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Abstract. The world outlook of mankind begins to change fundamentally, the epoch of neoclassicism / postmodernism is over, when the “mirror of the world” in which man saw himself has been shattered. In comparison with the classical and the non-classical the emerging modern neoclassical type of understanding of the world and thinking brings major and unusual changes to the problem of the essence of the living, which for the first time actually becomes new and relevant. Since everything that is alive, especially its “genesis”, is a problem of problems projecting the other ones, it has to be dealt with. Reductionism, vitalism, irrationalism, particularly creationism, have little to give in the fundamental understanding of the essence of living. In the previous types of philosophy and particular sciences - in the classical and the non-classical - the scholars cover various aspects of the essence of the living, that is, material, structural and functional. They have already discovered many of its essential features, but with the fragmented aspects of the analysis of the essence of living, that living does not admit of itself by definition, in our opinion, little attention is paid to the essence of the first order: to the self-causality of the living and its agenesis, hence to its non-epiphenomenality and non-originality in being, as well as to the assertion of existence of an absolutely inanimate, without even posing the question of the origin of the latter. Note that any manual does not comprise the definition of “living” or it is identified with the concept of “life”. The central aim of this article is to try to reconsider the basic foundation of the essence of living and its agenesis-eternity, from the standpoint of the modern neoclassical worldview, paying special attention to the study of the phenomenon of self-causality of living and its non-epiphenomenal status, which has been reserved for it so far (“living has emerged, it originates from non-living”). Our worldview and methodological basis are: the modern neoclassical stage of the development of philosophy, the methodology of realistic and transdisciplinary approaches, the comparative and hermeneutic methods of cognition.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The rediscovery of the universe and the role of living in it by means of synergetics and situational approach at the turn of the centuries becomes to be unprecedented: the world first appeared realistically as “the world without the Absolute”, as the universe-left-on-its-own, and not on something weird, where the reason of reasons of being is essentially a living thing (Menchikov & Sharifullin, 2015). But what is a living thing? The studies reveal that, to date, in the understanding of the essence of living, there have been visible shortcomings in the very approaches and statements of questions. a) Living is considered either beyond the principle of determinism, or from the standpoint of simplified, not fractal determinism. b) the issues of the essence of living continue to be considered dichotomously, in relation to the so-called absolutely non-living. c) The question of the origin of “non-living” in being is not stated; the existence of an absolutely non-living (in the known methodology, “imagine that”). d) The Living on our Planet is identified with the living of the Universe or the living in the universe is judged not as an open system. e) one attempts to understand the living from the position of any one-sidedness, from the position of the part to judge the whole; to consider the living not as a living thing, but in pathological anatomical way - from the material, structural, functional aspects, and not in an integrally holistic way. Nevertheless, the already revealed features of the very living things are as follows: the ability to reproduction, dissymmetry, differentiation of sides, irreversibility, response, unequal counteraction, anticipation of a result, variable mass of living matter, etc. (Vernadsky, 1994). However, in this case, the attention is not focused, in our opinion, on the main - on the self-causality of living, on its generating itself. Questioning why the living is alive, we believe that the main, however, unique and most essential feature of the living is its self-causality - the ability to self-emergence, self-birth and agensis in the universe, generation of another life, to the transgressive, irrepressible immortal growth of the living.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Before looking into self-causality of living, it is necessary to define what living is. Toward this end, we believe that it is necessary first and foremost to expand the criterion of living in order to avoid the dichotomy, especially absolutely “non-living”, as if the latter miraculously appeared in being from nowhere or in creationist way. To extend the living to organicity, an organic, an organism. Where organicity is treated that in being “in itself bears the source” of its appearance and movement, where “the driving force is not applied from without”, it is the parento it, “and the mechanism, and the motor, and the regulator” (Landau, 2011), that is, the source of the movement is immanent in living, but not with supernatural, hylozoism immanence. Taking a realistic approaching, the organic composition includes: organic compounds (the compounds of carbon with other elements); a complex mixture of natural organic compounds, small components of soils, marine and lake sediments, sedimentary rocks, underground and surface waters; the organic in plants, humus, sapropelic, and lytobiolitic; in sedimentary rocks the mass of coals and combustible shales, which are the source of oil and combustible gases; organogenic rocks from the remains of plant organisms and animals or the products of disintegration, limestone, shell rock, chalk, fossil coals; organoids or organelles, permanent special structures in plant cells, animals, mitochondria, golgi complex, cell center, endoplasmic reticulum, ribosomes and others.

Relying on the principle of fractal determinism, let us try to realize the main thing in the process of self-causality. The most important property that provides an explanation for the self-causality of the living in being is, apparently, the property of dissymmetry - a special state of space and time (the property of extension and division) of living. In its stretching (space), any substance is synthesized in the variants left and right. But in the living - the amazing inequality of «leftism» and «right nature». The isomers in the living are formed not in an equal number and location, they are not the same, and one of them prevails. The living matter differs drastically in duration (time). Living in time is irreversible. The irreversibility of living is ensured by its self-multiplication, the eternal transition from one state into another. Moreover, it is fractal (jagged, fringed, fractional, in different directions) and heterarchical, and not only linear and hierarchical, as classical thinking presents, and not only nonlinearly, curvilinearly and relationally, as non-classical thinking offers.

And further, if to compare living with the so-called “non-living”, the fact is that “non-living” is not accidentally written in inverted commas, since it is not absolutely inanimate. Any “non-living” is in fact also a living thing, the products of the decay of the
living, its transition to another level and often a kind of a conserved state, waiting for more or less appropriate conditions, for example, as on our planet, for its irreversibility and transgression. Only the living has self-causal freedom, self-generation, the birth of another living, self-reproduction. And the reason for this freedom of living is explained by the fact that the living being, an asymmetric state of being, trying to turn into a symmetrical state, seems to violate (to grow into) a natural asymmetry, thus—the enactive “games of mutual opposite tensions” (Knyazava, 2015) – in this way, self-causality or more self-determination. “Determination” means nothing more than the ability to produce and be produced or to arise the action to implement the action (Knyazava, 2013).

The enactivity of living is “by means of action in the environment”, the inactivation of oneself and environment. This, when a living, interactively adapting itself to the world around, builds it for itself, and its own specific to its kind simultaneously. This is when all the sub elements of a complex system that make up a single process of living (the body, its elements and sub elements, the environment, the structural organization, the clinamen nature клинаёмость, the psychoidity, the autopoiesis of the internal and external, the interactivity, the interface, etc.) are drawn into a mutual recursive deep co-determination, overlap some breach of the body and environment, the internal and the external, all acquire (and a part, having become the part of the whole and the whole as the body and the environment, as the body being immanent in the environment and the environment being immanent in the body) the emergent qualities, dynamic co-emergence. Consequently, the living is the cause of the causes for being, the living is perpetual.

3. RESULTS

Speaking about the eternity of the living, and, therefore, the lack of its origin, the non-origin of life or a genesis of life, we will note the following. Firstly, it would not be correct to identify “the living on Earth” and “the living in the universe”, in the world of worlds. If today we finally see the world as an open, not a closed system, as an endlessly eternal system, we cannot but agree with the fact that life has always been, because it is of the same age as the eternity of the universe. But, that’s when we talk about life on Earth, here we can talk about the emergence of life, but again about the emergence of more developed forms of the living. Perhaps, according to panspermia in principle it originated simultaneously with the formation of the Earth. And the indirect evidence of such hypothetical theory is being studied thoroughly by science. The facts of the origin of the living organism from the absolutely non-living, as if such an absolutely inanimate existed, are not discovered. As the experiments show, the living arises from the living. The experiments on growing life in a test tube did not bring convincing scientific arguments in favor of abiogenesis as well.

A non-living matter, in essence, is not ontologically absolutely non-living, but it is relatively non-living (non-living in inverted commas) or “inanimate”. “Inanimate” is in fact the product of the decay of the living, the reduction of the living, which is absolutely not eliminated. The existence of absolutely non-living in nature is not observed and is not proved. The analysis of again the falling asteroids and the tons of cosmic dust discovers the microorganisms (bacteria and viruses) that survived (not burnt) in them. And then the so-called evolutionary-coevolutionary technology. In principle, billions or n-years are simply spent on the evolutionary and coevolutionary unfolding of microorganisms, of course, under the conditions similar to those existing on our planet.

Let us also refer to the biotic cycle, which also proves the essence, eternity, the non-origin of the living, its ability to self-emergence and the birth of another life. The living is subdivided into active living and passive living. So, in the biotic cycle of autotrophs the solar energy is directly used and the “non-living” substance is processed into food. And heterotrophs do not produce the necessary food by themselves, but they use the produced by autotrophs, process them into producers (green plants) and reducers (carnivorous animals). Further, green plants create an organic substance, the non-green destroy it, turning it into mineral compounds, new green plants build a new organic substance from them and so on endlessly. The processes of synthesis and decay ensure the continuity or eternity of the living in the universe. Each substance excretes and gives what other substances use. This continuity is inherent in organic substances. The biotic cycle consists of different cycles (individuals, populations, biocenoses), where each of them is a model of the biosphere in miniature. In the biotic cycle, each species is a link of continuity. Moreover, one should keep in mind that continuity occurs not only linearly, not only nonlinearly or curvilinearly, without intersecting, but also fractally.

4. DISCUSSION
The actuality and relevance of research on the issue of “living” in the context of neoclassical reflection is beyond doubt, the modern anthropological turn has spawned a great number of studies on the allied topics, most of which relate to the field of philosophical anthropology, as well as interdisciplinary disciplines at the intersection of the humanities and natural sciences. Among the most famous works of recent decades, one can single out the studies by John Creus (Krois, 2007), Michael Lendmann (Landmann, 1974), Philip Honenberger (Honenberger, 2016) and Antoine Vergote (Vergote 1996). Unfortunately, the interest of Russian researchers in such topics is not great, most of the contemporary Russian philosophical works cover various aspects of social philosophy and are performed within the framework of the postmodern paradigm, which seems to be critical, by virtue of the necessity of transition to a neoclassical examination of basic philosophical problems. To date, the leading Russian scholar in the field of philosophical anthropology, who develops a synergistic approach to the study of matter, is E.N. Knyazeva, as well as the researchers of the philosophical department of the Kazan Federal University (Menchikov & Krasnov, 2016).

5. CONCLUSION

The first conclusion. Classical and non-classical philosophical and ideological initial bases and arguments prevail in the explanations of the essence of the living and the “non-living” today. But they are inadequate and become, to put it mildly, uncorroborated. In future, it seems to us, our descendants will think about us as we sometimes do about our respectable scientific ancestors, that we were still at this level of scientific development (the living emerged from the non-living—it is out of the question from where, from what and how, the so called “non-living” originated and is born), when still fell out of the logic of being, the most complex fractal deterministic logic of it. A simplified variant of the explanation of the living according to the “F. Redi principle” is also not suitable here: “the organism originates from the same organism and does not do it in any other way” (the emphasis added). The statement “from the same” slips into a creationist explanation of the whole problem of the essence of being and the living in it. Of course, the pear falls directly from the pear, not from the apple, but clinamen effect, to be proved today in synergetics, being not a rigid understanding of evolutionary changes by C. Darwin, confirms that the part of the body that performed one task through the slow procedural changes adapts to performing not the same, but completely different tasks, without beginning and without end.

The second one. From the perspective of the emerging neoclassical stage of the development of philosophy, the explication of this problem and the resulting conclusions from it are as follows. The living exists eternally and is non-epiphenomenally. The living does not have a problem of origination, genesis in the universe, it is agenesis and is thus the realistic dissymbolized Absolute. This proves its essence and its difference from the relatively non-living one. The essential features of living show that the living is eternal (tantamount to real being) but it exists in different levels, forms and states: from the reductive living or apparent with dysfunctional approach of an absolutely “non-living” to ultimately developed living -human being.
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