SOCIAL SCIENCES

DIRECTIONALITY OF THE LIVING: EVOLUTION, FORMS AND CONSEQUENCES OF MANIFESTATION (FILOMENOLOGICAL ASPECT)

Inna Dyachenko
PhD, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Natural and Social Sciences and Humanities Disciplines,
Zhytomyr Medical Institute Zhytomyr Regional Council, Ukraine
e-mail: i-dyachenko@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0002-9047-671X

Summary

Based on the analysis of natural science research on directionality of evolution, a general criterion of evolutionary progress is formulated: a living being achieves the highest level of activity of the organism as a whole. The idea of a living being potential connection with his activity and life is stated. Potential is considered as a set of biological properties, qualities, internal adaptation mechanisms of any living organism, physical, mental, socio-psychological abilities, that are inherent for a human being and are inside him. Life, the attribute of which is activity, is impossible without full realization of the received potential and is the goal, to which a living being will always aspire, creating corresponding conditions of his existence. Value is a form of a goal manifestation. Everything that contributes to the achievement and realization of the goal will be values for a living being, a man. The main value for any living being is the desire to fully realize the inherent potential, to live a full life in an ever-changing environment. A general value of a man, as a living being, is the desire for the fullness of his life or love of life (philomenology). The degree of awareness of a man's existence and activity goal as well as the level of the general value development determines the nature of a man's attitude towards everything that he establishes links with, what/who he chooses, how he acts and the result of his activity.

Keywords: evolution directionality, life activity of a living being, a human being, life, potential, goal, value, philomenology.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.23856/3834

1. Introduction

Pandemic 2020 is an extreme situation, a space for a man to meet what he cannot change (death, suffering…). It is an opportunity to readdress the questions about one's nature, a chance to make the right choice: to live or not to live? To confront or to match? Experiencing an extreme situation makes one think about the degree of his loneliness and remember his belonging to the world of the living.

The modern worldview climate creates a context for a specific-historical discussion of human behavior aspects related to biological, social and cultural regulation.

Today the recognition of a greater universality of biologically regulated aspects of human behavior, as compared to cultural and social ones, allows us to consider biological determinants as a basis for the typology of human behavior *(Serikov A., 2015)*.

However, the basis that integrates aspects of behaviour and connects all levels of its regulation is not clear. As a consequence, there is no generally accepted typology of human behaviour in all behavioural sciences. A man and his behaviour remain an open problem and a risk factor for a man himself and for the living world at large, which brings the topic of our work up to date. It is impossible to clarify the motives, goals, values of activity, behavior of a human being as a biosocial being without addressing the issues of evolution, the highest result of which a human being is.

The aim of the study is to formulate the main direction, purpose, value of a living being functioning, human activity, which integrate and regulate all forms of human behavior.

The research tasks: 1) to analyze and systematize the results of scientific research on the problem of directionality of living organisms evolution; 2) to reveal and substantiate the connection of a living being and a human being activity with their potential; 3) to prove the connection of the potential of a living organism with his life; 4) to clarify the content of the concepts of "potential", "life", "human life", "goal", "value"; 5) to theoretically support the connection between the purpose and fundamental value (philomenology) of changes in a living being, their influence on the nature of human attitude to the world.

The author uses the dialectical method, which implies thorough study of the object and constant reflexion over its own content, and the freely functioning complex and synthetic method, which allows to approach the meaning of human life through the actualization of the idea of human birth.

2. "Biological" and a man: the problem of directional evolution

Among many theories of evolution (Darwin-Wallace, epigenetic, synthetic, theory of "neutrality", theory of "intermittent equilibrium", "philetic gradualism", neodarwinism, lamarckism, philembryogenesis and others) the concept of directional evolution (orthogenesis) occupies a special place.

The main ideas of orthogenesis are to recognize the predisposition of a living organism to vary in a certain direction, which causes evolution, first of all, and the refusal to recognize adaptation as the general direction of evolution.

The idea of directional evolution appeared during the XIX–XX centuries in more than 20 concepts (theory of perfection, mechanic and physiological bases of evolution (1856–1884), heterogenesis (1864–1872), batmism, batmogenesis, neolamarckism (1868–1897), purposeful world creation (1876), orthogenesis (1893, 1987, 1919, 1950, 1958), ologenesis (1898–1931), aristogenesis (1912–1934), nomogenesis (1922–1926), historical biogenetics, biogenesis (1914, 1924), apogenesis, allelogenesis (1900, 1920s), physiological reduction (1930s–1940s), typostrophism (1930s–1950s), organicism (1950s–1960s), panbiogeography (1960s), Frankfurt School of Constructive Morphology (1970s–1990s), "contours of evolution" (1982), 2002), co-evolution, autoevolution (1980–90s), the theory of "individuality-autonomy" (1990–2006) and others) in all developed countries of Europe, America, Asia, in different branches of science such as biology (botany, histology, microanatomy, zoology, ichthyology, embryology, microbiology, animal morphology, cytogenetics, paleontology), economics, chemistry, geography, philosophy *(Popov I., 2006: 14–15)*.

Developing arguments for the idea of directional evolution (existence of non-adaptive features, convergence and/or parallelism, limitation of variability, existence of regression

directions and evolution inertia, neoplasm in evolution), its representatives avoided the teleological question, showing reluctance to clarify and justify the purpose/general orientation of evolution.

The vagueness of this theory representatives' statement about the mechanisms of evolutionary development orientation did not contribute to the clarification of the situation with the directionality of evolution: there are mechanisms, but as long as they remain unknown (G. Osbrn), the mechanisms are associated with the action of supernatural forces (E. Dacke, T. de Chardin), the knowledge about the molecular bases of biology may clarify the issue of the mechanisms of evolution directionality (L. S. Berg, L. Plate), the mechanisms of evolution directionality are associated with the processes of cosmic scale (D. N. Sobolev).

Thus, intrumentalism in the approaches to understanding the predisposition of organisms to vary in a certain direction drew attention of directional evolution representatives to the phenomena that were difficult to explain, for example, "non-adaptive traits", "parallelisms," "irrational directions of evolution", "inevitability of extinction", "emergence of new organs". This fact moved the researchers away from solving the problem of directionality aim and mechanisms of its implementation rather than brought them closer to it.

Close to orthogenesis is the idea of "organicism", according to which species and groups of higher taxonomic level undergo birth, growth, blossoming and natural death like specimen. The similarity of the concepts of vitalism *(Driesch H., 2020)* and 'directional evolution' also had no positive result in solving the main contradiction of vitalism-orthogenesis: is it possible to reduce biological processes to those known from other natural sciences, or do the living beings still have a certain originality, that is, autonomy, which can be correlated with the direction of their development.

Moreover, it was stated that the directionality of evolution was determined by the same processes as inorganic nature *(Thompson D., 1992)*. The reduction of the animate to the inanimate only aggravated the situation, on the one hand.

On the other hand, the research results in the context of "directional evolution" have proved that everything in the body is interconnected and, as it becomes more complex, a complex system of correlation of different processes or organs develops, which further limits its ability to vary. This has led the researchers to think not only about a certain directionality of evolution, but also about the fact that the body can only do what it is designed and is capable to do, and the system of "prohibitions" *(Zavarzin G., 2018)* narrowed the directionality to the task of survival of this particular organism.

Thus, the most primitive beings can synthesize all the organic substances they need from inorganic ones, and then, as the complexity grows, the ability to synthesize steadily decreases. The most complex beings depend on the receipt of many different complex organic substances (mainly proteins and vitamins) and can no longer vary greatly in this respect, and since everything is interconnected in the body, then the scope of possible changes in other features of these organisms is also reduced. Hence, the evolution represents definitely directed development, as the features of structure, functioning, physical and chemical composition of the organism, the system of "prohibitions" limit the possible vectors of development and to a great extent determine the directionality of evolution. The importance of the selection itself, that implies many directions of variability (it is also limited), has come into question, so it can function on the basis of random selection. If this set of variability directions does not exist, then perhaps the selection itself is a mechanism that allows organisms to move in a certain direction, first of all. Secondly, if the directionality of evolution does not depend on natural selection, the reason of orthogenetic evolution must lie in the organism itself.

So, the field for comprehension of the potential in a living organism, its connection with functional activity and directional change in different conditions was formed.

The relevance of this research vector is confirmed by the fact that when the modern scientific community recognizes the inevitability and constancy of variability, the questions remain open: what makes an organism that is already well adapted to the living conditions still change over time?

3. The directionality of a living being individual development and evolution mechanisms in the concepts of "Synthetic Theory of Evolution" architects

To support our vision of solving the problem of changes directionality in a living being in general, and a man as a biosocial being, in particular, we turned to A.N. Severtzov *(Severtzov A., 2017)* and S.A. Severtzov's *(Severtzov S., 1941)* concept of morphofunctional and biological progress, the theory of ontogenesis autonomization of Ivan Schmalhausen *(Schmalhausen I., 1982)*, and J. Huxley's theory of evolutionary stasis *(Huxley J., 1957)*. This choice is due, firstly, to the fact that the architects of STE (synthetic theory of evolution) embodied in their theories the highest level of systematization of research material. Secondly, they proposed a fundamentally new way of theorizing (triad: genetics – individual development – evolution). Thirdly, they searched for a common criterion of evolutionary progress applied to any large taxon. According to J. Huxley the criterion was the biological "improvement", that did not interfere with further progress, and, according to I.I. Shmalhausen, – the increase in the life activity of an individual living being as a whole. Fourthly, they retain their importance at present *(Vorobyeva E. et al., 2008)*. It is especially important that neither I.I. Schmalhausen nor J. Huxley were supporters of gradualism on speciation and origin of higher taxa, which is often blamed on supporters of STE/evolutionary synthesis, first of all. Secondly, having rich experience in embryology, growth, morphology, they constructed a single holistic concept of evolution without dividing it into micro- and macroevolution, without controversial extrapolations and panselectionism.

A.N. Severtzov's morphofunctional and biological progress theory reveals ectogenetic character of evolution and distinguishes two different types of changes progress/direction: biological and morphophysiological. Within the boundaries of the adaptive scheme of evolution of animals and based on the classification of the main types of adaptations L. Plate, G. Osborn, A.N. Severtzov pays attention not so much to the diversity of adaptive changes as to their expediency, which is associated with the benefits for the living organism as a whole: "…even among the passive organs we have not been able to find indifferent organs, i.e. useless formations consisting of functionally or morphologically coordinated tissue formations that have undergone more or less complex and long term evolution and have not been ever useful to the animal in which they developed. All active and most passive organs of animals evolve as useful formations, i.e. as adaptive traits" *(Severtzov A., 1939: 254–257)*.

Formulating and characterizing by examples all ways of biological progress (aromorphosis, idioadaptation, cenogenesis, degeneration) he comes to the conclusion: it is the evolution in the direction of biological progress that leads the evolutionary species to biological prosperity. It is achieved through the development of those organs, whose functioning influences the rise of the general vital activity of the animal body. In its turn it determines the activity and longevity of the representatives and the biological species as a whole.

Thus, the direction of evolution is revealed by A.N. Severtsov with the help of concepts of biological progress, usefulness for the organism, general vital activity of the organism, activity and life expectancy of species and its representatives.

I.I. Schmalhausen proceeded from the classification of evolution directions developed by A.N. Severtsov, which he thoroughly differentiated (aromorphosis, epimorphosis, allomorphosis, telemorphosis, hypermorphosis, catamorphosis, hypomorphosis). I.I. Schmalhausen, having carried out the fundamental large-scale synthesis of knowledge from mutations and adaptive modifications to the problem of human formation as a final phase of evolutionary progress, thoroughly documented not only the wide spread of individual adaptation of organisms, but also revealed the evolution of forms of individual response (growth regulations and structural changes in plants and sedentary animals, changes in body color in insects, fish, amphibians, behavior flexibility in birds and mammals). A variety of zoological and botanical material showed that the modifications are the result of historical development of response norms, which is a class of potential phenotypes created by a certain genotype without mutation changes under genetic control. In this connection the ability of organism to develop adaptive modifications was the result of interaction of genotype and medium variables, in which this biological species lived and could survive.

Obviously, adaptive modifications perform a protective function because they allow the organism to react quickly to sudden changes in the environment and thus ensure survival.

The formation of adaptive modifications occurred by differentiating systems of general value reactions into more particular ones. If adaptive modifications are constantly needed for organisms' survival, then there is a replacement of reaction systems by correlative ones, i.e. external factors of individual development are replaced by internal ones. I.I. Schmalhausen called this evolutionary method the autonomization of ontogenesis.

The researcher suggested that the genetic mechanism of transition of non-inheritable changes into hereditary ones lies in selective replacement of adaptive modifications with similar phenotypic manifestation mutations. Adaptive modifications prepare an outwardly imperceptible process of hereditary transformation of the organism through natural selection of genocopies.

It is especially important that individual adaptability, as I.I. Schmalhausen considered, gives a huge advantage to the species, because it allows to adapt very quickly to new conditions and to find in them favorable conditions of existence.

The direct individual adaptability of organisms, which is caused/conditioned by the variability of living conditions in general, acquires a special importance in case of a thorough change of the external environment, as it allows organisms to survive many such changes until stronger hereditary changes are established *(Schmalhausen I., 1983: 43)*.

I.I. Schmalhausen's view on the direction of natural selection in the process of anthropogenesis almost coincided with J. Huxley's position. In the process of biological evolution selection for survival is more significant, because it is this very selection that influences the specimens by differential survival, causes evolutionary effects, that were described by Ch. Darwin: 1) most of the specimens who will survive and mature, will mate and leave offspring, 2) most of the phenotypes that survived have a genetic basis.

Natural selection, according to J. Huxley, may also act by means of differential reproduction of mature individuals, but in fact it is a reproductive selection, which has extremely small evolutionary effects.

I.I. Schmalhausen also singled out the selection for fecundity, which coincided exactly with the selection for reproduction, and the selection for the highest organization or selection for viability. Interpreting the survival J. Huxley mirrored I.I. Schmalhausen having suggested the concept of selection for viability.

An attempt was made to link the theory of natural selection with the problem of progressive evolution, including the origin of a man.

Morphological formation of a man is due to the development of the brain, which was activated by the development of higher forms of nervous activity, which allowed a man to use his hands for making tools. These changes have the character of aromorphosis], which is the basis of the entire mammalian branch *(Schmalhausen I., 1939: 59)*, namely: these are such changes in the organization and functions of animals, which having a general meaning, increase the activity level of the animal organism. Changes in the organization and functions of animals, which have a general meaning, prove useful to the animal not only in some favorable changes of the environment, but also in many adverse changes.

So, on the basis of almost all domestic literature and foreign sources on genetics, ecology, species structure and species formation, the problem of growth and embryology, theories of evolution, paleontology and morphology, I. I. Schmalhausen and J. Huxley linked and outlined the directionality of evolution in general, and of human beings in particular, as the final stage of evolutionary/biological progress, with viability, survival, continuation of life due to individual adaptability or genotype flexibility and expansion of interrelations / interconnections between genotype and phenotype. In other words the living organism aspires to realize that internal, potential which is caused when interacting with the external environment. It contributes to the formation of adaptations/adaptation modifications and raises the organism viability and guarantees its survival and life expectancy.

Functioning, biological progress or regression, purposeful movement of a living being is conditioned by the presence of the potential received from birth, which aims at actualization and realization. Regardless of the conditions, the potential of a living organism will seek to be realized. Conditions only affect the speed and completeness of the potential realization by animals. An animal will always strive to realize this potential as Aristotle pointed out in "Metaphysics" *(Aristotle, 1976: 240)*.

Thus, from the biological point of view, the main need of a living organism is related to the preservation of his uniqueness in different environments, that focuses the directionality of its evolution to active life, as well as the use and formation of those mechanisms that will be significant / valuable for the biological progress of a living organism. In the context of evolutionary doctrine, the essence of a man and his invariant is definitely related to everything that is connected with life and is inherent to a living being.

4. Life, the living, human being: philosophical perspective of the directionality problem(filomenological aspect)

Today, thanks to the works of representatives of ecophilosophy, natural-scientific cosmism, teilhardism, "awe of life", "philosophy of life", biophilosophy, a systematic approach in biology, a complex study of a man is still forming a new, neoclassical scientific picture of the world, a scientific worldview, is being formed. Life no longer opposes the laws of physics, it does not struggle against them to prevent its death. Most scientific community recognizes that there is living nature (wildlife) and it is unified *(Sattler, 1986)*.

The idea of human inclusion in the world of living beings as a special species, whose identity is historical is stated and developed. Evolution is not considered to be guided by some transcendent or immanent teleology *(Nigmatullin Ch., 2005)*, but is explained in terms of causality and teleonomy *(Pittendrigh C., 1958)*. Thus, the antagonism of the subject to the object and a human being to nature, is removed. The human being is considered not as a kind of "reasonable man" (Homo sapiens), "Man playing" (Homo ludens), etc., but as a kind of "Man living" (Homo vivens) of the "Vivens" genus *(Dyachenko I., 2019)*.

J.M. Schaeffer emphasizes that the term "animality" indicates the inclusion of a human being, as a biological species, in the continuity of the living world and he cannot be removed from it *(Schaeffer J.-M., 2010)*.

In such context nature, a man, an object, a subject, cognition process, everything is involved in the network of life. Without understanding the essence of life neither further development of knowledge nor preservation of a man, society, nature is possible. At the current stage of science development, the concept of "life" acquires the character of a polysemantic philosophical category, the principle of understanding the essence of the world and human activity in it.

Obviously, the properties that characterize living organisms should also characterize humans as biosocial beings. Modern biologists distinguish the following abilities of living beings: 1) character of living organisms activity, i.e. ability to synthesize considerably more complex molecular structures in comparison with initial ones; 2) active maintenance of normal and moreover specific structure; 3) ability to reproduce themselves, i.e. creation of a new unit, in basic features similar to the previous one, requires not only specific synthesis, but also ability to transfer this specificity from initial unit to a new one, which is its offspring; 4) ability to transfer occurring from time to time specificity changes to the offspring; 5) ability not only to transmit information, but also to interact with the living and non-living environment; 6) ability to "self-regulate", i.e. ability to "compensate" the disturbing influences and return to norm at later stages of morphogenesis; 7) ability to maintain at a constant level not some single parameter, but the long process of change, i.e. trajectory; 8) stability is characteristic for living beings. Its mechanism is represented by the ability of the system to return to the state of equilibrium *(Ashby W., 1962: 100–102)*; 9) ability to adapt, i.e. ability to form structures and abilities, which allow living beings to successfully perform their amazing vital functions in the most unusual conditions, often very unfavorable for reproduction; 10) non-random phenotypic variability; 11) activity, which is confirmed by the results of studies of the life phenomenon and living beings in different directions of modern science (vitalism, mechanicism, reductionism, machinicism, organicism, psychophysics) *(Deniskin S., 2010)*.

Based on these abilities of living beings, any system that has a structure with special properties of the living must exist as an independent active unit. Otherwise, it will not be able to carry out external activity if the living system itself is not capable of activity, of being. So what ensures the functioning of the living system as an independent unit?

Proceeding from obvious connection of living organism's activity with functioning of adaptation mechanisms, which act entirely inside a living organism and human body, let's suppose, that these adaptation mechanisms should correspond to properties, qualities of a living being in general, and a human being in particular, due to which these mechanisms are formed and used by living organism. Probably, these specific internal properties are "called" out in the process of functional connection of a living organism with external environment for performing certain tasks and for achieving some goal.

We associate the activity of a living organism/living being with a set of biological properties, qualities, internal adaptation mechanisms, etc. of a living organism, which we call its potential. Human potential is the totality of biological properties, qualities, internal adaptation mechanisms, psychological, socio-psychological abilities, that acts as a force acting inside a person, causing his directional evolution and functioning. The potential of a living organism does not exist outside it. The potential of a living person does not exist and does not change outside of him. Potential requires actualization, which in its turn determines activity.

Hence, activity does not exist independently, it presupposes the existence of internal potential, which requires realization in the process of interconnection and interaction of a

living organism, a human being with the external environment and formation of corresponding conditions.

A human being is a born creature, so, in our opinion, receiving his potential is to some extent connected with his birth. Birth is always a connection, transmission, reception, change, overcoming, transition, qualitative change. Firstly, birth presupposes the existence of the one who gives birth and the one who is born. Secondly, birth is always the connection of someone with someone, the transmission not only from someone to someone, but also of something that determines the continuation of life at this moment and in the future. Thirdly, birth is a transition from what was to what is and what/who can be. In his "Physics" Aristotle pointed out that "something that is born goes from something to something because it is born. So what is it born into? Of course, not into something, where it [came from], but into something what it will be" *(Aristotle, 1981: 84)*. Fourthly, birth implies the existence of a life invariant, i.e. a set of basic features that remain unchanged during certain transformations. This makes a human being a generic creature, bound, capable of connectivity, which is a necessary condition of his existence and functioning as a living being and as a human being. The idea of homeoresis, proposed by C.H. Woddington, reflects the ability of the living to provide stability in the flow of formation from birth to death *(Woddington C., 1957)*, i.e. to preserve the invariant.

The recognition of the birth of a living being suggests a heterogeneous potential. Firstly, the obtained potential should contain those properties and qualities that allow to keep the connection with the common/generic for the system / species, representative of which is a living being. Secondly, the potential necessarily implies those properties and qualities that allow its carrier to be an independent, certain representative of the community. Hence, the existence in potential of a living being, a "generic" and "species" human being, implies not only the gradation of properties, but also the existence of integrating/founding, core component of potential. This component is an invariant due to which a living organism determines the general strategic direction of movement, the character of changes in a living being, adaptation modifications are selected, and something is preserved that not only contributes to differentiation and specialization of a living system, but also to the integration of these differentiated among themselves, thus benefiting a living organism in general.

The potential striving for maximum realization allows the living organism to move from one level of development to another. This explains its ability to move, change. The very transition from something to something presupposes the existence of that, according to Aristotle, "for the sake of what" this transition is carried out, i.e. the goal *(Aristotle, 1976: 68)*. Modern humanitarian and natural science recognizes and actively uses the teleological approach *(Petrenko V., Suprun A., 2012: 17–20)*. The teleological approach contains a significant rational grain, which is found when the process of birth is considered as a whole, revealing at the same time the internal regularities of its course (the principles of self-moving of the system, the algorithm of its self-development), which allows to speak about the purposefulness of the process, about the internal necessity of generating one state by another.

Rethinking Aristotle's tradition, who stated that it is necessary to cognize a thing not up to a certain limit, but up to that limit "for the sake of what" every thing exists *(Aristotle, 1981: 87)*, we consider the goal to be the long-term desired result of a living being. It may be unattainable in the considered period of time, but it is available in the future.

So, for the sake of clear understanding of the purpose or of something for the sake of what a living organism acts and changes, we should pay attention to something, without which any act, change or activity is possible.

Achieving the goal is impossible without realizing the potential and acting in accordance with its characteristics. If activity is recognized as an attribute of life, living system/organism/

person, and it is conditioned by potential and necessity of its realization, there is no life without realization of potential.

Hence, the purpose of living beings is to live, and thus to realize the existing potential.

The living will always strive to realize its potential, to act within the limits of what it is capable of, to stay/preserve a living, purposeful system. A living organism is functionally dependent on the external environment to a greater or lesser extent. A purposeful object must correlate with certain environmental features and must be oriented and guided by the goal. If the conditions surrounding the object change, the object acts purposefully, if it continues to pursue the same goal, changing its behavior when external conditions change *(Acoff R., Emery F., 1974: 22)*. Hence, no matter how the conditions of a living organism existence change, it will strive to live, to realize the existing potential.

The potential of a man as a living being is aimed at the life of its carrier, it ensures the quality of his life, and can therefore be described as essential. The life of a man and his potential are interdependent and in direct proportion: the more actively the potential is recognised, functioning and fulfilled, the more viable a man will be, and the higher his or her adaptability or survival under changing conditions will be.

The researchers of subjective human vitality have made an invaluable contribution to the development and understanding of the essence and nature of human life potential *(Dyachenko, 2012)*. They have experimental proofs of innateness and autonomy *(Deci E., Ryan R., 1991)* of this potential, and thus of the necessity of its manifestation, cognition and realization.

In this connection, we believe it is possible to correct the content of the concept "life" of a man as well as to specify the meaning of the general value of human activity.

From our point of view, the concept of "life" of a human being includes, firstly, the fact that he is forced to accept the undifferentiated vital potential that he received even before birth. The undifferentiatedness of potential characterizes its syncretic nature, which must be recognized. Something that a man can, wants and must realize must be crystallized in it. This, in fact, constitutes the content of his unique individuality and determines the degree of his personal resource.

Secondly, the efforts of a man, his actions on recognizing those abilities, properties, mechanisms in the latent potential, actualization of which will allow a man to realize his uniqueness and harmony of existence with the diverse forms of life in the Universe.

Thirdly, the concept of "life" includes human efforts to strengthen ancestral memory, i.e. the link that guarantees the identification and integration of a man in and with the existing world of objects.

To live means for a man to be purposefully active, to cognize himself and his potential completely, to perceive oneself as a whole, not to prevent the vital potential from manifesting and realizing in the process of human activity in the network of interconnection with all existing beings. This is the purpose of human activity, that determines the content of his life.

Everything that contributes to the achievement and realization of the goal will be values for a living being, a human being. In this context, a value is a form of purpose manifestation, that guarantees the preservation of life of a living being, his dignity, strengthening the connection with everything he is related to and connected both physically and metaphysically.

In our opinion the main value for any living being, will be the desire to realize its inner potential to the fullest extent possible, to live its full life in an ever-changing environment.

The general value of a man, as a living being, is striving for the fullness of his life or love of life (philomenology) *(Dyachenko I., 2017)*. It should be noted that a man's love for his life naturally brings him or her to the level of love for Life as a whole.

A man, as a living being, characterized by inner activity associated with his potential, will always strive to realize this potential, to manifest and define his activity, that is, to live in the world that exists as an interconnected combination of natural, social and metaphysical reality. There is a single generating principle at all levels of the world. It is reciprocal connections, mutual consistency, and interconnectedness of parts into a whole. A man is involved and interconnected with each of the existing realities, so he is a bio-socio-spiritual being. Being an organic whole, a human being exists actively, organizes himself, steadily reproduces himself, on the basis of the organic links principle, realizing his potential in each act of his activity, i.e. a man self-actualizes.

Forming connections at all levels of realities (natural, social, metaphysical/spiritual), a man makes a set of connections and relations between objects of natural, social, spiritual realities directly participating in or related to joint existence and activity (activity manifestation). These sets of connections and relations between a man and objects of natural, social and metaphysical realities are called "body". There is a natural, social, spiritual body of a human being. "Social body" is not a soulless structure and function, not a separate norm or rule. It is a personified social reality, which exists exactly as long as there is an emerging and solvable social problem in synchronous and diachronic changes. The formation of social "bodies" implies the existence of dominant subjects and their personification. Those people who are part of our "social bodies" help us to solve the problems that arise in the process of realizing our inner potential, which aspires to its fullness, are called "ours". Those people, who do not help us in the process of realizing our inner potential, in the process of self-moving, self-discovery, self-fulfillment, are not in our social "body," even if they are close friends, brothers or matchmakers, they are "strangers".

Thus, philomenology (love of life) is the value that guides not only a particular man on the way to the fullness of his life, but also determines the nature of the relationship, and thus its consequences for a man and all those people whom he interacts with. The level of philomenology development affects the degree of intelligibility of a man in the connections and interactions that he forms. In its turn, it increases the requirements to education, upbringing, self-discipline, culture of a man and his responsibility towards himself and others. The "philomenology" value can act as a determinant of the education program, upbringing of a human being in general, their subjects and personnel in particular.

Life is what a man exists for, the purpose of his existence and activity. In this regard, everything that does not prevent him from living, allows him to completely realize his vital potential will be significant for him, that is, valuable. The goal is the only one. It is life, the general value is formed according to the goal. It will also be the only one. It is desire/love for life (philomenology). In our opinion, a value is a form of goal manifestation. The values will match the goals.

The degree of awareness of a man's existence and activity goal as well as the level of the general value development determines the nature of a man's attitude towards everything with which he establishes links, what/who he chooses, how he acts and the result of his activity. It should be noted that a man's love for his life naturally brings him to the level of love for Life in general. But as A. Schweitzer stated a man still has to learn to live among Life (of other living beings). Further development of the problem of philomenology will help in this.

5. Conclusions

1) The analysis of scientific research on the problem of living beings directional evolution confirms the existence of the basic need of any living being to live, to preserve his uniqueness and integrity in different environments, that focuses the directionality of its evolution

on active life, as well as the use and formation of those mechanisms that will be significant / valuable for the biological progress of a living organism.

2) In a modern neoclassical picture of the world the idea about inclusion of a man, as a biological species, into the continuity of the living world is stated as well as impossibility of withdrawal from it, with its characteristic features.

3) Activity, as life attribute and feature of a living being, does not exist by itself, it presupposes the existence of internal potential in a living organism, that requires realization in the process of interconnection and interaction of a living system, a human being with environment and formation of appropriate conditions. The human activity is connected with the potential, receiving of which is conditioned by birth of a man.

4) Life, activity and potential are interconnected: there is no life and activity without realization of potential.

5) A living being will always strive to realize its potential, to act within the limits of what it is capable of.

6) Life as realization of potential is the goal of existence of any living being.

7) Everything that contributes to the achievement and realization of the goal will be valuable to a living being, a human being. Value is a form of the goal manifestation.

8) The main value for any living being will be the desire to fully realize the potential inherent in him, to live his full life in an ever-changing environment.

9) General value of a man, as a living being, is the striving for the fullness of his life or love of life (philomenology).

References

Aristotel. (1976). Metafizika [Metaphysics] (Vol. 1). M.: Myisl. [in Russian]

Aristotel. (1981). Fizika [Physics] (Vol. 3). M.: Myisl. [in Russian]

Akoff, R., Emeri, F.O. (1974). O tseleustremlennyih sistemah [About purposeful systems]. M.: "Sov. radio". [in Russian]

Drish, G. (2020). Vitalizm, ego istoriya i sistema [Vitalism, its history and system]. M., URSS. [in Russian]

Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 38, 237–288.

D'yachenko, I.N. (2019). AntropologIchniy povorot u pedagogItsI: teoretiko-metodologIchniy poshuk fundamentalnoYi tsInnostI dIyalnostI lyudini [Anthropological turn in pedagogy: theoretical and methodological search for the fundamental value of human activity]. Journal "ScienceRise: Pedogogical Education", 1(48), 29–37. [in Ukrainian]

D'yachenko, I.N. (2012). Fenomen sub'ektivnoy vitalnosti:teoretiko-metodologicheskie osnovyi osmyisleniya [The phenomenon of subjective vitality: theoretical and methodological foundations of comprehension.]. Vestnik Zhitomirskogo gosudarsvennogo universiteta im. Ivana Franko. Filosofskie nauki. 62, 17–25. [in Ukrainian]

D'yachenko, I.N. (2017). Tsel, sredstva i tsennost deyatelnosti cheloveka(filomenologicheskiy aspekt) [Purpose, means and value of human activity (philomenological aspect)]. In A. Kordonska, R. Kordonski (Ed), Quo vadis, humanitas? (385–398). Warszawa-Lwow-Kijow: Wydawnictwo VERBINUM. [in Polish].

Deniskin, S.A. (2010). Poznanie zhivogo: teoretiko-metodologicheskie osnovyi [Knowledge of the living: theoretical and methodological foundations]. Chelyabinsk: Tsitsero, 2010. [in Russian]

Eshbi, U.R. (1962). Konstruktsiya mozga. Proishozhdenie adaptivnogo povedeniya [Brain design. The origin of adaptive behavior]. M.: Inostrannaya literatura. [in Russian]
Huxley, J. (1957). The three types of evolutionary process. Nature, 180 (4884), 454–455. [in English]
Nigmatullin, Ch. M. (2005). Tselepolaganie osnovnyih biologicheskih sistem: organizm, popu-lyatsiya, soobschestvo i biosfera [Objective of the main biological systems: organism, population, community and biosphere]. Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo. Ser. Biologiya, 1 (9), 142–153. [in Russian]
Pittendrigh, C. S. (1958). Adaptation, natural selection, and behavior. In A. Roe and George Gaylord Simpson (Ed.), Behavior and Evolution (pp. 390–416). New Haven: Yale University Press. [in English]
Popov, I.Yu. (2006) Ideya napravlennosti evolyutsii: istoriya i sovremennost [The idea of the direction of evolution: history and modernity]. Vestnik SPbGU, Ser. 7, 4, 13–19. [in Russian]
Petrenko, V.F., Suprun, A.P. (2012). Tseleustremlennyie sistemyi, evolyutsiya i sub'ektnyiy aspekt sistemologii [Purposeful systems, evolution and the subject aspect of systemology.]. Trudyi ISA RAN, 62(1), 5–27. [in Russian]
Serikov, A.E. (2015). Diskussiya ob instinktah cheloveka v psihologii i etologii [Discussion about human instincts in psychology and ethology]. Vestnik Samarskoy gumanitarnoy akademii. Ser. Filosofiya. Filologiya, (17), 65–87. [in Russian]
Severtsov, A.N. (2017). Glavnyie napravleniya evolyutsionnogo protsessa: Morfobiologicheskaya teoriya evolyutsii [The main directions of the evolutionary process: Morphobiological theory of evolution]. M.: Izd. stereotip. URSS. [in Russian]
Severtsov, S.A. (1941). Dinamika naseleniya i prisposobitelnaya evolyutsiya zhivotnyih [Population dynamics and adaptive evolution of animals]. M.-L.: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR. [in Russian]
Shmalgauzen, I.I. (1982). Organizm kak tseloe v individualnom i istoricheskom razvitii [Organism as a whole in individual and historical development]. M.: Nauka. [in Russian]
Severtsov, A.N. (1939). Morfologicheskie zakonomernosti evolyutsii [Morphological patterns of evolution]. M. ; L. : Izd-vo AN SSSR. [in Russian]
Shmalgauzen, I.I. (1983). Puti i zakonomernosti evolyutsionnogo protsessa [Paths and patterns of the evolutionary process] (2-e izd.). M.: Nauka. [in Russian]
Shmalgauzen, I.I. (1939). Nauchnaya deyatelnost akademika A. N. Severtsova kak teoretika-evolyutsionista. [Scientific activity of academician A.N. Severtsov as an evolutionist theorist]. Pamyati akademika A. N. Severtsova: 1866–1936. M.; L.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1, 55–65. [in Russian]
Sattler, R. (1986). Biophilosophy. Analytic and Holistic Perspectives. Springer-Verlag. Heidelberg. NewYork, Tokyo, 212–236. [in English]
Sheffer, Zhan-Mari. (2010). Konets chelovecheskoy isklyuchitelnosti [The End of Human Exclusivity]. M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. [in French]
Thompson, D.W. (1992). On Growth and Form. Cambridge: University Press ; New Ed edition. [in English]
Vorobeva, E.I., Feoktistova, N.Yu. (2008). Akademik A.N. Severtsov i sovremennost [Academician A.N. Severtsov and modernity]. Zhurnal obschey biologii. Sinopsisy. 69(2), 84–93. [in Russian]
Waddington, C.H. (1957). The Strategy of the Genes: A Discussion of Some Aspects of Theoretical Biology. London: George Allen and Unwin. [in English]
Zavarzin, G.A. (2018). Fenotipicheskaya sistematika bakteriy. Prostranstvo logicheskih vozmozhnostey [Phenotypic systematics of bacteria. Logical Capability Space]. M.: URSS. [in Russian]