Research Article

Dychotomy of Individual-Biological
and Social in Formation of Socio-Cultural Priorities

Oksana Nadibska[1], Konstantin Palshkov[2]

and Katerina Afanasieva[3]

[1] Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophy,
Social and Humanitarian sciences, Odessa State University of Internal Affairs
[2] PhD in Political sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy,
Social and Humanitarian sciences, Odessa State University of Internal Affairs
[3] Postgraduate student of the Department of Administrative Law and Administrative Process,
Odessa State University of Internal Affairs
Email: ksenadcom@gmail.com; tel.: +380939144048

ANNOTATION:
It is stressed in the article that during the process of socio-cultural priorities' formation, humanity is guided by both as individual and biological interests and social interests that have different content but are of common origin. It is emphasized on recognition of the priority of individual biological interests, the role of an individual in the formation of one or another structure, and on the other hand, the recognition of the full domination of a structure that dictates to the personality the outline of his own behavior.

The problem of the influence of the individual-biological and social on the socio-cultural priorities' formation can not be resolved definitely. Different societies show us different degrees of personal or social interest in shaping priorities but we dared to argue that in any case the nature of the priority is socio-cultural and can not depend on the will of an individual or a certain group of people. An individual and society are in so complex relationship that it is difficult not to be tempted to choose a simplified version of the answer to the question of the motive power of the social system. We must state that the answers to the questions on the nature of the motive force of social development are still divided into two ideological and semantic groups. In the semantic center of the first variant of the answer is the belief that history makes the person, respectively to their biological nature. The second group is based on the assertion of the omnipotence of the structure. Each person in society pursues individual goals, builds an individual system of priorities in accordance with its natural and biological nature but at the same time it is the realization of individual interests that leads to the realization of the interests of society, to the construction of a system of socio-cultural priorities.

It is researched that individuality and society are not the opposite of each other. On the contrary - that filigree and differentiation of human mental functions which we express by the word "individuality" is possible only due to the fact that a person grows up in society. The socio-group is superimposed on the individual-biological. They do not oppose each other by nature but in the mind of a person belonging to a functionally differentiated society and they can take the form of antinomy. Man is the subject of social life, he/she realizes himself/herself only in society. However, he/she is also a product of the environment, because he/she reflects the peculiarities of the development of biological and social aspects of social life. The interaction of biological and social, human and society, at every historical stage, have their own peculiarities, which also have a great influence on the formation of socio-cultural priorities. Thus, the source of the socio-cultural priorities' formation is as an individual-biological and social-group which has different content but common origin. Both the first and the second is formed in the process of social interaction and is based on the formation of a certain structure of relations. Socio-cultural priority is formed in a paradoxical way of processing of a fundamentally new value from those purely individual interests that are realized by specific individuals in the field of social interaction.

Key words: individual-biological, social, socio-cultural priorities, society.

INTRODUCTION

The unity of the individual-biological and social in the priorities' formation is a specific "two whales", two cornerstones, on which the socio-cultural reality is formed. Socio-cultural priority can be arranged exclusively at the intersection of personal- natural and social interest, because it is a peculiar form of understanding the ways to achieve a better life.

At the same time, in the understanding of this issue, there was created a certain tradition which in its foundations is rooted with realizing of how biological and social in the formation of reality, are interrelated. It is important here to emphasize that the biological in a person appears not as a parallel and completely autonomous in relation to the social environment of the world, but is located in the sphere of social as a source and a fundamental basis. Biological appears as the initial level of the hierarchical essence of an individual, which contains the necessary natural properties, and at the same time are both a part of nature and its highest product. So, Michel Mais proposed a thesis on "the formation of life", saying that "Me" (add to it - biological) is not simply embodied in essence, but is also partially due or formed by social interactions and is strongly influenced by social norms and values "[5]. Thus, an individual creates his/her cultural and social world on certain natural grounds, which serve as a kind of building material for the creation of man's material and spiritual values.

The interaction of the biological and the social in a person can never be considered complete and act in a completed form. Their unity is the infinite filling of biological by social content. And also transformed by biological social factors, because things that people use, are not natural in the form, as they are directly given in nature. Biological structures and functions under the influence of social factors were modified and reached a higher level of development.

Hence, the question of the influence of the individual-biological and the social on the socio-cultural priorities' formation can not be resolved uniquely and forever. Scientific researches on this issue are not finished. For our study is very interesting the opinion of the authors of the research work "Managing consensus and self-confidence in multiplicative preferences in group decision making", which introduced a method called "self-assured multiplicative preferences", which is formed taking into account multiple levels of self-confidence in a multiplicative advantage and allows you to derive individual and collective vectors of priorities in order to reach the consensus of society [3].

Different societies show us a different measure of acceptance of a personal or social interest in shaping priorities, but we dare to argue that in any case the nature of the priority is socio-cultural and can not depend on the will of an individual or a certain group of people. Only the social world as a whole can create a sufficient field in which such powerful lines of stress will be formed that can correct and direct the society as a whole and each of its members separately.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The question of the role of individual-biological and social efforts in a system of priorities' formation requires special attention and a description of the methodological program of this study, the tension between the two sides of the system of priorities. Modern science pays much attention to the nature of social. The crisis of classical rationalism in the late nineteenth century focused the researchers' attention on such a supposedly ephemeral phenomenon as knowledge. Thus, in the 1920s, the term "sociology of knowledge" was associated with the theoretical activities of the German theorist Max Scheler. Karl Mannheim, who demonstrated the socio-historical conditionality of thinking in society in the work "Ideology and Utopia", and became the second leading figure in the study of social nature. Within our scientific research, concerning the role of the biological and social in shaping the interests of society, it is necessary to pay attention to the position of one of the founder of sociology, Auguste Comte, who considered biology as the foundation of sociology. He explained the

diversity of social activity "instinctive impulses", which is extremely important for realizing the interaction of the biological and the social in the socio-cultural priorities' formation. For this study, the phenomenological research line of social affairs, which is associated with the theoretical heritage of Alfred Schütz, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, is particularly significant.

Also, we understand the nature of the emergence of socio-cultural priority within the communicative direction of humanitarian research. On this basis, we can say that there are only personal interests in society. However, a special way of coexistence and co-operation of personal interests creates a social priority.

The most appropriate in the context of our study is the theory of the German sociologist, representative of the historical sociology by Norbert Elias. In his well-known work «Society of Individuals», Norbert Elias focuses on the dichotomy of the individual-biological and social, the relation between them in both historical and civilizational aspects. Let's try to examine in more detail the basic concepts of his theory.

RESULTS

The theoretical and practical significance of the study is to profound the scientific meaning of such concepts as "individual-biological" and "social" as a reflection of the subjective-objective phenomenon in the form of some modern concepts and problems of philosophy, axiology and psychology which allows in all the difficulty to pursue comprehensively the values of social development in the context of globalization processes. The practical significance of the research is determined by the fact that the results of theoretical and empirical studies of priority processes will contribute to the further development of the valuable problems of modern science.

Referring to the theory of Norbert Elias, we will take into account the postulate that seems to a modern man as an axiom: the nature of a man and a society are the opposite concepts. But that's not right. An individual and a society are

so in a complex connection between themselves that it is difficult not to be tempted to choose a simplified version of the answer to the question of the motive power of the social system, what is the main task of the article. The difficulty of finding the answer lies in the fact that society as a phenomenon does not have a "physical body", it is not embodied into any particular structure or personality. Society, it is a lot of people together. But many people together in India create a different society than in America or England [1]. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the functional role of the natural in a person or something higher than it in the formation of society and the socio-cultural structure itself. Norbert Elias points out the weird paradox - society as we know it, was not consciously planned by any of the people or by all of the people, but only because individual people, according to their biological nature, seek to pursue their own interests, and at the same time it does not depend on the will of individuals [1].

Answers to questions about the nature of the motive force of social development are still divided into two ideological and semantic groups. In the semantic center of the first variant of the answer is the belief that history makes the person, respectively, their biological nature. The second group is based on the assertion of the omnipotence of the structure. Since the time of writing "Society of Individuals", the second one became the prevailing point of view, but without the complete depreciation of the first. Especially in the postmodern tradition it is possible to observe this in the purest form. It should be recalled such core categorical units as the concept of "violence of code" (Jean Baudrillard), "power" (Michel Foucault), "structure" (Jacques Derrida), etc. The general place in the modern humanitarian thought is the statement about various kinds of covert informational violence - from the side of Mass Media, the state, advertising, globalization, PR etc.

It seems that in the formation of a system of values and landmarks of a modern person, are involved any structures, but not the person

himself. In a situation of such a divergence of views on the fundamental link in the development of society, it is appropriate, in our opinion, to return to the conclusions of Norbert Elias made in the thirties of the last century on the relation of individual and social activity in the process of society's development.

The notions of individuality and society are antinomies, as Norbert Elias states. It is obvious that total individuals creates a little more than just a large number of people. The sociologist resorts to the use of the classic Aristotelian example of the difference between the stones from which the building is composed, and the building itself. So it is impossible to realize the structure of a house considering each stone separately. But our consciousness, in this regard, as Norbert Elias observes, protests against such an alternative interpretation of the essence of society. So, the house in relation to stones - this is the goal. If society consists of people just like a house of stones, then in this case, we must recognize ourselves as a building material for the creation of a society. We can not accept this, the more so (add from ourselves, this is beyond the discourse of Norbert Elias) that the ethical guides of the New European philosophy, in particular the Immanuel Kant's theory, recall for a man to see the sole purpose but not means.

Just on this unwillingness, to see itself as a building material for any incomprehensible or simply mentally alien project, it is based the conflict itself, between the inclinations of natural individual existence and the requirements of life in society. The deadlock, noticed by Norbert Elias, arises at the point of finding the highest truth. That is why it is necessary to determine that it is an individual with its natural and biological origin or the whole. Depending on the answer to this question, a system of values is formed. It is on this, the system of priorities is based on a key conceptual unit, outlining the dominant components of the very essence of society. "When some people say that the highest goal is a society, while others that it is an individual, then they both think as if superhuman essence or its substitute in our thinking," nature "or" god-

like mind ", acting to any experience, has forever defined this ultimate goal and this scale of values. ... In a deeper penetration into the problem, it turns out that neither individuals nor the society of which they are composed of are equally devoid of purpose. In this case, one does not exist without the other "[1].

For the researcher of the problem section of the issues which are related to the identification of the social conditionality of the emergence of priorities, it is important to comprehend in a panoramic way the essential nature of those goals, that are the true causes of the development of society. As a society, consisting of specific unique personalities, each of which has its own natural essence, sets ambitious goals itself, outlining the "horizons of hope"? How are the goals of society formed, which does not coincide with the goals of specific people with their individual biological aspects? Actually, it is the vision of the goals that the society is guided by them and allows us to determine the priorities.

Referring to the theory of Norbert Elias, which appears the most appropriate in this context, we can state the following. There is no one goal beyond those that people can put forward. "The question arises in the way that it is possible that due to the common existence of many people, due to their common life, their interaction, their relationship there is something that no one in itself did not achieve, did not conceive, did not create and part of what, he/she wants this or not, hence, how a connection of interdependent people arise, society? "[1].

Let's analyze the goals that arise from individuals and groups of people or society as a whole. When we observe the human crowd's movement, it seems to us that these people are not connected with each other. But, according to Norbert Elias, each of these people has its place in this world, has its own home, work, a certain way and style of life. Even homeless are a product and a part of this hidden order at the same time, which is at the basis of this mixture [1]. A human can not, by his own will, in spite of his/her individual nature, change his/her goals or functions. Since birth, it has been put into

certain functional relationships, it has to be "inbuilt" in the system of connections that already exists. This factor defines the individual goals set up by a person and outlines the system of priorities that a person creates for orientation in the public space. A person can choose from a number of opportunities, but this amount is limited. Thus, a person can choose his/her personal way only by that measure, that the system in which its existence lasts. The actions of a particular person consist of a great amount of separate acts aimed at achieving a specific goal, the realization of a particular desire. Individual actions of a person, in accordance with his/her nature, are due to the achievements of mainly their own goals. And, not necessarily, a person must consciously act for the sake of achieving social goals. The paradox lies in the fact that where social interests were clearly higher than personal, society fell into a crisis that led to collapse. The priority of building a new type of state, for which it was required to postpone his/her own personal interests or, in general, to neglect them, in the times of all known revolutions were collapsed. The requirement to ignore personal goals and priorities in favor of the abstract ideals of Freedom, Equality and Fraternity turned into terrible Jacobin terror in the name of these ideals, and therefore - turned into a disagreement of society with such a historical reality, where the concrete life of a unique person was sacrificed to abstractions. It turned into a spiritually-intellectual protest of people against the socio-historical practice of revolutionary power, when not Freedom, Equality and Fraternity, but guillotine managed human destinies. Thus, the collapse of the French Revolution of 1789-1794 became a logical one. Certainly, it is unnecessary to recall the experience of the Soviet totalitarian era, since the conclusions from this recent history of social and historical experience were evident by their tragic content.

Recalling all these historical experiments, we pursue only one goal - to show that the normal (in a greater or less degree) evolutionary development of society, the development

without bloody human sacrifices on the altar of abstractions, development for the sake of progress and the benefit of all members of society, take place only when the structure is not imposed to a person with the inherent biological individuality, the primacy of his/her own interests. In this contextual measurement, in a certain apparent, but not inherent paradox, there is the phenomenon that we can contemplate today - every person in society pursues individual goals, builds an individual system of priorities, in accordance with his/her natural and biological entities, while at the same time, there is the realization of individual interests that leads to interests' realization of society, to the building of a system of socio-cultural priorities.

A human wants to achieve a well-being, status, respect, notability. There are many individual goals that are made up of individual priorities. Man naturally and biologically acts primarily for the sake of achieving his/her own goals, realizing the interests of his/her family and his/her loved ones. For the sake of realizing personal goals, he/she interacts with other people, creating complex chains of relationships. Separated from other people, nobody can achieve the realization of their own interests. Every other person is a link in that chain, a part of which is created by our actor. These chains can not be felt by touch, they are elastic, flexible, variational, but they are no less real than steel.

Returning to the analysis of the concepts by Norbert Elias, it should be noted that the researcher recognized the complexity of establishing a relationship between individual-biological and social. One can state only the existence of relations between individuals. But it is difficult for us to imagine that relations can have a structure. Therefore, it is easier for a person to imagine the patterns of the development of relations between individuals, to seek the cause of these relations in any other substance outside of these relations [1].

Affirming that the relationship between the individual and the community is something unique in their own way, Norbert Elias calls for the transition from thinking at the level of things

and substances to thinking at the level of relations and functions. The researcher illustrates his thoughts as an example of a complex court dance. The movements of each participant are oriented towards other people, the role of each individual dancer can not be read out of the roles of others. The style of behavior is determined by the relationship between the dancers with each other. Similarly, human behavior in society is determined by past and present relationships with other people.

In the flow of our study, the following conclusion of the German sociologist are very important. Individuality and society are not opposite notions to each other. On the contrary - the filigree and differentiation of the human mental functions, which we express by the word "individuality", are possible only because of the fact that a person grows up in society [1]. Newborn is only a human project that (the project) is not realized by itself, just like the plant grows out of the seed. The fact that a person grows, depends not only on his/her individual biological characteristics, but on how he/she communicates with people.

The indisputable fact is that in different epochs the ratio of universes of personality and society was different. Even the very individualization, the bursts of which we observe at certain stages of the development of European society, is not the result of a sudden mutation of internal psychological structure of a large number of people, but caused by significant changes in the structure of social relations.

Our modern era feels a significant tension between the interests of an individual with his/her natural-biological nature and society. The feeling of loneliness in the face of the encoding power of society, the desire to break beyond the boundaries of civilization to a something"true", cause a strong sense of opposition between the interests of an individual and a society. It makes no sense to resemble the examples of Western intellectuals' refusal from their own civilization for the sake of life, so said, among the African tribes. The life of Albert Schweitzer is not the only example of such a solution. The hostility of society is felt by

many as a basis for a liberative rebellion. Let's recall in this context the concepts of the glorious work by Guy Deborah, "The Society of the Performance" - a manifest of the revolutionary changes in the environment in which we live. Society is an act in which we are forced to play a role, not even knowing that there is a freedom, and there may be a just social system that we must build by changing the theater of the absurdity in which we live now. Let's remind the glorious slogan of the Parisian student rebellions in May of 1968 - "Structures do not go out to the street." What other words can so clearly show the opposite between the interests of an individual and a society? Can we build a system of priorities that include both the values of a biologically individual person and a large people's group? Is it really large to the size of society as a whole?

Speaking on the sense of opposition between the interests of structure and personality, we must not dwell only on examples of revolutionary consciousness (Schweitzer's example is as revolutionary as the example of Guy Deborah). Even the everyday consciousness of the ordinary person of nowadays, gives us examples of this alienation. Let us refer to the text of Michel Uelbek, one of the so-called "intellectual pillars" of postmodernism, who reflecting the intellectual and social laws of being of his contemporary, in his famous novel, "Platform", describes a person who does not find places in his own world. The text is marked by the words and thoughts of the heroes trying to escape from their own habitable space: "I do not like the world in which we live ...", "get out of this crap ...", "I am increasingly embracing with doubts: is that world we are building?" [7]. Heroes of the novel do not understand the world in which they live - this moment is emphasized by the author constantly.

The protagonist of the novel does not try to change consciously his life at all, although he understands the incompatibility of his own system of values with the public. He so clearly feels the strength of structure, that the incompatibility of priorities is considered as a sign of his own inability to understand what is

actually true and what is false. He reflects: "I lived in a country of moderate socialism, where the possession of material goods was carefully guarded by law, and bank deposits were protected by powerful state guarantees. I was not threatened with ruin, nor with bad bankruptcy ... To cut the story short, I no longer had to worry about anything ..."[7]. The life was organized by a powerful state, without requiring a special tightness from the official of the Ministry of Culture.

The protagonist of "Platform" even feels his own inferiority because of the understanding of the contradiction between his own personal and social knowledge - so, he can not distinguish the brand thing from the ordinary (and this creates a serious percentage of public knowledge of the community to which he belongs). Rejecting the simulative knowledge of society, he, at the same time, feels inconvenience from the fact that he (knowledge) "does not feel it". "From the standpoint of society, I was, of course, wrong. I clearly understood that I belong to a minority, therefore, I am mistaken ... Of course, there must be a difference between the «Yves Saint Laurent» shirts and the rest, between the «Gucci» shoes and the «André» shoes. This difference was not noticeable only by me, probably due to some inferiority, that is, I was proud of nothing and condemn the world for nothing "[7]. Considering the outside world, the narrator periodically feels the excitement of helplessness in the face of unclear things. "I was completely adapted to the time of information, therefore, not adapted to anything" [7], - he thinks something paradoxically, suddenly feeling a philosophical horror when he looks at things, in the production of which he absolutely did not understand anything. The conflict between the individual-biological and the public is felt here very clearly.

We consciously made a stop at an example of fiction, since it has been from the days of Fyodor Dostoevsky not only to reflect, depicting the existence of people, but also the existence of ideas, their transformation and ways of realization in the modern world. In the contemporary humanitarian outline, the bestseller's phenomenon is best shown by the general line in the perception of the opposition between society and an individual. But such branching is not typical for every society. We must see the source of such a non-alignment of priorities, first of all, in order to identify the general nature of the emergence of the values of an individual and society, not taking a particular situation as a rule.

In this context, let us return to the theory by Norbert Elias again. The researcher calls our era as highly individualized and points to the sharp antinomy contained in the modern mind: I am the social world that kills my personality, my nature. Relatively speaking, this value-semantic paradigm unfolds in such categorical measurement: "I would like to live like that, but society makes me choose what I do not consider completely by my own, that corresponds to my true values." Norbert Elias shows that such a sense of opposing priorities arises from the differentiation of society. In weakly differentiated societies, people learn their adult functions, create a system of personal knowledge, so to speak, in the process of their life. Since childhood, it is included in the functioning of society and does not experience a gap between the learning process and life. In such a society there are few functions at all, therefore, the personality largely coincides with the public and creates a single system of priorities.

In a differentiated society, the number of functions and levels of implementation of professional and social skills is sharply increasing. The complexity of professional implementation requires more thorough and specialized training, professional skills can not be mastered simply in the process of life. The training process becomes longer. Preparations can not be received in the course of the activity (as a disciple from an artisan or a future knight from an aristocrat, who was given up in a childhood), specialist institutions - schools and universities - are created for training. Functionally dismembered society, thus, creates a one-sided-oriented selection space [1]. The continuity of life, similar to the life of a

medieval artisan or knight, in a modern, differentiated society is recorded infrequently. For young people, special "reserves" (universities) are created, which operate according to their own rules, which are made in accordance with the values produced in these institutions. The transition from such a space to the space of direct professional activity is perceived by an individual as a great fault. In the educational space, the young person develops numerous creative abilities that should enhance his/her adaptability to life, but very often these value universals do not find realization in adult life. Thus, in the spiritual life of an individual, a sense of tension and breakdown rises. The group knowledge acquired during the training turns out to be unfit for use, and the person remains largely self-in-own with his/her own personal knowledge, which needs to be adapted to new conditions. Adult life competition, limited specialization and professional life in a differentiated society increase the risk of defeat.

The following observation by Norbert Elias is extremely important for the understanding of the sense of a deliberate breakdown between personality and society. As the functional differentiation and progress of civilization grow, a single individual constantly finds that in order to remain a member of society, he must leave an underdeveloped majority from which he actually is. He/she must "sin" against his own nature, "inner truth", he/she will not become the one whom he/she would like to become most of all. The conflict is so deep that every individual creates a dense network of unharmed lives, unrealized natural inclinations [1]. Hence, there is an internal conflict and the feeling of the need to protect their own priorities from society.

At the same time, we must realize that the opposition of the systems of society and an individual is extremely apparent. We have to see the source of the formation of those and other categories in order to understand that even the sense of a conflict of priorities has socio-cultural origin. Unlike an animal, even a highly organized animal capable of adapting, a person has not fixed and elastic psycho-emotional functions. In order for a person to be able to

function effectively among other people, it requires a multi-year modeling of the mechanism for self-control with the help of other people, that is, social modeling. Norbert Elias even considers that "in order to understand the structure of the soul of an individual, we must understand the structure of relations between individuals" [1].

Returning to the problem of the relationship between the priorities of an individual and a society, in the light of what has been said, we must note that there are societies in which the structure of social relations does not change for centuries (archaic societies that are today represented, for example, by Australian Aborigines). But there are other forms of social life that by themselves, push to changes. They are aimed at new forms of interpersonal relations and institutions. Such society, in particular, is a contemporary western society.

Mentioned above, declares a connection between the relationships of individuals, united in a society, and the formation of socially understandable values and priorities. If we talk about the interests of an individual, we must first of all recognize that united people are forced by economic interests. But economic relations are oriented not only to the satisfaction of the most pressing existential needs associated with the existence of a human as a physical being. Turning again to the words of Norbert Elias, we should note that animals are also motivated by starvation, but they do not manage [1]. In instinctive natural-biological needs of a person there must interfere a certain Super-ego and planning functions. Social groups would never have formed, if not such basic needs as a hunger, but they would not be formed without long-term, also natural-biological impulses - the need for property and even more wealth, the desire for tiredness, security or a privileged social status, the authorities, in expressing the benefits [1]. All these orientations, as we see, are formed precisely through the relationships between people. The formation of priorities plays a major role in the values of superiority, domination, and competitiveness. We should know that we are the best. It is built on any

value, any priority. The best, the richest, the most influential, the most gifted one can be felt only against the background of other people. Thus, researching the general social signs of personal and corporate competitiveness, Katerina Evplova notes that "If the first is achieved solely at the expense of their own abilities in the process of rivalry with other individuals or groups of colleagues, then the second is expressed by the priorities' recognition of a team's interests to more fully meet their needs in future "[2]. So, by establishing a priority for a person, he/she compares himself/herself with others, and shows his/her affection to a certain system of priorities. If we talk on the priorities' content which is formed at the level of an individual and a society, we should note that everyone has its own specifics. As the authors of the work, «Temporal modeling of basic human values from social network usage», rightly pointed out that "the fundamental human values reflect what we consider to be important in our lives, including security, independence, success, kindness and satisfaction. Each of us has different values with varying degrees of importance "[6]. However, the society's priorities can not be regarded as some kind of an equalizer of all the priorities of some individuals. The social priority is different from each individual's own synthetic nature. That personal is created to meet the requirements of a particular individual. That social is formed as a result of the searching by all individuals, the most convenient way to realize their own interests. So there are synthetic priorities that ensure the functioning of the whole. So, the authors' team in the work "Creating Sustainable Health care Systems Agreeing Social Priorities through Public Participation" notes that "social value system, decision-making is anaudit tool"and "easy-to-use method to help to the involved parts (including the public), to understand the need to prioritize ... this provides a pragmatic way of reconciling different points of view "[4].

Any social position is connected with the possibility of influencing and exercising their own freedom in a particular environment. Whether it is talked about the priorities of financial standing, social status, or creative self-realization, etc. – all this is connected with the desire to get a definite position in a group that a person recognizes as meaningful for himself/herself.

We found that socio-cultural priorities have one source of origin - individual -biological, inherent to an individual, and social, but different content. Personality and society have different ratios in different cultures. As we already noted above, archaic societies practically do not share these systems. The measure of the development of functional differentiation of society has such a phenomenon as individualization, which leads to the fact that in the social consciousness the priorities of a biologically individual personality and a society begin to diverge and even to contradict.

In European culture, the transition to individualization inherent to personality dates back to the Renaissance, when for the first time in the history of Europe, the values of personal realization began to be described as the highest priority of human life. Since then, the traditions of the tragic rupture and opposition of an individual, biological and social, which during the Renaissance were realized in the idea of victory over fortune, in the era of romanticism – in the figure of a genius that opposed to the crowd, began to emerge. The philosophy of life calls for the rejection of socialsl a very and penetration into the living natural-biological flow of life. Particularly vividly the question of the opposition of social and individual-biological arises in the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche who described the various types of people who have or do not have the right to be called a free person. The doctrine of a superman is the ultimate embodiment of this tendency. The fact that this tendency determines the further development of European culture, demonstrates in the best way the popularity of Friedrich Nietzsche' teaching in our days.

We can observe different variants of the correlation of the individual-biological and the social in the formation of priorities not only in

the historical, but also in civilizational and cultural terms. And this creates special lines of tension in the inter-civilizational space of the age of globalization. Western society, as was already mentioned above, demonstrates the development of the idea of individualism and a sense of contrast between the individual-biological and the social. At the same time, the countries built on the bases of Muslim or Buddhist religions, demonstrate the priority of the similarity of these systems.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the source of the formation of socio-cultural priorities is as an individual-biological, and social-group which has different content but a common origin. Both,the first and second forms in the process of social interaction and is based on the formation of a certain structure of relations. Socio-cultural priority is formed by a paradoxical way of the processing of a fundamentally new value from those purely individual interests that are realized by specific individuals in the field of social interaction.

Social interaction supplies the necessity for competitive acquisition of their own place among themselves by individual-biological characteristics. This is a need in favor of the most diverse dimensions – from the power in the literal sense as the possibility to control the freedom of another person to assert himself/herself as the best in any sense (the richest, the most generous, the most titled, etc.). There is nothing but the interests of some individuals, but the compilation of the realization of these interests into the system leads to the creation of a new character of social interests that are not isolated from the individual.

Thus, the socio-group is imposed by the individual-biological. They do not oppose to each other by nature, but in the mind of a person belonging to a functionally differentiated society, they can take the form of antinomy. Thus, the system of priorities, consisting in functionally differentiated societies, contains certain voltage lines that are not natural, but create a real sense of opposition between the

interests of a society and an individual. The priorities of such a society include a guideline for constant development, updating, the necessity in a creative implementation. It is the opposition between the individual-biological and the social that generates the tension that could be used deliberately in the direction of public energy to achieve individual creative success, changes and constant renewal.

REFERENCES

1. Elias N., (2001), Society of Individuals. Moscow, pp. 336.
2. Evplova E., (2019), Social characteristics of personal and corporate competitiveness of future specialists: results of sociological research, The Education and science journal, Vol. 21(2), pp. 132-154. (In Russ.), https://doi.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2019-2-132-154
3. Liu Wenqi, Zhang, Hengjie, Chen, Xia and other, (2018), Managing consensus and self-confidence in multiplicative preference relations in group decision making, Knowledge-based systems? Vol. 162, Issue SI, pp. 62-73, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2018.05.031
4. Littlejohns P., and other, (2019), Creating sustainable health care systems: Agreeing social (societal) priorities through public participation, Journal of Health Organization and Management, Vol. 33, Issue 1, pp.18-34, https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-02-2018-0065
5. Maiese, M., (2019), Embodiment, sociality, and the life shaping thesis, Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences, Vol. 18, Issue 2, стр. 353-374, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-018-9565-z
6. Mukta, Md., and other, (2019), Temporal modeling of basic human values from social network usage, Journal of the association for information science and technology, Vol. 70, Issue 2, pp. 151-163, https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24099
7. Wilbeck M., (2011), Platform. St. Petersburg, pp. 288.