

4. Кузнецова Е.И. Государственно–частное партнерство в реализации инновационной стратегии: новые возможности для взаимодействия бизнеса и государства/ Е.И. Кузнецова, Д.М. Зарецкая. – М.: «Инфра – М», 2004. – 436с.
5. Макконнелл К.Р., Брю С.Л. Экономикс: принципы, проблемы и политика: : [монографія] / Пер. с 13-го англ. изд. – М.: ИНФРА-М, 1999. - 974с.

*Рецензент: Дацій О.І., д.е.н., професор.*

### **Alfred A. Kuratashvili**

Doctor of Economic Sciences, Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy and Law, Professor in the field of Social Studies, President of the International Academy of Social-Economic Sciences, Full Member of the New York Academy of Sciences, Academician of the Academy of Political Sciences of the USA

## **PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL GOAL – INITIAL THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE EFFECTIVE STATE MANAGEMENT**

*У науковій праці пропонується створена автором філософія соціальної мети - як вихідна теоретична основа ефективного державного управління.*

*В научном труде предлагается созданная автором философия социальной цели – как исходная теоретическая основа эффективного государственного управления.*

*In scientific work is offered philosophy of social goal created by the author as the initial theoretical basis of the effective state management.*

The whole history of development of philosophical, political, legal and economic thought, as well as modern views and approaches of scientists, politicians and so on towards problems of functioning and development of the society, the state and mankind as a whole, in my deep belief, were based and are based, as I call it, on the philosophy of the means.

In this connection, I consider it necessary to pay attention to the fact that under the philosophy of the means I imply the scientifically formed by me that philosophical system of views, which as distinct from the created again by me the philosophy of the goal and the philosophy of the social goal considers as criterion of essence of social-state system not the goal, not the social goal and its realization, but the means.

It is necessary to particularly note that the created by me the philosophy of the goal represents the fundamentally new scientific trend, which radically differs from the approach, based on the means, deep-rooted in the entire civilized world during the centuries.

On the basis of the profound analysis of the mentioned approach I created the scientific trend, which I called the philosophy of the means and through which (i.e. through this scientific trend) the theoretical bases of this approach were disclosed.

Thus, according to the philosophy of the means, the means represent the criterion of distinction of the social-state (social-political) systems, whereas, in compliance with the created by me the philosophy of the goal – the goal, in my deep belief, is the only true theoretical-methodological basis of distinction and classification of the social-state systems.

Besides, the true human philosophy of the goal in comparison with the philosophy of the means indicates the way to the theory and practice both in scientific researches and in management of the social-state system in the right direction.

Practical manifestation of the philosophy of the means are the facts, when the social-state systems distinguish from each other through the means, in particular, through technique, level of industrial development of the state and so on.

Examples of manifestation of the philosophy of the means represent also distinction of the social-state systems through forms of ownership, methods of management and so on.

As for the created by me philosophy of the social goal, it represents the system of philosophical views, which (i. e. the philosophy of the social goal) like as the philosophy of the goal considers as criterion of essence of the social-state (social-political) system not the means, but – the goal to which this or that social-state system serves.

At the same time, the philosophy of the social goal differs from the philosophy of the goal for the aspect that if the philosophy of the goal represents the criterion of distinction of the social-state systems and the theoretical-methodological basis of their classification, and if both the philosophy of the social goal and the philosophy of the economic goal, which, as it was already noted, is the practical manifestation of the certain variety of the philosophy of the means generally in fact relate to the philosophy of the goal, then the philosophy of the social goal at the same time is the fundamentally new scientific trend, which (i. e. the philosophy of the social goal) represents the philosophy of the goal of the true human society and state – represents the philosophy of the true human goal and which is the initial theoretical basis of formation and functioning of the true human social-state system.

Thus, in the true human society and state, i. e. in the social-state system, which serves interests of people (which should serve interests of people), both in scientific researches and in the management of the society and the state, one should proceed from the social goal based on the philosophy of the social goal, and the assessment of results of functioning of this social-state system should be accordingly carried out according to the degree of realization of the social goal – according to the degree of realization of interests of people.

Hence, the philosophy of the social goal – is the philosophical system, which represents the theoretical-methodological basis of the purposeful direction of formation and functioning of the true human society and state – this is the philosophical system, which represents the theoretical-methodological basis of determination of the social purposeful direction of functioning of the true human

social-state system, i. e. the philosophy of the social goal – this is the philosophy of the goal of the true human society and state.

From this it logically follows that the philosophy of the goal in the true human society and state – is in fact the philosophy of the social goal and in that social-state system, where the goal is economic – money, profit, capital, the philosophy of the goal represents the philosophy of the economic goal, i. e. represents the philosophy of end in itself of the economic means that in fact is an evident example of manifestation of the philosophy of the means.

Correctness of the above-mentioned confirms, for example, the fact that views of ideologists of capitalism and practice of development of the given social-state system always were based on the approach, called by me the philosophy of the means or the philosophy of end in itself of the means, since capitalism always assigned primary importance to getting the maximum profit, enrichment, gain – as the goal that in reality is the end in itself of the economic means – manifestation of the philosophy of the means in practice and that is basically peculiar to the intrinsic nature of capitalism, i. e. is peculiar to capitalism in the true value of this term.

And if capitalism serves interests of people, then it is not capitalism any more – it is not capital “ism” (not “ism” of the economic goal, not the domination of the capital), and, accordingly, it should have another name.

Besides, it is necessary to particularly emphasize that without getting of high profits at the enterprises, in the society and in the state, realization of the social goal – realization of interests of people, i. e. realization of that goal, which is peculiar (which should be peculiar) to the true human society and state is inconceivable. However, profit – getting of profit – in the true human society and state, according to the created by me theory of social-economic laws [1], should be considered only as a necessary condition of realization of the social goal and not as the end in itself of the economic means as it is peculiar to capitalism.

Thus, it is quite natural that the means of realization of the goal have great value, since the goal cannot be realized without the relevant means. However, while researching problems of functioning of the true human society and state, and more exactly in the process of management of this society and this state it is necessary to proceed not from the economic means – as from the end in itself, but it is necessary to proceed from the social goal and it is necessary to be based on this goal with regard to the corresponding real and potential means of its realization.

It is necessary to particularly note that, for example, the utopian socialism was also in fact based on the philosophy of the means, since for founders and theorists of the given doctrine “the good is defined by transformation of private property into the common” [2], i. e. the means again serve as a criterion for socialistness.

As for the Marxist so-called “scientific socialism”, which, in my deep belief, is no less utopian than utopian socialism, it is also based on the philosophy of the means.

In particular, under socialism Marxism implied abolishment of private property for the means of production: "... Communists, – K. Marx and F. Engels wrote in "The Manifest of Communist Party", – can express their theory by one provision: abolishment of private property" [3, vol. 4, p. 438].

Besides, under socialism Marxism implied liquidation of commodity-money relations, market, exchange of products of work and so on.

In this connection K. Marx wrote: "In the society based on the principles of collectivism, on the common possession of the means of production, manufacturers do not exchange their products ..." [3, vol. 19, p. 18].

Thus, the cited above provisions, first, confirm utopianism of Marxist socialism, since even if to abolish private property, that in principle is organizationally possible (another question: what it leads to – how much is it reasonable and rational proceeding from interests of people?!), abolishment of the exchange of products of work in any way is impossible (is unrealizable) and therefore Marxism is the Utopia.

And, second, the aforesaid once again evidently confirms that Marxism is based on the philosophy of the means, since if Marxism had been based on the philosophy of the goal then proceeding from the term itself – "socialism", in my deep belief, it should admit as the criterion of socialistness realization of the social goal – realization of interests of people and not the so-called public property to the means of production, absence of market relations and so on.

However, Marxism, like founders of utopian socialism, considered as the main criterion of socialism not the social goal – as realization of interests of people, but social – as the so-called public property to the means of production.

It is necessary to pay attention also here to the fact that the recognized and popular in the developed capitalist countries theories and concepts – of industrial society, postindustrial society, informational society and so on, exactly by their names confirm that they are based on the philosophy of the means.

Besides, despite the fact that authors and supporters of the mentioned theories, concepts and views, as a rule, consider themselves to be anti-Marxists, in fact they reflect the Marxist – deeply erroneous comprehension of distinction of the social-state systems (I wrote about it many years ago [4]), according to which "epochs differ not in what is produces, but how it is produced, through which means of work" [3, vol. 23, p. 191].

It should be also noted here that K. Marx in this case wrote about distinction of economic epochs, but he *ibidem* (before this) analogously – in fact on the basis of the same criterion – pointed also to distinction of "social-economic formations".

In connection with the above-mentioned if take into consideration that, according to Marxism, economy – the economic system – defines essence of the social-state systems, and, consequently, also their distinction, then it becomes clear, that K. Marx identified distinction of economic epochs with distinction of the social-state systems that represents an evident error, first, because such an approach is based on the philosophy of the means, whereas, proceeding from interests of people, the determinative should be the philosophy of the goal – the

philosophy of the social goal, and, second, in view of the fact that the epoch, as it is known, means time – the certain period of time, K. Marx's mistake consists also in the fact that he could not imagine the existence in one epoch of simultaneously different "social-economic formations" – different social-state systems, in view of which the level of development of the means of work (which in different social-state systems in one epoch – during the certain period of time – can be approximately equal) was put by him to the basis of their distinction.

Though, if even in each epoch – during the certain period of time – only one social-state system had been functioning, even then it would be erroneous to be based on the philosophy of the means while defining the essence of the social-state systems and while defining the distinction of these systems, since proceeding from interests of people, the main and determinative should be the goal to which this or that social-state system serves, in view of which definition of essence of the social-state systems and definition of distinction between them should be based on the philosophy of the goal – on the philosophy of the social goal.

It should be particularly mentioned that of great importance is the level of development of the means of work, level of industrial development of the society, level of development of mass media in the society and so on, but all of them are (should be) only the means of realization of the goal, which depending on the purposeful direction of the social-state system, can be used both for enslavement or even for destruction of people, and for increase of their well-being and so on.

Hence, not the deep-rooted philosophy, called by me the philosophy of the means, should be the initial and determinative scientific basis of construction and functioning of the true human social-state system – the social-state system serving interests of people, but the created by me philosophy of the goal – the philosophy of the social goal [1; 5; 6; and others], which is reflected almost in all scientific works published by me from the beginning of the 70-ties of XX century and which should be assumed both as the basis of scientific researches and the basis of functioning of the society – as the basis of management of the society and the state, as well as the basis of the name of the given social (state, political) systems, since the name of the social-state system, in my deep belief, should point to the determinative purposeful direction of its functioning.

In this sense, the name of the social-political system – "capitalism" seems absolutely correct to me, since this is the social-political system that serves the determinative economic goal – serves the economic end in itself of the means – money, profit, capital, whereas the social-political system, serving the determinative social goal – interests of a person, interests of people, should be called the true human society.

At the same time, if classically and traditionally comprehended socialism (pre-Marxist, Marxist and generally the socialism in classical and traditional comprehension – with denial of the private property, market relations and so on) had not been called socialism, then the social-political system, serving realization of the social goal – serving realization of interests of people, should

have been called socialism (“ism” of the social goal) or humansocialism [1; 7; 8].

In fact, it is very difficult in the modern civilized world to find such a scientist or a politician who would oppose realization of the social goal – realization of interests of people.

Consequently, they (these scientists and politicians) could not oppose socialism, if socialism in classical and traditional comprehension would not mean abolishment of the private property, abolishment of market relations, exchange of products of work and so on, and if instead of this, under socialism, according to the created by me – qualitatively new theory of socialism, there is implied realization of the social goal – realization of interests of people, for achieving of which all ways, forms and methods are justified provided that they exclude the antisocial, inhumane, immoral phenomena [9; 1].

However, as a result of unacceptability of socialism in classical and traditional comprehension and as a result of fear to lose their property, apologists of capitalism support domination of money, domination of capital in the society and the state and ardently oppose socialism, what is not surprising.

It is necessary to especially note that me myself always opposed classical and traditional comprehension of socialism – abolishment of private property, abolishment of market relations (that – abolishment of market relations – is unrealizable in principle) and so on.

Therefore, it is not surprising that some scientists – apologists of communism – in the 80-ties of XX century in their works "criticized" me as an anti-Marxist, expressing their surprise on the fact that, how they noted, I for some reason did not share Marxist-Leninist views on these or those problems and so on (?!).

Besides, in this case I abstain from naming these authors, for, to put it mildly, not to put them into awkward situation. Moreover, later on – after disintegration of the Soviet Union – they quite often acknowledged the incorrectness of their criticism towards me (?!) and the life has also confirmed it.

It is also important to mention that alongside with criticism of socialism in classical and traditional comprehension I always also opposed capitalism – domination of money, domination of capital over a person.

Thus, on the basis of the created by me theory of supremacy of interests of people, I always acted as an initiator and supporter of supremacy (an initiator and supporter of dictatorship, an initiator and supporter of domination) of interests of a person, I always supported realization of the social goal – realization of interests of people.

Though socialism in pre-Marxist, Marxist and generally in classical comprehension, as it was already noted, is an obvious Utopia. Therefore, in order that my comprehension of socialism, which proceeds from the philosophy of the social goal, i. e. proceeds from the social goal and implies realization of the social goal, not to be erroneously understood as the Marxist and in general the classical comprehension of this term – with abolishment of private property,

with denial of market relations and so on, it is more expedient – to call the society serving interests of people as the true human society and not socialism.

Of fundamental importance here is the circumstance that the purposeful direction of the social-state system and degree of realization of the goal of this system simultaneously are also the parameter of the level of development of the means of realization of the goal, since without the corresponding real or potential means, the goal cannot be realized.

However, under conditions of functioning of the true human society and state, to which is peculiar (should be peculiar) realization of the social goal and not the end in itself of the means, as it is under capitalism, it is necessary to proceed from the scientifically substantiated social goal and, naturally, the means of its realization should be necessarily taken into consideration.

It is necessary here to pay attention to the fact that according to the created by me philosophy of the goal, the criterion of capitalistness is domination in the society and the state – market, money, capital, i. e. realization of the economic goal and not existence of private property and market relations, since, first, these economic categories are peculiar to any social-state system, and, second, such an approach represents the erroneous approach named by me the philosophy of the means.

Though the overwhelming majority of scientists and politicians all over the world erroneously considers as the criterion of capitalistness exactly the existence of private property and market relations that is based on the philosophy of the means and in fact represents the Marxist erroneous approach, despite the fact that many (probably, almost all) of these scientists and politicians consider themselves to be anti-Marxists (?!).

At the same time, attention should be drawn to the circumstance that capitalism (classical capitalism) became obsolete a long time ago and the developed nowadays capitalist countries rescued themselves by evolutionary transformation of classical capitalism into Sociocapitalism, whereas the socialist (though during last period of its existence – pseudo-socialist) states (first of all, the republics belonging earlier to the former Soviet Union are implied) through the counter-revolutionary way were thrown off back to capitalism, moreover – to the wild, gangster capitalism, declared by apologists of capitalism – scientists and politicians – as “the movement forward” (?!).

It is necessary to especially note also that Sociocapitalism, the theory of which was created by me earlier and was published by me as far back as 1990 [10], – is the society, which alongside with the basic economic goal of capitalism – profit, money, capital – puts into the forefront and solves social problems, but again as the necessary condition and the means for realization of its essential economic goal, i. e. for realization of economic end in itself of the means.

Though in process of its development, Sociocapitalism more and more keeps away from capitalism and gradually moves from capitalism to the true human society, as a result of which necessity of resolving of social problems is more and more put into the forefront.

As a result of all the above-mentioned, it is logically confirmed the correctness of the created by me fundamentally new scientific trend – philosophies of the goal, as methodological basis of determination of essence of the social-state systems and also as theoretical-methodological basis of determination of criterion of classification of these systems and distinction of social-state epochs and the conclusion that the philosophy of the social goal as again the created by me fundamentally new scientific trend – is an initial scientific basis of formation and functioning of the true human society and state, which, at the same time, should be put into the basis of orientation of development of the mankind and social-economic progress.

*Cited literature:*

1. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. Objective bases of advantages of socialism. Theory of social-economic laws. (In the Russian language). Tbilisi: Publishing house “Sabchota Sakartvelo”, 1982. The given theory was published by me earlier, in particular, in 1974, 1977 and so on.  
It is necessary to focus on the fact that in the title of the given monograph – under the socialism and its objective advantages – I mean not the Marxists unrealizable socialism or socialism in its traditional meaning, but the socialism in my – Kuratashvili’s – interpretation of the latter.  
In particular, under the socialism I imply the society, the criterion of which (i.e. the criterion of the socialistness) is not the lack of the private property and market relations, not the so-called public property for the means of production, not the balanced development to plan and so on (since such approach is based upon the philosophy, called by me the philosophy of the means and in my op deep belief representing the profoundly erroneous approach), but the realization of a social goal – the realization of interests of people based upon the created by me philosophy of a social goal that in fact represents the criterion of the true human society and state.
2. Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary. (In the Russian language). – Moscow: INFRA-M, 1997 p. 427.
3. K. Marx and F. Engels. (In the Russian language). Works, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
4. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. On criteria of distinction of economic epochs. (In the Russian language). Materials of the Republican scientific conference: “Main goal of our plans” (May 17-18, 1979). Tbilisi: ”Metsniereba”, 1979.
5. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. Philosophy of the goal – alternative of philosophy of the means. (In the Georgian and Russian languages). Tbilisi: “Metsniereba”, 1997.
6. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. Philosophy of the social goal – an initial scientific basis of formation and functioning of the true human society and state. (In the Russian Language). International scientific journal “Progress”, 2000, #1-2. Tbilisi: International Publishing House “Progress”, 2000.
7. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. Intrinsic nature of socialism and revolutionary reconstruction. (In the Russian language). Materials of scientific conference: "Topical issues of social sciences under modern conditions" (November 13, 1989). Tbilisi : “Metsniereba”, 1989, pp. 7, 9, 18.
8. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. To humanosocialism. (In the Russian language). Journal “Party word”, 1990, № 9 (May). Tbilisi, 1990.
9. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. Philosophic and political-economic miniatures. (In the Russian language). Materials of the Republican Scientific Conference: “Topical problems... of theories” (May 15-16, 1980). Tbilisi: “Metsniereba”, 1980, p.93.
10. Alfred A. Kuratashvili. New methodological approach in the research of problems and teaching the social sciences. (In the Russian language). Materials of the scientific-

methodological conference: “Problems of perfection of researches and teaching in the social sciences” (March 15, 1990). Tbilisi: ”Metsniereba”, 1990.

**Anzor A. Kuratashvili**

Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Business-Engineering Georgian Technical University, Vice-President of the International Academy of Social-Economic Sciences, Full Member of the New York Academy of Sciences

**CONTRADICTIONS OF SOCIALLY ORIENTATED MARKET ECONOMY AND THE ROLE OF STATE MANAGEMENT IN THEIR OVERCOMING**

*The work considers the contradictions of the socially orientated market economy and the role of state management in their overcoming.*

*Particularly, the contradictions between the inner economic direction of the market economy and its social orientation, the author considers as a basic contradiction of the socially orientated market economy.*

*The author also considers a number of other contradictions of the socially orientated market economy and bases the necessity and ways of their overcoming through the purposeful application of the legal mechanisms, which should be established for the implementation of this goal.*

*В научном труде рассматриваются противоречия социально ориентированной рыночной экономики и роль государственного управления в их преодолении.*

*В частности противоречие между внутренней экономической направленностью рыночной экономики и ее социальной ориентацией автор рассматривает как основное противоречие социально ориентированной рыночной экономики.*

*Автор, вместе с тем, рассматривает и целый ряд других противоречий социально ориентированной рыночной экономики и обосновывает необходимость и пути их преодоления с помощью целенаправленного использования правовых механизмов, которые должны быть созданы для осуществления этой цели.*

Formation of civilized market relations are definitely necessary for transitive economy.

In addition, the existence of civilized market economy is impossible without social orientation of this economical system. Just because of it, searching for the ways of formations of social oriented market economy deserts special attentions.

The scientific research of the socially orientated market economy and the purposeful application of the positive results of the research represent the precondition for efficient social-economic development of the society.

“Economy, which is based on new technological structure, cannot function successfully, if it does not serve directly or indirectly to its natural purpose – satisfaction of human requirements, increase of profits of the population and national welfare” [1], i.e. the successful functioning of the economy, based on