

УДК 14

## Human Being: Integrity and Wholeness

Igor A. Belyaev\*

Orenburg State University

13 Pobedy prospect, Orenburg, 460018 Russia<sup>1</sup>

Received 4.05.2011, received in revised form 11.05.2011, accepted 18.05.2011

*The article covers the differentiation between notions of integrity and wholeness in respect to specificity a human being as a natural, social and spiritual being. Integrity of a person is interpreted as an existence and unity of all its constituents. At that, integrity of a human being is equated to a human being, considered in all infinite variety of displays of the organism, personality and soul. The wholeness of an individual is considered as integrity with multiscale goals peculiar to him, determinacy by them, focus of all cognizable and incognizable, objective and subjective, actual and potential in them. Accepting that wholeness is a highly important feature of human integrity, the author points out two sides of it: structural and functional. Specification of a structural side can be discovered by appealing to the content of concept "expediency", functional side – to that of "purposefulness". The expediency represents target conditionality of integrity, conformation of its structure towards that purpose which is objectively peculiar to it and to some degree is mediated subjectively, while the purposefulness is an inclination of any functioning integrity to aim at the resulting achievement, which shows the best correlation with its purpose.*

*Keywords: human being, integrity, types of human integrity, wholeness, goal, expediency, purposefulness.*

### Introduction

In different philosophic and research texts meanings of notions "integrity" and "wholeness" are quite often mixed up, and frequently they are even equated. The terms are used spontaneously, interchanging without any logic within one text. Disarray of the researchers' views in regard of it is due to differentiation between phenomena represented by the said terms becomes highly acute in the course of discussion of problems of a human being, its nature and existence. This is a direct evidence of topicality of clarification of a question in relation between notions of integrity and wholeness in respect to specificity of human nature. It is evident that we cannot set aside

the fact of absence of empirically reasonably sufficient and at the same time heuristically valuably conceptualized conceptions about a person. It may be assumed that a measure of interdisciplinary universality of determination of notions used for their description reliably confirms vitality of such ideas.

Thinkers of different times and cultures made lots of attempts to establish truly universal determination of the notion "human being", but none of them had even a chance of being successful. The reason for this – multireality of a human being which is reflected in inexhaustibility of its features that may be notion-making in different dimensions. Nowadays it is impossible

\* Corresponding author E-mail address: igorbelyaev@yandex.ru

<sup>1</sup> © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

to define the notion “human being” which would impeccably reveal its content, and probably this task will not be solved in the future. That’s why we may assume that conceptual uncertainty of a man is its attribute. However, one should never absolutize this uncertainty; all the history of formation of anthropological knowledge testifies to the fact that the correct reflection of a certain part of notion-making features of a human being is necessary for the successful development of a large range of the research issues which is quite possible in most cases.

### **Point**

It is possible to talk about integrity of this or that something, i.e. that it is a whole one, only if “that from which is absent none of the parts of which it is said to be naturally a whole, and that which so contains the things it contains that they form a unity” (Aristotle, 1976, pp. 174-175). If we study this judgment all by itself, its truth seems unquestionable. It’s quite another matter how efficient will be the support on its distinctive content if it is investigated “all by itself” without taking into consideration its correlation with judgments indicating the fact that integrity has other necessary essential and specific features. It is thought that recognition of any integrity that is natural to a given situation by the sum of its components which is unproductive from onto-epistemological point of view in view of its doubtful correctness in respect to a high number of specific fragments of existence. This approach makes concepts of integrity and the parts which are extremely empty so they lose their heuristic possibilities almost a hundred percent.

However a full refusal of consideration of all without an exception integrities as summative formations which inevitably puts a researcher in an opposition to de facto state of affairs. Summative integrities of course have their place in the life and this explains and even justifies, to some

extent, concentration of the research attention on the peculiarities that they possess. One should not lose sight of the fact that the summative peculiar to some integrities is non-absolute in principle, moreover their real existence is merely an exception than a rule.

Integrity is the unity of parts, their common synthetic quality; while the parts being viewed individually are separate carriers of the elements of this quality served as potency. Moreover, integrity and its constituent parts can be detected and revealed exclusively throughout their correlation in some aspect. This circumstance predetermines the difficulties which almost always arise while attempting to reveal details of true correlation between integrity and its parts. In fact, on the one hand the objectively existing relations between the parts are made in integrity generalizing them. On the other hand, revealed features of an interconnection of parts of a specific integrity inevitably appear misrepresented and subjectified, information about them contains something controversial, wrongly treated, and sometimes even having nothing to do with itself, introduced by a researcher and being a direct demonstration of intentionality of his own world-attitude. Any integrity at the moment of its examination, has been artificially pulled away from its previous and following conditions, devoid of varied mutual influences with other integrities, and it is something relatively completed, becoming permeated with unity and resultant for the process of development of a certain fragment of reality. This version of its vision is quite admissible, but only in the context of a pure research and an instrumental application.

Turning towards a discussion of features of the integrity of human beings, first of all it should be noted that combination of relations between parts, different by intensity and nature, with availability of aggregate system features of the whole allows to acknowledge it as oversummative.

In this case, it certainly would be more pure and whole because its existence is characterized by the internal interaction of the parts combined with interaction of the whole with the external environment and the ability of self-development. Moreover, the importance of correlative and unifying (integrative) connections between the parts is so high that they cannot function outside the whole, and change in one of them will inevitably entail changes in other parts, so throughout the whole.

It is by the different, rather isolated, specifically made out parts, the aspects of his formed integrity, the person is realized in three worlds—fragments of the integral World accessible to him. These worlds are revealed to person as three qualitatively different spheres of his existence: the natural, social and spiritual. In the natural sphere, in the real-material world, the man shows his own nature as an organism, i.e. body with a certain set of organs, embodying its potency during space and time limited, morpho-functionally conditioned life activity. In the social sphere, through the world of interpersonal relations, a person is presented with his personality, which is his social quality, arising, formed and revealed in the course of its social and role representation. In the spiritual sphere, in this world fundamentally different regarding nature and society, in the realm of Absolute Truth, Goodness and Beauty the man is realized (at least potentially) by the soul – body of an intimate spiritual life, through which he transcends, breaking the boundaries of determinate existence. Being the various forms of realization of human nature, corresponding to the specific nature of certain spheres of human existence, body, personality and soul are the existential elements of his integrity that is the hypostasis, in which his life passes in the World.

No integrity, including human, can “be carried out abstractly. Realization means individualizing” (Plesner, 1988, p. 113.); concrete

integrity, being concrete unity of the concrete parts which are in concrete relations, appears before the researcher in one of possible types.

According to D.V. Pivovarov, the definition of a type of any integrity is possible on the basis of character of communication and a degree of unity of its parts. The existence of three significantly different from each other ways of communication between the whole and its parts, their mutual influence suggests the expediency of allocating three basic types of integrity: the totalitarian, partitive and harmonic (Pivovarov, 2009). Totalitarian integrity occurs when the whole dominates over the parts, partitive – when parts dominate over the whole. Harmonious integrity is characterized by the absence of domination of parts and the whole over each other, mutually revealed character of their communication.

Examination of human integrity allows us to find out all three mentioned types. The description of the signs, presence of which acts as the basis for the statement about its belonging to certain type, can be summarized as follows:

1. Totalitarian integrity is carried out by means of consecutive levelling of the most strongly pronounced properties of those parts of which it consists. In this case, the dominance of the whole over the parts which is built as more or less explicit ‘borrowing’ from one of them, some certain intentions natural for it and formation on their basis of intentionality of the individual world-attitude of a human being. The analysis of possible specificity of an intentionality of the world-attitude testifies to an admissibility of relating integrity of the given individual to either natural centric, or social centric or theocentric modification. The first of them, natural centric modification of this type of integrity that reflects accented implementation needs and abilities of the

organism, finds display in consecutive influence the hedonistic goals connected with egoism and self-sufficiency of the human being. The second one is social centric modification of this integrity which assumes primary actualization of personal abilities and needs expressing the originality of developing public relations which are found out in uniquely conformist and collectivist orientation of the person combined with his excessive social activity (or, on the contrary, socially approved passivity) and actual loss of his own individuality. The third, theocentric modification is focused on the work of the soul and spiritual quests, totalitarian integrity acts as an inclination of a person to reflect on the meaning of life, to find God in himself and himself in God, as constantly reflexing inclination to reduce his own social activity to an admissible minimum; along with it quite often there is a relation to the body as to the sinful flesh which is probably unworthy of care and even subject to mortification.

2. Partitive integrity is also revealed in three modifications – natural centric, social centric and theocentric. Here, the primary and explicitly revealing is a specificity of predominating properties of one of the parts of the person, not intentionality of his integral world-attitude, therefore the revealed modifications are characterized by a higher than in previous case level of denial of that which has a direct relation to the properties of his other parts. These modifications find the most vivid concentrated expression in animality of the human being, in its social zombieism, and also in religious or antireligious fanaticism. Animality as hypertrophied naturalness is expressed

in concentration on a person satisfying his/her own corporal needs; at that his world-attitude is developed in a range from bestiality (stupid senselessness) to beast-likeness (unbridled rapacity). Social zombieism appears in various forms of reckless careerism or recusancy, coupled with a clear indication of the importance of one's role in society and his own irreplaceability in this role. Relating to a spiritual phenomena of religious fanaticism and its seamy side – dogmatic militant atheism, are expressed in the man's all-consuming addiction to messianism, in his quest for selfless devotion, in the sacrificial aim.

3. Harmonic integrity of the person is a genuine unity, perfect consistency, attunement of all natural, social and spiritual components of his nature. The carrier of harmonious integrity quite consistently conducts a healthy way of life, shows sincere disposition and love towards people, creatively carries out development of accessible fragments of the reality. As to allocation of any modifications of human integrity, here it will hardly help the researcher to understand the real situation better.

It is evident that integrity of a human being, which is in the state of harmony, is a very attractive version of its specific-vital embodiment from very different points of view. At least, there is a reason to recognize such a type of human integrity as ontologically more perfect. Here we may cite with G.W.F. Hegel: "Harmony is the correlation between qualitative differences, taken in their aggregate and *flowing out of the essence of the thing itself* (my italics. – I.B.)" (Hegel, 1968, p. 149). It makes sense to emphasize that the state of harmony achieved by full-grown man in the course of formation, is not an abstraction born by

imagination of a researcher who has little to do with reality. Though this state is really ephemeral, it is still attractive for any self-conscious human being and available for him in essence.

It should be noted within the framework of integrity which has acquired true harmony, all of its parts – existential components – don't lose originality of its nature, but even get an opportunity to reveal it. All of them – the organism, the personality and the soul even after achievement of ultimately accurate harmony and coordination between each other still remain by themselves, living as substantially so functionally not only a quite full-featured general life and a quite full-featured own life keeping and demonstrating their natural characteristics. However, individual features of components of human integrity are secondary to its system features which are expressed concentratedly in its distinctive abilities and needs. Speaking of the latter, their correlation between each other and conditions of actualization loses a former degree of optimality under any transformation of human integrity. Direction and the scale of changes of this degree essentially determine specificity of anew originating state of human integrity and its type correspondingly.

However, it seems that detection and taking into consideration of the typical in the features of some human integrity should not be a sufficient ground to take no notice of the fact that in each specific case, in any moment of its formation it is still deeply individual and unique in its originality regardless of any appendant circumstances. As a matter of fact, integrity typical to a certain person can be equated to it, is considered in all almost infinite variety of displays of its own nature. On the one hand in the unity of always somewhat unique, spiritual and social features and relations it possesses. On the other hand it is more or less evident peculiarities of interior structure of its organism and its functions.

Detailed differentiation of content of concepts such as integrity and wholeness in anthropological aspect should be premised with a direct indication to what which is the sense of correlation between phenomena denoted by them. *Wholeness* is one of the notion-making features of any oversummative organic *integrity*, its ultimately important fundamental characteristic is concerned directly with a goal that springs from it and serves as an index of its presence. Aristotle, in particular, writes that “the becoming moves to some beginning, i.e. some goal (because the beginning of a thing – is what it exists for, and its formation is for achievement of the goal); meanwhile, aim is a reality, and ability is gained for the goal” (Aristotle, 1976, p. 246), which in turn may exist and exists only in connection with the need which agrees with it according to quality. At the same time, goal according to G.W.F. Hegels – “is its inside motive to the implementation” (Hegel, 1997, p. 679). R. Ackoff and F. Emery who examined prior parameters of purposeful systems, in other words integrities, which are system-organized and function for goal achievement, logically note that “goal is a desirable result unachievable during the time period under study, but available in future, and during this period the result may be brought near” (Ackoff and Emery, 1974, p. 66).

Human being usually possesses relative wholeness, though sometimes in the state of ultimate disharmony a human being almost loses it.

It may be assumed that the concept of “wholeness” should define such feature of integrity as structural-functional. It makes sense to point out two sides of wholeness: structural and functional. The specificity of a structural side can be discovered by appealing to the content of concept “expedience”, functional side – to that of “purposefulness”. It is clear that such a separation cannot be acknowledged as only

instrumental, dictated by the necessity of rational understanding of reality. So, Ackoff and Emery who link a concept of structure and a function while trying to show their complete match, state that “the structure is a general notion applied to geometric, kinematic and mechanic features, as well as all features represented as their functions” (Ackoff and Emery, 1974, p. 26). Speaking of the human integrity it should be noted that its structure which plays a part of the source and carrier of different functions, including strictly human ones, specifically reacts upon the changes in the external natural-social-spiritual sphere responding to them by some changes in itself with all the ensuing consequences.

*The expediency* represents the target conditionality of integrity, conformity of its structure to that purpose which is objectively peculiar to it and to some degree is mediated subjectively.

In the natural sphere the expediency of human integrity is concentratedly expressed in self-changing adaptive activity of an organism, in its conformity to real-material living conditions and in coordination, attunement of the functions realized by it. In social sphere it primarily reveals in adaptive activity of the person, reforming the environment, and in efficiency of its inclusiveness in processes of social and role representation. In the spiritual sphere, it is clearly revealed as the creative activity of the soul, its focus beyond the boundaries of determinate existence.

At any moment of the human life the expediency of its integrity is relative. In other words, the possession by the human integrity of the said feature means that its exact conformity with the aim and environmental conditions of existence may be lost and found again.

Specifying the content of the concept of expediency, it is considered necessary to follow Kant who pointed out that it is appropriate to tell that “an object, or state of mind, or even an action

may, although its possibility does not necessarily presuppose the representation of a purpose, be called purposive simply on account of its possibility being only explicable and intelligible for us by virtue of an assumption on our part of fundamental causality according to purposes, i.e., a will that would have so ordained it according to a certain represented rule” (Kant, 1966, pp. 222-223). According to Kant, expediency may be subjective and objective. At the same time he discovers external and internal components within objective expediency; the internal expediency for him is utility, and external – perfection (ibid).

G.W.F. Hegel describes external expediency as “the case when the real matter does not possess a notion in itself which defines it, but is related to it with some other subject as an external form or relation” (Hegel, 1973, p. 121). According to his statement, internal expediency “is something that is a goal in itself and the means, that is its own product and the beginning making this product. And here, – as the German thinker quite reasonably marks, – is the end of itself” (ibid., p. 168).

*The purposefulness* is an inclination of any functioning integrity to aim at the result achievement, which shows the best correlation with its purpose.

Human integrity is usually characterized by the goals, changing with time, due to which its determination is reflected in the regulation by an individual of his actions, acts, behaviour in general. Thus only the person who possesses such abilities and needs which allow him to define the clear and worthy purpose and carefully follow it regardless of any collateral circumstances can be recognized purposeful. It should be noted that the volume of functions realized by any integrity, including human, is limited by natural possibilities set by its structure. However, if any living conditions are unfavourable, the people face need to overcome arising difficulties at

the cost of denial of previous and development of new variants of functioning. However we should not exaggerate the dependence of the process of actualization of adaptive and creative potentialities of human integrity from a measure of stability of external environmental influences. In particular, the integrity acting as a purposeful system “can change its tasks under constant surrounding conditions: it chooses tasks as well as means of their fulfillment. Thus it expresses the will. The most famous example of such systems is men” (Ackoff and Emery, 1974, p. 40).

Specificity of actualization by the integral human being of his purposefulness consists in realization of ability and needs to set and achieve not only the general, “final”, supra-individual in their essence goals, but also the private goals connected with concrete-vital circumstances and with primary display of peculiarities of one of its hypostases – of an organism, person or soul. Purposefulness turns out to be related primarily to the readiness of the individual, even if he does not realize it, to direct, if necessary, his natural, social and spiritual essential forces on achievement of the goals called “final” herein. It makes sense to specify that these goals are only sometimes realized by the person in a more or less obvious and true way, but usually they take the form of vague, but very strong inclinations. It is also important to realize that people, according to Kant, “think little on this. Each, according to his own inclination, follows his own purpose, often in opposition to others; yet each individual and people, as if following some guiding thread, go toward a natural but to each of them unknown goal; all work toward furthering it, even if they would set little store by it if they did know it” (Kant, 1966b, pp. 7-8).

Certain goals may be achieved or not be achieved, one may serve to them or not, they can become obvious to an individual or remain hidden from him, defined in themselves and for

themselves, but anyway it is their combination that the system determines as wholeness of any human being. In other words, the wholeness of the individual is how filled his integrity is with multiscale goals peculiar to him, determinacy by them. All the objective and the subjective, actual and potential in its purposes, blend in each other. It combines both what is present in the purpose and can be understood, as well as what inevitably remains incomprehensible by the man himself and the people around him irrespective of any circumstances.

Adhering the Aristotle’s position on hedonism in its synthetic version, alien to the extremes of hedonism and moralism, we can declare that a genuine, truly ultimate goal of any human being is happiness (Aristotle, 1984). Actually, the movement of the individual to happiness and this only makes him more perfect, harmonizes the integrity of his nature by disclosing previously unclaimed resources of organism, personality and soul that become necessary to counter the natural, social and spiritual concrete-vital circumstances and to master them. In this regard, the integrity of the human being must be recognized as his eventual-ontic predetermination, a measure of an individual potential of solving contradictions between self-existence and other-existence, that is freedom available to him. Realizing his freedom, the person aspires, consciously or unconsciously, to overcome the borders which are not naturally born by existing condition of his wholeness, and therefore chaining him, making his existence compelled, defective, bearing a minimum of happiness and maximum of suffering, that is essentially disharmonious.

True human happiness presumably consists of the natural-social-spiritual well-being of the individual. Objective measurement of such well-being allows to reveal a harmony of his integrity. Subjective measurement indicates a feeling of a happy person that he is exactly what he should

be, that he possesses all that is necessary, and in the eyes of the others he even looks like he should look in his own opinion.

Integrities, belonging to the totalitarian and partitive types, correspond to the potential wholeness. Both in that and in other case it is quite obviously that the wholeness is inherent in human integrity, however we may only guess its concrete parameters. The wholeness of the harmonic integrity will certainly be actual. This circumstance acts as enough reliable precondition to judge correctly the prospects of the effective analysis of the basic features of wholeness of the certain human being.

J. Njutzen writes that “generally speaking, the ability to concretize one’s vague needs in realistic goal-objects is a major element in personal maturity and mental health in the different periods of life. A state of need that cannot be converted into “something realistic to be done or achieved”, i.e. in a behavioural goal – creates a permanent condition of discomfort and helplessness in childhood as well as despair in old age” (Njutzen, 2004, pp. 233-234). Agreeing with the author who has expressed this idea, I want to underline that the true nature of integrity peculiar

to an individual at each moment of his formation as integrity, always finds more or less obvious display.

### Conclusion

Wholeness defines the dominant vector of formation of human integrity, its transformation in the transition from the present into the future, setting at the same time some boundaries for its development. Having only operational and situational character, these boundaries go into oblivion as a person approaches them. At the same time, the integrity of a human being reveals in its denial of absolute faultlessness of existing condition of own integrity and in affirmation of necessity and possibility of its positive, adaptive-creative change. Thus, initial-essential imperfection of human integrity is taken only in its actual integrity. The presence of such wholeness almost completely eliminates the possibility of a conflict of the de facto existing system properties of the individual, his abilities and needs which are strictly hierarchical and coordinated in accordance with the natural and social and spiritual conditions of his existence.

### References

- R. Ackoff, F. Emery, *On Purposeful Systems* (Moscow: Sovietskoe radio, 1974), in Russian.
- Aristotle, “Metaphysics” in *Aristotle, Works, in 4 volumes, v. 1* (Moscow: Miysl, 1976), 63-367, in Russian.
- Aristotle, “Physics” in *Aristotle, Works, in 4 volumes, v. 3* (Moscow: Miysl, 1981), 59-262, in Russian.
- Aristotle, “Nicomachean Ethics” in *Aristotle, Works, in 4 volumes, v. 4* (Moscow: Miysl, 1984), 53-293, in Russian.
- G.W.F. Hegel, “Lectures on Aesthetics” in *G.W.F. Hegel, Aesthetics, in 4 volumes, v. 1* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1968), in Russian.
- G.W.F. Hegel, “Philosophical Propaedeutic” in *G.W.F. Hegel, Works of various years, in 2 volumes, v. 2* (Moscow: Miysl, 1973), 5-209, in Russian.
- G.W.F. Hegel, *The Science of Logic* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1997), in Russian.
- I. Kant, “The Critique of Judgement” in *I. Kant, Works, in 6 volumes, v. 5* (Moscow: Miysl, 1966), 161-527, in Russian.

I. Kant, "Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View" in *И. Кант. Works, in 6 volumes*, v. 6 (Moscow: Miysl, 1966), 5-23, in Russian.

J. Njutzen, "Motivation, planning, action" in *J. Njutzen, Motivation, action and the future perspective* (Moscow: Smiysl, 2004), 15-348, in Russian.

D.V. Pivovarov, *Ontology of religion* (Saint Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2009), in Russian.

H. Plesner, "The Levels of the Organic and Man. Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology" in *The problem of man in Western philosophy* (Moscow: Progress, 1988), 96-151, in Russian.

N.A. Berdyaev, "The Problem of Man" in *N.A. Berdyaev On a man, his freedom and spirituality: Selected works* (Moscow: Moscow Psychological-Social Institute: Flinta, 1999), 21-37, in Russian.

M. Buber, "I and Thou" in *M. Buber Two Types of Faith* (Moscow: OOO «Firma "Izdatelstvo AST", 1999), 24-121, in Russian.

G.P. Bystray, D.V. Pivovarov, *Unbalanced systems: integrity, efficiency, reliability* (Sverdlovsk: Izdatelstvo of the Ural University, 1989), in Russian.

A. Cervera Espinosa, "Who is the man? Philosophic anthropology" in *This is a man: Anthology* (Moscow: Higher School, 1995), 75-101, in Russian.

I.P. Chetverikov, "From the lectures on general psychology" in *Russian religious anthropology. Anthology, in 2 volumes*, v. 2 (Moscow: The Moscow Philosophy Fund, The Moscow Spiritual Academy, 1997), 335-343, in Russian.

E.M. Gashkova, "Anthropology of wholeness as a problem", *Scientific and technical bulletins of Saint Petersburg state polytechnic university*, 66 (2008), 67-75, in Russian.

E.M. Gashkova, "Existential and ontological grounds of anthropology of wholeness", *News of The Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia*, 10 (2005 5), 272-283, in Russian.

H.E. Hengstenberg, "To the revision of notion of human nature" in *This is a man: Anthology* (Moscow: Higher School, 1995), 211-250, in Russian.

W. James, *Psychology* (Moscow: Pedagogics, 1991), in Russian.

V.P. Kapets, "Wholeness of a man as one of the aspects of his integrity (philosophic analysis)", *Bulletin of Adyge State University*, 8 (2008), 20-25, in Russian.

N.P. Koptseva, "Modelling of integrity in philosophic cognition", *Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State University. Humanities Sciences*, 2 (2000), 12-17, in Russian.

V.V. Lazutkin, "From cleavage to wholeness: origins of fanaticism", *Omsk scientific bulletin*, 5 (2008 72), 115-117, in Russian.

V.Y. Nagevichene, D.V. Pivovarov, *Integral man (Christian tradition)* (Yekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo of the Ural University, 2005), in Russian.

D.V. Pivovarov, *Main categories of ontology* (Yekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo of the Ural University, 2003), in Russian.

D.V. Pivovarov, "Objective and Subjective Religiousness" *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 2 (2008 1), 250-252.

D.V. Pivovarov, "Problem of Synthesis of the Main Definitions of Culture" *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 1 (2009 2), 17-22.

D.V. Pivovarov, "The part and the whole" in *Contemporary philosophic dictionary* (Moscow: Academic Project, 2004), 797-799, in Russian.

Platon (Igumnov), archimandrite, *Orthodox Moral theology* (Saint Trinity Sergius Lavra: B.i., 1994), in Russian.

P.A. Rachkov, "Man in the mirror of philosophy", *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy*, 2 (1998), 33-46, in Russian.

V.V. Rozanov, "Aim of the human's life" in *V.V. Rozanov Metaphysics of Christianity* (Moscow: OOO "Izdatelstvo AST"; Kharkov: "Folio", 2001), 471-528, in Russian.

V.N. Sagatovsky, "Anthropological integrity: status and structure" in *Essay of social anthropology* (Saint Petersburg: TOO TK "Petropolis", 1995), 41-55, in Russian.

A.A. Semenova, N.P. Koptseva, "Truth as a Form of Modelling of Integrity at Social Being Level" *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1 (2009 2), 31-55.

V.S. Solovyev, "Meaning of love" in *V.S. Solovyev, Works, in 2 volumes, v. 2* (Moscow: Miysl, 1988), 493-547, in Russian.

N.A. Telnova, "Integrity of a man: specificity of modality and ways of measuring", *Bulletin of the Volgograd State University. Series 7: Philosophy. Sociology and social technology*, 4 (2005), 73-79, in Russian.

L.N. Tolstoy, *Way of life* (Moscow: Higher School, 1993), 242-243, in Russian.

L.A. Tronina, "Philosophic and anthropological and natural-scientific aspects of integrity of a human being", *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*, 18 (2009), 30-34, in Russian.

V.I. Filatov, *Social and ontological grounds of integrity of a man* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGUK; Omsk: Omsk State University, 2001), in Russian.

V.I. Filatov, "The problem of ontological grounds of integrity of a man", *Bulletin of Omsk University*, 4 (1997), 43-46, in Russian.

## **Человек: целостность и цельность**

**И.А. Беляев**

*Оренбургский государственный университет  
13 пр. Победы, Оренбург, 460018 Россия*

---

*Статья посвящена разграничению содержания понятий целостности и цельности применительно к специфике человека как природно-социально-духовного существа. Человеческая целостность связывается автором с наличием и единством всех присущих ей частей. При этом целостность человеческого существа отождествляется с ним самим, взятым во всём практически безграничном многообразии проявлений его организма, личности и души. Под цельностью человека понимается проникнутость его целостности свойственными ему разномасштабными целями, определённости ими, средоточие всего познаваемого и непознаваемого, объективного и субъективного, актуального и потенциального в них. Признавая цельность исключительно важной фундаментальной характеристикой человеческой целостности, автор выделяет в ней две стороны: структурную и функциональную. Специфика структурной стороны раскрывается при обращении к содержанию понятия «целесообразность», функциональной – понятия «целеустремлённость». Целесообразность выступает здесь как целевая обусловленность целостности, соответствие её структуры той цели, которая ей свойственна объективно и в какой-либо мере опосредована субъективно, целеустремлённость – как склонность всякой функционирующей целостности стремиться к достижению результата, в наибольшей мере соответствующего её цели.*

*Ключевые слова: человек, целостность, типы человеческой целостности, цельность, цель, целесообразность, целеустремлённость.*

---