
2. Communication	0,9	0,9
3. Culture and art	4,8	4,9
IN TOTAL P2, number of Russian infoclass	8,5	7,4

TABLE 4. Number of P3, Russian **orgclass** in millions people

Employed in the orgsphere's branches:	1991	1996
1. Number of the management staff	1,7	1,9
2. Finance, credit, insurance	0,4	0,9
3. Other branches (defence, policy, security, custom-house etc.)	1,9	1,8
IN TOTAL P3, number of Russian orgclass	4,0	4,6

TABLE 5. Number of P4, Russian **technoclass** in millions people

Employed in technosphere's branches:	1 9 9 1	1 9 9 6
1. Industry	22,4	16,3
2. Agriculture and wood industry	9,8	9,8
3. Construction	8,5	6,3
4. Transport	4,9	4,4
5. Trade and public nutrition	5,6	6,8
6. Housing and communal services	3,2	3,3
IN TOTAL P4, number of Russian technoclass	54,4	46,9

Statistical sources: National economy of Russian Federation. Moscow, 1992; Russian Federation in 1992. Moscow, 1993; Labour and employment in Russia. Moscow, 1996; Social sphere of Russia. Moscow, 1996; Demographic year-book of Russia. Moscow, 1996; Russian statistical year-book. Moscow, 1996; Russian statistical year-book. Moscow, 1997.

The number of Russia's population: $P=P_1+P_2+P_3+P_4$. In 1991 it equalled 148.5 million people, in 1996, 148 million people. Comparing the Russia's indices we can see, for instance, that Russia still has a long way to go to an information society, although the tendency to downsizing in the technosphere -- an important feature of an information society -- is very strong, and over 5 years 7.5 million technosphere workers have been downsized.

Similar sphere indices P , i.e. the numbers of sphere classes **can be calculated for any country**: U.S., Japan, France, Germany, China, etc., as well as **for any branches of the economy, regions, businesses**. We want to emphasise that forming sphere indices is extremely effort-consuming: for each sphere index, dozens, hundreds, sometimes thousands of operative indices have to be adjusted.

Analysis of sphere social structure and sphere classes poses a fundamental question: have sphere classes been always present, or are they just emerging; are they new for society and in history, or only for social consciousness and social sciences? **If society has always been in need of PIOT resources and of appropriate SIOT spheres of reproduction, sphere classes, therefore, are just as necessary and permanent**. Thus, all types of social structures: caste, estate, class, primitive, slave-holding, feudal, capitalist, etc. **can be regarded as different historical forms of a single sphere social structure of society, this form being the most fundamental and basic among the other kinds of social structures**. Other kinds of social structures of society can be interpreted as distortions, limitations, absolutization, undevelopedness of sphere social structure. All historical castes, estates, branch classes can be similarly interpreted in their relation to sphere classes. They constitute a single immense sociological **fact, traceable throughout the history, of disharmony, global imbalance, antagonism within the social world, unevenness and disequilibrium of the development of its spheres and sphere classes in the past**.

Sphere classes are new not for social world and its history, but for our level of knowledge about it and for traditional social thinking. Social world is as little known about as natural world. The level of our knowledge about it depends not on these worlds, but on our exploration methods, on the quality and level of our theories. Einstein thus formulated this dependence: "it is theory that defines what we are to see." This is a universal rule applying to exploration of both natural and social worlds. **Sphere social structure and sphere classes become discernible only through TetraSociological theory, only within the framework of definite-dimensional pluralism**; they are not distinguishable by monism or traditional dimensionless pluralism. Exploring sphere classes, sociology is certain to discover lots of new social laws and qualities. But to do this, it must acquire the postpluralistic framework of theoretical outlook.

Even today, **sphere classes exist as elemental and primordial forces, alien and unknown to the individual**, hidden from him in the unknown depths of society. At the level of social world observable and perceivable to traditional theoretical outlook, sphere classes are conceived either as stratified classes (upper, middle, low), or as branch classes corresponding with major branches of industrial world's economy. Let us review their links to and differences from sphere classes.

What are the main differences between sphere classes and traditional, economic, branch ones? Up until the last quarter of the XX century, until the beginning of formation of information society, the economics sphere (the technosphere) prevailed, and industrial society was predominant. Its social structure was mainly branch-based. It consisted of branch classes employed in the technosphere's main branches: workers, peasants/farmers, managers, proprietors. One of the most widely used, Marxist definitions differentiates the classes according to their relation to the means of material production (private property criterion). If we compare this definition with the definition and example of sphere classes, the difference of the latter consists in the following.

1. It is **reproductive employment of the object/product** (employment by reproductive transformation of a object into a product) **not ownership**, that differentiates sphere classes from traditional ones. Employment is universal, it does not recognise borders in historical space and time of social world, while private property on means of material production is delimited by historical time and space. All people are employed everywhere from birth to death, but never and nowhere can all people be private owners -- and have not been. **The sphere classes are classes of equality, though they do not exclude an inequality, and**

all other classes are classes of an inequality. From this main distinction of sphere classes ensue their derivative distinctions.

2. Sphere classes are universal, equally necessary, cooperative and intersupplemental classes, while branch classes are historically transient, variously necessary (both between themselves and between themselves and so-called "stratuta"), exploitative and antagonistic classes. Sphere classes, differentiated by employment, which is universal, represent **harmonious classes, in contradistinction to traditional, antagonistic classes.** Sphere classes' harmony is the opposite of branch classes' antagonism. Historically, to our regret, antagonism has been prevailing, but it is being replaced now by harmony.

3. Sphere classes **include all the population without exception**, while branch classes, only a faction, and not always the biggest one.

4. Recognising sphere classes, we recognise **all the population as productive**, socially useful. Socially the certain occupations of the people, but not itself people can be harmful, except for genetic deviations. Recognition of branch classes, meanwhile, leads to differentiation between productive classes and groups and non-productive ones, to confrontation, struggle and antagonism between them.

5. Sphere classes **eliminate class struggle and a desire for a dictatorship and domination** over other classes, which are inevitable with branch classes. The prevailing kind of relation between sphere classes is not class struggle, desire for a dictatorship, assertion of one's superiority, but **equality, cooperation and desire for harmony and coordination of different classes' interests**; a competition between sphere classes, as well as local conflicts between them, are expected, but they are resolved peacefully, non-violently.

6. Branch classes prove to be a **particular case** of sphere classes.

Sphere and stratified classes share several features: they include all of the population, they are universal, they banish class struggle, recognise the priority of social "upward" mobility over "downward" mobility, etc. But there are important distinctions between the classes as well.

1. Sphere classes are differentiated by the object/product of employment, while stratified classes, by the set of secondary attributes: profession's prestige, education, relation to power, income, property, etc.

2. Sphere classes are equally necessary for a society, lean on **one** fundamental basis of employment, which makes them socially equal in this respect. (In this regard TetraSociology is a **sociology of equality** between sphere classes and groups.) Stratified classes, on the contrary, posit social inequality, absolutize it, ignore class equality.

3. Sphere classes do not eliminate, but **preserve stratified classes**, recognising a necessity for sub-stratification inside each sphere class. So, it is recognised that each sphere class contains upper, middle, and low strata/classes, which are differentiated according to secondary attributes. These layers of sphere classes are as necessary as the classes themselves, because the same kind of employment in case of people with differing needs and abilities leads to differing results: upper, middle, low. **Sphere classes express social equality of people, while stratified classes, social inequality among them.** Finding the harmony and balance between equality and inequality to ensure all social groups' prosperity is the most difficult part of social problems solving.

If sphere classes are so fundamental, then why are they still elemental and unknown? Because, first, there was no social need in them – the social world could live without them; second, there was no appropriate social theory able to "see" them. Because of social world's uneven and one-sided development, there have always been a predominance of one or another sphere -- usually economic one, -- and of appropriate branch classes, who have socially needed to maintain or achieve superior position in society. On the other hand, to discover sphere classes, to turn them from elemental forces into self-aware social actors, an appropriate theory is needed. **Branch classes could produce nothing but Marxist-type theories of class struggle.** Only when, at the end of the XXth century, branch classes domination was banished and the last and the mightiest class system -- communist -- collapsed, only then did it become clear that **new classes and a new, adequate theory need to be discovered.** TetraSociological theory is the first among these, although not the last and, therefore, the single one. It enables us to discover new sphere classes and to explain why, in the past, they were remaining **in the shadow of history** and why they are being actively formed nowadays, i.e. the present-day social need in them. The theory reveals the causes of traditional

branch classes' incongruity with the new global problems and challenges: the challenges are so immense, while branch classes are so weak, small and absorbed in their "class struggle," that **they in principle cannot provide theoretical or practical responses to the challenges**. TetraSociological theory has it that **only new, sphere classes are CAPABLE of providing theoretical as well as practical responses to the modern challenges**. But these classes themselves have to turn, to use an old expression, from "classes in themselves" into "classes for themselves."

The intensive formation of sphere classes is expressed in the re-distribution of the employed population among the social production spheres, in decreasing numbers of those employed in the material sphere and growing numbers of those employed in the three other spheres. This process, begun in the second half of the XXth century and especially intensified in the century's last quarter, is connected with the formation of the information society, spread of communications, and expansion of globalisation, and **leads to "death" of traditional branch classes and to formation of sphere classes as new and harmonious social actors** for the XXIst century. However, the parallel process of the raise of **awareness of sphere classes identity**, which we will call "**sphere identity**", necessary for formation of this classes, -- this process has just begun. Formation of sphere classes requires self-awareness: the spiritual, theoretical component, indispensable for it. (It is the modern fact of the lag of consciousness and theory from a reality.) Self existence and formation of sphere classes are noticeable only through an appropriate theory. Sphere classes obtain in TetraSociology their self-awareness and concept of "sphere" identity, which turn them from elemental forces into self-aware social actors of harmony, who transform traditional actors. Constructing sphere classes theoretically and socially, TetraSociology "discovers" them in this sense. Transition from branch identification to sphere one is necessary for finding adequate responses to the challenges. Disjoined and often conflicting branch groups cannot provide the responses, any more than realise them in practice. Transition to new, sphere identification can be accomplished only with the help of a theory similar to TetraSociology.

Ignorance of sphere classes, the lack of their identification led in the past **to total social disharmony** with all its manifestations: class struggle, exploitation, wars, crime on a mass scale, terrorism, clash of civilisations, conflicts between religions, unfair distribution of wealth and power, predatory attitude to nature, "one-dimensional man" (H.Marcuse's term), etc. (Is not it this total disharmony that accounts for the postmodern "total deconstruction," which absolutizes total disharmony as an eternal reality, as a new "absolute truth"?) **Total disharmony in the social world creates total disharmony in the traditional social actors**: castes, estates, branch classes. **Harmony in the social world is achievable only by sphere classes**: they are the opening key to it. Only sphere classes are interested in harmonious, proportional development of all spheres of social world, and therefore, the individual, rather than in superiority and domination. NO OTHER classes are interested in harmony in the social world and the individual. So, sphere classes are new and harmonious social actors of prosperity, who steps out on the historical arena in the XXIst century and starts to act in an informational civilisation. It is classes of a **harmonious civil society**, of a **highly advanced** civilisation. They use information and technologies, instead of property and economy, as the key instrument for social harmony and prosperity. In the XXIst century the **sphere classes** will become a social basis of culture, policy and economy. **They** will make their harmonious.

2.13. Sphere social groups: youth, women, middle class

Sphere classes exist in many social groups, first of all in groups as permanent and universal as women, men, youth. (We will categorize as youth, or more precisely -- younger generations, the population UNDER 40). Contiguous to them is such social group as middle class, which, though not as universal as women, men, and youth, shares a common sphere nature with them. What does this mean? It means that women, men, youth, middle class **are belonged to all sphere classes: they are employed in all, without exception, spheres** of social reproduction. This evident fact does not necessitate an additional proof: there is not a single sphere in which they are not employed. Here is one more group -- intellectuals; they are kindred to the previously mentioned groups because they constitute one of sphere classes -- informational. The common qualities described here enable one to categorize these social groups **as sphere ones by nature**. The following table tentatively charts the sphere nature of these groups.

SPHERE CLASSES GROUPS	Humanitarian P1	Information P2	Organization P3	Technical P4
Women	Women P1	Women P2	Women P3	Women P4
Men	Men P1	Men P2	Men P3	Men P4
Youth (UNDER 40 years)	Youth P1	Youth P2	Youth P3	Youth P4
The older generations (FROM 40 years)	Older generations in P1	Older generations in P2	Older generations in P3	Older generations in P4
Middle class	Middle class in P1	Middle class in P2	Middle class in P3	Middle class in P4
Intellectuals	-	Intellectuals = P2	-	-

The sphere nature of these groups means that they are just as interested in social harmony as sphere classes, albeit differently. We will call these groups "**sphere social groups**". They are kindred to sphere classes, inseparable from them, and are parts of them, their partners and high-priority forces, albeit in differing ways. For sphere classes, it takes decades to acquire priority, and this happens only gradually. By social priority we mean a leading role in society played, over a stretch of its history, by one or several social groups, which control most part of the society's resources.

Sphere classes' priority begins with the priority of one of them – the informational or intellectual class. The information society in the making ensures intellectuals' priority, which are employed in information and informational services in all spheres. Importantly, we're talking here not of a single branch class, but of an entire sphere class, employed in information in all spheres and branches without exception. Sphere identification of intellectual class is the beginning and an example of the formation of similar identification in other sphere classes and the entire population. Information and infoservicing, just as the appropriate employment of intellectual class, are necessary pre-conditions for society's harmonization and **re-distribution of priorities** between social groups. Intellectual class, however, is not yet numerous and strong enough, while it is plain negligible in many countries. Together with this class, the information society stimulates an intensive formation of harmonizing social forces: sphere classes (intellectuals first of all), youth, women, middle strata.

Another historical fact of the establishment of sphere classes' priority is the priority of middle class in the most developed countries. Middle class' priority means harmonization, prosperity and stabilization/stability of appropriate societies through harmonization of the population's income, a majority of whom have middle-level incomes. This method of harmonization, however, is insufficient and limited: it is not at all in all countries that the majority of population belongs to middle class; besides, the method does not solve the problems of women and youth, who mostly belong to the "low" or "upper low" class. Middle class' priority does not lead to sphere identification among the population, which is indispensable for social harmonization.

The crucial change in social groups priority rankings will occur when the change affects the most important gender/age groups present in every society: women, men, younger and older generations. Until now, all the social shifts notwithstanding, the position of priority has been occupied by the social group of older men -- from 40 on. Arguably, **all throughout the human history, from patriarchy to the present, older men, controlling most of the resources: human, informational, organizational (first of all power and financial), material, have been dominating and occupying the position of social priority.** Other social groups, first of all youth and women, have found themselves as resource-poor as can be, especially in the XXth century, in transition-period and developing countries. So, socially, women and youth are the most deprived social groups. They, therefore, are more than the others interested in social justice and harmonizing the position of ALL social groups.

Until now, it is older men who've been at the helm in traditional branch classes, which have always been forces of disharmony, and often of immense world-scale destruction, the most vivid example of which is the XXth century. In that century, **ruling men instigated three world wars, dozens of revolutions, thousands of local wars, murdering and maiming hundreds of millions people.** All totalitarian systems of the XXth century were created and were headed not by the women or the youth, and men of the older generations. There is no space here for facts and statistics, so we will formulate a hypothesis: **The blame for all the crimes of the past, for world total disharmony lies with older man** -- the backbone of traditional

branch classes --, who has been initiating and leading all destructive and disharmonizing actions both worldwide and locally, and who has been drawing into these actions all the population, including women and the young. **To harmonize the social world, therefore, social priority needs to be transferred from older men to other, harmonious, actors: sphere classes, youth, women, middle class.** This transfer is beginning in information society at the end of the XXth - the start of the XXIst century.

The following table charts the shifts in social groups priority rankings in the XXIst century.

AGE	WOMEN	MEN
Young generations, UNDER 40 years (the youth)	Priority since XXIst century	Priority since XXIst century
Older generations, FROM 40 years	Priority since XXIst century	Priority up to the end of the 1st quarter of the XXIst century.

Note. The trend in priority rankings shift charted in the table is grounded in the modern processes: the numbers of women and the young in leading branches in all society's spheres are growing; this trend needs an appropriate factual verification and empirical exploration, which will be conducted in the future. But the **tendency is clear**: the social world of the past was mainly male and old, while the social world in the new century will be gradually getting harmoniously gender-balanced and primarily young, even though older generations will be growing in numbers. (**Increase of a priority and number are not identical.**) The historical task for men in the XXIst century consists in going beyond paying lip-service to women as the humankind's better half and helping them in deed to become the better half by ceding to them control over society at every level.

By no means does the suggested hypothesis belittle older men's great services, achievements, discoveries, oeuvres and good deeds. On the weighing-machine of history, however, destruction, aggression, violence by older men, and their domination and superiority, weigh out. **Who, if not they, are responsible for the crimes of the past, for total disharmony? --Women? --No. --The young? --No.** For women and the young have always been resource-poor and depending on older men; they've almost always been instruments of older men's will and executors of their orders. Until now, **history needed disharmonious forces able to gain a particular end by any means. Only older men could fulfil this historical mission**; only they could assume the role of the social leader; only they could have social priority. They fulfilled their historical mission bringing it to a logical closure -- the real danger of the humankind's destruction as a result of either a nuclear war, or ecological disaster, or clash of civilizations, or international terrorism, etc. This global threats were brilliantly creating exactly by older men, rich and masterful, almost all-powerful. What the humankind is to do now? Wait for the decease, like a lamb being led to the slaughter, or change a social groups' priority rankings? The humankind have chosen the latter, although the global threats are certain to be persisting for long.

To which groups can and should the social priority be transferred in the informational civilization in the XXIst century? --To those who, being "closer" to information, are the forces of sphere harmony and prosperity, rather than of branch disharmony and destruction. Why are women and the young "closer" to information? Because, due to their humanitarian, age and/or psycho-physiological qualities, they have more talent for information technologies than older men, who are more disposed to authoritarian and violent solutions. Which social groups are the forces of harmony and universal prosperity? History has shown that it is not older men or branch classes. Therefore, **youth, women, middle classes, intellectuals, who possess a common sphere nature and have sphere classes as common denominator, are the new century's forces of harmony and prosperity.** So, **only sphere classes and groups can achieve social harmony**; this is why, albeit with difficulty, they are gradually gaining social priority. In other words, in sphere classes, adult men, who are playing leading roles in all the branches, are starting to cede their priority to the young, women, the middle strata, and intellectuals. Being painful as it is for older men, this process does not belittle their significance or infringe on their rights or aspire to subordinate them to another master: what is replacing the domination by older men is not a different kind of domination, but rather harmony, justice, and equality of social groups.

In purely theoretical terms, we can establish an approximate "quota of harmony" for major, age/gender-based, sphere groups: it rests on an equal distribution of leadership positions among them and amounts to a quarter, 25%. What does this quota mean? It means that leadership positions should be evenly divided between men and women, between older and younger generations. Hence we have 25% as a kind of ideal. If the quota is divided among four spheres, it equals 6,25%. (We can compare with the sphere groups'

harmony quota the current distribution of leadership positions among these groups in the world, separate trading one kind of chauvinism or domination for another. It rejects both; it renounces them, champions a transition from them to social harmony, eliminating any chauvinism, domination, etc. It states a feasibility of and prognosticates a necessity for such a transition and the shift of social priorities. countries, spheres, branches, cities, and to find out **how far they are from harmony.**) In this harmony of sexes, generations, sphere classes, older men will occupy an appropriate position, which, obviously, will be worthier and fairer than the one they've been occupying so far. So, TetraSociology cannot be accused of

2.14. Discovery of the sociocultural technology of harmony: the aspect of sphere/global democracy

To designate priority forces for social harmony, it is necessary to answer the question about the technology of the forces' operation. This is a problem of sociocultural technology. When, in the past, social transformations amounted, basically, to nothing more than violence (revolutionary, military, religious, familial, etc.), such a problem didn't exist. But when it is being asserted that social harmony can be achieved only non-violently, then a very complex problem arises regarding sociocultural technology. In the most general terms, sociocultural technology is a system of **non-violent ways to gradually achieve social harmony and prosperity for non-violent sphere classes and groups**; for them, this is the way of employment, life, practice. Briefly, this is the **sphere sociocultural technology of harmony (SSTH)**, which, essentially, is a sphere one and which we will call sphere technology or sociocultural technology, each meaning the same. TetraSociology aspires to be not only a theory of SST, employment, sphere classes, social equality, social harmony, etc., but also the sociocultural technology for achieving harmony, equality, justice, prosperity.


TetraSociology and sociocultural technology are two sides of the same medal: the second one is a result and a practical realization of the first. As a sociocultural technology, TetraSociology can be interpreted, roughly, as a quest for the necessary and sufficient **harmony** of any society's resources, processes, structures which leading to the society's prosperity. Quest for and achievement of harmony through the sociocultural technology means a particular system and sequence of the practical transformations of the coordinates and constants of social objects/subjects.

Sociocultural technology regards prosperity as the most propitious, optimal, stable, the best possible social **state**, the state which the social world in general, and all its elements, down to a private person, teleologically aspire to. The **state of non-violent and fair prosperity can result only from a harmonious, balanced and proportional development of sphere structures**; and such a development, in turn, results from the harmony of reproduction processes and sphere resources. The prosperity's beginning and foundations lie in the harmony of PIOT resources within the harmony of people's reproductive employment; the latter determines the harmony of PDEC resources and SIOT structures, the apex for which is prosperity, equilibrium, stability. Because resources are spheres' (SIOT structures') products, the **process of achieving and preserving prosperity is an essentially endless repetition of the development cycle: resources-processes-structures**. But each separate developmental cycle causes a modification, whether positive or negative, of resources, processes and/or structures. Inasmuch as they are dimensions of the social world's statics, dynamics, structuratics, they, together with people's employment that binds them together, determine the genetics of prosperity. All social dimensions and states, including prosperity through harmony, start with employment. Hence the compact formulation for sociocultural technology: **prosperity through the harmony of employment in statics, dynamics, structuratics**.

Sociocultural technology is a conscious and regulated repetition of developmental cycles, aimed at achieving and preserving prosperity as the ultimate goal; this goal permanently necessitates supplies of and confirmation by resources/statics, processes/dynamics, structures/structuratics. Sociocultural technology realized in controllable developmental cycles can be roughly pictured as a closed-circuit dialectic model, where each element influences everything (including itself, according to the law of feedback), but taken together, the elements are teleologically oriented at one element -- prosperity, its genetics.

Chart. The sociocultural technology cycle





In a small book, there is no room for detailing all elements of the sociocultural technology cycle, so we will review, as before, only the first and determinative element: resources/statics.

So, if sociocultural technology is a quest for, achievement and preservation of prosperity, the latter being a result of harmony, then what resources are necessary for seeking and achieving harmony itself? The answer to this is grounded in statics. Here it is: For seeking and achieving social harmony, the following resources are NECESSARY:

1.Social forces/actors that are interested in and capable of achieving harmony. As we established above, sphere classes and groups are the forces/actors .

2.Appropriate information and informational technology, enabling us to calculate the balances and proportions of sphere resources, processes, and structures necessary for harmony. As we established above, SIST is the IT required.

3.Appropriate sphere organization of the power mechanism ensuring a proportional resources distribution among all the society's classes and groups. The proportional resources distribution by mechanisms of power, which is necessary for harmony, **is the most difficult question** of both theory and technology: we explore it further.

4.Material resources are necessary for social harmony, and provision of the social norms of these resources which are minimally necessary for social harmony.

The sequence of stages for realisation of sociocultural technology and its logic correlates with the priority rankings among SST coordinates and constants: PIOT resources/statics, PDEC processes/dynamics, SIOT structures/structuratics, PDDD states/genetics. We will limit ourselves to reviewing the stages for realisation of sociocultural technology within the framework of statics.

First stage. Designating sphere social groups interested in seeking and achieving social harmony exactly due to their sphere structure/employment, and capable of achieving it exactly due to sphere employment.

Second stage. Elaboration of a sociocultural project of harmonisation any social element on the basis of necessary information and SIST.

Third stage. Organising power and management according to the sphere pattern; this is necessary for harmonisation resources, processes, structures in order to achieve prosperity.

Fourth stage. Material resources necessary for harmonisation and prosperity.

Of the stages and resources of sociocultural technology mentioned, the first two are explored above. **As for material resources, we will assume that the current state of the technosphere allows to provide them, in needed quality and quantity, for social harmony at any level**, from an individual to the humankind: the problem lies only in their harmonious and fair distribution, which power is to ensure. What has left is the third, organizational resource and stage of sociocultural technology --, the most complex and crucial one, connected with **organization of power distributing resources**.

Let us explore it in detail, applying it to country level.

On country level, organizational resource is concentrated in the state, state power and its different organs, although it is not limited to the state. Of the two possible forms of state organization, monarchy and

republic, in the XXth century - **totalitarianism and polyarchy, democratic republic or pluralistic democracy won**. W.Churchill wittily summed up the result of this historical contest: "Democracy is the worst form of government, with the exception of all others". In other edition this judgement is those "Democracy is imperfect, but better its mankind nothing has thought up ". Therefore, there is no need to prove that only democracy, as the single appropriate form, can be the organizational form of harmonisation's sociocultural technology.

But there is democracy and democracy. Democracy's shortcomings, weaknesses, failures are well known. Democracy's main defect consists in its branch arrangement, dimensionlessness of its branch pluralism, branch interests' domination over common ones: a situation whereby only branch elites rule and struggle for power. **Branch division and distribution of power proves unequal, unfair, disharmonious**; it discredits the idea itself of folkpower causing it to degenerate into a domination by branch elites. The branch arrangement of traditional democracy is determined by branch classes, which make the basis for traditional democracy and which we explored above. Thus, there is every **reason to call traditional democracy "branch democracy"**: this sums up its general defect leading to many of its other well-known weaknesses and limitations. Just as **branch classes are to blame for the social world's total disharmony, branch democracy (branch governments) is responsible for it too**, and for disharmonious unjust distribution of all resources of society. Neither branch classes nor branch democracy are able of overcoming total disharmony and unjust distribution. Such is TetraSociology's general evaluation of traditional, branch democracy.

Only sphere classes and groups organised into a new appropriate kind of democracy, which we will call sphere democracy, can achieve social harmony. Let us define sphere democracy. **Sphere democracy (tetrademocracy, tetrarchy) is a specific, harmonious form of pluralistic democracy, based on the division of population into 4 sphere classes, and on inclusion of all population into the definition of "people/folk" and on EQUAL power distribution among elected representatives of all sphere classes in all sectors and forms of power.** Sphere democracy aspires to social harmony and justice. It ensures that they are achieved and preserved through an appropriate arrangement of state power, fit for distributing social resources harmoniously. **Sphere democracy is GLOBAL, accessible and acceptable for all nations.**

Over traditional branch distribution of power, sphere democracy superimposes a new, sphere classes power distribution, which creates a qualitatively new social basis for power, and this basis, in turn, determines power's qualitatively new features (see below). EQUAL power distribution between sphere classes, ensuring equal and harmonious distribution of other resources between them, rests on EQUAL necessity for exist society of EACH ONE of sphere classes, IRRESPECTIVE of the number of people in a class, which constantly change from great set of variety social factors. The following table charts, drawing from an example of the Russian state, sphere democracy's major difference: EQUAL power distribution between the representatives of all four sphere classes.

Table. Distribution of power between sphere classes and groups.

POWER: Branches Bodies CLASSES of the PEOPLE	Legislative Parliament (Total: 450+188 places)	Executive Government (Total: roughly 60 ministerial places)	Judiciary Courts (Equal number of the judges?)	Presidential Administration (Total: roughly 2800 staff places)
Humanitarian class	157 places	15 ministerial places Social Subgovernment	Social and Family Courts	Humanitarian Department ~ 700 places
Information class	157 places	15 ministerial places Information Subgovernment	Information Court	Information Department ~ 700 places
Organizational class	157 places	15 ministerial places Organizational Subgovernment	Administrative and Criminal courts	Organizational Department ~ 700 places
Technical class	157 places	15 ministerial places Economic Subgovernment	Economic Arbitration Court	Economic Department ~ 700 places

Notes.

1. The table deals with power branches only on federal level, although the principle of equal power distribution between sphere classes of the people applies to all power levels, including local self-government.
2. Federal Assembly, the Russian parliament, has 450 seats in the lower house - the State Duma, and 178 seats in the upper house/Soviet of Federations. 628 seats overall; divided by four, it makes 157 seats for each sphere class.
3. The Russian government has about 60 ministries and departments. The number for ministries and departments is constantly changing, so the number provided can be incorrect, but it does not matter in our case, because the number does not affect the principle of equal distribution of governmental posts between sphere classes. The same applies to courts, and sections of the President's Administration. Each sphere group of ministries form a SUB-government in the government, coordinated by the relevant vice-premier. Significantly, over 15 years ago in the U.S., administrations in 25 states established four sub-governments (economy, human resources, organizational management, nature resources), and in Canada, the government of Quebec province created four inter-branch committees: economic, social, cultural, and regional development⁵³. In both cases, these government bodies are very similar to our sphere subdivisions or bodies. Re to sphere courts, their main task is consideration of the population complaints on illegal actions of state branch bodies of the appropriate spheres.
4. We are not able to participate in the polemics regarding the reasons for singling out presidential power as a power's special branch. Although some constitutions essentially identify it with executive power, many other constitutions bestow on it additional functions of coordinating and dovetailing the actions of three other branches; we believe this is a sufficient reason for regarding it as a power's separate branch.
5. Similar power tables can be created for any country, any state, any power level. (In 1990-1993 years, when I was the deputy first democratic Lensovet/Petrosovet, I developed the administration bill of branch structure reorganisation of legislative and executive power in St.-Petersburg in sphere structure. See: The list of applications of a TetraSociology in the Appendices.)

Sphere democracy's major aim is ensuring for sphere classes an **equal** participation in power, **equal** power distribution between them, which **with necessity** will ensure fair distribution of other resources between them. Political harmony is the first necessary condition of social spheres and classes harmony. It will ensure an optimum level of socio-economic equality and overcoming of stratification extremes, will make a basis of prosperity. Sphere democracy excludes absolute equality, which is utopian, harmful, unattainable. It requires the **only certain** level of equality/inequality that is necessary for social harmony and prosperity, and this level varies at different stages of society's development: it is constantly fluctuating, albeit within **certain limits**. Sphere democracy's ultimate goal consists in ensuring harmonious balance of equality/inequality between sphere classes at every given stretch of time of society's existence.

Let us briefly go over sphere democracy's major qualities and features.

1. **Constitutional** division of the country's population/people into 4 sphere classes and securing for each an equal right to power. **By social basis of sphere democracy, power and politics are sphere classes, that is fixed in Constitution.** This provision disallows a forceful tethering of a person to a class; the classification is based solely on a person's main employment. Any restrictions on mobility and on occupation changes, except professional ones, are disallowed too.

2. Equal power distribution between sphere classes in all four power branches: presidential, legislative, executive, judiciary, in appropriate power organs, called sphere organs.

3. Providing voting rights for minors, whose access to power branch democracy bars, thus limiting its own scope; prior to the child's full legal age, his/her voting right is vested in the parents. This makes sphere democracy the most social kind of democracy.

4. A significant increase in the numbers of orgclass, not so much by recruiting more state officials as by involving people (women and the young in the first place) into local self-government and introducing a

⁵³ Morgachev V.N. The Forms and Methods of Territorial Management in USA and Canada. Moscow, 1987, p.53, 55.

modest fee for the participation. (Transition from the priority of electoral democracy to that of participatory democracy.)

5. Introducing electronic democracy: electronic voting (electronic plebiscites), by sphere classes, on the most important bills concerning self-government, the country, spheres; anti-fraud security and informational safety of the voting should be guaranteed.

6. Forming political parties by sphere principle, by sphere classes, rather than by branch principle.

7. Securing, for every sphere organ of power, equal rights to control over the other sphere organs, thus preventing or significantly diminishing corruption and abuses of power.

8. Securing the right to equal representation for men and women in sphere organs of power, as well as equal representation for the young.

9. For the post of the head or president of the state, sphere democracy prefers a young person to an old one, a woman to a man. At least four candidates participate in choices on a post of the state head: the young woman and man, elderly woman and man, representing four sphere classes.

10. The Constitution classifies civil rights and freedoms according to society's spheres and people's employment.

11. Introducing the notion of "sphere majority," whereby decisions are made by each sphere class's or organ's majority, rather than by a simple majority.

12. Sphere democracy is directed against the traditional and stale political priority secured for themselves by the power elite of older men, and their characteristic methods of governing society (branch-based, disharmonious, primarily authoritarian, violent, divisive, one-sided, etc.).

13. Constitutional establishment, within certain limits, of an approximate equality among classes (though not individuals!) with regards to property and wealth.

14. Sphere democracy contributes to fair and harmonious globalisation, which enriches, rather than levels, national and regional diversity. Sphere democracy makes easier adopting and disseminating the following **supplemental** staples of diversity: a) artificial language Esperanto as a language for international communication; b) a single global religion as a synthesis of modern world religions; c) regional unions of nation-states erasing a frontiers between them, but not distinctions; d) new, multi-polar world order.

15. Sphere youth mass movements, i.e. new non-violent youth movements organised by employment spheres and aiming at realisation of appropriate sociocultural projects, can trigger off a formation of sphere classes identity and sphere democracy. These movements will prepare, on a mass scale, pre-conditions for sphere democracy. To head the movements, youth leaders are needed, who are educated, on a competitive basis, in appropriate universities, which can be called "Sphere mass movements leaders universities" or " Schools of the presidents ". (As similar university I spend now occupations on sociology and politology with the students.)

16. The transition from a branch to a sphere organization of power, and then to social reproduction balanced on private and state ownership, will allow for rises in labour productivity and rates of socioeconomic development of any country by, in my estimation, a factor of 2 up to 10, by means of the mobilization and harmonization of organizational resource. These are the efficiencies of sphere democracy.

Sphere democracy combines the best features of the social state and lawful state, civil and informational society. It is adequate to a global informational civilisation. Harmonising power and politics, it harmonises society, ensuring its prosperity and victory over total disharmony. Such is the organizational mechanism of sociocultural technology, expressed in general terms.

Harmonisation of employment structures is the glue, that holds together sociocultural technology, connecting all its dimensions and stages. For a society, be it a city, country or the world in general, this is harmonisation of employment of four sphere classes of population or the social structure's harmonisation. For a person, this is harmonisation of a person's employment as harmonisation of the person's structure, composed of a person's sphere needs and abilities. For a family, this is harmonisation of family structure, composed of the sphere components of its reproduction. The same applies to businesses, branches, regions, cities, countries. For a state, this is the harmony between power structures, consisting in equal power distribution between population's four sphere classes. **A change of employment/activity** represents the most important method for employment's harmonisation on all levels, from individuals to society spheres. The

problem of employment change, however, is so complex that it would require a separate study going beyond this small book.

The link between the diametrical sphere structures, that of population and of a person, is the core of sociocultural technology. As we explained above, the sphere structure of population is composed of four sphere classes, which are qualitatively different from traditional branch classes and professional groups in that they are permanent, rather than transient; united and harmonious, rather than antagonistic; socially oriented, rather than self-interested. ONLY SPHERE CLASSES ENSURE JUSTICE AND HARMONY IN SOCIETY. Only sphere classes form a fair and harmonious social structure, ensuring justice and harmony in the state, power, democracy, and resources distribution. Sphere classes are impossible without a person's sphere structure, composed of four kinds of person's sphere necessities and abilities, corresponding with four spheres of social reproduction. ONLY A PERSON'S SPHERE NECESSITIES AND ABILITIES ENSURE JUSTICE AND HARMONY IN A PERSON, THE PERSON'S SUPREME QUALITY. SOCIETY'S HARMONY STARTS WITH A PERSON'S HARMONY. The sphere structures of population and those of a person are as similar as macro- and micro- world. They do not exist without each other. Sphere class identification and structurization in population can happen only on the basis of a person's sphere structurization and identification, and vice versa. These are two sides of a single global sociocultural process, which is just beginning now.

In a society that only recently emerged from its industrial phase, branch structures continue to dominate both in the society and in persons as narrow-scope "one-dimensional" specialists. History and modernity show that branch classes and a persons, and branch processes and structures corresponding with them, do not ensure justice and harmony in the institutions of the state and family. What they do is only create some resources and pre-conditions for harmony. Only the information/network society tackles people's and a person's sphere structure, which forms the basis for solving the problem of people's and a person's harmonisation and prosperity. So, sociocultural technology is born by and for this society. As a theory adequate for the society, TetraSociology offers the society sociocultural technology as a new practice of harmonisation and a new social movement, to make itself known soon.

Sociocultural technology ELIMINATES VIOLENCE IN THE STRUGGLE for sphere structures of power and resources distribution; it accepts only NON-VIOLENT FORMS OF STRUGGLE. This does not mean that sociocultural technology is conflict-free. Operating in the field of total branch disharmony, which is also a field of total conflict, it separates positive, innovative conflicts from the negative, violent, destructive ones⁵⁴. Conflict solving through sociocultural technology is based on identifying the causes in these coordinates/dimensions: resources/statics, processes/dynamics, structures/structuristics, states/genetics.


This is an outline of sociocultural technology, a description of which concludes TetraSociology's theoretical chapter. The paragraphs to follow contain a final figure of coordinates, a table of TetraSociology structure and its relation to globalisation, belief and new racism is opened.

2.15. Continuum and structure of TetraSociology

Four continuums **are constructed** above: **first** - coordinates and variable constants of social space - time; **second**, appropriate to it - the continuum of four dimensions and sections of TetraSociology; **third** - the quantitative continuum of sphere indices, embodied in the information technology (SIST), **fourth** - the continuum of the sphere sociocultural technology of harmony (SSTH). They are incorporated by **the continuum of the social** (HIOM) and together make (create) **one continuum** of TetraSociology which is schematically represented in the following figure. On it each qualitative coordinate and the constant - **24 parameters/dimensions of the social world in total are distinguished** - submitted by an arrow expressing its quantitative changeability.

⁵⁴ Zoi L.N. Practical Konfliktology. Moscow, 2001, p.53-59. In this book the widest classification of the conflicts, in many respects close to a TetraSociology is given.

Fig. 1. One Continua of TetraSociology.



WHERE the continuum of social space - time is:

1. First axis of social space is RESOURCES with constants PIOT: P - People, I - Information, O - Organisations, T - Things;
2. Second axis of social space is PROCESSES with constants PDEC: P - Production, D - Distribution, E - Exchange, C - Consumption;

3. Third axis of social space is STRUCTURES with constants SIOT: S - Social sphere, I - Informational sphere, O - Organisational sphere, T - Technical sphere;

4. Fourth axis is axis of social time - STATES with constants PDDD: P - Prosperity, D - Deceleration, D - Decline, D - Dying.

WHERE the continuum of four measurements and sections of TetraSociology is:

1. Social STATICS, studying and measuring resources PIOT,
2. Social DYNAMICS, studying and measuring processes PDEC,
3. Social SRTUCTURATICS, studying and measuring structures (spheres) SIOT,
4. Social GENETICS, studying and measuring states of development PDDD.

WHERE the continuum of sphere indices and Sphere Informational-Statistical Technology (SIST) is:

1. SIST of a statics as calculation technology of social resources PIOT.
2. SIST of dynamics as calculation technology of social processes PDEC.
3. SIST of structuratics as calculation technology of social structures SIOT.
4. SIST of genetics as calculation technology of social states PDDD.

WHERE the continuum Sphere Sociocultural Technology of Harmony (SSTH) is:

1. SSTH of a statics as harmonisation technology of social resources PIOT.
2. SSTH of dynamics as harmonisation technology of social processes PDEC.
3. SSTH structuratics as harmonisation technology of social structures SIOT.
4. SSTH of genetics as harmonisation technology of social states PDDD.

WHERE the uniting continuum of the Social (HIOM), distinguishing the social world from the natural, is:

1. Human component of the social as reproductive employment (occupation) of people (H).
2. Information component of the social (I).
3. Organisational component of the social (O).
4. Material component of the social (M).

WHERE the double arrows express quantitative, in directions of reduction or increase, variability of constants. Each of them is an **empirical variable** having statistical expression as for global and for any local scale.

The point of crossing of coordinates, their "zero", has some interpretations.

1. At the zero meaning of one or several coordinates, all the system is reduced to zero: the existence of the social world is impossible.
2. The zero meaning expresses the complete identity of coordinates at which their system is reduced to zero, the existence of the social world is impossible.
3. The point of crossing of coordinates as their beginning expresses the reproductive employment of people and the individual which gives a beginning to all the social, to all its parameters. It defines and constructs social space - time, all phenomena of the social world including the individual. Thus, the beginning of the system of coordinates of social space - time is reproductive employment of the individual. Zero of employment means zero of the social, death of society. While the individual is engaged in reproduction the social world lives. Concentrated in this point are both the life and death of the social world, its beginning and end.
4. The point of crossing of coordinates as a beginning of all beginnings of the social world can be interpreted as the identity of the SST continuum with the employment continuum and the social time continuum. This **highest theoretical identity** of TetraSociology **reveals the fundamental unity** of the social world and its space – time structure with people’s reproductive employment and with the time of their lives as social time. **ONE (single) continuum of TetraSociology reflects just this unity as unity of a much - 24 parameters/dimensions of the social world - in tetra rhythmic/metrics.**

In the continuum of TetraSociology the research and harmonious transformation of any element of the social world is possible. On the other hand, each social theory can be considered as a certain interpretation of its continuum or its fragment.

The structure of TetraSociology (TS) can be summarised in the following table.

COORDINATES Of SST	CONSTANTS and SECTIONS of TS	SPHERES and BRANCHES	SPHERE STATISTICS	TECHNOLOGY SIST	TECHNOLOGY SSTH
RESOURCES	Constants PIOT Statics	Spheres and branches PIOT	Statistics of resources PIOT	SIST of resources PIOT	SSTH of resources PIOT
PROCESSES	Constants PDEC Dynamics	Spheres and branches PDEC	Statistics of processes PDEC	SIST of processes PDEC	SSTH of processes PDEC
STRUCTURES	Constants SIOT Structuratics	Spheres and branches SIOT	Statistics of structures SIOT	SIST of structures SIOT	SSTH of structures SIOT
STATES	Constants PDDD Genetics	Cycles and stages PDDD	Statistics of states PDDD	SIST of condition PDDD	SSTH of condition PDDD
TS as macrotheory and global model of the social world	TS as the theory of constants of the social world	TS as set societal (sphere) and branch theories	TS as macrostatistics of the social world	TS as information technology	TS as sociocultural technology

Note. The movement from the left to the right in the summary table expresses the main transition of TetraSociology: the transition from the theory to technologies that take pragmatic advantage of the conceptualisations.

The multidimensionality of TetraSociology beget for musical associations and similarities. The polyphony of Carl Orff's "Carmina Burana" is represented to most adequate to this multidimensionality .

2.16. TetraSociology's globalism and anti-globalism

The world is becoming global, integrated, all its parts are inter-linked. The social world's globalization results from informatization. The social world is global because of a common communicational- information network, rather than by nature. TetraSociology, as we demonstrated above, is a global sociology in every sense: in its scale, cohesion, integration of its parts, and information technologicalness. It meets the criteria distinguishing it from traditional sociology, defined by G.Therborn: 1. It recognises plurality of globalization (plurality and multi-dimensionality of globalization processes), 2. Substitution of the global for the universal, 3. Substitution of space for time, 4. Openness and sensitivity to global changes, 5. Integration into world networks, 6. Empirical stock-taking of international communications in the different parts of the social world⁵⁵. Certainly, globalism's "substitutions" shouldn't be interpreted literally as "discarding, destruction", but rather as a priority ranking, expansion, inclusion. For example, " substitution of space for time" does not mean repudiation of space, but rather understanding it through time, an approach allowing to interpret globalization as "modernity's flight into space," as "oriented toward spatial extension"⁵⁶.

G.Therborn stresses globalization's ambivalence, the ambivalence of its effects. He argues that globalization is not necessarily fair, causing as it does a lot of injustice and having not only positive, but also negative results⁵⁷. He formulates three challenges to globalization at the millennia's threshold: 1. Cognitive: an adequate conceptual explanation of globalization, 2. Civil, aimed at benefiting from globalization and coordinating one's actions in it, 3. Managerial: the problem of a new world order. A world government remains an utopia, while world management becomes a practical challenge⁵⁸. (These globalizational challenges correspond with three non-material spheres of the social world).

Globalization is not new. Therborn refers to six historical waves of globalization and de-globalization, starting with Christianity's and other world religions' globalization. Globalization combines in itself the global (universal) and plural (diverse), world-wide and local, macro- and micro-social. Correlating with these trends, TetraSociology, both as theory and technology, corresponds with globalization trend. It

⁵⁵ Therborn G. Globalisations are Plural. Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance // International Sociology, 2000, 15 (2), p.149-179. Let us note, that Therborn widely uses such concepts, as " resources, processes, structure, dynamics, structuration, multidimensionality, plurality " etc., which are key for a TetraSociology, truth, in another paradigm. The similarity paradigms of both globalization and TetraSociology consists in them multidimensionality and plurality. Therborn's theory of globalization, constructed on system of two coordinates, also is an example of transition from traditional, "dimensionless" pluralism to dimensional postpluralism. The truth, transition this is carried out by the author faster intuitively than consciously.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p.150

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.154

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.153,173

creates not only global (integrated and pluralistic) SST parameters, but also forecasts the coming of a global language (Esperanto), global religion (plurotheism), global sphere classes, global sphere democracy and global tetraharmonious person. However, if Therborn's theory sees the essence of globalization in "tendencies to a world-wide reach, impact or connectedness of social phenomena or to a world-encompassing awareness among social actors"⁵⁹, TetraSociology sees this essence in the formation of new, truly global, sphere social actors, operating throughout the world, and making their appearance in all its parts and at all its levels. Sphere understanding of the globalization essence, certainly, is hypothetical, but it is no less significant than other hypotheses.

Network society is global, therefore its sociologies should be global. TetraSociology is one of these. But its globalism is different from the globalism of industrial society's monistic, essentially imperialistic, sociologies. Based on sphere structures, TetraSociology's globalism, or tetra globalism is harmonious and fair. It repudiates modern civilisation's disharmony and injustice caused by branch structures, including transnational corporations. Globalization often progresses along the old lines today: the poor became poorer, the rich became richer. This is the result of domination by branch structures. It is disharmonious and unfair. Such globalization is the source for the powerful antiglobalist youth movement, whose claims are essentially legitimate. TetraSociology REPUDIATES such a globalization. In this sense, TetraSociology is antiglobalist. It champions a harmonious and fair globalization, a balanced distribution of globalization-engendered wealth among nations and groups. "Globalisation's wealth for everyone, not for the choice few," this principle is shared by antiglobalists and TetraSociology alike. Only sphere classes and groups, only sphere democracy can ensure the fair globalization. Antiglobalists and TetraSociology are not against globalization as such; they are not against the internet, information technologies, mass communications, etc., but rather against profits concentration in TNCs and individual countries. TetraSociology hypothesises that sphere classes and groups and sphere democracy represent the major mechanism able to remedy this modern civilisation's defect. Such is the essence of TetraSociology's globalism and antiglobalism.

2.17. Union with Bahai faith

TetraSociology is a global pluralistic scientific theory that pre-supposes a spiritual affinity with belief and supreme moral values. It accepts all gods of all religions inasmuch as they accept one another and abandon claims to exclusivity. TetraSociology does not claim that it is a religion nor creates one, but it does have a spiritual **likeness and affinity** with Bahai faith, founded by Baha'u'llah nearly 150 years ago. With 6 million followers, it is the second most geographically widespread of the world's religions⁶⁰. Spiritual kinship between Bahai belief as a religion and TetraSociology consists in pluralism of the both. TetraSociology's pluralism is explored above. Regarding religion, it consists in the "plurotheism" idea/hypothesis, recognising equality of all religions of the world as different incarnations of a single god, and necessity for combining them into a single "plurotheist" religion.

Bahai belief's pluralism consists in that this is the only religion that recognises all the other religions. It proclaims "belief in all manifestations," i.e. all prophets/messengers of a single God, whose revelations and religions "are absolutely the same" in this regard. All religions are parts of a single faith. Hence a call to the religions' unification, to a dialog between confessions to develop a global ethical code of major moral values shared by the all religions. The prophets as representatives of different races, cultures, languages, rather than God, determine differences between religions. From Baha'u'llah's viewpoint, he who rejects one religion rejects all of them, so all religions should be recognised, as different insights into God and "facets of the same truth." Not a single religion, including Bahai, can claim the absolute and ultimate truth of God. This truth is beholden to God alone, who reveals it to people gradually and in different forms of different religions. So, the plurotheist idea, arguably, was first formulated by Baha'u'llah within Bahai faith. Herein lies the major similarity between Bahai and TetraSociology, although not the only one.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.154

⁶⁰ In more detail about Bahai faith to look: Baha'u'llah. Kitab-i-Aqdas in <http://bahai-library.org/russian/bha/aqdas/index.html> and essay: Shefer U. Baha'u'llah's Paradigm of Unity in www.geocities.com/wchupin/ftp-collection/PARADIGM.ZIP on Russian.

Bahai faith regards all people as equal citizens of a single country -- the Earth. It admonishes people to unite spiritually and politically, to create a unified social order for all nations based on the pluralistic principle "**unity in diversity**". It considers love of humankind, justice, brotherhood, renouncement of war, and eternal peace to be the supreme values, and humankind's prosperity, the ultimate goal. Bahai recognises a fair globalization, but repudiates an unfair one, the one making the poor more poorer and the rich more richer. TetraSociology completely shares these Bahai ideas; it not simply declares them, but provides a sociological foundation for them and equips them with a technology. Bahai and TetraSociology, therefore, are spiritually kindred and **inter-supplemental as a religion and a science**. Combined, they are bound to become very efficient socially in the network society, where, to paraphrase L. Boltzmann, there is nothing more practical than a technology-equipped theory. This applies to sociological theory too. Its transition to technology is simultaneously a transition from monotheism to plurotheism as a belief adequate to the new global world.

2.18. Resistance to racism: continuation of Wallerstein

In the recent article, I. Wallerstein raised the problem of resistance to new racism in connection with the famous incident: 1999 electoral victory in Austria of a pro-fascist party, Freedom Party, and its leader's, Joerg Haider's, taking a seat in the country's government, which caused the EU to break with Austria⁶¹. Wallerstein writes that the West, though liquidating after 1945 such a form of racism as Nazism, "resuscitated a purified racism" of superiority over, arrogance and inequality regarding immigrants flooding the West. Along with it, "more or less racist parties are springing back into life." The symbol of racism, a dead albatross, "is hanging on our (the West's -- LS) neck." "The racism of the Pan-European world," the world considering **itself the sole** outpost of modern civilisation, rests on world's universal values, on the world-wide capitalist economy, on the middle class' superiority over the immigrant lower class, on a persisting ethnic violence. Wallerstein sees the general cause of racism and all its forms in "**increase of deep inequality**" within the world system, which emerged after 1945 and resuscitated racism's deep historical roots.

Wallerstein writes about his regrets about compartmentalisation and weakness of social science, unable to explain the essence of racism and to confront it not only outside, but inside itself as well. From Wallerstein's viewpoint, **such a social science like this is unable to even minimally resist the new racism**, lacking a new vision of world system needed for this, because the old world system is collapsing and getting chaotically transformed. The author admonishes to fight racism in people's minds and souls, to expiate it, to combine quest for truth with quest for the good, and to create a world system that would "surpass racism." Wallerstein combines all this in the notion of "resistance to racism"⁶². To economic, political, and scientific racism we should probably add linguistic, religious, and cultural racisms, which, too, are hanging on humankind's neck as a dead albatross.

If the essence, and deep roots of new racism, just as those of the old one, lie in social inequality, then the task for social science, sociology first of all, consists in identifying the social inequality's causes and forces to it resisting. Where there is inequality, there are superiority, intolerance, incompatibility, leading to violence or smouldering in mutual alienation of the peoples. One of the profound causes of September 11 terrorist attacks at the U.S. lies in the Western culture's new racism and corresponding mentality, which Wallerstein vividly portrayed. Both terrorism and its profound roots are incarnations of the same: racism. If racism as a belief in the West's fundamental superiority characterises Western pluralistic mentality, then this mentality is akin to monism. Although acknowledging plurality and diversity of cultures, **traditional pluralism has not yet gone as far as acknowledging parity of all the world's cultures, religions, and languages**. Monism is a racism by definition, because it affirms someone's superiority and cultivates the relevant kind of domination. Its bloodiest examples are Fascist and Communist totalitarian regimes in the XXth century, which brought racism to the most brutal extreme. It is a "brutal" racism. Traditional pluralism

⁶¹ Wallerstein I. Albatross of racism: a social science, Joerg Haider and resistance // Sociological studies, 2001, № 10, p.36-46.

⁶² Ibid.

disowns it and does nothing to support it in the open. However, as Wallerstein shows, traditional pluralism implicitly condones a weaker kind racism, which we can call "mild" or "new" and which pre-supposes the West's "fundamental" superiority. But mild racism can turn into the harsh one, while the latter, initially, pretends to be mild. It is traditional, dimensionless pluralism that helped such harsh racists as the Nazi to legally take power in Germany in 1933. Thus, traditional pluralism is but a step to real pluralism or **postpluralism as the recognition of equality of the values cherished by different cultures, religions, languages**. Each culture has supreme values, while also having aspects that other cultures may abhor. These differences, however, shouldn't serve as a basis for asserting one culture's superiority over another (Catholics/Protestants, Israelis/Arabs struggle) or for "holy wars against the impure ones".

Traditional pluralism and social science have a defect preventing them from resisting racism. This defect is the lack of understanding of social equality and its global foundations. **Without understanding equality foundations, social science and pluralistic thinking cannot resist racism**. But raising awareness of equality foundations requires a global theoretical model of the social world. The monistic models were racist and premised on ideologies of inequality. **Only the pluralistic models can serve as the basis for understanding and cultivating social equality**. Among these models, however, **only the definite-dimensional, postpluralistic ones can fulfil this function**, rather than the traditional dimensionless models. TetraSociology is one of the definite-dimensional models. **Recognising social equality of global sphere classes and equal society's necessity for them, TetraSociology builds up a resistance to racism as powerful as can be**. As a "four-dimensional" pluralism, TetraSociology finds in each culture and civilisation the **common** denominator consisting in socially equal sphere classes, who create **special** coordinates and constants for **their** respective social space-time. Certainly, sphere classes as the common denominator look very differently in the different cultures and civilisations. Instead of the old principle of cultural superiority, exclusivity and domination, TetraSociology uses the **principle of equality and inter-supplementality** of all cultures on the basis of equality of global sphere classes.

Thus, TetraSociology moves **from racism to resistance on the basis of recognition of global sphere classes' equality**; it proposes the following courses of action for the sociocultural renovation of traditional pluralistic mentality and the social sciences. These courses of action are presented in the appropriate projects (listed below) designed to achieve harmony using sociocultural technology.

1. Sphere classes and groups are sources of all persons', countries', nations', cultures' and civilizations' equality; **they are actors for overcoming racism in all its forms and for resisting it**; they are creators of social harmony and prosperity.

2. **Esperanto is the classes' and groups' common language**, which, acceptable and accessible for all cultures, supplements, rather than eliminates ethnic languages. Rejecting English as a universal language means repudiating linguistic racism, while adopting Esperanto as the language for international communication **is a resistance to linguistic racism** and an instrument for achieving of linguistic harmony.

3. **Sphere classes' common religion is plurotheism**, which, acceptable and accessible for all cultures, supplements religions already existing, rather than eliminates them; it is built on mutual tolerance and synthesis of the religions' foundations. **Plurotheism is a resistance to religious racism** and an instrument for achieving of religious harmony.

4. The global type of sphere classes democracy is **sphere social democracy**, acceptable and accessible for all social groups; it pre-suppose equal representation of four sphere classes in all branches of political power. Sphere democracy **is a resistance to political and gender racism** and an instrument for achieving of political harmony.

5. Wealth distribution pattern common for different market systems is a sphere one, which pre-supposes an **approximately equal property distribution among sphere classes**, and a balance of sphere markets, and eliminates the outlandish, inordinate and unfair disparities between the poor and the rich. Sphere distribution of material wealth **is a resistance to economic racism** and an instrument for achieving of economic harmony.

6. New form of family -- tetragamy (two wives, two husbands), which supplements, rather than eliminates, traditional forms of mono- and polygamous family. **Tetragamy is a resistance to all**

manifestations of family racism and an instrument for achieving of the family harmony and harmonious rearing of children in families.

7. New form of personality's development: tetraharmonious, which, acceptable and available for all cultures, supplements, rather than eliminates, traditional forms of a personality's development. **TetraHarmonious development of a personality is a resistance to her one-sided development, to "one-dimensionality racism"** and an instrument for achieving of personal harmony.

8. A common instrument for an all-round monitoring of all kinds of negative social deviations, first of all terrorism -- sphere statistics and appropriate information technology. **Sphere statistics is a resistance to the branches' statistical, informational racism**, and to terrorism and crime; it is also an instrument for informational harmony. Sociocultural prevention of terrorism through neutralisation of racism as the terrorism cause does not rule out appropriate military methods of struggle; resting all the hopes with them, however, is inefficient. As September 11 terrorist attacks show, the U.S. military and intelligence machine couldn't investigate them nor prevent. Terrorism and the danger of it represent the most dangerous and fast growing challenge to the world today. **It is an AIDS of the humankind grown from racism** and it calls for immediate and large-scale global actions, both sociocultural and military ones. First of all, it needs a systemic analysis and pluralistic sociocultural technology for anti-terrorism. **Resisting racism is resisting terrorism and vice versa**. This resistance is multi-dimensional and needs an adequate multi-dimensional theory and technology, versions of which TetraSociology offers.

All eight aspects of appropriate sociocultural technology outlined above are courses of action and instruments for multi-dimensional pluralistic resistance. Below they are presented as abstracts describing sociocultural projects submitted to the XVth World Congress of Sociology (WCS). So we should regard them as a problem raised and to be solved, rather than as a finished product.

PART 2. RESPONSES TO CHALLENGES: SOCIOCULTURAL PROJECTS

The book's second part presents the thirteen sociocultural TetraSociological projects as possible responses to some of the XXIst century's challenges. We want to stress again that our project proposals **are exploratory, tentative and hypothetical**. They are summarized in very brief abstracts, to be submitted at sessions of the XVth WCS. Project "Tetraempirism" is to build the **empirical basis for all the projects** proposed, so it comes first. Four projects after it concern the social sphere, the next three, informational, and the following two, organizational and technical spheres respectively. Three last projects are not as global as the previous ones, but significant in their own way nonetheless. They are distinguished for their national or organizational specificity.

1. The list of TetraSociology abstracts submitted to the 32 sessions of the XVth WCS

In 2001, the author made 32 abstracts for the WCS sessions and forwarded them to the sessions' chairpersons. Besides fulfilling the main function -- to introduce sociocultural projects -- the abstracts also serve other purposes. First, they are intended to give an idea of TetraSociology's scope, **its ability** to respond to many contemporary problems. Second, they are a kind of sociological **test** to fathom TetraSociology's acceptability for Western specialists, who are not aware of it: not a single publication on the subject has appeared in the West. The author was interested to learn how Western sociologists would treat a new theory, how many abstracts would be accepted, how many not accepted, how many would receive no response. Of 32 abstracts, 9 (28%) were ACCEPTED; 12 (37,5%), NOT ACCEPTED; 11 (34,5%) NO RESPONSE. This is an empirical fact. For an **unknown** theory, the **initial** approval rate of 28% is probably the quite good result, attesting to its substantiality. Certainly, forming an opinion about a new paradigm from brief (200-500 words) abstracts outlining fairly ambitious projects is not easy, which explains a big non-response rate. This also explains a high rejection rate. True, in some cases the reason for rejections lied not in the abstracts' content, but in the sessions' limited time-allotments, which cannot accommodate all those sending the abstracts. Understandably, the sessions' chairpersons' individual qualities account in a big part for the reactions to the abstracts: accepted, not accepted, no response. What has also important is that the **abstracts'**

quality varies: some are better, some are worse. But overall the abstracts do give an idea of TetraSociology and its sociocultural projects.

The abstracts are listed with the title first, then the Research Committee's name and number, then the session's number and name, then the session's or committee's chairperson's name and country, then the chairperson's or committee's decision on the abstract: accepted, not accepted, no response.

List of Leo M. Semashko's Abstracts submitted on 32 Sessions of ISA XV World Congresses of Sociology

1. TetraSociology: Peace Jerusalem, the Lessons of the XXth Century

RC01 Armed Forces & Conflict Resolution

Session 5: World in New Millennium: the Lessons of the XXth Century

Chair: Proshanta Nandi, India. NOT ACCEPTED

2. Tetra Format of Sociological Education: Innovative Experience

RC04 Sociology of Education

Session 8: Education and Society: the New Challenges

Secretary: Ari Antikainen, Finland. ACCEPTED

3. TetraSociology: Hypothesis of TetraGamy as New Family Form

RC06 Family Research

Session 2: New family forms

Chair: Jan Trost, Sweden. ACCEPTED

4. TetraSociology: Hypothesis of TetraGamy

RC07 Futures Research

Session 4: The social world of the XXIst century: the future of family and kinship culture

Chair: Lorne Tepperman, Canada. NO RESPONSE

5. TetraSociology: Hypothesis of Pluratheism

RC07 Futures Research

Session 4: Religion in the social world of the 21st century: toward a world ethos

Chair: Rudolf J. Siebert, USA ACCEPTED

6. Social Use of TetraSociology as Information Technology

RC14 Sociology of Communication, Knowledge & Culture

Session 10 Social uses of information and communication technology

RC14 President, Gaetan Tremblay, Canada ACCEPTED

7. TetraSociological Theory: Universalism of Four-dimensional Continuum of Social Space - Time

RC16 Sociological Theory

Session 6: Can there be post-modern universalism?

Convenor: Jeffrey Alexander, USA. NO RESPONSE

8. TetraSociology: New Philosophy of Social Space - Time

RC16 Sociological Theory

Session 10: New philosophies of social science

Convenor: Patrick Baert, UK NOT ACCEPTED

9. TetraSociological Theory: for What, of What and for Whom?

RC16 Sociological Theory

Session 12: Theories for what, of what and for whom?

Convenor: Piotr Sztompka, Poland NO RESPONSE

10. TetraSociology as the Adequate Feminist Sociological Theory

RC16 Sociological Theory

Session 14: The feminist challenge to sociological theory.

Convenor: Sasha Roseneil, UK. NOT ACCEPTED

11. TetraSociology: Sphere Quality of Classes and Democracy in the XXIst Century

RC18 Political Sociology

Session 4: The quality of democracy in the 21st century

Co-Chair: Eva Etzioni-Halevy, Israel. NO RESPONSE

12.TetraSociology: Hypothesis of Pluratheism as Tolerance and Union of Religions

RC22 Sociology of Religion

Session 5: Religious tolerance and intolerance

Convenor: Ivan Varga, Canada. NOT ACCEPTED

13.TetraSociology as Social Theory of Ecological Harmony

RC24 Environment & Society

Session 7: Social theory and the environment

Chair: Frederick H. Buttel, USA. NOT ACCEPTED

14.TetraSociology: The Ecological Modernization and Harmony Through Social Modernization and Harmony

RC24 Environment & Society

Session 9: Ecological modernization: theory and practice

Chair: Frederick H. Buttel, USA. NO RESPONSE

15.TetraSociology: Esperanto as the One Language of Technologies and Intercourse in the XX1st century

RC25 Sociolinguistics

Session 4: Language, technology and work

Chair: Max Travers, UK. ACCEPTED

16.TetraSociology: Discovery of New Statistics

RC26 Sociotechnics, Sociological Practice

Session 6: Applying sociological knowledge: the challenges of sociotechnics and sociological practice

RC26 President: John Alexander, Canada ACCEPTED

17.TetraSociology as the Adequate Feminist Sociological Theory

RC32 Women in Society

Session 5: Feminist sociological theory

Organizer: Eva Blay, Brazil. NO RESPONSE

18.TetraSociology: Discovery of New Statistics - Revolution for Quantitative Sociology

RC33 Logic & Methodology in Sociology

Session 7: Qualitative (?) computing - a revolution for qualitative (?) sociology

Chair: Edith D. De Leeuw, Netherlands. NO RESPONSE

19.TetraSociological Statistics: Conversion of General Method in Tetraempiricism

RC33 Logic & Methodology in Sociology

Session 11: General Methods and Statistics

Chair: Edith D. De Leeuw, Netherlands. NO RESPONSE

20.TetraSociology: Constructing and Using of Four-Dimensional Social Space - Time in the Analysis of Youth

RC34 Sociology of Youth

Session 5.9: Constructing and using of space, time and place.

Chair: Carmen Leccardi, Italy. NOT ACCEPTED

21.TetraSociology: the Concept of Sphere Global Democracy

RC35 Committee on Conceptual & Terminological Analysis

Session 1: The concept of global democracy

Organizer: Henry Teune, USA. NO RESPONSE

22.TetraSociology: the Concept of Four-Dimensional Social Space - Time as Four-Dimensional Concept of Society

RC35 Committee on Conceptual & Terminological Analysis

Session 3: The concept of society

Organizer: Martin Albrow, UK. ACCEPTED

23.Russian Sphere Classes: Formation of New Actors

RC47 Social Classes & Social Movements

Session 2. The formation of new actors

President of RC47, François Dubet, France. ACCEPTED

24. TetraSociology: Peace and Global Jerusalem

RC48 Social Movements, Collective Action and Social Change

Session 2. Political conflict, violence and social movements

Chair: Tamar Herman, Israel. NOT ACCEPTED

25. TetraSociological Modeling of Social World: Transition from Theory to Computer Technology.

RC51 Sociocybernetics

Session 4: Modeling the Social World by Using Computers

Session Organizer: Cor Van Dijkum, Netherlands. NOT ACCEPTED

26. TetraSociology as New Paradigm of Understanding Society

RC51 Sociocybernetics

Session 5: New Paradigms for Understanding Society

Session Organizer: Vladimir Dimitrov, Australia. NOT ACCEPTED

27. TetraSociology as World-System Analysis in the Twenty-First Century

RC51 Sociocybernetics

Session 9: World-Systems Analysis in the Twenty-First Century

Program Coordinator, Bernard Scott, UK. NOT ACCEPTED

28. TetraSociology as the Answer on Childhood Challenge to Sociological Theory

RC53 Sociology of Childhood

Session 1: Childhood and sociological theory

Organizer: Robert van Krieken, NO RESPONSE

29. TetraSociology: the Game Social Space-Time of Children

RC53 Sociology of Childhood

Session 7: Children in time and space

Organizer: Helga Zeiher, Germany. NOT ACCEPTED

30. TetraSociological Statistics: New System of the Social Indicators

WG06 Social Indicators

Chair: Robert A. Cummins, Australia. ACCEPTED

31. TetraSociology: Russian Sphere Classes - Formation of New Actors

Russian Speaking Forum

Session 2. Contemporary Russia as a process: where does it lead?

Chair: Nikita Pokrovsky, Russia. NO RESPONSE

32. TetraSociological Statistics as the Means of Multi-Faceted Surveillance and Prevention of Terrorist Attacks in Information Societies

Ad Hoc Session on Surveillance in Information Societies

Chair: David Lyon, Canada. NOT ACCEPTED

From them only those abstracts are placed below, which express appropriate sociocultural projects. Other abstracts duplicating the theoretical contents of TetraSociology are not placed. All projects, except for two last, **are global and long-term designed not for one decade**. These projects, in spite of hypotheticness, create, from our point of view, new quality both **empiricism and pragmatism of sociology** open before it completely new applied horizons.

2. Tetraempirism

This project is to round out the methods for tetraempirical studies, i.e. empirical studies of any social phenomenon with application of sphere indices in four (hence the name: tetra-, i.e. four-dimensional empirical study) dimensions: statics/resources, dynamics/processes, structuratics/structures, genetics/developmental states. A detailed description of a tetraempirical study is provided below, in the "Russian Theoretical Sociology" chapter. Tetraempirical studies create a qualitatively new empirical basis for sociological research at all levels, which is described in the appropriate abstract.

TetraSociology: Conversion of Theoretical Method in Tetraempiricism **RC33 session 11**

TetraSociology is a global theory of four-dimensional social space - time which simultaneously is a general theoretical method. The discovery in its framework of qualitative new, sociological statistics allows to convert this method in qualitatively new empirical method, which possible to name "tetraempirical" (or "tetraempiricism") according to the theory creating its.

Tetraempiricism overcomes limitations of sociological opinion polls and economic statistics but does not exclude and supplement them. Advantages of tetraempiricism:

1. Universal system of new quantitative (statistical, empirical) indexes and common information technology of their formation and processing.
2. Synthesis of theoretical and empirical researches on all micro -, meso -, and macro- levels of society overcoming of their breaks.
3. Classification of tetraempirical researches on coordinates and constants of social space - time. The allocation in them of researches of a statics/resources, dynamics/processes, structuratics/structures, genetics/states, within the framework of which will be carried out study of all aspects of the social phenomena.
4. Maintenance of the programs, hypotheses, techniques of empirical researches by the general theoretical basis and common information technology. This will allow to overcome their unsystematic character, incomparability and separation, to leave from 'sociology of trifles' (P.Sorokin).

Tetraempiricism transforms the sociological theory into experimental and exact science and for empirical researches it gives quality of fundamentality. It is result of pluralism conversion from the theory in technology in TetraSociology framework.

This sociocultural project gives the response to that challenges of modernity, which consists in disparity, limitation and weakness of existing empirical toolkit of sociology, which is not capable to put it on a level of the modern science about a society.

3. Sphere classes, children, the young, women

This sociocultural project gives the answer to a question about the new social actors of the XX1st century capable harmonising the social world and to ensure to it prosperity. The given project is by the **major** sociocultural project of TetraSociology, which opens a social basis **for all** other projects. It includes an analysis of sphere classes' and groups' statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics; statistical estimate of the classes'/groups' numbers in each country and the whole world; and the study of their stratification and mobility in different spheres and countries. It gives the answer to the **main** question of modernity: **what** the social actors are capable to give the responses to global challenges of the XX1st century. Some aspects of this project are submitted in the following abstracts.

TetraSociology: Russian Sphere Classes - Formation of New Actors

RC47. Russian forum.

TetraSociology distinguishes in society four spheres of reproduction: social, information, organizational, technical. **On the criterion of the reproduction of employment, all the population of Russia is distributed in these spheres, forming sphere classes: Humanitarian (Social), Information, Organizational, Technical.** The number of these Russian classes is in 1991 and 1996 accordingly in millions of persons.

The humanitarian class consists of, at first, the employed in branches of public health services, education, social maintenance, physical culture and sports, church (6,8; 7,1), second, not working, but employed by self-reproduction - pensioners, invalids, children, housewives, jobless (74,8; 82,0). Its common number: 81,6 and 89,1.

The information class consists of the employed in branches: science, designing, information service, communication, culture. Its common number: 8,5 and 7,4.

The organizational class consists of the employed in branches of management, jurisprudence, finance, policy. Its common number: 4,0 and 4,6.

The technical class consists of the employed in industries, agriculture, construction, transport, trade and etc. Its common number: 54,4 and 46,9.

The main social contrast of Russia is that the smallest class of country - organizational possesses and disposes mostly of all country resources. This misbalance has reduced country in decline. But it is the main reason of formation of Russian **sphere classes as actors of social harmony, excluding of the class struggle and antagonism. The similar sphere classes can be allocated in any country of the world.**

TetraSociology: the Game Social Space-Time of Children

RC53, session 7.

The problem of social space - time is until unsolved sociological problem now. One variant of its solution is TetraSociology as the pluralistic theory. In it the social space-time is considered as four-dimensional in system of four coordinate / measurements: Resources, Processes, Structures, States. From them first three coordinates are space and fourth is temporal. Each coordinate is expressed by four variable constants which in their turn are expressed by new statistical indices called sociological or sphere.

The social space-time of children as well as adults has the same coordinates, constants and indices but it has one qualitative difference: it has a game character. The children's relations and occupations are game as the form of children preparation for adult relations and occupations. As far as completely children's games envelop coordinates and constants of social space - time so completely and harmonic children are prepared for adult life. Definition of parameters of children's game life creates methodological basis of childhood sociological researches.

According to four coordinates all children's games are divided on four large groups: 1. Static - games with resources, resource games, 2. Dynamic - games with processes, process games, 3. Structuratic - games with structures, institutional games, 4. Genetic - games with states, temporal games. First are the simplest and last are the most complicated, including the elements first and available for eldest group of children.

We shall name the elementary examples of resource games. The social resources in TetraSociology include four constant groups: People, Information, Organizations, Things. Four classes children's resource games are accordingly selected which conditionally named Humanitarian, Information, Organizational, Technical.

The humanitarian games are games in "people", "professions": "daughters-mothers", "teachers, doctors, pilots, seamen, firemen, cosmonauts " etc. To this class it is necessary to refer and sports games promoted to physical, volitional and moral development of children forming of their character.

The information games are games with information, intellectual games: "guesses", headaches, rebuses, crosswords etc. There are art games and art occupations as games here. In information society this class includes a huge set of computer games which take priority place in children's game world of this society.

The organizational games are games with organizations: the military, administrative, legal, financial etc.

The technical games are games with different things and technics: industrial, building, transport, agricultural etc. The various kinds of children's designing and modelling concern to this class: ship-, air-, electro-, radio- etc.

The children's world is the game world in the same coordinates and constants of social space - time as adults' world. The children's world is the game modelling and assimilation of its coordinates and constants. Quality and structure of the game children's world determine quality and structure of their socialization, their sociological imagination and preparation for adult life. Quality of youth, quality of the person generally are determined by quality of childhood and it is defined by game space - time of children.

TetraSociology as the Response on Childhood Challenge to Sociological Theory

RC53, session 1.

The new information / network society advances youth and children in number of priority social groups of the XX1st century. The requirements to education of children are increased at school and in family considerably. Their traditional systems do not give them new quality that determine rising challenge of childhood. The new quality of training children and children's person in network society requires the new sociological theory.

In history of sociology all theories, with rare exception, ignored interests of children. Until now there is no theory answering their interests. Let us state a **hypothesis: the traditional monistic theories are not relevant to interests of children but only pluralistic theories are relevant to them.** One of them arisen in end of the XXth century is TetraSociology as the pluralistic theory of four-dimensional social space - time in four its of coordinates / measurements: Resources, Processes, Structures, States. TetraSociology is one of the possible responses on childhood challenge to sociological theory. It makes the following conclusions.

1. Rights of children formulated in the UN Declaration on Children Rights are united in four groups appropriate to spheres of life of society and children. Infringement of children rights should be qualified as **criminal and/or moral crime before children** with the appropriate sanctions. 1. (On the basis of TetraSociology and its appendices to childhood in 1991 by group of the scientists and lawyer of Children's fund by name of F.M.Dostoevsky, which president was I, the **first Family code project** of new, postkommunist Russia is developed.)
2. The interests of harmonic and reliable development of children are answered not monogamous family which is adequate to man's domination **but tetragamy (two wives and two husbands) which creates also family equal rights to women, and family reliability to children, and new quality of their family education.**
3. The adequate status of childhood requires **allotment of the minors by the election right which is passed to the parents, mothers first of all.** It will eliminate political discrimination of interests of children saved until now.
4. The **harmonic school education of children requires balance of school disciplines and programs on four spheres** of society and children life. (Project of similar school reform of Russia is developed by me in 1988.)

TetraSociology giving the substantiation to these conclusions is the theory adequate to interests of childhood.

TetraSociology: Constructing and Using of Four-Dimensional Social Space - Time in the Analysis of Youth

RC34, session 5.9.

The sociological analysis of social space - time (SST) of youth lifts its research on new level. TetraSociology is one of the pluralistic theories of SST. TetraSociology opens the statics, dynamics, structuratics and genetics of youth, its situation in coordinates of SST, dependence of its the actions from social resources, processes, structures (institutes) and states. It analyzes functions of SST as the important principles of organization for private and public experience of youth as tools of constructing of their identity and structuring of their social practices. On the basis of these parameters the diversity of concrete places of daily live of youth is investigated. But it considers time and its acceleration priority in relation to coordinates of space.

The research of a statics, dynamics, structuratics and genetics of the youth conflicts in coordinates the SST allows to outline profiles of 'resistance identities' of the young people to understand use by them of features the SST as the weapon, in particular, against globalization and in protection of the traditional forms. **The youth should master sociological principles of constructing and using of SST. It is necessary for harmonization of itself social practices vital biography personal growth.** Technological using of new statistics based on new, sphere, indices of SST opens before youth a new input in cyberspace, globalization and calculation of SST parameters with the purpose of them harmonization.

TetraSociology as the Response on Feminist Challenge to Sociological Theory

RC16, session 14. RC32, session 5.

Actuality of the gender equality problem in all society spheres, completeness of women rights on a level with men is not reduced but increased. On information of " UN Fund Development for Women " for last 10 years only 8 countries have executed the international conventions on observance of sexes equality principle. The women continue to make majority poor and have not equivalent access to all resources. Despite of series of significant successes the discrimination does not cease, up to equality far, and in series of cases the status of women was even reduced.

Among many social reasons of gender inequality the considerable role belongs to sociological theory. In history of sociology **almost all of its theories, behind single exceptions, were created by men and for men.** The domination of men in all society spheres was reflected in theory. Until now there is no sociological theory which answered on interests of women. **To feminism and gender equality of rights resist political totalitarianism, man's extremism, religious fundamentalism, theoretical monism, common in essence.**

Let us **state hypothesis: the theories of monistic quality answered the interests of men and the theories of pluralistic character answered the interests of men and women.** One of them is TetraSociology arisen in end of the XXth century. Principal values of TetraSociology are harmony and equilibrium including gender.

TetraSociology is one of the possible response on feminist challenge on the following positions.

1. The **masculine potential of aggression and violence exploited by the past loses the social priority** in information / network society.
2. The masculine priority in the past put foundation of modern civilisation but the female priority will give perfection and new source of its development. **This priority is created by real female equality.**
3. In information society accepting ideal of social prosperity on base of harmony and information **priority gain female harmony and peaceful** disposition.
4. It is necessary for prosperity: a) **equal participation** of women in all spheres include government, b) **equal right to power** of four sphere classes of population and **women**, c) **passage from monogamy as dominance man to tetragamy** (two wives and two husbands) as real family equality women, d) appropriation to minors of the election rights which are passed to the parents, first to mothers, e) **recognizing of female labour in family as equitable labour.**
5. TetraSociology affirming necessity of equal participation of women in all spheres, including government, is **feminist theory adequate to interests both women and men.**

4. Pluralistic TetraSociological education

This sociocultural project reflects the need in restructuring sociological education according to the principles of postpluralism, ensuring the formation of the **new, constructive social thinking in young people.** Without the such thinking, adequate for the new century, it is impossible to respond to the century's challenges, to form a sphere identification in the young, to realize global sociocultural projects of harmony and prosperity. The author has been introducing since 1994 new lecture and seminar courses in sociology in different higher education institutions and a secondary school in St.Petersburg. The experiment results, constituting the practical basis of this sociocultural project, are briefly outlined in the appropriate abstract.

Tetrah Format of Sociological Education: Innovative Experience and Response to Challenge

RC04, session 8.

Tetrah format of sociological education is a teaching of TetraSociology as global sociological theory. The basis of TetraSociology is the four-dimensional continuum of social space - time represented by four coordinates: Resources, Processes, Structures, States. Each coordinate is researched in appropriate social theory/part of tetrasociology: Statics, Dynamics, Structuratics, Genetics, in each of which the appropriate four variable constants are considered. The centre of TetraSociology as empiricism is the system of the aggregated, new sphere/sociological statistical indices expressing quantitative changeability of social constants of many social phenomena from the individual up to the world society.

TetraSociology (Sphere Approach) has been developed by me since 1975, but I could teach it in high schools of St.-Petersburg **only** since 1994. Since then researches are indissoluble combined with tutoring at different faculties (technical, economic, legal) of St-Petersburg's universities, in different rates: ' Common Sociology ', ' Politology ', ' Sociology of Person ', ' Family ', ' Policy ', ' Right ', ' Culture ' in universities of St. Petersburg.

The publications on TetraSociology were practically impossible in Russia till 1991, and after that were extremely hampered. However in 1999 I published the first part of the text-book for the students under the title ' Sociology for Pragmatists. From Monism to Tetrism ' (376 p.).

The main purpose of my course of Sociology, which is now named: ' TetraSociology: Prosperity through Harmony', consists **in forming of pluralistic, four-dimensional sociological thinking/imagination of students** and in refusal from one-dimensional, monistic, first of all Marxist thinking as inadequate to many-dimensionality of the individual and modern information society. In all themes of the rate the main idea of pluralistic, many-dimensional vision of society is represented to the students. It consists in recognizing **equal** necessity of many **different** social constants: Resources of society (People, Information, Organization, Things), Processes of their reproduction (Production, Distribution, Exchange, Consumption), Structures/spheres of their reproduction (Social, Information, Organizational, Technical), States of social evolution (Prosperity, Deceleration, Decline, Dying). On duration the rate is varied in limits from 156 till 16 hours for different audiences.

On seminar occupations the students express and form own convictions in free tolerant discussions. On inquiries, **85 % students have pluralistic convictions and at the teachers, for a comparison, have only 20%**. This is, approximately, the **measure of pluralism in modern Russia at different generations**. It expresses the difficulties of consolidation of pluralistic sociological education of students in Russia and powerful obstacles in the way of its official recognizing.

Pluralistic format of sociological education in Russia was represented in lecture rates and text-books of M.Kovalevsky, P.Sorokin and their followers till 1918. In Soviet Russia **any pluralistic education was excluded in essence. It practically absent down to the present time**. It is even not fixed in the State educational standard on sociology. The exceptions make the extremely rare, single, author's rates, including my. TetraSociological education is actual not only for Russia. In view of TetraSociology globality, this education can make the sociocultural project for international and interdisciplinary cooperation. It will become one of the responses to challenges of education in general, sociological in particular.

5. Tetragamy: supplement to monogamy

This sociocultural project concerns the destiny of so a basic society institution as family, traditional forms of which, in general opinion, has been long in crisis, posing the challenge to this institution. At first sight, the idea of tetragamy (two wives, two husbands) seems so "crazy" as to be rejected right away. However, if we approach the problem thoughtfully rather than through the prism of an established dogma, if we take into consideration that polygamous and polyandrous types of family have been long around and, along with monogamy, are now experiencing a crisis, then why cannot we accept a balanced poly-marriage involving two women and two men as a supplement to the traditional forms? Tetragamy is yet considered as a **theoretical hypothesis** of a person's and family's harmonious development. But this hypothesis is an inevitable result and a demand produced not only by theory, but also by modern society, which is ripe for tetragamy and has the all conditions in place for it. **Psychology is the main obstacle to tetragamy**. All people, men and women, **are divided, psychologically, into two big groups: the monogamous and the polygamous**. Monogamy is fit for monogamous group, while for polygamous group, not only traditional polygamous marriage and family are befitting, but also the new, culturally bounded form of group family: tetragamy. Tetragamy, therefore, is regarded **only as a supplement** to monogamy and other traditional forms and as acceptable **only for polygamous group**. This project is one of TetraSociology's most controversial projects; however, it is not offered as an immediate solution, but is rather expected to get developed over **several decades**. The abstract below outlines some of the project's ideas.

TetraSociology: Hypothesis of Tetragamy as New Family Form

RC07, session 4. RC06, session 2.

Tendency 'of radical alteration' and 'disintegration' of monogamic family institute is well-known. It becomes less adequate to modern requests. **More than half** of husbands are unfaithful to wives, have mistress and **about half** of wives are unfaithful to husbands, have lover. Considerable part of western people lives in the diverse forms "non-standard" (unmonogamic) family. For example at USA in them lives from 27 up to 53 percents of the population (N.Smelser, 1988)

This tendency is generalised by TetraSociology in a new fashion. From its point of view the optimum of any social phenomenon is made by harmony of four resources, for family - four spouses. In TetraSociology the **hypothesis** of origin and wide spreading **in 2nd half of the XX1st century** of the new family form - TETRAR (fourfold), **including two husbands and two wives**, is advanced. Its single examples are met already now. Such form of family and matrimony can be called as **TETRAGAMY**. It has its features and advantages.

1. Tetragamy is acceptable **ONLY** to those men and women, which are capable to have not one, and two sexual partners. **About half of married women and more than half of married men, having nowadays the second sexual partner, there are capable to tetragamy in principle already today.** Naturally, tetragamy can be **only** voluntary, based on the consent and mutual love all its members.
2. Tetragamy represents the cultural form of group matrimony corresponding of the requirements of twinning and gender balance, ordering its modern chaotic forms.
3. Dignities of tetragamy is the **new quality**: a) of family upbringing and the development of children; b) of sexual and psychological relations between the partners, c) of relations between the parents and children, d) of gender equality, e) of family harmony.
4. From tetragamy everybody essentially win: men and women, adults and children, but most of all - children and women. Tetragamy is capable to decide demographic problem. Certainly tetragamy has defects but they are outweighed by dignities. Tetragamy is subject of the interdisciplinary and international researches for many decades, one of the possible responses to the family challenges.

6. Plurotheism: synthesis of religions

This sociocultural project, also expected to take decades to develop, is to unite religions in a single global world-wide religion, called **plurotheism**, with one pantheon of gods. Plurotheism is not the polytheism of the past, any more than the monotheism of modern religions; rather, it is an organic synthesis of the religions as equal. One of ancient analogues of plurotheism can consider a recognition antique Romans of the gods of the countries seized by them. They placed these deities in Pantheon with the purpose to extinguish the international conflicts and to keep unity of the Roman empire. It is well known that the tendency to religions' unite began over a century ago with the ecumenical movement and inter-confessional dialog, but was not very successful. What accounts for the disconnection, and often conflicts and antagonisms between religions is that neither the state, nor science, nor UN, etc., can unite the religions: only a religion can do that. The joining can happen only on the basis of the religion which would clearly differentiate between the single true god, unknown and inaccessible to any religions, and particular gods championed by particular confessions; this new religion would regard the "particular" gods as partial revelations of the single true god. These revelations occur due to "particular" prophets, begotten by cultures just as particular/partial, rather than by god. Only such a religion can unite the gods of all religions and become a true intermediary in this extremely complex, long and convoluted process. But this process is vitally important. **Global world needs a global religion**, which is certain to arrive.

Of all religions, we think that only Bahai faith is capable to unit religions. So, this sociocultural project is intended to help Bahai faith to accomplish the synthesis of religions and to demonstrate to all believers that, rather than disadvantage anyone, the unity of religions and churches will nurture the most sacred values of mutual love, fraternity, peace, and harmony, eventually bringing prosperity. Every believer acknowledging a common religion, which can be called "Bahai faith" or "plurotheism" or whatever, can worship any single god, or several gods, or all of the integrated gods at once. This is a matter **ONLY** of the believer's religious consciousness, and no one else's, -- the consciousness that does not **IN ANY WAY**

distinguish, humiliate or raise him over any other believer. What has important is the faith in a god, it does not matter which one; a choice is for individual believers alone to make.

A common faith is a faith of people who are equal. Different faiths are faiths of people who are **unequal**; differences between the faiths foster, promote and sanctify world inequality, leading to global conflict, to clash of civilizations, to religion-inspired wars, be they quiet or hot, to disharmony of the already disharmonious social world. Global world can exist only in harmony; otherwise, it is bound to cease to exist. Global world vitally needs a global common faith, the faith of people who are equal, the faith of equality. Discovering the basis for global social equality in sphere classes, TetraSociology **discovers of the social foundations for unity of religions**, while Bahai faith discovers the religious foundations; this brings TetraSociology and Bahatism close together. Next abstract gives a rundown on the sociocultural project for religions' unity and consent in plurotheism.

TetraSociology: Hypothesis of Pluratheism as Tolerance and Union of Religions

RC07, session 4. RC22, session 5.

Modern world is united by processes of globalization, remaining pluralistic and saving originality in regions. The similar process envelops religions.

TetraSociology advances hypothesis of PLURATHEISM as the possible way of religions union on the basis of unity of four world religions at intermediary and on a platform of Bahai belief. TetraSociology is the theory of four-dimensional social space - time. It considers religions as DIFFERENT IMAGES of ONE GOD created in different cultural priorities of common social space - time. Pluratheism is union of many Gods in frames U.Shefer's (1996) 'paradigm of unity' of religions, which is found out by him in Bahai belief.

The social nature of religion is contradictory. Religions are monotheistic reflecting the one God but simultaneously they are polytheistic reflecting Him in mirrors of different cultures. Earlier dominated polytheism was replaced by monotheism. Now the time of religions union at preservation of their uniqueness came. Pluratheism corresponds to it. Its principles:

1. Equality of all religions as different images of one God. The faith in anyone His image is One Faith.
2. Equal right on life of all religions recognizing one God for all.
3. All religions have in one God the basis of unity expressed by common spiritual values.
4. There is form of common values recognizing acceptable to all religions.
5. All religions have inalienable right on preservation of originality in any union by P.Tillich's principle of religions **supplementation** and according to ecumenical theology.
6. Arbitration and mediation of other religions are accepted in interconfessional conflicts of two religions.
7. Uniform analysis and evaluation of each religion in general coordinates of social space - time. (Here help of the sociologists is necessary to religions.)

Pluratheism keeps the originality of religions. At the first stage to it to not avoid of an eclecticism. It is new statement of interconfessional dialogue question and the religions tolerance. It is the response to religious challenge. However, rather than traditional branch actors (groups, classes), it's sphere classes as actors of harmony that need plurotheism as a single global belief. Until they self-identify and self-organize, emergence of a single common belief is unlikely. It is difficult to hope for origin of a single belief without it.

7. Esperanto: language for international communication

This project, like the previous ones, is expected to take decades to evolve; the project is to gradually disseminate across the world a single language for international communication; we believe that only Esperanto is fit for the purpose. Global world with the unified information network, unified economy, unified sphere classes and, in the future, an unified religion, needs a unified language. Serving only the purpose of international communication, such a language is **to supplement the languages already existing**, rather than to replace them. The limitation by this function will not allow it to change the international communication by ethnic peculiarities of one or another natural language.

English, spread widely today, cannot efficiently serve as an international communication language precisely because of its national specificity. English as the international communication language signifies

social inequality among languages and cultures, which is the opposite of equality advocated in global world. Each ethnic group speaking a non-English language will be asking, "why is it the national peculiarities of English that are elevated to the position of the universal language?" Such a wide spread of English is tantamount to linguistic imperialism, which can be result in other kinds of imperialism. The English language domination causes suspicion, and more disharmony and cultural friction. Moreover, English itself has different versions: American, Australian, Caribbean, Canadian, South African, New Zealand, Irish, etc., which significantly impedes communication not only internationally, but between Anglophone nations too. Also, English as the international communication language hardly helps to preserve the individuality of English culture. True globalism preserves, rather than eliminates, national singularity. Many sociologists have justly spoken about disadvantages and erroneousness of having English as the international language: A.Touraine, M.Veverka, M.Sasaki, T.Sudzuki, etc.

Moreover, why do Spanish, Chinese, Arab, African, and other language worlds have to use English for international communication? Why not the other way round? Such questions are absolutely legitimate and valid. Voluntary adoption of an artificial language equal for everyone would take these questions off the agenda.

For an international artificial language, Esperanto is the best choice: it has been tested for over a century and has millions (the figures quoted differ from 10 to 20 million) of advocates in nearly 120 countries; it is very simple and easy to use, write and pronounce. The Esperanto Declaration adopted in 1905 by the International Congress of Esperantists thus defines the essence of Esperanto and Esperantism. "Esperantism is the endeavour to spread throughout the entire world the use of this neutral, human language which, "not intruding upon the personal life of peoples and 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 of public institutions in those lands where different peoples fight amongst each other over language". And further: "Whereas in the present time there is no researcher in the whole world who already doubts that an international Language can be only artificial [designed], and whereas out of all the numerous efforts made in the last centuries all researchers presented only theoretical projects, and only one language appears effectively complete, thoroughly tested and perfectly viable and most suitable in all relations, Esperanto: for this reason the friends of the idea of the International Language, acknowledging that theoretical controversy leads to nothing and that the aim [of an international language] can be attained only by practical work, have for a long time rallied around the language Esperanto and continually work towards its dissemination and for the enriching of its literature".

TetraSociology consolidates arguments for adopting Esperanto as a common auxiliary language, parallel to the national ones. It asserts that **only Esperanto can be the adequate response to a global language challenge**. Its arguments are briefly expressed by the following abstract.

TetraSociology: Esperanto as the One Language of Technologies and Intercourse in the XX1st century.

RC25, session 4.

The globalization of modern world increases cultural pluralism and simultaneously requires of increasing unity, including linguistic. More 100 years ago L.Zamenhof (1859-1917) created the auxiliary artificial language of Esperanto, which does not displace national languages and appears as peacemaking language of international dialogue. Today tens millions people possess it almost worldwide.

TetraSociology as the global theory of social space - time generalizes arguments of Esperanto statement as the world language. They are:

1. The global space-time of modern social world created by global communications and technologies aggravates problem of acceptance of one world language. It becomes necessary condition of further diversification and the development of technologies, work, culture. The powerful pluralism created by the Internet requires powerful unity including language.
2. The English language as most wide-spread can not claim for status of world language as it inevitably limits vision of world by English vision (A.Touraine, M.Sasaki, T.Sudzuki) which prevalence is recognized "harmful" for other national languages and world culture. Besides the interests of preservation of

English originality and identity, early or late, will become irresistible force on way of its transformation in one world language.

3. From all artificial languages extreme simples in use and checked by secular practice is Esperanto. The best applicant for a role of one language is not present.
4. Actual statement of the electronic hypertext world language (M.Castells) precedes to acceptance of one language of intercourse.
5. Acceptance of one language qualitatively will increase a potential of technologies, work, culture, international cooperation, marriages, interconfessional join.

The sociologists should help Esperanto to be ratified as one language putting forward for example idea of World Summit convocation about Esperanto and to accept it as the official language for the ISA. Esperanto is acceptable response to a global language challenge. However, Esperanto as a single global language for international communication is required to the sphere classes as actors of harmony rather than traditional branch actors (groups, classes). Only when these classes will find self-identify and self-organize only then a single language will be accepted. It is difficult to hope for the statement of a single language without it.

8. New statistics and information technology

This project, as the others, is a long-term one, but it is different in that while not requiring expenditures, it can become a source for billions worth of revenues, which can be invested in other sociocultural projects. Its theoretical foundations are described above. This project is to help overcome the limitations of traditional statistics and technologies in use and to bring them into the social world of personalities, cultures, communities. New statistics and information technology, which TetraSociology creates, are needed for this. They prepare responses to the appropriate challenges of the XXIst century. The abstracts below describe some of the usage's of these statistics and technology.

Social Use of TetraSociology as Information Technology

RC14, session 10. RC26, session 6. RC33, sessions 7,11. RC51, session 4.

TetraSociology is global theory of **four-dimensional social space - time**, each coordinate of which is expressed by four variable constants. TetraSociology is not limited to the theory. It turn into technology. On it base since 1980 the new information technology (IT) is being developed which has received a title '**Sphere/sociological Informational-Statistical Technology ' (SIST)**'. There are more than 70 examples of social use it. There are four steps of tetrasociology transition from the theory to IT:

1. **Sociological**. It is made by 16 variable constants of social space - time which measurement is reduced to a measurement of four resource constants: People, Information, Organizations, Things.
2. **Statistical**. It is made by system of sphere statistical indices expressing variable constants, summing the economic branch indices. They free from scantiness of economic indices. The summing of the enterprises indices in the branch indices is adequate to economy, the summing of branch indices in sphere indices is adequate to sociology. Therefore sphere indices are sociological. They, summing branch indices, give essence new, not known until now, information about social objects of any scale. They transfer a social information from economic in sociological quality.
3. **Mathematical/algorithmic**. It is made by system of algorithms of transformation of sphere/sociological indices and also appropriate statistical-mathematical models specified on kinds of products of SIST.
4. **Program**. It is made by set of Software products (SP), which embodies technology SIST as such. Main SP SIST are ' Individual ', ' Family ', ' Standard of living', ' Country ', ' World Society ', 'Environment ' etc. SIST is combined with the traditional IT. Essence difference of the SIST from them consists in transformation **of the contents, but not the form** of the social information, in control above it by means of new sphere indices.

SP SIST define the scale and quality of social use new IT, scale of new empiricism and pragmatism of the tetrasociology. SIST can be used not only as IT, but also as the communication technology. It creates the new technological model of the social communications between different social groups, religions, cultures, peoples. It can become the effective tool of their mutual understanding and globalization. SIST opens possibilities for realization of the **new strategies of community, prosperity, stability** through

harmony of social parameters of individuals and societies on base of information. It is project for international cooperation. It is one of the possible responses to an information challenges of new century.

TetraSociology as World-System Analysis

RC51, session 9. WG06.

World-systems models of Leontiev, Forester, Meadows, Wallerstein and others are very various. Each has the dignities and defects. World-system analysis is on extensive stage of development of various models. TetraSociology is one more approach of world-system analysis. TetraSociology is the pluralistic theory, which considers the world-system in four-dimensional continuum of social space - time. Four its world coordinates are Resources, Processes of reproduction, Structures / spheres of reproduction, States of social evolution.

Each coordinate of social space - time is expressed in four constants. The resources are expressed by constants: People, Information, Organization, Things (PIOT). Processes - constants: Production, Distribution, Exchange, Consumption. Structures - constants of spheres: Social, Information, Organizational, Technical. States - constants: Prosperity, Deceleration, Decline, Dying. In total 16 world-systems constants are distinguished.

The constants quantitatively are expressed by aggregated indices, which are called "sphere". Sphere indices are created new statistics, which is adequate to sociology and can be called "sociological" or, is synonymous, "sphere". This statistics forms on base matrix of sphere indices expressing of the four resources division into four spheres of society consequently, by dimension 4x4, has the following form:

$P = P1 + P2 + P3 + P4$, where P is people, population, and P1, P2, P3, P4 - their 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 organization, and O1, O2, O3, O4 - their blocks,

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

Lines of matrix express appropriate sphere 'outputs', i.e. production of appropriate products in them, and columns express appropriate sphere 'inputs', the use of appropriate resources in them.

With help of derivatives from it matrixes (4x16, 4x64 and etc.) in new statistics the volumes of availability and cost of resources PIOT, their production, distribution, exchange, export / import, consumption, efficiency and other social parameters for different branches, regions and countries of world are express. The sphere indices is free from scantiness of economic indices. The sphere indices transfer a social information from economic in sociological quality which is relevant to world-system analysis.

Sphere indices are linked by mathematical algorithms which are programmed and calculated on computers.

Dignities of TetraSociological world-system analysis are: 1. It gives one qualitative (theoretical) and quantitative (empirical) language for description of world-system and any its fragment. 2. Qualitative and quantitative languages in it are coordinated and they are complete, expressing necessary and sufficient aspects of world-system. 3. It allows to compare models of different regions of world-system developed by different scientists. 4. It allows quantitatively to evaluate states and dynamics world-system as whole and any its region, to compare them among themselves. 5. It corresponds to requirements of network society as it is embodied in information technology combined with other technologies; that is adequate to the world communication web and globalization.

TetraSociological world-system analysis is the project for international and interdisciplinary development.

9. Project "Antiterror"

This project uses, in a **particular manner**, sphere statistics and technology to solve the most urgent problem of combating terrorism and crime through informational means.

The fact that September 11 terrorist attacks at the US took the country by surprise and that even the intelligence service of the world's most powerful country didn't foresee it tells us that an adequate informational instrument for security is lacking. The security organs proved informationally powerless when

faced with terrorists. **The organs do not have the systemic and comprehensive information about the terrorists' activity.** The hosts of computers and a plethora of intelligence information alone do not amount to informational security, which requires qualitatively different methods. First and foremost, it is systemic information that helps to win the fight against terrorism.

Terrorism is a systemic and multi-dimensional destructive social phenomenon, painstakingly concealed, deeply rooted, and very dangerous for society. But no matter how deeply rooted and well concealed it is, it exists within society and, tied with it through hundreds of ties, uses traditional resources and legal structures. In order to track terrorist activities, we need to establish, which resources and starting from when "disappear" from which structures, to become terrorist resources. An universal informational statistical instrument is needed for obtaining this sort of systematic and comprehensive information. Traditional economic statistics is insufficient for the purpose, because it is "choppy," has many inner gaps for information leaks, is unsystematic and unglobal.

I discovered more than 20 years ago and have been since developing, within TetraSociological framework, a qualitatively new statistics: global and systemic, secured against inner informational breaches, it is called "sphere statistics." It can serve as the basis for project "Antiterror," outlined in the presentation to be made at ad hoc session.

TetraSociological Statistics as the Means of Multi-Faceted Surveillance and Prevention of Terrorist Attacks in Information societies. Project "Antiterror".

Ad Hoc Session on Surveillance in Information Societies.

The growing diversity of social information in today's world, generated by globalization, light speeds of its distribution, its all-permeability and its extremist outputs, as for example, in the form of terrorist attacks in the USA - all this does it surveillance (high-technological monitoring of terrorist deviations) urgent. The traditional means of economic statistics, empirical researches, inquests etc. are obviously insufficient, are limited and inefficient for the similar purpose. The qualitatively new instrument adequate by globalization, flexibility and applicability for surveillance of the information and social situations in any region of the world, in any organization, on any aspects, first of all deviant and especial terrorist is required. Such instrument can not be developed on the basis of a separate social science and traditional statistics. It can be constructed only on the basis of the common sociological theory and sociological statistics making all information data qualitatively comparable, substantially reduced, quantitatively measurable. Such theory is TetraSociology, which creates universal system of social space - time parameters. In this system can be registered any given deviations.

TetraSociology is the pluralistic theory of four-dimensional social space - time. Four its coordinates / measurements are Resources/Statics, Processes/Dynamics, Structures/Structuratics, States/Genetics. Each coordinate is expressed by four measurable constants on the basis of which the qualitatively new, sociological, statistics is created. In each indexes of this statistics the allocation of terrorism indicators is possible, that will allow to transform it into the powerful means of surveillance in information societies. It is possible to allocate five steps of transition TetraSociology from theory to the means and technology of surveillance.

1. **Sociological.** It is made by 16 variable constants of social space - time, which measurement is reduced to a measurement of four resource constants: People (P) (man-power resources), Information (I), Organizations (O), Things (T). The resources are produced and consumed in appropriate spheres of society: Social, Information, Organizational, Technical (economic). The statistical indexes expressing resources of these spheres refer as "sphere" on object and "sociological" on a scientific source.

2. **Statistical.** It is made by system of sphere statistical indices expressing variable constants. This system is formed with base matrix of sphere indices expressing of the four resources division into four spheres of society, consequently, by dimension 4x4, has the following form:

$P = P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4$, where P is population, and P1, P2, P3, P4 are its sphere classes,

$I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4$, where I is the information, and I1, I2, I3, I4 are its complexes,

$O = O_1 + O_2 + O_3 + O_4$, where O is the organization, and O1, O2, O3, O4 are its blocks,

$T = T1 + T2 + T3 + T4$, where T is things, material goods, and T1, T2, T3, T4 are their groups.

The sphere indices is sum up (aggregate) the economic branch indices. They are free from their scantiness. They give a qualitatively new, not known until now, aggregating information about social objects of any scale. They transfer a social information from economic in sociological and global quality.

3. **Special, concrete.** On it in every sphere index the parts - indicators are allocated which intended for expression of resources, processes and structures used by the terrorists. These indicators are expressed by sphere indexes with the appropriate sign, for example "d". Then the base matrix of sphere indexes of a terror gets the following kind:

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

$Id = I1d + I2d + I3d + I4d$, where Id is information resources of a terror , and I1d + I2d + I3d + I4d are its complexes from different spheres of a society;

$Od = O1d + O2d + O3d + O4d$, where Od is organizational (including financial) resources of a terror, and O1d + O2d + O3d + O4d are its complexes from different spheres of a society;

$Td = T1d + T2d + T3d + T4d$, where Td is material resources of a terror, and T1d + T2d + T3d + T4d are its sphere groups.

The base and derivative from it matrixes will make the information means of surveillance behind terrorist activity, behind its resources, processes and structures. Let us name system of sphere matrixes on surveillance over a terror "**Antiterror**". In system of sphere matrixes "Antiterror" there are no information cracks for the terrorists, it creates impenetrable for them an information network. It expresses all spectrum of their resources and processes, all spectrum of resource inputs and outputs of terrorism. The inquest of any terrorist act or its prevention can begin with any separate index, from their group or from this or that derivative matrix. The ultimate aim of information surveillance behind terrorist activity is safety of the citizens and states, prevention of attacks, complete neutralization of terror. The system of sphere matrixes arms antiterrorist activity by powerful information means of strategy and tactics planning of struggle with terror.

4. **Mathematical / algorithmic.** It is made the system of algorithms of formation and transformation of sphere indexes "Antiterror". The system of the appropriate statistic-mathematical models specified on kinds of tasks solved with the help of sphere matrixes "Antiterror" is created on it.

5. **Technological.** The diverse program statistical products (applied programs) technologically embodied functions of system sphere matrixes "Antiterror" are created on it. The set of this software will make qualitatively new information technology which is not having of analogues in the world. It has received name 'Sphere/sociological Information - Statistical Technology' (SIST) "Antiterror".

The states and services of safety have an urgent need in similar information technology (high-technological surveillance), all world community is interested in it. SIST can be produced only globalization and association of information resources of all countries. At the same time it will lift process of globalization on qualitative new level. It will create the information means of global antiterrorist safety.

The creation of SIST is extremely labour-consuming and expensive business. It can be created only on a basis of interdisciplinary researches and theoretic-sociological construction. The heavy expenses for creation of SIST pay off by safety and prevention of destruction of thousand people in terrorist attacks. It can be used not only against terrorism, but also in struggle with business of drugs, criminality, corruption and that similar deviations, giving the answer to the appropriate challenges.

10. Sphere democracy -- global democracy

Global world needs global forms of democracy, a democracy which, while universal in its core, does not impinge on nations', cultures', traditions' political specificity. Sphere democracy can become a form of such democracy. Sphere democracy is based on global and harmonious sphere classes, elected representatives of which equally participate in the workings of state power, of all its branches and organs.

Only this kind of government can become harmonious and is able to organizationally ensure social harmony and prosperity. Any disharmonious government, including democratic ones, reproduces nothing but disharmony.

Montesquieu discovered that the **quality of power structures, "democracy's strength and prosperity" depend on "the correct classification of people"**. For him, the greatest legislators were Solon, who divided the Greeks into four classes, and Servius Tullius, who divided the Romans into six classes: these classes not only elected governmental officials, but provided themselves, on voting basis, persons for the posts. Organisation of the power structures in accordance with these classes' interests brought the Greeks and the Romans prosperity, lasting for several centuries. Hence, Montesquieu formulated **"the main law of republic" and democracy: "Dividing into classes the population that has the right to vote"**.

The problem lies in choosing the criterion for dividing population into classes equal in relation to power. For the high quality of global democracy, the appropriate division of population into classes is needed; one of major versions of such a division is division into sphere classes according to the criterion of main sphere employment. Each one equally needed by society, sphere classes should have power divided between them; such division is the sphere democracy's, or tetrademocracy's, backbone. The remote historical analogue of a tetrademocracy is **tetrarchia** in ancient Greece and Roman empire This sociocultural project is to gradually bring nearer sphere democracy and to gradually prepare the necessary conditions. Next abstract outlines sphere democracy's content. Sphere democracy is a possible response to the challenge of the XXIst century democracy.

TetraSociology: Sphere Quality of Classes and Democracy in the XXIst Century.
Concept of a Global Democracy
RC18 Session 4. RC35 Session 1.

TetraSociology as a global model of four-dimensional social space - time are distinguished four spheres of social reproduction with own objects, products and appropriate technologies. 1. Social (Human) sphere: its object and products are population which are reproduced by humanitarian technologies of education, public health etc. 2. Information sphere: its object and products are information which is reproduced by information technologies. 3. Organizational sphere: its object and products are public relations and organizations (political, legal, financial, managerial), which are reproduced by organizational technologies. 4. Technical (material, economic) sphere: its object and products are things, all material wealth, which are reproduced by industrial and agronomic technologies.

The population of any region is divided on employment (occupation) in these spheres on appropriate SPHERE classes: Humanitarian (Social, Human), Information, Organizational, Technical. The middle class also has sphere quality as it enters as the middle strata in all sphere classes. Up to the 2nd half of the XXth century dominant was sphere of economics. The social structure of society was branch, appropriated by branches of economics: workers, peasants, managers and owners. The branch form of democracy saved until now corresponded to branch classes. In the second half of the XXth century in connection with rapid growth of non-material spheres especially information and connected with its reduction of employment in material sphere the passage from branch to sphere social structure from branch to sphere classes of society was scheduled. The branch classes are antagonistic and the sphere classes are non-antagonistic. The process of forming and consciousness of sphere classes identity only begins. The passage from branch to SPHERE democracy or TETRADEMOCRACY is happened in parallels.

Main signs of its sphere quality. 1. Equal distribution of power between sphere classes and equal participation of their representatives in all government bodies. 2. Forming of political parties not on branch and on sphere principle. 3. Participation in elections of all population including minors by transference of their voice right to their parents. 4. Fixation in Constitutions of sphere democracy of population division on sphere classes, equal on importance, with equal rights to power, with equal representation in all government bodies, with the equal right of each body on control all other and with equal representation of men, women and the young in these bodies.

The sphere quality will ensure new level of democratism and power responsibility before people, minimization of corruption and other abuses of power. The tendency of society and State divergence and

insufficient representation of society in State is overcome TetraDemocracy, sphere organisation of State. It is adequate to the requirements and challenges of new century, it is global. The development of the sociocultural project of sphere democracy and its promotion require of the interdisciplinary and international scientific efforts, will borrow not one decade. However, rather than traditional branch actors (groups, classes), it's sphere classes as actors of harmony that need sphere democracy as global democracy. Until they self-identify and self-organize, emergence of a sphere democracy is unlikely. It is difficult to hope for origin of a single democracy without it.

11. Tetraharmonious ecology

The ecological sociocultural project is the continuation of the previous ones. Its main idea is that **only social harmony leads to harmony between society and nature**, i.e. harmony of ecological relations. And social harmony based on global information network needs a single language Esperanto, a single religion plurotheism, designation of global sphere classes, establishment of women's and the young's priority and of global sphere democracy. Only with these, or similar, pre-conditions, which harmonize social world, harmonious relation between social world and nature is possible, first of all through harmonization of the technosphere's (material sphere's) impact on the environment. **Humankind can respond to ecological challenge only with social harmony**. Harmony between society and nature is called **tetraharmonious ecology**; it requires harmony among all four society's spheres. We hypothesize that **only tetraharmonious ecology can ensure a stable evolution for social world in the natural world around it**. This is the project's key idea; next abstract elaborates it.

TetraSociology as Social Theory of Ecological Harmony through Social Modernization and Harmony RC24 Sessions 7 and 9.

The ecological crisis of the XXth centuries is caused by social disharmony excessive and uncontrolled development of material production (first of all of weaponry) at the expense of restriction of other social spheres. Ecological crisis is consequence of system social disharmony. The overcoming social disharmony is possible on the basis of modernization requiring new social theory. One of them is TetraSociology as the pluralistic theory of four-dimensional social space - time. Four coordinates its are Resources, Processes, Structures, States. Each coordinate is expressed by four measurable constants on the basis of which the qualitatively new, global statistics is created. It is embodied in new information technology.

From the position of TetraSociological integrated approach the ecological harmony of environment and society is reached by means of harmonization of four spheres of social reproduction, interests of four social classes employed in these spheres, equal representation of these classes, and also men and women, in all branches of state power. Only such, harmonious, organization of a society and state will ensure ecological harmony. The information means of harmonization of society and its ecological relations is the new information technology created on the basis of new global statistics. TetraSociology realizes transition of the social theory in the high technology adequate to an ecological challenge in information society. However, rather than traditional branch actors (groups, classes), it's sphere classes as actors of harmony that need harmonious global ecology. Until they self-identify and self-organize, emergence of a harmonious global ecology is unlikely. It is difficult to hope for origin of the harmonious global ecology without it.

12. Peaceful Jerusalem

This sociocultural project is built over the previous ones; it is a synthesis and an example of application of them. Almost thirteen centuries old, with no resolution in view, the Arab-Jewish conflict is one of the humankind's most poignant problems. Systemic, and involving all spheres and resources, this conflict necessitates, for its resolution, an approach just as multi-dimensional. Two ethnic groups sharing a historical homeland and a geographical area of settlement are different in every other respect: classes, culture, language, religion, political organization, economy, living standards. So, **inequality, which can be called sphere, or systemic, inequality, is the conflict's original cause**. Inequality produces the evil of conflict and ineradicable mutual hate, leading to numerous and unjustifiable deaths on either side.

Resolution of the conflict is possible only on the basis of equality, meaning acknowledgement of **common** sphere classes, **common** language Esperanto, **common** religion plurotheism, priority **commonly** given to women and the young, **common** sphere democracy, **common** economy, **common** information network and technologies. This is the only possible peaceful and non-violent resolution, ruling out physical destruction of one of the ethnic groups.

No matter how "crazy" and utopian this resolution may seem at first glance, what other peaceful and non-violent solution can serve as an alternative? There are many possible tactical methods for implementing such a resolution, but there are no strategic alternatives that we can think of. True, there is one more, an absolutely utopian solution, whereby one of the ethnic groups voluntarily leaves the land of promise and settles elsewhere, e.g. in Siberia or Brazil, if a land is provided. If, nonetheless, these ethnic groups do not want to leave their shared territory and to exterminate each another completely, then there is only one solution for the conflict, described above. The solution is **to find commonality and equality in all spheres and all dimensions: classes, language, religion, culture, information network, politics, economy, living standards**. Certainly, such a strategy will take decades and generations to work, but there is no way to settle the conflict peacefully and promptly. Jerusalem being the conflict's focus and centre, the resolution process should proceed from the city.

Arab-Jewish conflict is not a local conflict which the rest of the world does not care about; it is a global, generic conflict of cultures to be found all over the globe, instead of being confined to the Arab-Jewish patch of land. So, settling the conflict peacefully is impossible without the participation of the humankind and the mediation from other nations, religions and cultures. This idea is realized through the sociocultural project outlined in next abstract.

TetraSociology: Peace and Global Jerusalem **The project of sociocultural technology**

RC01, session 5. RC48, session 2.

Centre of the Arab-Jewish conflict is Jerusalem where are located the relics of three world religions: Christianity, Judaism, Islam. Their conflict has created thirteen centuries back ethnic conflict which in the XX1st century has become challenge for globalization. Each side wants to have undividedly Jerusalem or to divide it and to be selected in the independent state. It is the reason of "immortality" of Arab-Jewish conflict in it as neither that nor other is impossible. Jerusalem is indivisible, the policy of separation is unpromising, the one-sided approaches, including military, army are without results. This is the lesson of the XXth century.

The new, pluralistic, many-dimensional approach is necessary, one of which is TetraSociology, outgoing from values of a pluralism, equality, harmony, justice, nonviolence. TetraSociology is the pluralistic theory considering social phenomena in four-dimensional social space - time in coordinates/measurements: Resources/Statics, Processes/Dynamics, Structure/Structuratics, States/Genetics. Each coordinate is expressed by four variable constants connected by four components of the social. The Arab-Jewish conflict has also the statics, dynamics, structuratics, genetics, resources, processes, structures, states expressed by appropriate constants.

From point of view of TetraSociology the common reason of the Arab-Jewish conflict is disharmony practically of all resources, processes and structures (institutes) of conflicting sides that predetermines state of their animosity and irreconcilableness. Necessary for peace and prosperity the harmony can be given only by new sociocultural technology as a system of tools and methods of conflict peaceful settlement. This technology based on TetraSociology, consists of the following.

1. The conflict is recognized not local but global requiring wide world participation in it solution.
2. Join of three religions by means of fourth for example Faith Bahai, having significant experience of installation of unity in variety, and creation of one religion. Priests being peacemakers among themselves will become peacemakers for the peoples. It is the most difficult and long problem in 10-20 years.

3. Resettlement in Jerusalem in buffer zones on voluntary and paid basis of several thousands bahaists which will make skeleton of constant peacemaking force among the population and priests of Jerusalem, which will become global city.

4. The intercourse of conflicting sides requires acceptance of the neutral language on which role the artificial language of Esperanto best approaches. Its carriers and teachers, obviously, should be the bahaists.

5. Joining political aim for conflicting sides should become idea of creation in 10-20 years of the ONE State "Israel - Palestine" ("Isralestine"?) with the Constitution ensuring equality of Jews and Arabs rights with equal representation in State organs of four SPHERE classes of population that and other people and also men and women, the young.

6. In all Israeli and Palestine temples, schools, means of information the propagation of nonviolence, harmony, peace, justice, equality, one religion and one State as necessary conditions of religious relics and territory preservation, consent and prosperity of peoples is carried.

7. World support of Arab-Jewish conflict settlement by specially created International fund possessing significant financial resources including in itself interested international organizations (Bahai, Arabs, Jews etc.) and under the aegis of UN.

8. Wide use of sociological inquiries and information technologies including based on TetraSociology.

Considered sociocultural technology offers adequate variant of the conflict solution and the answer to appropriate global challenge. **The peace through globalization.** Jerusalem is a pattern for solution of similar conflicts in world. Appropriate sociocultural project "Peace and Global Jerusalem" requires interdisciplinary and international participation. It could be initiated for example ISA together with Bahai. Nevertheless, rather than traditional branch classes and groups, it's sphere classes as actors of harmony that need peace in Jerusalem and Israel. Until they self-identify and self-organize among the populations of Palestine and Israel, enduring peace in these lands is unlikely. Only these actors are able to generate a single will, belief, language and democracy of peace on the holy lands of Jews and Arabs; only then shall the centuries-old hostility die away. The God has put the Jews and Arabs before a choice: or you will destroy each other in infinite enmity, or will find a way peacefully to live in one land. The way of peace life on one land requires one belief, one language, one state. I think, they are capable to establish only sphere classes.

13. TetraStructure of the International Sociological Association

This project, unlike the others, is not global, but it concerns an influential international organization, which influences, or can influence, both the ways the rising challenges get interpreted and international responses to the challenges.

ISA's structure has been historically shaped over 50 years: this period embraces the end of industrial civilization and transition to an informational one. Today ISA has 53 Research Committees, 2 Working Groups and 4 Thematic Groups. This structure reflects not only realities of the social world, but the level of sociological knowledge too. Obviously, the reflections of both are not up to the new civilization's demands and, I believe, do not adequately respond to the rising global challenges. These **challenges call for a restructuring of the ISA.** The new structure should rest on an inter-disciplinary synthesis, rather than on traditional branch division. **The ISA branch structure can only record the rising global challenges, but it is not able to generate adequate responses to them** and to produce big sociocultural projects. Social construction of the responses and the projects is impossible without appropriate interdisciplinary synthesis, because all global challenges are multi-dimensional and multi-асpected; and ISA branches cannot properly respond to them.

To get to the level of global challenges and adequate responses, ISA, we believe, should replace its branch structure with a sphere (tetra), or integral one. The purpose of re-structuring the ISA is to overcome the current compartmentalization and disconnection between the branches of sociological researches and to give permanent priority to inter-disciplinary researches. TetraSociology, with its SST coordinates as a global model of the social world, is one of the sources to draw on to re-structure the ISA. We suggest that on the basis of these coordinates, 59 structural (branch) ISA divisions be re-organized into **5 Research Unions (or**

Departments). Four among the Unions correspond with four SST coordinates/dimensions: resources/statics, processes/dynamics, structures/structuratics, states/genetics. These Research Unions can be called accordingly:

1. **Social statics and resources,**
2. **Social dynamics and processes,**
3. **Social structuratics and structures,**
4. **Social genetics and states.**

The fifth Research Union, which elaborates general theoretical models and methodological foundations for the other four Unions and creates various SST paradigms, can be called **Global, or Systems Union**.

Three points should be stressed here. 1. Integral (tetra) structure of the ISA **does not abolish** the branch structure, but rather complements it and sets it in order. 2. Importantly, because the ISA divisions have many aspects, the division proposed further is **only tentative and exploratory**. 3. The integral structuration represents an inter-disciplinary synthesis, consolidation and classification of the ISA branch divisions on the basis of the criteria formulated above and of SST dimensions.

We believe that the structuration of the ISA within the system of TetraSociology's SST coordinates is a natural result of the total course of sociology's history. We propose the following tentative scheme for grouping the ISA divisions into five Research Unions (RU).

1. **Social statics and resources RU** unites the ISA divisions focusing on various social resources: human, informational, organizational, things (material-technical). To them it is possible to relate the following RCs: 03, 04, 05, 11, 13, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, as well as Thematic Groups 01, 03, 04. This amounts to 32 ISA divisions.

2. **Social dynamics and processes RU** unites the ISA divisions focusing on various social reproduction processes: production, distribution, exchange, consumption. To them it is possible to relate the following RCs: 09, 14, 31, 36, 45, 46, 48, as well as Working group 05. This amounts to 8 ISA divisions.

3. **Social structuratics and structures RU** unites the ISA divisions focusing on various society's structures, the largest among which are four spheres: social, informational, organizational, technical (economic). To them it is possible to relate the following RCs: 01, 02, 06, 10, 12, 17, 18, 21, 29, as well as Thematic Group 06. This amounts to 10 ISA divisions.

4. **Social genetics and states RC** unites the ISA divisions focusing on various states of society development: prosperity, deceleration, decline, ruin. To them it is possible to relate the following RCs: 07, 08, 39. 3 ISA divisions overall.

5. **Systemic (global) RC** unites those ISA divisions that focus, mainly, on elaboration of general theoretical paradigms and sociological methodologies in general. To them it is possible to relate the following RCs: 16, 20, 33, 35, 51, as well as Working Group 06. 6 ISA divisions overall.

The current ISA divisions are distributed between the RUs in the following proportion: **54 : 14 : 17 : 5 : 10**. It means that more than half of the ISA (54%) is focused on social world's statics, and its tiniest factions, on social world's developmental states (5%) and on theoretical paradigms (10%). Based on this, we will formulate a **hypothesis: what accounts for the weakness and inadequacy of ISA responses to the rising challenges is insufficient attention to social world's states/genetics and its theoretical paradigms, even giving the due credit to the high quality of the research into social statics.**

Certainly, no clear-cut boundaries between the RUs can ever exist. The differences between the Unions are relative. The RUs' research interests are inter-penetrative and inter-inclusive; still, each RU's dominant subjects are easily identifiable. These subjects serve as the criterion for the classification. The author is far from claiming that this classification is error-free and the only possible one.

The ISA RUs **can be**, in turn, divided **inside** themselves into four groups according to the four classes of variable constants. But this is one of debatable issues that gets raised with a further discussion in mind within this TetraSociological sociocultural project.

14. Russian theoretical sociology

This sociocultural project deals with the development of the Russian theoretical sociology and formation of its self-awareness. For all the seeming insignificance of the subject, it is very important for

helping the Russian sociology to overcome the crisis and for enhancing the role it plays in the society: this role is now negligible. The project is important not only for Russia, but for other countries too, where sociology's position and role is not much better than in Russia. As N.Luhmann noticed bitterly but justly, **in the XXth century "in theory of society, sociology has not advanced significantly"**; the lack of such a theory results in a crisis for sociology, producing the "impression of fatigue and depression" in sociology⁶³. Sociologists do not know society any better than they do themselves. There hardly exists a sociologist who can answer these simple questions: How many sociologists serve each sphere of society in a particular city, country, in the world? Which spheres and branches do sociological studies affect, and to what extent? What is the quality of the sociological product and what is its volume in every particular spheres of society? What is the cost of the product? How does the product affect the reproductive dynamics of society's other resources? How much do sociologists know about the society they live in, and how much they not know it? What modern challenges does sociology record, and to what extent? What sociocultural projects have sociologists proposed to respond to those challenges? --Their mentality traditional, narrowly empirical and used to compartmentalized perception of the world, the sociologists, for the most part, do not have answers to these and similar questions, because they do not even have such questions. **(On my researches more than 80 % of the Russian social scientists are monists, Marxists in an overwhelming part, which remain the irreconcilable opponents of pluralism.)** The proposed project, which is in fact **the program for a new big sociological research** into the sociology's basics -- theory -- is intended to overcome this narrow-mindedness. I hope this project will inspire interest not only nationally but as well internationally. The project is elaborated in an article that was prepared for publication in a major journal almost an year ago but was not published.

RUSSIAN THEORETICAL SOCIOLOGY: PLURALISTIC APPROACH AND PROGRAM FOR EMPIRICAL RESEARCH.

(For the English publication, we paired down this article to the list of Russian sociology paradigms and the program for empirical research into the Russian sociology, which can be of interest to non-Russian readers.)

If Russia does not have institutions for theoretical sociology, then does the latter exist in individual scholars' work? Are there in Russia individual sociologists who can propose sociological macrotheories? Yes, there are. They are few, but it is only due to them that sociological production in Russia is still alive. **IT IS ONLY IN THIS SENSE THAT THEORETICAL SOCIOLOGY EXISTS IN RUSSIA!** Theoretical sociology is a matter subtle, very complicated, depending on individualities and requiring a lot of creativity. So, sociologists-theoreticians are "piece-goods." In my estimate, there are no more than 40-50 sociologists-theoreticians in Russia. Based on the abstracts from the First All-Russian Sociological congress in 2000 and some other sources⁶⁴ I'll try to compile a list of the sociologists and the theory names.

A.N.Alekseev: Dramatic sociology,
 E.S.Barazgova: Ecological approach,
 V.I.Bolgov: Cosmoplanetary, energy-informational sociology,
 A.N.Vetoshkin: Dialogical sociology,
 N.N.Vitchenko: Cognitive sociology,
 A.A.Davydov, A.N.Churakov: Modular analysis and socium construction,
 T.M.Dridze: Sociology as "science of sciences"
 S.E.Dubrovskaya: Informational approach,
 V.Y.Elmeev: Social phenomenology,
 I.V.Katerny: Environment-centric approach,
 S.G.Kirdina: Institutional matrices theory,

⁶³ Luhmann N. Theory of Society // Theory of Society. Moscow, 1999, p. 199 etc.

⁶⁴ Sociology and Society. Theses of the First All-Russia sociological congress. St-Petersburg, 2000; etc.

M.S.Komarov: Sociocultural approach,
 I.G.Kuzina, O.N.Kozlova, V.V.Vasilkova and others: Synergetic approach,
 S.A.Kuzmin: Social systems (Systems approach),
 V.G.Nemirovsky: Universum sociology,
 M.M.Ohotnikova: Consensus-sociology,
 Y.M.Reznik: Social ontology,
 T.N.Salnikova: Activity paradigm,
 L.M.Semashko: TetraSociology,
 A.I.Subetto, S.I.Grigoriev: Non-classical sociology,
 I.P.Yakovlev: Spectral-functional and systemic-cyclical approaches.

The list may be incomplete (I may be not aware of some models and paradigms in the Russian theoretical sociology); second, the choice of names is quite arbitrary: it is based on a single criterion, the one which is necessary but insufficient: the sociologist's claim to a "big individual pretentious theoretical project" (A.F.Filippov). Left out are many theoreticians exploring individual theoretical sociological problems, e.g., correlation between the empirical and the theoretical (V.V.Ilyin, Y.L.Kachanov), problem of time (N.K.Serov), problem of social mood (Z.T.Toshchenko), problem of "sociology's sociology" (A.F.Filippov, N.E.Pokrovsky, etc.), etc. My list is only the first rough draft requiring further research, and choice of a criterion for categorising sociological studies as theoretical. But even this list shows the main quality of the Russian theoretical sociology: its PLURALISM, diversity, multicolouredness, multi-paradigmality. These qualities cannot be dismissed, because they are the sociology's source of vital energy and inner creative potential. As I see it, only pluralism and tolerance, rather than monism (which cannot generate anything like that), can lead to renaissance and blossom, and creative integrity, of the Russian sociology. The list shall probably expand. I do not think, however, that there are more than one hundred sociologists-theoreticians in Russia today. The sociologists-theoreticians alone constitute the Russian theoretical sociology's empirical existence and create individual sociological production, for social production is at zero point today.

Russian sociologists-theoreticians are on the verge of extinction. Their main occupation is teaching, which pays 30-40 roubles (it hardly is more than one American dollar) in hour. Such a situation can be described only as "THE LEAST FAVOURABLE CIRCUMSTANCES." What the remedy is?

What is essential is to create for theoretical sociology the MOST FAVOURABLE circumstances: to assign top priority to the task of providing it with human, informational, organizational (financial first of all) and material resources, which would generate a situation favourable for SOCIAL reproduction of sociological theories. And who is to create these circumstances? We are personally.

If we do not take care of the problem, no one will. To accomplish it, the Russian sociologists should unite into an appropriate social Movement.

Sociological community should understand that only at a high level of theoretical sociology, the level composed of many DIFFERENT "high" but equal sociological theories, resuscitation of the Russian national sociology, its self-identification, and spiritual unity in pluralism and tolerance are possible.

It is an empirical research and a program for it that should serve as the launch pad for the sociology's renaissance and generation of the favourable circumstances. Quality of the ensuing sociological discourse and sociology's evolution depends on the quality of this program. The program's framework, from TetraSociological viewpoint, should consist of four major sections.

* **The Russian sociology's STATICS.** Designating resources involved in the sociology: People (staff, employees; their gender/age distribution; education and qualification, distribution among Russia's regions; living standards, incomes and its sources, etc.); Information (the Russian sociology's main schools of thinking and trends within the framework of monism and that of pluralism, distribution of sociologists among the schools/trends, volumes of empirical and theoretical information they contain, etc.); Organizations (their institutional forms: sub-faculties, departments, universities, research centres, learned societies; branch, university, academic sociologies; empirical, medium-level, theoretical sociology and sociology's sociology; the numbers of the employed; main schools of thought, and monistic and pluralistic trends in them; volumes of state and private financing; participation in international organizations, etc.);

Things, Material-technical base (premises, transportation, communications, computers and other equipment and supplies, counted up by institution, school of thought, trend).

* **The Russian sociology's DYNAMICS:** production, distribution, exchange and consumption/use of the Russian sociology's produce, since 1991, in different institutions, schools of thought, trends; international liaison. Types and kinds of the output produced by the Russian sociologists.

* **The Russian sociology's STRUCTURATICS:** its sphere complexes: Social, Informational (cultural), Organizational (political, legal, financial, managerial), Material (economic), which correspond with society spheres. (Or, how does the Russian sociology's structuration correlate with the spheres of Russia's social life and social reproduction; what are the amounts of the sociology's sphere output and input, statistically).

* **The Russian sociology's GENETICS:** changes of the developmental states over the last decade; trends and growth rates by region, by institutional form, by school of thought, by trend, by publication, etc. Disbalances, disharmony and disproportion of the Russian sociology's evolution, their causes.

The proposed structure for the empirical study Program -- Statics, Dynamics, Structuratics, Genetics -- is fit for exploring not only the Russian, but any other national sociologies: French, German, American, Polish, etc.

15. Conclusion

Overall, what is clear about TetraSociology is that it is a postpluralist, i.e. definite-dimensional and technological, global model of the social world; a new form of rationalism; a social theory of equality, employment, harmony, democracy, justice, prosperity; one of viable sociocultural projects of man's and society's harmonious development; one of viable adequate responses to the XXIst century global challenges. TetraSociology is not a helpless onlooker. As one of viable and promising approaches, it contributes to the energetic quest for solutions for the modern world's and sociology's problems. It shows that postmodernist ideas notwithstanding, social science's rationalism, which in fact has not arrived yet, still has a big potential. Social science is still coming into existence in the adequate postpluralist shape, as a new, definite-dimensional and technological, rationalism. The chief asset of the new, TetraSociological humanism is that it provides theory of and technology for social harmony, based on a multi-dimensional classification and systemic parameterization of the social world today. New rationalism needs new Enlightenment and opens up new vistas for new Pragmatism.

Asserting the groundlessness of monistic sociologies as integral models, TetraSociology's postpluralism keeps and synthesizes their basic ideas, while releasing them from absolutism. Monism is kept and revived in it as an aspiration to unity but of a qualitatively different kind: not as a unity all under one domination but as a **unity of many in equality and harmony**. The European union is a modern example of that. It is a problem for those who are strong and the rich in social harmony **to help others also become strong and rich**, instead of caring only for themselves. The aspiration to one language, to one belief, to one democracy, to one harmonious set of sphere classes grows in the epoch of globalization alongside the aspiration to preserve the cultural and national variety of existing languages, religions, democracies, classes. TetraSociology sees in the harmony of actors - in sphere classes – the social basis for a new, global and harmonious unity. Only one language, belief, democracy is necessary for these classes. Only these classes are capable of overcoming the total disharmony of the social world and of ensuring for it harmony in a new unity.

PART 3. Appendices

1. Examples of the Applications of TetraSociology and its Technologies since 1980.

On the basis of TetraSociology and with use its information and sociocultural technologies since 1980 were developed the following projects. (At left: number, year, name of the project and its volume in pages.)

1. 1980. Planning Krasnoselsky area of Leningrad. 5 p.
2. 1981. Structure of sphere indices and sphere matrixes. 30 p.
3. 1981. Target comprehensive program (TCP) of extended reproduction of the consumer goods (CG)32p.

4. 1981. Matrix macro model of city. 16 p.
5. 1982. Methods of Regional TCP of production of the CG. 55 p.
6. 1982. Methods of forming of the food program of Leningrad region. 24 p.
7. 1982. Scheme of TCP of building of North. 3 p.
8. 1982. Structure of the purposes of TCP of foundry production. 10 p.
9. 1983. Tree of the purposes of TCP of "Labour and Staff ". 15 p
10. 1983. Ideology of the Automated System of Planned Accounts (ASPA). 225 p.
11. 1983. Program of settlement experiment on new technology. 18 p.
12. 1983. Problem of correlation sphere indices. 7 p.
13. 1984. Standard of living: the review of the literature and new approach. 113 p.
14. 1984. Review of the literature and offers on designing s/s "Public health Services" ASPA. 45p.
15. 1984. Territorial complex program of "Paid Services". 10 p.
16. 1985. Conception of the Automated data reduction system of Leningrad Managing organ (ADRS). 32 p.
17. 1985. Clarification of the technical Project on a subsystem ASPA "Standard of living". 33 p.
18. 1985. Organization of information fund of the vice-president of the Leningrad Executive Committee. 22p.
19. 1985. Model and tree of the purposes of a Youth Housing Complex (YHC). 11 p.
20. 1985. Principles and plan of studio of Family Complex Development of Children (FCDC). 18 p.
21. 1986. The technical project (TP) on a subsystem "Public health Services" ADRS. 15 p.
22. 1987. Statutes of student's club "Demiurge". 10p.
23. 1987. Fundamentals of the conception of school reorganization. 7 p.
24. 1988. Structure of cooperative society Organizational Consulting. 7 p.
25. 1988. Program of amateur performance of the population on a residence (in hostels of Kirov Factory). 35 p.
26. 1988. Conception of self-management of hostels. 11 p.
27. 1988. Project of system of national education. 10 p.
28. 1989. TP on reorganization of public health services of city. 8 p.
29. 1989. TP on the conception of the cost accounting of State Optical Institute (SOI). 6 p.
30. 1989. TP on the conception of the republican cost accounting. 11 p.
31. 1989. TP on the conception of ecological activity in Russia. 9 p.
32. 1989. Conception of YHC in Cheboxar. 15 p.
33. 1989. Conception of self-development of small cities. 56 p.
34. 1989. Conception of the Code about children, marriage and family. 37 p.
35. 1989. Conception of the sphere regional cost accounting. 25 p.
36. 1990. Sphere structure of Organs of Leningrad management. 10 p.
37. 1990. Statutes of Children's fund by name of F.M.Dostoevsky. 19 p.
38. 1990. Position about sphere committees of the Leningrad City Council. 10 p.
39. 1990. Position about sphere management of the Executive Committee of Leningrad. 6 p.
40. 1990. Sphere variant of transition to the market. 10 p.
41. 1990. Sphere conception of family. 28 p.
42. 1991. Family Code of Russia. The project of Children's fund by name of F.M.Dostoevsky. 113 p.
43. 1991. Program - methodical complex of the sphere analysis of the enterprise. 105 p.
44. 1992. Statutes of Sphere democracy fraction of the St-Petersburg City Council. 7 p.
45. 1993. Sphere analysis of the Statutes of Consignment of green. 3 p.
46. 1993. TP on the project of the St-Petersburg City Council structure. 8 p.
47. 1993. Project of the sphere structure of St-Petersburg Executive Committee. 10 p.
48. 1993. Conception of the bankers Association. 4 p.
49. 1993. Slip in Government of Russia about Sphere informational technology. 11c.
50. 1993. Task for development of the structure of St.-Petersburg Government. 48 p.

51. 1993. Definition of the tree purposes of regional structures of Representative and Executive Authorities. The program of the Russian Academy of Management " Optimization of structures and mechanisms Federal and regional management ". The report 90 p.
52. 1993. TP on perfecting of SOI control system. 76 p.
53. 1994. Sphere model of stable development. 12 p.
54. 1994. Conception of St.-Petersburg Children's Forum. 10 p.
55. 1994. Mathematical models of the sphere equilibrium. 44 p.
56. 1994. Structure of management of the Leningrad regional museum center. 5 p.
57. 1995. Conception of home television. 35 p.
58. 1996. Statutes of student's club "Leader". 4 p.
59. 1996. Position about a Public relief fund to wretched children of St.-Petersburg. 6 p.
60. 1996. Sphere marketing. 6 p.
61. 1997. Application of the sphere approach for want of designing Hydroelectric Stations. 12 p.
62. 1999. Program of tetra-harmonic development of the person (teenager). 3 p.
63. 1999. Constitution of Russian Federation. The chapter "Culture". The project. 7 p.
64. 1999. Statutes of TetraAssociation of Democratic Youth (TADY). 10 p.
65. 1999. Project of the pluralistically sociological education in Russia. 8 p.
66. 1999. Conception of middle class as predominant of accelerated development of Russia. 4 p.
67. 1999. Conception of work of the deputy of the Legislative convention. 3 p.
68. 1999. Conception of sociological service of the Legislative convention. 3 p.
69. 2000. Offer to the First International Forum of the Russian intelligence. 1p.
70. 2000. Offer to the First All-Russia sociological congress. 1 p.
71. 2000. Sphere informational-statistical technology. The Investment Project. 11 p.
72. 2000. Program on "Social Science" for X-X1 classes of high school. 16 p.
73. 2000. Program of the rate of "Sociology" for the students of a higher school. 22p.
74. 2001. Offer in the Program of Russian Union of right forces. 4p.
75. 2001. The concept of the television program for the teenagers " I - tomorrow ". 8p.

IN TOTAL in the list are 75 examples of applications of a TetraSociology and its technologies, not considering less significant, minor and duplicating. From them is published no more than 20 projects, generally, in structure of my monographs. Let us emphasise once again, that first, sociocultural, application the TetraSociology has found in organisation, program and work of labour-student's club "Demiurge" (1976-1980) on tetra-harmonic development of youth. The program of this club has found recurrence in " Principles of studio of family complex development of children " (1985), in " Statutes of student's club "Demiurge" " (1987) and in "Statutes of student's club "Leader" " (1996). These clubs and their statutes were created by the author.

2. Results of students poll

In December 1999 -- January 2000 I conducted a sociological poll among three groups of second-year students of the Economics department at the M.A.Bonch-Bruevitch State Telecommunications University in St.Petersburg, after the students have taken my one-semester, 32-hours course in sociology.

The poll was conducted in the groups, who received the following **questionnaire**:

WHAT IS:

1. The course's major merit _____
2. The course's major drawback _____
- RATE on one-to-five scale the course's components:
3. Humanitarian (teacher's work) ____
4. Informational (substantive) ____
5. Organizational (systematic order, structure) ____
6. Material (visual aids, obviousness, charts) ____
- RATE the course's aspects:
7. Lectures ____

- 8.Seminars____
 9.Novelty (originality, creativity)____
 10.Practical implications of tetrasociology for persons and society____
 DETERMINE:
 11.What do you value more: friendship or truth, pluralism or monism (underline your choice).
 12.Priority sphere for practical application of tetrasociology in Russia_____
 13.A sphere of its application in collaboration with the author. Yes. No.
 14.TetraSociology is a new, consistent outlook and way of thinking for the young. YES. NO.

The questionnaire has three parts: qualitative (2 questions), quantitative (8 questions), and value-oriented (4 questions). The first part asks to name the course's main merits and drawbacks. The second part asks to quantitatively rate the course's four components (humanitarian, informational, organizational, material) and its four aspects: lectures, seminars, novelty, practicality. The third part asks to choose among values. The questionnaire has 14 questions overall; 46 students filled it out.

The questionnaire's general results.

1. The following course's qualities were praised most often: "new outlook," "systematicity, solidity," "well-substantiated, open-minded," "novelty," "depth," "optimism," "good practical assignments," "solid theoretical basis," "persuasiveness, consistency, well-foundedness," "practical applicability," "competent presentation of the ideas," "it makes students think," "it teaches to formulate and argue one's opinion," etc.

2. The following course's drawbacks were mentioned: "shortage of time," "subjectivity," "emphasis on TetraSociology," "incoherence of information provided," "not enough practice," "idealism, practical unfeasibility," "impossible to put into practice during the first couple of years," etc.

3. In the quantitative questions, the course's average rating was 4.3. (In the 1997 questionnaire, it was 3.9; in 1998, 4.1; in 1999, 4.2.) The ratings run all the range from the lowest to the highest, and the whole gamut of opinion is present: from most laudatory to extremely negative.

4. Regarding the value questions. 85% accepted pluralism; 6%, monism. (For reference: among St.Petersburg professors and social scientists I polled in 1999, only 20% accepted pluralism.) 70% found collaboration with the author acceptable; 30% didn't. **88% recognized TetraSociology as a "new, consistent outlook and way of thinking for the young"; 12% didn't.** (For comparison: only 5% of the professors and social scientists answered positively. Let us remind that almost 80 % from them remain by monists, opponents of the pluralism.) The results displayed a variety of ratings and opinion among students who'd been lectured in TetraSociology; the overall attitude was positive. This is what counts.

3. Results of Russian and Western sociologists poll

From May 20 to 23, 2001, I polled, via e-mail, 150 Russian and Western sociologists (75 in each group) about their opinion on TetraSociology. The poll's objective was to gauge the INITIAL level of attitude to a new and practically unknown sociological paradigm. The respondents received a 10-page summarising article: "TetraSociology as Theory of SST and as Technology"; three-questions questionnaire; and a brief cover letter. **The summary consisted of the pp. 2.2.--2.9. (see above)**, abridged. The article was translated into English (6000 words) and prepared for a Western journal. Two of the three questions in the questionnaire concerned the article. Below is the text of the letter with the questions.

Dear colleague!

More than 25 years I have been developing of pluralistic tetrasociology which proceeds from recognizing of four beginnings and measurements of society. TetraSociology is four-dimensional (tetra - four) sociological theory. For this time any central Russian journal, through the known ideological predilections saved until now, has not published on it any my article. Only in September 2001 in a magazine "Sociological studies" my article "TetraSociology - sociology of four measurements " was published. In total for 25 years - about 400 UNpublished works. Attempt to be published in 2000 year in 'International Sociology' also has failed. It has confronted with the negative opinion of Russian experts on which occasion there was an Editor of the journal. In connection with the given situation of restriction of publications

freedom I want to clarify the opinion of sociologists, for what I conduct selective inquiry on e-mail 75 Western and 75 Russian experts. Each of them I send the small survey article "TetraSociology as the Theory of Social Space-Time and as the Technology" (about 6000 words). I have asked each to read it and to answer three questions:

1. **Whether are you pluralist in the own theoretical sociological position? Yes. Not. I am loss to answer. I do not answer.**
2. **Whether you consider the possible publication in western journals of the represented article? Yes. Not. I am loss to answer. I do not answer.**
3. **What is your common estimation of advantages and lacks of TetraSociology? Write briefly.**

Thank for answers.

I ask you convincingly to read the enclosed article to answer questions and to send me the answers on e-mail. The outcomes of inquiry will be published on my site " Tetra _ Sociology ", which will be soon placed in the Internet. Comparison of inquiries outcomes is remarkable fact of " sociology of sociology ", which will be represented to XV World Sociological Congress. **You can be the categorical opponent of TetraSociology but main in another: whether you recognize the right on life of other sociological theories except for yours?** Whether you recognize pluralism of the sociological theories? Whether are you pluralist? Here in what sense of inquiry.

Believe any your answer for me is extremely important has vital significance. I'll be very grateful to you for reading of the article and answers to questions.

With deep respect, with hope for the response,

Leo Semashko

Pool results

The letter, the questionnaire and the article were e-mailed to 75 Russian and 75 Western sociologists on May 20-23, 2001. As for Russian researchers, St.Petersburg sociologists' emails were culled from the "St.Petersburg Sociologists: Who Is Who" (SPb, 1999) directory; emails for other cities were obtained from other sources. As for Western researchers, I, as an ISA member, culled their emails from the "International Sociological Association. Directory of Members 1998. Madrid". 11 Russian and 10 Western emails, amounting to 14% of the sample, proved invalid.

Responses were received from two Russian sociologists, who answered "yes" to the second question, and from five Western sociologists, two of whom answered "yes," two, "no," and one, "no answer." **Such is the initial level of attitude to TetraSociology.** Considering its novelty and uncertainty, and, importantly for non-Russian readers, imperfection of the translation, such a response is probably unsurprising. We should also take into consideration that the survey was conducted at the school year's end, on the threshold of summer, and many considered it a "spam" (unsolicited ad), which determined the low feedback rate: 5.4% overall (Russians, 3%; Westerners, 8%). So, these numbers cannot be regarded as an adequate expression of the attitude to TetraSociology. **Not only TetraSociology is unknown; many are not prepared, able and willing to appreciate a global theory.** Thus, the low feedback rate speaks not only for the theory's uncertainty, but also of the researchers' unreadiness to accept such theories too. Those who have a knowledge and are open-minded, react differently. For instance, the students who attended my course mostly accept TetraSociology (88% -- see the poll results above), while among the **social scientists of older generations in Russia, 80% of whom, according to my polls, preserve traditional, narrowly-empirical and/or monistic orientation, 95% reject TetraSociology.** Thus, not only the aspect of theory fame (knew/not knew) is important in forming an opinion on TetraSociology, but also such aspects as "young/not young," "able/unable to understand". As is well-known, not a single new theory was ever accepted by everyone and immediately. Some theories won recognition only after decades. Such is probably TetraSociology's destiny.

In June-December 2001 I sent the same article as mentioned above, in English, to Western journals and ISA Research Committees, whence came 7 more characteristic responses, which, along with the first five, I present below unaltered.

4. TetraSociology: “a nugget of gold,” “a brilliant” or “ambitious imagination”? Western sociologists' pluralism of opinion on TetraSociology

The answers settle down in the chronological order. The key phrases are allocated with a greasy font by me.

1. Dear Professor Semashko,

I found your account of tetrasociology **impressive in its own way and it is obviously based on very wide reading of a kind of sociological literature**. Nonetheless I have to tell you that it is not the kind of sociological work which I do. Throughout your terminology uses physical analogies and seeks to place sociology within the general field of natural science. My own sociological theorizing is based up on that of Max Weber in which all structures are ultimately seen as reducible to the categories of action and interaction as set out in the first four chapters of Weber's *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* which I read in its English version translated by Roth and Wittich. Chapter One is crucially important but so also are the next three chapters of Volume 1. **I should be surprised if someone does not agree to publish your work**. No doubt you will, be in touch with the Theory Group of the ISA. I find it increasingly difficult to get my own kind of sociological theory published.

With greetings to a valued colleague,

Sincerely,

John Rex,

Professor Emeritus,

University of Warwick,

United Kingdom

21.05.01.

2. Dear Dr Semashko,

I'm afraid you will find my replies to your questions rather disappointing.

For your first question, I am not sure what you mean, which makes it hard to answer. Of course I recognize that there is in practice a plurality of sociological theories, and I do not feel any objection to that - except that I do not think that a theory is of any interest unless it has empirical implications and, since the adequacy to empirical reality is the test of a theory, of ones which disagree with each other some must be wrong, or weaker, unless they are simply about different things. For your second question, no, **I do not think the article is publishable in a western journal**. For your third question, I fear that your 'theory' is probably not a theory in the sense in which I understand the word - or if it is, it is not a kind that I find useful. It is a member of a wider class, of which T. Parsons' and in particular Stuart Dodd's are other examples, which attempt to encompass everything in a framework which is essentially arbitrary (for instance in treating everything in terms of three, or in your case four, factors), and ends up playing with words rather than seriously discussing social realities. I know that it is very easy to get drawn into the fascination of elaborating such material, but I do not think that it is wise. Sorry! Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Platt.

Professor of Sociology

Book Review Editor, International Sociology

School of Social Sciences

University of Sussex

United Kingdom

22.05.01.

3. Dear Professor Semashko,

I have read your article and, although I appreciate the effort you have put into it, **I do not think it is likely to be published in a western journal**. The problem is that it attempts to be too original (if you will excuse the term). It does not connect sufficiently with current debates in sociological theory or follow on in the

same style of argument as those debates. It is too '**metatheory**' and not sufficiently 'middle-range'. Sorry if this sounds discouraging. Good luck with your work. Sincerely,

Kenneth Thompson,

Co-chairs of ISA RC 16 Sociological Theory.

22.05.01.

4. Dear Professor,

I am sorry but I must tell you frankly that **I am not interested in spending the time to deal with your development: tetrasociology**. I respect your theoretical **imagination and ambition**, but it is not something I wish to get involved in discussing at this time.

Sincerely,

Jeff Alexander

1.06.01.

5. Dear Professor Semashko

I have read your short paper with interest, but at its present state, it is not suitable for publication in Sociological Theory. What you are proposing is obviously **very ambitious**, and in the paper version, the arguments are too terse and short to communicate effectively the approach. At present, you offer a typology, or actually several typologies, but just how these increase explanation of the social universe is unclear. **I think what you say is very suggestive and interesting, but it is really the kind of argument that needs to be developed in a book, or at least a much longer article**. I am sorry that I cannot accept it for publication. Please keep me advise on your progress in working with your approach.

Jonathan Turner,

Editor, SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY, USA.

18.06.01.

6. Dear Professor Semashko:

Thank you for submitting your work "TetraSociology: from Theory to Technology" to CURRENT SOCIOLOGY. The editorial review of your paper is now complete. **We find your paper interesting and well done**, but regrettably it is inappropriate for CURRENT SOCIOLOGY. Our mandate is to publish shorter review articles of strong interest to sociologists internationally on any area of sociological inquiry. Your paper would be more appropriately submitted to a theory journal or a generalist sociology journal that publishes theoretical articles. There are, as you know, many of those journals in various countries. We wish you all best wishes in finding a suitable venue for your paper.

Yours sincerely,

Susan McDaniel,

FRSC Editor, CURRENT SOCIOLOGY

15.07.01

7. Dear Leo Semashko,

We have now had the opportunity to study your paper submitted by e-mail, but frankly **we do not know what to make of it**. However, what seems to be clear is that a great deal more explanation is required. To do this satisfactorily would we feel turn the work **into a book rather** than a journal article. There is so much that is not clear at present. For this reason we have to say that the work is not suitable for publication in Sociology in anything like its present form.

Best wishes,

Maggie O'Neill and Tony Spybey

Joint Editors, 'Sociology'

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Staffordshire University UK

18.07.01

8. Dear Leo Semashko,

Our journal works on the basis that all papers submitted are reviewed by three anonymous referees. This is normal in Britain. As it is a mainstream journal and the flagship journal of the British Sociological Association, your paper would not fare well in this process.

Best wishes

Maggie O'Neill and Tony Spybey

19.07.01.

9. Dear Dr. Semashko,

We have reviewed your article both in this office and by an outside reviewer (assessment follows), and I am afraid we cannot accept it for publication in INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGY. **The English language problem appears insurmountable.** I wish you success with the **book version** which has already appeared in Russian.

Said A. Arjomand, Editor

International Sociology

Department of Sociology, State University of New York

Reviewer's Assessment;

As it is, of course you cannot publish it. It is barely comprehensible, and dubiously useful. On the other hand, it might be good, although I'm not sure that the author can change it so as to make it good. I'm not saying I think it is good; I merely am saying I cannot at this point definitively rule that out.

The basic problem is dual. **First of all, it is in the style of Parsonian theorizing** - an extensive morphology which claims to be comprehensive. (It is also Parsonian more directly, in the emphasis on tetralogies rather than trinities.) Personally, I am allergic to this kind of work, so I am scarcely the fairest judge. But I did plow through most of Parsons when I was a graduate student. Obviously, Parsons was a very bright man, and there are insights all over the place. But Parsons is almost incomprehensible in English, and English is his native language. Imagine if Parsons had tried to write it in German, which he claimed to know. That's what we have here. What Semashko is like in Russian I do not know and couldn't evaluate (apparently, someone else did, but who?). **But Semashko in English means we have sentences which have no clear meaning**, words wildly misused (humanitarian for human, for example) and so on. Can one fairly judge? I doubt it. So, maybe we have **a nugget of gold**, but if so, it is covered in slime.

Forwarded by Said Arjomand

08.08.01.

10. Dear Professor Semashko,

The Editor has now carefully considered your article 'Tetrasociology' which you submitted to the Journal.

He found it of interest but regrets he is unable to offer to publish your paper in the BJS on this occasion. I am sorry to give you this disappointing news but hope that it will not deter you from submitting other articles to us in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Jacque Gauntlett

Journal Manager, British Journal of Sociology

London School of Economics

22.08.01

11. Dear Leo.

Your article **is brilliant**, but needs being re-elaborated. Besides, the English needs deep revision. But you have certainty ideas. Good work,

Mino Vianello

editor REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE.

3.10.01

12. Greetings from ISA Research Committee 51 on Sociocybernetics

Dear Leo Semashko,

I have received your paper and abstracts on TetraSociology from Felix Geyer and **I have read them with great interest and profit**. In fact, some of the questions you try to tackle have been also my concern since a long time. This, however, in the context of modeling social systems. It is my great pleasure to send you with this e-mail some of my writings which hopefully may be of interest to you. There is one other article, I think the most important one, which I have to send as a paper copy because of diagrams. Maybe you can send me your postal address.

In my own work I was not oriented towards statistics as you are. Nevertheless I encountered as the two main problems the issue of choosing the right basic concepts and then to obtain sufficient and appropriate empirical data. These, it seems to me, are also difficulties for you. What also becomes very clear from your papers, although it is not said explicitly, is the general problem, dealt with in model theory, that a model is always a simplified representation of some empirical reality. Therefore I cannot quite follow your optimism in really tracking down completely terrorist networks, although your approach may indeed be a valuable contribution to dealing with this kind of problems.

With regard to the basic concepts you are using I don't fully agree with everything, although in part this may be a problem of terminology and language and only in part a problem of theory. In particular I give myself a much more fundamental and important place to information and information processing following the work of Tom Stonier. In your theory information seems to be simply covered by "resources". Also I feel uneasy about your status constants. **On the other hand I consider the basic idea very valuable and I have not really covered this dimension in my own approach**. Very much certainly depends on how to break down the constants of TetraSociology. Maybe we can have some discussion on this when you have had a chance to read my papers.

In a way **I very much see your TetraSociology as a combination of the Systems Dynamics framework (in which, however, information flows are an explicit basic concept) with input-output analysis**. Both systems dynamics and input-output analysis are important tools at the level of (general) systems theory. Interpreting such a (general) systems framework with sociology has always been a major focus of my own work. In TetraSociology, at least from the little I could read so far, I cannot quite see how you interpret your systems framework with sociology on the basis of theoretical sociological arguments. Of course, this may be found in other parts of your work.

So I see two transitions, both of which are very difficult: (a) interpreting a systems framework sociologically and (b) interpreting the sociological framework empirically, i.e. with data. With regard to (b) an important question is what the transitions (or equations used to represent them) in the matrix look like in empirical cases and another one, whether we can get adequate empirical data for it. The possibility of calculation, or in my case modeling, depends to a very large extent on adequate answers to these latter questions.

Your very admirable and challenging aim of a quantitative mathematical sociology, which would also be optimal for modeling and computer simulation, my own interests, seems to me still difficult to achieve. This in particular, if information is to be quantified too. This is of course possible and our member Shann Turnbull has done very interesting work in this direction. Nevertheless, the meaning and effectiveness of information does not lie in the bits and bytes but in its meaning. And that is precisely what cannot be quantified (yet?).

As I said, I did not go myself towards statistics. Yet indicators have been a concern of mine and I think the work of my friend Hartmut Bossel on indicators and orientation theory could be very valuable for you. I enclose some references in an attachment to this mail. If you are interested I could send you some articles by paper mail.

It is this work on indicators which leaves me doubtful about your proposition that everything going on can be reduced to price and cost. In a way I can follow your complaints about the insufficiency of traditional economic statistics, but on the other hand ecological statistics, social statistics, quality of life

statistics are quite common meanwhile, at least in our Western Countries. Much of this has been initiated already a long time ago by the so-called social indicators movement and the quality of life movement. Similarly I think it is not enough to equate "technology" with information technology, even if I'm working myself in this branch of society and economy.

From the little I have seen **I think the scope and ambition of your scientific work is truly admirable. I think it is important to be consequent like you are and to go all the way from philosophy to sociology, application, and even software.**

I'd very much enjoy to have the opportunity to discuss with you personally your theories at our meeting in Brisbane and I think it would be a very important and fertile contribution to the discussion in our group if you could present your concepts and theories to us in Brisbane.

At this point I'm not quite sure, whether you did send the papers I received from Felix Geyer officially to our Review Committee who has to approve all the abstracts and whether you are planning to join us in Brisbane. Of course, this travel will be quite expensive for all of us, but if there is anything I can do for you in this respect I'll be very happy to send you a formal invitation or a letter of recommendation which may help you to get some travel support.

With best regards

Bernd R. Hornung

- President -

ISA - RC51 on Sociocybernetics 2.12.01

Brief comment. The variety of evaluations and opinion vividly testify to Western sociologists' **pluralism**. The array of opinion is as wide as can be: from sharply negative to the most laudatory, **from "a brilliant, a nugget of gold, admirable scope and ambition," etc. to "ambitious imagination, Parsonian theoryzing, metatheory,"** etc. Obviously, comments about "poor usage" of English are fair; this, however, while becoming for some an additional argument for rejecting the theory, didn't prevent others from seeing in it something "interesting, useful, admirable." We also cannot help pointing at racism, arrogance and scorn in some responses. But these are few. Overall, a majority finds the article and the theory interesting, while pointing at certain substantive and stylistic drawbacks, which make the article in its current shape unfit for publication. This is a decent evaluation. Besides, several reviewers note that **the theory presented requires a book, rather than a short article**, to fully expound the arguments. **This recommendation is followed upon in this book. I can only express my gratitude to all those who sent me their comments, many of which I heeded and which helped to make my book better.** The only thing that saddens me is the instances of racism. My another regret is that TetraSociology **stirred much more interest in the West than at home. There it understand better and faster, than in Russia, despite of the very insignificant information on it.** But this can be easily explained if we consider the legacy the Russian mentality is shedding. Overall, the evaluations quoted demonstrate the INITIAL level of attitude to TetraSociology, which will serve as the reference point for the polls to follow in 2-3 years.

5. M.N.Rutkevich: monistic attack on TetraSociology or agonies of Marxism.

The completion of the book coincided with the publication of M.N.Rutkevich's article⁶⁵ assaulting TetraSociology. Russian Academy Science's corresponding member, M.Rutkevich is a leading Marxist theorist among those 80% (on our researches) of Russian social scientists who are still loyal to monism, particularly to its Marxist variety. He criticizes the very brief summary of TetraSociology published in the same journal⁶⁶.

⁶⁵ Rutkevich M.N. Natural science and sociology. On appropriateness of transposing notions, in Sociological Studies, 2002 (3), p.12-18.

⁶⁶ Semashko L.M. TetraSociology: Sociology of Four Dimensions. Towards Formulating the Problem, in Sociological Studies, 2001 (9), p.20-28. The article includes abridged pp.2.2-2.6 of the book. Remarkably, that has been the only and, probably, the last one of my publications in the journal, which declined my articles more than once. My request to have a more detailed exposition of TetraSociology published in the journal was declined too.

For all the obviousness of the intent, which is to bash and trash (reject) TetraSociology, M.Rutkevich's article is very devious. We cannot neglect to respond to it because it is a typical example of Marxist-type criticism still prevailing (making 80% of the total!) in Russia. We will try to briefly go over the motives behind the subterfuges in M.Rutkevich's article, separating Marxist grain there from Marxist husk and smoke-screens.

In length, M.Rutkevich's article is nearly equal to ours: it has 27 paragraphs, only 9 of which focus on "critique" of (or rather, assault, rejection of) TetraSociology. And are the other two thirds about? What does M.Rutkevich "critique" and on what grounds does he reject TetraSociology?

On the face of it, this is what M.Rutkevich criticizes me for: "L.Semashko's article attempts to apply the physics notion of four-dimensional space to sociology"⁶⁷. This, along with the article's title, suggests that the key argument against TetraSociology is that I supposedly "transpose" (or broadcast) physics into sociology. For reasons that are not clear, M.Rutkevich devotes a big part of his article to expounding well-known mathematical and physical ideas of N.Bohr, W.Heisenberg, H.Lorentz, G.Minkovsky, A.Einstein, totally unrelated to the imputed "transposition," which does not exist in TetraSociology, but only in the "critic's" mind. TetraSociology draws an **analogy** between physical and social space-time, but does not "transfer" or "transpose" the former into the latter. My arguments are straightforward. If society is a part of nature, then social space-time, most likely, is **similar** to physical space-time, and if it is four-dimensional, then social space-time, most likely, is too. (This kind of similarity is the most probable of all, but it is not absolute.) The crux of my article is that I disprove identity between the two nor try to "transpose" one into another. What I try to do is to establish the optimal number of social space-time dimensions based on its obvious inclusion into physical space-time, it is built over physical and supplemental to it. At all distinction they can not be absolute unsimilar.

Another **analogy** that I take the license to make is social space-time's dependency on social invariants, which is **similar** to physical space-time's dependency on the mass and kinetic energy of bodies in Einstein's theory of relativity. These are two ideas about **similarity** that TetraSociology takes the liberty to advance. I make no "references" whatsoever "to the theory of relativity, applying it to sociology"⁶⁸. In TetraSociology, social space-time's coordinates -- social resources, processes, structures, and states, as well as the components of the social linking them -- **have nothing to do whatsoever common** with space-time parameters in the theory of relativity. Thus, it is not clear on what logical grounds M.Rutkevich imputes to me the "transfer and transposition," i.e. **identity** of social space-time with physical. As is known from the school course in logic, **analogy is similarity, not identity**, between separate objects. It is a mystery how the respected and highly experienced corresponding member of the national Academy could make a schoolboy's mistake of confusing analogy with identity; and the explanation to this is M.Rutkevich's overwhelming desire to trample down TetraSociology.

Thus, there are grounds to believe that this academician's peremptory and totally unfounded conclusion about the "absolute *scientific groundlessness* of applying the notions derived from a particular theory -- theory of relativity -- to constructing four-dimensional social space-time" is a malicious slander and does not have **any** logical foundations. Obviously, the reasons and motives behind Rutkevich's statement lie **outside** the realm of logic. Thus, the first grain of the "critique" is hollow and false.

The second grain of the "critique" is the charge of "ineptness" of my categorizing processes as spatial coordinates, which I regard as **primarily** synchronous, and categorizing developmental states as a temporal coordinate, regarded as **primarily** diachronic. The "critic" ignores the oft-repeated word "primarily," which I use to indicate that in society there is no clear-cut boundary between spatial and temporal coordinates and that they are dialectical and inter-inclusive. Unfortunately, because of space constraints, I had to leave out of the article a very important chapter on the social space-time dialectics (see above p.2.7). The point of this dialectics is that ALL social space coordinates are various forms of social time, the latter being people's life and employment times. Resources are the past, people's frozen time;

⁶⁷ Rutkevich M. Ibid., p.13.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.17.

processes (functioning) are the present, people's "short," current time; structures are a combination of both kinds of time; and states are people's "long" time inhering in developmental states, which embrace people's past, present and future times. Yes, for the reason indicated, the article does not explain the space-time dialectics; however, the oft-repeated word "primarily" points at it.

M.Rutkevich is known for his works on dialectics and he could not have missed this word; obviously, he neglected to notice it **on purpose**, in order to simplify the task of branding TetraSociology "inept," something which it is not. Only metaphysicians or schoolboys can make rigid distinctions between space and time. M.Rutkevich, meanwhile, is no schoolboy and he considers himself a dialectician; therefore, inter-inclusion of polarities should be an axiom for him. Why then does he consider "inept" inclusion of time into space, if ALL social space-time coordinates are a continuum of different forms of people's life time? M.Rutkevich's conclusion does not seem to have logical grounds. It seems to have **ultra-logical** motivations. Now having done away with the "grains" of the "critique," We will proceed with an analysis of the motivations. We have fathomed already the quality of the "grains" and their worth.

What is essential in the ultra-logical motivation for the criticism is a desire, by **all possible means, to discredit and reject pluralism**, which has always been the ideological foe number one for Marxists, and which Marxists have always rejected and trampled down by all means possible, including violent ones. As an intransigent and belligerent Marxist, M.Rutkevich could not have failed to understand that TetraSociology's pivot and chief value is a variety of pluralism, the four-dimensional (tetra) one. Being a form of pluralism, TetraSociology is scary and dangerous for Rutkevich. However, in the XXI century, after the obvious triumph of pluralism across the globe and 12 years after the fall of Communist totalitarianism, the collapse of the USSR and the indisputable collapse of their ideological base, Marxism -- the collapse which even sceptics cannot but acknowledge (the Marxism's crash is rejected only by its fanatics) -- fighting against pluralism openly and honestly would be an outrage. This is now a "mauvais ton" in general, and in science in particular. M.Rutkevich has not mustered the courage for a frontal attack; he resorts to a ruse instead. He disguises his attack as a "criticism" (rejection) of **subjectivism**, with this criticism running for more than half the article. "Why subjectivism?" an uninitiated reader may ask. Go look into Soviet-era Marxist dictionaries and encyclopaedias and see how they define pluralism: "[it is] only a disguise concealing the **subjectivist**-idealistic foundation of contemporary bourgeois philosophy"⁶⁹ (italics mine -- L.S.). This kind of appraisal of pluralism is often accompanied with epithets such as "eclectic." Criticizing and rejecting subjectivism, M.Rutkevich rejects pluralism, being wary of even mentioning the term. Fighting against subjectivism is simpler, more familiar, less dangerous than fighting against pluralism, which has always been a terra incognita for Marxists.

So, what are the shortcomings of subjectivism (read -- pluralism), from our "critic's" viewpoint? The key one is all the attempts "to transpose individual concepts and theoretical notions" from one science into another, in particular from natural science into social science. Rutkevich includes into this "barren," in his opinion, "branch" of research not only TetraSociology, but also the "new historical chronology" proposed by the mathematician, RAS member F.T.Fomenko, and the principle of complementarity in sociology postulated by I.S.Alekseev and F.M.Borodkin, and the new interpretation of social time proposed by historian A.Gurvich and sociologist G.Zborovsky. The "critique" equates these theories with A.Comte's attempt to liken sociology to "social physics" and the attempts by Social Darwinists to apply the Darwinian ideas about struggle for existence to society. The critic labels these ideas as "Kantian variety of agnosticism" and "a subjectivist position"⁷⁰, which does not prevent him from calling one of the endeavours "a noble banner"⁷¹. What an eclecticism of Marxist evaluations!

Even sensible varieties of Marxism do not deny the usefulness and fruitfulness of drawing **analogies** between different sciences, and applying notions derived from one science and **modified** to another; they do not deny productivity of cross-disciplinary links in science. We can not elaborate on this purely philosophical topic, which is so dear, for the reasons indicated, to our "critic." If not him, who is to know about the

⁶⁹ Kondakov N.I. Reference book on logic. M., 1975, p.447.

⁷⁰ Rutkevich M.N. Ibid., p.15, 16 and further.

⁷¹ Ibid., p.18.

significance and fruitfulness of ideas cutting across different sciences: if we are not mistaken, he has written about it more than once.

Each scholarly theory deserves a criticism, but it should be an honest criticism, not a trumped-up one; a criticism grounded in logic, and not in an ultra-logical desire to completely discredit and trash the theory. Having always been a platform for **diverse theories about the same subjects**, both natural and social sciences are **pluralistic** at the core. Herein lies the gnosiological source of the sciences' progress, and the indication of eternal limitations and incompleteness of the human mind. For some reason, the "critic" rejects these axioms, indirectly trying to show that the sole and absolute verity for all sciences resides in Marxism alone, which God-like towers over both natural science (remember the attempts to discredit cybernetics, genetics, structural linguistics, etc.) and social sciences. And now there are new, fledgling theories to trash and trample out, because they are not as "perfect" as Marxism, even the dead one. Such is the "critic's" true design.

Can we regard this "critique" as a critical evaluation and dialectical negation contributing to progress in sociology? The article provides no reason for that. This is why we call the author not just a critic, but a "critic" in inverted commas, meaning destroyer, naysayer, terminator. M.Rutkevich certainly remembers Marx's famous pronouncement about the difference between metaphysical negation as "barren, futile, sceptical," as a total destruction, and dialectical negation as "a link in the chain and a progress which retains what is positive." If TetraSociology and the other theories which the "critic" labels as subjectivism/pluralism are "totally unfounded," and he completely rejects them, seeing nothing positive in them, then what else can we call such a position if not metaphysical? That's a rhetorical question. And where is, in the critique, the dialectical negation as a link in the chain and a progress? The critique lacks it. Just as it lacks life and development. There is nothing but death and destruction in it. Dead Marxism is grabbing theories that are alive, trying to strangle them. Such, objectively speaking, is the essence of this kind of "critique," whether the authors realize it or not.

With intransigent belligerent Marxism, the end justifies the means. In the nine paragraphs that "critique" TetraSociology, M.Rutkevich often uses the following epithets: a mere nothing, inept, contrived, unpersuasive, groundless, confusion, far-fetched proposition, futile, not innocuous, deification of quaternary, lacking coherence of thought, scholasticism⁷². That many epithets on only a page and a half! Instead of presenting a strong argument, M.Rutkevich calls names and adopts a belligerently monist stance.

The following phrase crowns the Marxist scholasticism: we will not "untangle the snarl that TetraSociology is," "all we need to do is to establish its futility and unharmleness" (and so on, with the epithets we quoted above)⁷³. How arrogant and supercilious this openly racist phrase is! This is the Marxist racism of the beginning of the XXIst century! Gods of Marxism do not have to try to understand other theories -- all they have to do is **to establish in advance that the theories are futile**. Then why put on this "critical" show with the roles assigned in advance: Marxism is the only true, God-given theory, while all other theories are vain attempts to replace it. If nothing has to be taken "seriously" and all is established beforehand, then, of course, spiteful words, trumped-up charges and falsified accusations would suffice. It would have been more honest to limit the article to two words: "**Rejected by Marxism**," and that would be it. Just rubber-stamp every new theory accordingly.

Had the "critic" conscientiously compared TetraSociology and historical materialism in their treatment of social space and time, the social, method, employment, social reproduction spheres, classes, sociological statistics, informational and sociocultural technology, democratic government, attitude to religion and racism, he would have to acknowledge that TetraSociology **retains** all that is positive and vigorous in Marxism. (And this would be a dialectical, rather than "futile," negation!) Besides, he would have found in TetraSociology many **new** ideas in a **new frame**, that are unavailable to Marxism. But it takes an honest and unprejudiced scholar, rather than a Marxist, to do this. Our "critic" does not see anything positive in TetraSociology, not even in the ideas it has borrowed from Marxism, although M.Rutkevich, I beg your pardon, concedes once that TetraSociology offers "several reasonable ideas", such as the notion of

⁷² Ibid., p.17-18.

⁷³ Ibid., p.18

four processes of social reproduction derived from A.Smith and K.Marx. But this single line in Rutkevich's article gets lost amidst the spiteful epithets and distortions I mentioned. The senile Marxism with its rotten teeth obviously cannot crack the nut of TetraSociology, or other new theories. "Perennially dated," Marxism cannot keep pace with the time. It cannot recant the obsolete monistic principle of primacy, with its oppressiveness and exclusivity, and adopt the modern principles of pluralism, supplementality and equilibrium. These are the signs of agonies.

Of all the numerous Marxist-type "critiques" of TetraSociology that have appeared over the 25 years of its existence (until 1998 TetraSociology was called "The system-spheres approach," or simply "The sphere approach"), all looked mostly like a witch-hunt with an implied suggestion to persecute the author (the persecutions proceed till now in relation to publications, work and protection doctor's) and none was constructive. All these critiques were tantamount to a more or less rude and barren rejection, i.e. mere repudiation. With Marxists, dialectical negation has obviously degenerated into metaphysical negation. The quality of their "critiques" bears no scrutiny and criticism.

To conclude, I am not sure that my response to our "critic's" article will be published in the journal, which already has two of my articles shelved away. For this reason I publish the response in this book, where it seems appropriate. The contrast between the **pluralism** of evaluations provided by Western sociologists and the **monism** of the Marxist rejection of TetraSociology is very typical too and is unflattering to Marxism.

6. Websites carrying publications about TetraSociology.

This book could not enter and small share of materials on TetraSociology, a number from which the reader can find on my sites and in my publications in Network, which addresses are resulted below. The truth on English while one site is published only.

1. Site: TetraSociology, May 2002, in English and Russian: <http://www.tetrasociology2002.spb.ru>
2. Site: Investment project of the SIST: on Russian: www.infotechsistr.narod.ru , in English: www.infotechsiste.narod.ru
3. Article. TetraSociology as format of the pluralistic sociological education an information society: [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Educ.doc](http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Educ.doc)
4. About 1-m the All-Russia sociological Congress " The Notes of Diogenes - I search for sociology ": <http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Socio.doc>
5. Book: TetraSociology - revolution of social thinking, way of harmony and prosperity. [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Tetr.zip](http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Tetr.zip)
6. Article. Spiritual culture - strategic resource of outstripping development of Russia in the XXIst century and Constitution. [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/dk.doc](http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/dk.doc)
7. Article. Paradigm of TetraSociology: sources and use. [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/dk.doc](http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/dk.doc)
8. Article. TetraSociology as the theory of social space - time and as technology. [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Tetr1.doc](http://www.socio.ru/public/semashko/Tetr1.doc)
9. Program sociology course for students. TetraSociology of an information society: technology of prosperity through harmony and information. [Http://www.socio.ru/public/semasko/Educ.doc](http://www.socio.ru/public/semasko/Educ.doc)
10. Other publications see on site of the Russian sociological network <http://www.creolab.com/portfolio/socio/>

Back cover

TetraSociology is global multidimensional model of the social world in 24 parameters of four-dimensional spatial-temporary rhythmic. It is developed by the author in Russia more than 25 years.

Five discoveries of TetraSociology are: sphere classes as actors of social harmony, sphere democracy, sphere sociological statistics, sphere information-statistical technology, sociocultural technology of prosperity through harmony and information. They give the new responses to global challenges of century.

The first estimations of western sociologists of TetraSociology: "nugget of gold", "brilliant", "admirable scope and ambition", "ambitious imagination", "Parsonian theorizing" and others.

The author is Ph.D., Associate Professor, Dept Politology of St. Petersburg State University of Low Temperature Technologies, member of the International Sociological Association (ISA), Director of unstate Institute of Strategic Sphere (Sociological) Researches, in 1990-1993 years the deputy of Lensovet/Petrosovet, in 1990-1997 years the founder and President of Children's fund by name of F.M.Dostoevsky in St-Petersburg, author 67 proceedings, including 4 monographs, has 20 years of the pedagogical experience, since 1976 develops and applies TetraSociology.

This book, as the author's scientific "visit card," being not only a summation, but a program for the future as well, is intended for all those interested in sociology, especially women and the young, but first of all for sociologists, the XV World Sociological Congresses participants, so they could familiarize themselves with Tetrasociology and evaluate its potential.