Studia Culturae: Вып. 1 (39): Academia: С.В. Борзых. С. 7-21.

С.В. БОРЗЫХ

Кандидат философских наук, доцент ВАК
Томск, Россия

ВОЗМОЖНЫЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ: ПОЧЕМУ ТАК МАЛО ФОРМ ВОЗМОЖНОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ СООБЩЕСТВ

Это эссе показывает, что существует не так много возможных форм организации какой-либо социальной сущности, несмотря на то, что мы видим это по-другому. Ключом к их организации является стабильность, которая достигается только в одних обстоятельствах, а не в других. А последних на самом деле мало, что позволяет выживать только тем учреждениям, которые сохраняются в течение длительного времени. Итак, закономерности, по которым функционируют все эти сущности, скудны, но они отражают нашу человеческую природу.
Ключевые слова: возможный, организация, стабильный, культура, человек

S.V. BORZYKH

PhD in social philosophy, HAC associate professor
Tomsk, Russia

POSSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS: WHY ARE THERE SO FEW FORMS OF POSSIBLE ORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITIES

This essay shows that there are not so many possible forms of organization for whatever social entity despite we see it differently. The key for organizing them is stability, which is attained only in some circumstances, not others ones. And the latter are in fact scarce, letting only those institutions to survive, which persist for long time. So the patterns, according to which all these entities function, are scant, but they reflect our human nature.
Keywords: possible, organization, stable, culture, human

If we would look around we would see many organized entities. There are companies, enterprises, social institutions and many complex things that we use everyday are also in this or that way organized too. For that matter it's quite difficult to meet something so simple which would consist only of one or few parts. But of much more interest is our culture which is even more complicated than all what I mentioned.

As it's known the word «organization» has two meanings. The first one concerns some physical object as it appears to an onlooker, the second one pertains to a mode of operation, which defines how something works. For example, there is an army, i.e. in broad sense a group of people who try to defend or conquest whatever they intend to and there are instructions and rules of how to execute these aims and also to

regulate relations between those persons. What I will describe and elaborate shortly refers to the second meaning.

Many people have proclivity to think about culture – and it's my main topic – in terms of multiplicity and diversity. Though we don't have any strong and sturdy definition of culture because there many of them nevertheless if we see something like it we always recognize it. However, what is more important is this propinquity itself and the real state of affairs.

Let me begin with the very human nature. Many if not all people propose and even contend that we as s species are highly superior and more are the apex of if not of creation so of evolution ineloquently. Few days ago I had conversation with my colleague who asked me about purpose. He's referred to the question why selection chose mind or culture or language etc. for our survival. Is there or here any end at all?

I doubt. Even more I suggest that this question isn't reasonable in principle. As it's known evolution doesn't create animals including humans too to reach some point or to show its abilities. There's neither will nor any goal. As R. Dawkins said about it, selection is blind watchmaker and it does much sense in what follows. Howbeit another problem stays. Why then for heaven's sake we do have all these features? It's often tough to think about something like culture in terms of evolution. Nonetheless, let try to do exactly this.

Humans as a species appeared approximately two hundred thousand years ago. And it's not critical that we don't know the concrete date because we don't need neat numbers. What is more important is following. At first. Bipedalism occurred much earlier. As it's known the split between future us and apes happened about six or seven millions years in the past. The very this feature predetermines many others including our big brain. At second. Fire was tamed not by us but by our forebears, maybe by Homo erectus or Homo habilitus. It's substantial because fire was and is immensely powerful instrument in transforming an environment. At third. Already mentioned Homo habilitus bears her name due to the fact that she was able to work and do tools what also can we. At forth. Humans were and are almost identical to our genetic cousins, i.e. Neanderthals, at least in categories of our genomes. Perhaps that's why they possessed culture too. And at fifth. In comparison to all other extinct homos we are first graders because we live here only a small fraction of time and it's hard to predict what will happen further. What does all this mean?

It's always hard to acknowledge that our culture, language or consciousness or cognition or even soul all have the same fundament. And its name is a physiology. Evolution went and stumbled until it created us. But it's wrong to suggest that it had some sort of a goal. It hadn't and hasn't. What happened is just that. We are here. Though, how it relates to our nature?

My colleague supposes that self-consciousness is the trait that determines what human is. The logic here is simple. Because all others animals don't demonstrate

something like this it means that we are at least special or even more the only species who has mind. But this logic is awkward and lopsided.

At first. We simply don't know have others critters aught like a reason or cognition or not. Why? Because they don't speak in the manner we do. All what we can is to interpret their behavior. And this is far cry from real understanding. For example, smile may signify sorrow or lust or fun or something else and we need to ask what is the exact sensation applying to language again. Moreover, words have many meanings and there stills possibility of omission, innuendo and misinterpretation.

At second. Actually, we can look around and recognize that some level of consciousness is in the high demand almost everywhere. Because all creatures have to cope with many challenges and tasks which are infeasible without some thought however automatic or mechanic it were. It's impossible to foresee all situations which can occur to an individual and that's why nature provides many genera with though small but not nonexistent freedom of reactions.

At third. Let it seems silly and dumb or trivial and banal but nature has only that material which it actually possesses. It means it's able to construct something using exclusively organic matter. In the case of ours or someone's else brains the result is quite identical. Scientists for long know that the content of ours and others skulls isn't the same but very similar. The difference is weigh, structure and separate sections but the building scaffoldings are the same. And by the way that's why they study aplysias, monkeys, worms, flies and so on notwithstanding it might look ridiculous to non-specialists.

At forth. There's Turing's test which posits that a machine if it can at least emulate the functioning of mind would be recognized as thoughtful. It's strange enough but only until we understand that someone's consciousness or cognition or self-awareness are given to us through mediator, not directly. As in the case of R. Descartes we are able to proof only our mind, not any other. So it's reasonable to surmise that animals possess it too.

And at fifth. In fact nobody knows what I is. If I look in mirror how I realize that the reflection is me? Because I'm aware that the cells of my organism perpetually change and despite of this I contend that yesterday I was the same I as I'm today. Moreover, as a child I was smaller though I was me and in the future I'll be yet different but nevertheless I'll be me. How it's possible? What self-consciousness means at all?

During childhood and also later people learn many things about themselves and about the world around them. No one appears here with total knowledge about something. And it relates to self-awareness too. In fact we acquire the sense of I and aren't bestowed with it from the very beginning. It's very long and tough path. But how it happened in the history of evolution that our species got I or mind or cognition and others ones became less happy? Let scrutinize this process in detail.

Conventional classification says humans and many others genera are eukaryotes and multicellular ones. The latter fact is of dramatically huge importance. Until now

majority of all genera are unicellular and also dominance in quite all categories belongs to them too. To be consisted of many parts isn't very good as it seems at first blush. Nonetheless, we and others are here what stands one essential question. Namely why did it occurred?

Alas, nobody knows. There are many suggestions and even speculations about such sort of things but in nub no one is certain. Indeed, we aren't so hapless as it's assumed. First of all many features and traits are emergent. For example, feathers appeared not for flight but for thermal regulation and only later became to be used for today's purpose. Another illustration. Language's acquiring occurs spontaneously when children attain definite threshold. In the beginning there are only unconnected sounds and vocalizations and then quite miraculously the true speech appears.

Many of our abilities can be understood in this way of reasoning. Our gait is the sum of big number of parallel and synchronized processes and the result of their interactions is the fact that we are able to walk. Our sensations and sentiments appear because of many co-occurring minor reactions to external stimuli which conflate to sire feelings. And, as I'll show later, the same relates to our thoughts and social bonds too.

What does it mean for multicellularity? Though nobody knows exactly why it happened at all everyone can observe how cells occasionally connect to each other and stay in this position for a while. For what ends they do it is unimportant for my discussion although for others reasons it's critical enough. What is indeed essential for me is that they do it in principle and, moreover, quite often. Multicellular organisms therefore might appear only because it was possible not for some odd aims.

Further. The process once began continued. The cells became specialized and some of their juxtapositions became able to produce new faculties, which in accordance to the theory of evolution, granted their hosts some advantages over other combinations. Here is no reason to reiterate the whole process but once upon a time on the scene appeared a new species, our long gone forebear. What is crucial he or she stand on two hind limbs.

Bipedalism is in no way a gift of heavens. We are slow, vulnerable and at least women suffer when giving birth to our children. It's usually said that this trait helped our ancestors to look further or to free our hands but on the start as also later it was bad. What it was in the eyes of evolution is quite simple – the next experiment. Only later this feature helped us to get bigger brain which in the turn is emergent too, but once again our gait is of no use per se and a fortiori wasn't good for our forebears.

Secondly. People tend to forget that our today's superiority or domination above all other genera excluding perhaps viruses and bacteria is recent phenomenon. As I mentioned before we are here for approximately two hundred thousand years of which agriculture, writing and many other elaborate entities we have only at best for ten thousands.

It's quite understandable that it's very small period of time to make any conclusions. Yes, we have today all known amenities and conveniences but we indulge in

them only briefly especially in relation to evolution's spans. As for our genetic or biological nature, it changed at best superficially. But to catch the deepest meaning of what we are we need to answer following question – what it's to be human?

Every creature has its own physiology. Usually it's viewed through the prism of fitness. The latter can be measured, for example, in terms of rate of survival or of total number of individuals in given territory or of prevalence in different habitats or in any other important category. Wolves in that grid are well adapted – they live quite long, there are a lot of them and they are represented on almost all continents and climatic zones.

People are happy in this system of coordinates too. We live tens of years, we are present on all continents and we are dispersed almost everywhere. But here's one critical caveat. All it's right but we need to be wary at least when we're concerning absolute quantities. As it's known Australia was populated some fifty thousand years ago. New world, i.e. both Americas, took its turn much later – circa fifteen thousands and many islands came much after. What is more essential is that we were rare in all these locations until modernity. And that means we were not so special or almighty during almost all history as we like to think.

There's the anthropic principle which states that the Universe needs a beholder to be viewed as it is. Fine, but it longs for him or her not defining who or even what he or she or something else must do it. There are fishes, insects, many genera of animals, stones in the end and they all in this or that manner look at the world around them and maybe think about it. Why people? Surely, it's we, who ask these questions, but as I wrote above we simply don't know ponder other genera or not.

Archeology shows us that people were quite insignificant during almost all of our species's history. Our numbers were small, we didn't dramatically recreate our surroundings and even if we beheld the Universe we did it in a humble terms quite certainly not in the ways we ruminate now. Moreover, the latter can live without someone's or something's peering at it. Live itself is nonsense not even mentioning multicellular one.

Thirdly. Many laypeople but more regrettably scientists stubbornly believe that they are smart and intelligent. Not trying to hurt someone's feelings I nevertheless have to say that that's wrong suggestion. Humans are mean persons in a lot of indicators and yes in category of intellect indeed too. There is so called normal or Gaussian distribution which shows that majority of individuals are something in the middle – they are not tall and not short, not beautiful and not ugly, not smart but also not stupid and so on and so forth.

What is usually hidden is following. It may look strange but people are not very smart in principle. Let me explain why. Our brains can be wired in many numbers of configurations, but, of course, not in all imaginable. The structure of our gray matter is partly preset by the very nature. For example, there are Broca's zone or visual compartment and so on. What is significant is that our neurons can be connected in

such a way as to attain the maximum of their efficiency. Surely, there is a lot of factors which influence this process but in the nutshell we are able to surmise that there is such an apex at all. What does it mean?

Imagine that we have a processor – though, of course, our brain isn't processor in conventional meaning of this word – that we can speed up so as to get the best result of its functioning. What we are able to tinker? In the case of our neurons in fact not very much. Even more, we are always dealing with a number of connections between them and with overall structure of this intercourse. And that's all.

These features are obtained during in most parts a period of a childhood but never cease to happen at all. As writes S. Kanazawa and others too the old debate of nature versus nurture doesn't matter. What is of more importance is our individual experience. Because we meet these but not those people, read these but not those books and on and on. Therefore, each of us gets absolutely unique wiring of his or her neurons which renders this or that level of maximum potential.

I doubt that there are or in this case can be ideal circumstances, which usher someone in the blissful and fantastical world of pure intelligence. There are so many distortions, shortcomings and mistakes that maximum potential is never reached. One example.

There are many contests of beauty. Miss Universe, Miss World, Miss Europe etc. All these girls are without discussion very pretty, but – also without debate – not ideal too. Because the latter includes all sorts of niceness – from appearance to manners. As it's known there isn't and can't be perfection in principle. So even winners of those competitions are at best lovely. On the scale from zero to ten maybe sevens and not more.

On the other end of this distribution are located ugly people. It's again very difficult to find someone who were nasty in all relations therefore on this corner we have fours or fives perhaps threes but this is very strong contention. However as you can see the difference between beautiful and lousy isn't so big as it's usually thought. And this is quite understandable. If it were another way we would have more genera but we are the same.

In the case of intellect the situation is identical. We have at best eights and at worst threes and all in between but no more no less. And if we don't run to extremes the bottom line isn't very impressive or dazzling – fives or sixes are norm. And this pertains almost to all our features and traits. But of what need are these ruminations and how they relate to the theme of order?

Before I continue let me give an example. I don't try to hurt somebody but nevertheless. Many people are religious ones. As for me faith – in God, in reason, in superstitions ad so on – is the first instance whence every trial begins. However it seems strange to believe that, for example, there was Jesus Christ who said truth which is today of the same relevance as it was two thousand years ago. I don't un-

derstand importance and efficacy of all these rituals and rites and I have many doubts about other sides of Christianity and other religions too. Though, I respect all of this.

Recently I was puzzled by the mode the God – if, of course, He or She exists at all – decided to create the Earth and the people. Why, as it's usually stated, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent and perfect superbeing did everything in such a way as we see it? For example, Judea is a very small territory in the Near East of no importance and with mainly desert sired three world religions. People believe what is said in the Bible and in the Koran quite literally notwithstanding historical evidence and facts. But more critical why and for what purpose the God with all – his, her or any other gender – faculties did aught so primitive?

The answer is simple. There isn't any need to make something more deliberate or complex only to persuade humans in its veracity. Faith or in that manner intellect mustn't be very sublime or high to believe. You haven't to concoct or contrive dramatically difficult concepts or systems. More primitive ones will win the game. And one more time. I don't insist on what is written above – there are my thoughts no more no less. However why it's so?

First. To use brain is meant to consume large chunks of energy. And more crucially – without obvious advantages. Judge for yourself. If somebody really thought he or she got almost nothing – neither respect nor material gains nor other boons. Of course, you can become a scientist but the ilk of the latter is rewarded indeed very humble in comparison, for example, to sportsmen or entrepreneurs or businessmen and businesswomen. As it's known from time immemorial that smart people are of no demand almost everywhere and quite never. Because they bring near to nothing to a society or a group.

I almost can hear objections, but wait for a second. I agree that today science plays a huge role in a progress, moreover it's associated with the latter. Nonetheless, that wasn't so during overwhelming majority of history. Innovations and insights are by their own nature very rare and occasional. And even this isn't enough modern big science is simply another social institute organized in the ways all others institutes are. There's no need to be very smart to participate in it. What you really need is to adhere to and to follow some rules.

However, it's essential that brain consumes much energy. It means that all others processes are deprived of it and can't be made. More pleasantly and useful would be to abandon thinking and rely on already prepared precepts and instructions not scrutinizing them. And this is the case of religion. When you are in a temple or a synagogue or a mosque or somewhere else you are almost prohibited to ponder in principle. All is said and what is left is to accept that wisdom not critique it.

But this is also true in many others instances. Because if we began to deem in, for example, state's organizations or in shops or in schools or… the roster goes on we would understand that this world is badly and even terribly organized. Here's an illustration. There's a spoon. This utensil is created to eat or better drink liquid food

– soups or otherwise. But to what extent is it useful? I don't think very much. The logic is following. Spoons are usually not very big what means we can't scoop a big quantity of what we consume. There're soup ladles but they are not comfortable to eat. Further. Spoons also let liquids to wash through their brinks so we can get dirty with what we drink. Handles of spoons are not convenient too. And notwithstanding all of this and of what I missed spoons stay the same.

As for organization of some processes here's another example. Today we are used to drive cars. There are many rules and norms how to do it. But they are not so rarely silly and dumb. And this knows everybody who happens to be on the road. Or take a manifold of state's bureaus. We all seldom think that they were specially and purposely created to exasperate us due to their modes of functioning.

By and large, I can safely postulate that this world is quite strange organized. There's order but it's not very clever. Things we use institutes we attend or belong to processes we partake in are all concocted and contrived without much effort only to execute a work ascribed to them. And that's why deliberate and thoughtful behavior is here excessive.

Second. Evolutionally we are all predisposed to many biases and proclivities. We're error-prone and make many mistakes. I have neither desire nor time to view all of them so let me present only one. People tend to deem that the whole world spins around them. Recently it was expressed in the geocentric theory today we meet such ignorance in the form of anthropocentrism. We like to consider that we're, for example, the only species who has consciousness or cognition, that our world outlook is sinless and seamless or in the same vein that we even have conquered or rule the whole planet. All of that isn't necessary so.

These hubris and hypocrisy are despicable and ineradicable. For example, many biologists now know that at least some sort of a mind is presented in other genera and that many of them have very similar to ours sensations and emotions. The Earth as it's learned in the school is spinning around the Sun and moreover its orbit isn't circular but ellipse-formed one. And each anatomist can say you that our organs let us to percept the reality in very limited numbers of its grandeur.

Despite of all that we continue to behave and act as if it doesn't concern us at all. We talk about sunset and sunrise notwithstanding our star is neither sets nor rises. We believe that we are superior to all others creatures. And even more – we do all possible to annihilate the whole world just to continue to lead unsustainable and undesirable to our planet lifestyle. As it was said in Matrix we're a kind of virus who kills the own host. Moreover, we tend to forget that the very our physiology steers our thinking in many subtle and vigorous ways. And you can reasonable ask me how is it realizable in principle. So the answer follows.

As I wrote before our brain's structure is largely preset by our genes. We simply aren't able at least yet to wire all neurons in such a way as to achieve desirable configuration. Then there are many epigenetic factors which influence the end result.

And this is also out of our personal control. And we mustn't forget about culture in which we happen to be. In sum we have very limited capacities to get what we really want. In a huge sense we are created by different environments not in reverse.

That means we can think only so and then how and when it's permitted by our anatomy and society. Here's example. How long ago if at all you tried to smell your working table? I sniffed. Or did you ever want to know what would be if someone has a go at tipping any text on keyboard by his or her nose? And yes, I did it. Or why don't you learn Khoisan languages? In fact they are very interesting because they have clicking sounds, which are absent in all other tongues. No, I didn't, I long for Spanish. People used to behave but also feel and think not unknown but painfully familiar. Why is it so?

The answer is simple. As I already mentioned brain's activity is very dear. Secondly, there're many rules and norms, which we haven't to transgress. And finally, we're learned not only to adhere to manners but also to sense and deem in quite predictable ways. Let me examine this list in order.

As for energy our brain strives for I wrote above. As for rules all here is understandable. So we're left with learning processes. Why someone or something dictates us what to do, what to feel and what to think and even the modes to exercise all of that?

First of all, there's no evil demon and no homunculus in your or my head. There are many neurons, which are wired following some blueprint – not necessarily by genes but by surroundings too. Second. All imaginable sorts of group's building aren't possible only few ones. I'll return to this concern later but for present purposes it suffices to say that a phantasy can create monsters in the same vein as angels. And third. We must always keep in mind our own faculties and also the opportunities of nature in the broad meaning.

I haven't enough time and space to explain all this in length but the essence is following. For example, our knees and elbows bend in opposite directions. That's because our forebears were reptiles and it was comfortable for them to move on the surface of the Earth using such a mode of articulation's flexing. And the same is true in relation to our behavior, sensations and thoughts – all they are possible only in a limited number of realizable.

Another illustration. There's such a phenomenon as synesthesia. In this condition people can hear paints or see hues of sounds and so on. Frankly, it's rare. Nevertheless even those individuals aren't able to smell how dogs do and have hyperopia possessed by eagles. Moreover, we can't imagine something transcending our potential in principle and here I stumble upon the very narrowness of every natural language and every human's mind because I'm human too.

Viewing our organism as a cage, in which we all are located, helps us to understand that we're bounded and tethered in many ways but usually don't see them. And we haven't even slightest opportunity or ability to do just that. On the one hand be-

cause of our nature, on the other due to impossibility of many variants. The latter needs explanation.

Third. As in many similar cases not all configurations are realizable and viable or feasible. We can, for example, imagine that there's a society which maims its members. It's joyful because in this role is presented every culture. In this or that way all of them mutilate us in many different manners. But let fancy such a collective which does it literally – maybe chopping off pinkies.

Surely, that sort of society can exist. There are tattoos, scaring, circumcision, castration, feet's binding and a lot of others initiations and consecration to an adult's life or aiming get something desirable. Pinkies are not of much use at first blush so we can severing them and at the same time not losing something important. And yes, people will aspire this moment of humiliation with fervor and thirst because of culture's appropriate settings.

Though let go further. Now we permit chopping off two fingers – pinky and a ring one. And again it's possible but with some difficulties. And forward. Let disconnect middle one. It's harder albeit not unrealizable. Index finger is much more crucial as thumbs are so perhaps it would be tough to liquidate them too. However, this example of thought experiment is very graphic. What does it show?

It demonstrates that not every impact is tolerant to our organisms. Because on some level it will be difficult to explain not even mentioning exercise this or that sort of pressure on human's organism. So there're limits. But what kind of them is presented in cultural sphere of our existence?

Returning to the question of a faith it means that not all stories can be stomached. For example, Jesus Christ didn't fly, but why? There's nothing in his nature what could stop him doing this. And nevertheless the fact remains. However strange it is it's quite understandable especially in the light of what I said before. Let me explain this point in some detail.

As it's known the sky is blue. That's because the axis of our planet is tilted and light goes through the atmosphere at a certain angle. People also can see paints in concrete diapason. Blue and green are adjacent. Those are basic facts. But what if we try to convince someone that sky is indeed green not blue? Is it possible? I think yes. I can attest it because history knows many examples when people believed in quite unbelievable but this didn't interfere them to lead normal life.

As for Jesus Christ he didn't fly maybe because in that case it would disclose his underwear or even an absence of it and this isn't acceptable. Or perhaps then he would appear too superior to humble humans despite he tried to produce very different impression. Or there can be other suggestions. However, he resurrected, healed, returned to life, walked on the water and even was conceived not in conventional way. He was and is the God after all.

In the sphere of believes not all of them are adaptable and admissible. Christ didn't fly whatever reason was and to try to convince that the sky is indeed orange is

more problematic than it's green albeit the latter is more discussible. Nonetheless, it's important to keep in mind that people tend to think, feel and behave in concrete diapason of possibilities. And that's why not all configurations or variants of their connections are realizable.

And at last but not at least. We rarely deem about the world around us in the terms of readiness. We accept uncritically and unconsciously that it's normal to have those environments that we actually possess. But this isn't natural in any sense of this word. And that's why.

Before I mentioned spoons in the prism of their efficacy. But we can also ask why we have namely spoons and other utensils too but not any of different kind. Let me explain what I mean. Europeans I think were surprised when they in the first time saw chopsticks for what they used damned spoons, forks and knives. In other parts of the world there were and are yet discrepant tools for eating. But what if we imagine that there are not known to us utensils but absolutely different?

We can play with many parameters in the end. Because we're able to change weight, length, breadth, size, angles, curvature and so on. And maybe we'll get much more useful cutlery. Though it's not very important. What is crucial is following. We all are surrounded not only by utensils but also by other things which and this is essential can be different. But what does it mean?

We tend to forget how and in what degree we are made by our culture. For example, it's not natural to speak English or Khoisan or Chinese as also in all other tongues. They are covenants no more no less. And each of us joins this contract simply by talking. But this also relates to an use of computers, clothes, cars, keys and all things and phenomena in whose world we are immersed in.

Attentive reader then can ask me doesn't this point contradict the former one? And he or she will be partially right. Culture in broad sense of this world is created by us, i.e. humans, and therefore is suited for us. But the logic goes back too. We're constituted by our environments. Where then lies a hedge between these two ways of influence.

There isn't the fence. A boundary is shifting and hazy therefore I can't show it exactly. Nevertheless, we must understand that it exists in principle. Because we have inherited material and also acquired one. This is the perpetual and odd struggle between nature and nurture. In reality they merge and fuse and the result of all of these interconnections are we ourselves. Though let me return to my last point.

Each personal development goes hand in hand with the world around us. We all stumble, falter, blunder, hobble and clash with quite concrete culture. There isn't any alternative reality which can make of us something diverse in comparison to indigenous people. In this sense we haven't choice – it was made before us and without consulting or asking for consent to us. And this poses the final question about modes or mechanisms of social cohesion. Let me answer it using one as it seems to me good example.

Natural languages are called so because they differ from artificial ones made for special purposes. They have many features, which belong to all of them, but it's not crucial here. What is more important is that they too are constructed intentionally but with one essential caveat – not all of their traits are realizable. Let begin with ends they are made for.

Each language must transmit some information. Usually it means that it has to construct such a structure as to let both speaker and listener to understand what is uttered. For this purpose sounds are used. Later appear letters and writing and they too obey this rule of difference from each other. The former are of big interest to us.

The letters «e», «o», «c» as of course others too demonstrate little discrepancies between them. To create «e» from «c» we need only to draw the line from one side to the next one in the middle of this letter. To transform «c» into «o» we have to connect its open stubs. And all of them are circles. To learn how and in what way they differ each of us ought to know and also see these in fact very minuscule distinctions. There are other languages, which have other letters similar to these three ones, but the demand stays.

What is critical is our ability to recognize these differences. For example for me it's quite perplexing to read hieroglyphs – and frankly I'm not able to – because they seem to me dramatically similar. But this is also true for more familiar for me and for you alphabets albeit we just accustomed to a ways they manage their main task of making difference.

If we would try to create something like letters or otherwise we must keep in mind human's natural faculties to discriminate one pattern or scribble from another. But and this is crucial only if we using namely marks, lines, circles or other scribbles. And here is a problem. Can we appeal to other means or we're stuck solely with them?

First. Looking through history we can see that there aren't any alternatives. To put it bluntly people didn't ever invent something else. There were always strokes, marks and lines and nothing more. Period. But does it means that we aren't able to create a kind of different aught? Possibly no.

To transmit information means to make distinctions. Though letters are very similar, especially in my example, they nevertheless aren't identical or the same. Yes, we use equal means to write something but letters distinguish from each other in critical features. In the end «c», «o» and «e» aren't the same. And this is also true in all others instances be it hieroglyphs or cuneiforms or pictographs.

Second. There's quite strange phenomenon. Its gist boils down to the fact that each language drops some means of expression notwithstanding this behavior lows its capacity to do its work. What do I mean? Usually a tongue rejects these or those letters and even sounds. If we would juxtapose, for example, Khoisan and English we would see that the latter hasn't some vocalizations namely clicks despite all people are able to utter them. Why?

There isn't exact answer. Each language is abundant and excessive at least in relation to a need. At the same time it lacks many means of high demand. For example in English there is a huge number of words which designate struggle or squabble or fight or… you understand and simultaneously it doesn't possess the name for the hue which in Russian sounds «goluboy» though in principle we can say about celestial tinge.

Why is it so? I don't know and I suppose nobody does. But the fact stays. A language elects one options and neglects others. What is much more important is that it doesn't hinder it to do what it aims at. Because we always can apply to palliatives, synonyms, substitutes, surrogates and on and on. Nevertheless, here remains the Wittgenstein's problem. But I want to reformulate it. Therefore.

Third. Can we say something about for what we don't have words or other designations? And even more broadly – can we ever think about those phenomena which we're ignorant of? On the first sight the answer is simple. Of course, no. But if we would try to be more accurate and comprehensive the problem arises.

For example, science deals with the very these things. Until Newton nobody has told about gravitation yet after him it was already possible. The same is true for genes, evolution, chemical bonds and so on. Creativity is what characterizes us as species as such. That means that in fact we can think about what we haven't any considerations at all. Though why it's important in my ruminations about language and its organization?

Even if science and creativity exist the question stays. All inventions were and are feasible because they appear in the zone of realizable. As we can't see infrared light so also we aren't able to deem about what we don't fit to. And language is of little help here. It's too not suitable for many things. And this is very simple to demonstrate. For example, there are feelings such as love or hate and we usually can't precisely express them.

That means that tongues are organized there where they can take place at all. And this also leads to contention that their elements could be connected in quite predictable ways because other ones are of no use and of low possibility if of no chance to happen in principle.

And the last but not the least point. As it's known there are a few polyglots. This fact implies that people aren't able to learn as many languages as they want to. But why does it matter? In the end we can get what we strive for without using many systems of communication a fortiori others are hapless in this sense too.

As a lot of experiments shows we acquire mother tongue appealing to quite concrete zone in our brain. There are, of course, bilinguals but usually we aren't disposed simultaneously to more than two or in rare conditions three languages. It's hard to accomplish. So all other languages later in our lives we get applying to different sectors of our gray matter. And this suggests that we can do it not so effectively as in the first time.

Moreover if we would keep in mind that a knowledge of many languages is of little use and of very limited benefit – because all others around us usually don't speak them – we would understand why polyglots are rare and also why they learn different tongues only for their own choice and joy. Though and this is important as has showed N. Chomsky languages are very similar at least in some relations.

Why I've bothered myself in such a detail to show the nature of language? Because social organization is realized and put into action through the analogues though not literal of words and rules which direct them. I call these entities social meanings. What they represent?

They are very similar to basic units of grammar. What it implies? There are two main pillars of all languages – the first one are words and the second are the ways they are connected to each other. Yet on more deep level we even don't need the former but only the modes of their construction, that's possible variants.

It's quite surprising that not all words are realized. For example, «murmur» is an actual entity but «murmurmur» already not. Why? Because there're limits on what we can and can't do in and with language. Length and compatibility are of the first concern. Then as I mentioned above each tongue desists some sounds and letters. And even more practical lexicons are traditionally not very big as also the number of necessary and crucial topics on which we as a rule talk.

Keeping this in mind we can grasp that in nutshell language as also society are organized around not very big number of substances and laws they obey. Albeit variance is here it's not dramatically huge, because it will be immensely difficult to build something of that scope using only limited material in whose role acts the very our nature.

It's amazingly strange and even odd proposition but only at first blush. Let me explain. In strict biological terms all people are… well, people. We all are the same species, because we can and actually interbreed and then sire quite viable descendants. If it were otherwise our children may be sterile as in the case of mules and other creatures. So the platform is identical. Further.

The ways we are organized too can't be very different. That's due to the fact that not all imaginable – but we must remember here the Wittgenstein's reformulated problem – modes of connections may be implemented. Actually there are few of them and they repeat themselves from one society to another.

And finally. Recently I assorted old junk. And there were inter alia a few smartphones. From the standpoint of today they were and are dubious because they have many redundant and unconventional buttons, they are constructed in as it seems now inconvenient ways and they lack some features which we consider critical. Nevertheless, they function quite well.

Evolution – as for genera so for smartphones and others things too – can go wherever it's possible. But once it attained some point of its development variance disappears because nothing is able to go in reverse. The same is true for societies. We like to think about our forebears in terms of creativity and innovation but reality is

much duller. In fact people prefer stability over experiments and if something works quite well though not perfectly so let it be. And one more time once aught is established it in many relations influences and determines a further state of affairs.

So what conclusions I and you must do? First. Order is in many ways predestined because of our. i.e. human nature. Second. Its manifold is a kind of myth, actually many social organizations are almost totally identical. And third. What exists is usually what is possible so we can manage but not transform our societies.