The selective aspects of production development from the point of view of modern sociogenetics.

† Lyubov Sergienko Ph.D.

[1]Lyubov Sergienko Ph.D.
***ISBN* : 978 − 0 − 578 − 91454 − 1**

The selective aspects of production development from the point of view of modern sociogenetics.

[1]ISBN: 978-0-578-91454-1(eng)/ISBN: 978-5-02-040135-8(rus).The selective aspects of production development from the point of view of modern sociogenetics.For assistance in placing a permission request, Copyright Clearance Center can be connected directly via phone: +1-978-750-8400 or e-mail: info@copyright.com.

Nauka (publisher company)©2018 by L. Sergienko

Contents

1 Preface

|Goes out to my older brother and mother|

The person is born then lives up to a life which does not turn out to be a repeatable framework. Therefore in the process of writing this book the key factor of every person in the course of evolution and its industry.

* * *

Simple economics is determined as a science that is a learning of socioeconomic relationships. Socioeconomic relationships are in the first place — Relationships of positivism.

And what determines specific forms of its content. Therefore that is they are self reformed and directed to the encountering body members that can produce the physical movement in a sense a self reformed body tone member. In the second place, the other fundamental Of formation and positivist development of relationships civic character.

Therefore the positive stick doing laying on the encounter of formation in development of data with the relationship, is one of the realizing of social aspects of the society that renegades with which is selected within the boundaries of law. There is judicially formative and genetically obvious for the household attitudes in which the subjects is the only social economic "genotype" which demonstrates the process of development in its evolution. Within the process of development there are a lot of data bases that form with its social economic genotype which will become the principle of backward communication in which the followed and controlled in in the attendance of social agents.

Another words we are interested in the genetically law for functionality of the human mind. The enveloping ecstasy of physiological consumption, brings all the members of the society into the adaptation of the human being (that has the most typical genetic precursed nature) to the social matters To a single goal of process and development of practical self-thoughtfulness. That is to say that the development will be determined by the participation of the human in it. One does not realize the self sufficiency of the genetic selective nature and logical behavior of how one remembers or a self own individual can demonstrate the selective socioeconomic genotype, how does a member As a whole of a certain organization has in his own arsenal availability to him the all rightful skill. This skill is demonstrated with a selective background of the self knowing arsenal of tools. In that sense a individual is in all time being and living acts like a part of one side of another skillful factor and how is social economic genotype as the other is a part of the whole collective. In the frames of the main community organization, one can reduce all the unnecessary for the successful self-aware battle for life.

Therefore the adaptive is, of obvious forces to social the applied subjective practical knowledge gathering. The current process has the belonging of itself,

looking for only itself "genetically given" nature and logic of completion itself on a specific level that precursors the acts of the subjects, and like the care-taking of socioeconomic genetic raise, in which assumes it's build up.

The other thing is, deserving attention of the viewpoint of inspection socioeconomic genetic termination. And logic formation and the rays of process of production of self-consciousness. Pride in the moment presences the production of realization of our the hosting practice, what demands, probably, the intake of some additional and changes in the governing society and the presentation of the meaning of its evolution.

More to say, the representational role and meaning their key mechanisms, the self realization which works in direction and the speed changes of it, realizing society, processes of all kinds of differential changes and differentiation.

From the times of writings of Adam Smith on can count that the formation and development of governing way of productivity that envelops the following acts of basic forces: social labor separation, free exchange mechanism, rule of struggle competitions.

So long if our task did not include a comprehensive review of the issue. We propose to dwell only on some points, which, in our opinion, are especially important for the correct assessment of the role of our ideas in the general construction of the theory of industrial evolution. There are three such moments:

1. The emergence of a new productive practical knowledge that has typical genetically defined boundaries of definition and modification (hereinafter we will call it "socio-economic genovariation").

2. The role of free exchange in the process of inheritance. The accumulation and dissemination of new productive practical knowledge and selection (competition mechanism).

3. The importance under these conditions of socio-economic purchasing, implements the process of productive practical-knowledge. It is necessary to clarify that the forces who represent a certain production co-knowledge at all stages of social reproduction, including the stage of consumption. By virtue of this category, "production" and "the process of productive practical knowledge" are identical for us and do not imply a definition of the traditionally distinguished stage of production in social reproduction.

2 Section 1

Chapter 1 THE APPEARANCE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GENOVARIES IN ECONOMIC PRACTICE

If investigative, as already noted in the introduction, we will use the (Territorial knowledge) instead of the usual term of “Innovation”, since the last minute “socio-economic geno-variation”(a new practice term much earlier than in sociogenetics, began to struggle in other areas of knowledge, for example, in management, this term is used to refer to a concept that also refers to the phenomenon of variability, but somewhat different in nature and logic of existence. For the management of “innovation”, having passed the stage of commercialization and acquiring the status of “innovation”, traditionally means a qualitative change (from the point of view of the prevailing value system within the given socio-economic community) of the production process over time. And “INNOVATION” are used by various researchers in several different senses, since it affects various aspects and ways of transforming economic life. The nature and logic of the emergence of socio-economic genovariation, a term also referring to economic variability, implies that any new formation (development, modification of the existing traditional mode of production) arises in the process of radiation, accumulation, transmission (repetition) limited by the human genetic nature tested in the course of a certain act of exchange-inheritance "bit" of knowledge (socio-economic "gene").

A gene is an information code (an individual “bit” is known that is obtained during the formation and implementation of socio-economic genotypically determined parameters for the forces to perform their own social functions in the production process in the form of the knowledge and skills acquired by them. In other words, based on the formation of the “ten” lies the process of apro-boom, accumulation and subsequent dissemination in society of production practical knowledge, realized either during the execution of any production process, or in a certain form of the product / service / impression produced, i.e. it is a process that has a spatio-temporal sequence.

Variation - core formation, modification of the individual “bit” of knowledge (socio-economic gene), the re-acquisition of new productive practical knowledge in the process of exchange-inheritance by interacting social agents that contributes to and provides them with an expansion of the boundaries of vital attraction and application of necessary resources. These changes are closely related to the features of the socioeconomic space that is naturally important for them due to the formation and development of human intelligence, which is the main means of implementing production activities in society. They in turn, affect the socio-economic activity of people. There are several levels of transition. The first, basic, level is the level of heredity. It is an acid, a DNA in which all biological and psi are encoded; it is represented by a hereditary substance: deoxyribonucleic genetic genotype $z1z2$). Their activities are aimed at satisfyingly.

Rhenium is primarily vital, and then social instincts; $z1z$ *socialidealists* its social and, to a lesser extent, ideal instincts. Social agents with such behavior

motivation, possessing additional creative and organizational abilities, become, as a rule, the creators of "NEW" ideologies, prophets, people's leaders, leaders of different levels who devote their lives to the implementation of ideas and plans related to life support society as a whole (heterozygotes, combined socio-economic genotype $z2z3$). forces with high energy This or that combination of the listed socioeconomic genotypes (representing them as forces), which is established both at the level of a certain type of production and characteristic for the social system as a whole, forms on one or another stage of the ongoing process of productive practical knowledge inherent only in her socio-economic genotypic structure and, accordingly, the environment of its own functioning, which, in turn, determines ogre ourselves to the process of socio-economic evolution of society.

In this regard, the use of the term "socio-economic genovariation" seems to us more preferable if we invest in this concept any newly arising "hereditary" change obtained in the process of joint implementation by economic agents of economic activity, any social economic genotypically determined neoplasm (new practical knowledge), a variation of the socio-economic genotype. The concept of "genovariation" includes both "hereditary" changes associated with the modification of the entire structure of the social structure and the production process in society, as well as those much more frequent changes that are associated with the improvement of the ECONOMIC genotype and, as a result, of the entire social system. We determine certain components and aspects of the acquisition by social agents of productive knowledge (its "bit") and the existence of which we judge only by the outwardly observed transformations in their economic behavior, initiated by process. At the same time, genovariation itself can have both an "explicit" character (that is, it can be fully realized by the forces reproducing it), and to a certain extent "implicit". In other words, in this definition we include all "hereditary" changes in the socio-economic genotype, due to socio-economic genotypical signs of people. For each actor who knows economic reality, heredity is represented by a gene type, and in a population of people in the socioeconomic community, the gene pool. The second level is the activity of the brain and nervous system. We are generally controlled by the constant work set of genotypic genes that ensure the formation and functioning of cells of the nervous tissue, organized into neural structures and form a neuron. The architecture of the brain is characterized by a specific neurotype, and the population of people that make up the social neurotype. Each economic and economic community as a whole is characterized by a neurofund. The frequencies of neurotypes in a neurofund are determined by the frequencies of psychoactive genes in the community gene pool. The third level is the mental activity of forces, which is provided by the activity of their neurotypes and, accordingly, the work of psychoactive genes.

Each business entity is characterized by a certain psychic activity — a psychotype defined by a neurotype, and society as a whole — by a combination of different psychotypes by a neurofund. The frequencies of psychotypes in a psychofund are determined by the frequencies of psychoactive genes in the gene pool of a socio-economic education. The fourth level is psychosocial activity,

social and economic life, which is carried out by the socio-economic genotypes of people, formed by the interaction of psychotypes and social environment. Each population of people (socio-economic community) is characterized by a combination of socio-economic genotypes — a socio-fund. The frequencies of socio-economic genotypes in society correspond to the frequencies of psychotypes and are determined by the frequencies of psychoactive genes in its gene pool. Social and economic life forms a culture, including its economic pool, the production process and, as a result, civilization as a whole. The fifth level is the evolution (change in time) of socio-economic life (the process of formation and development of sustainable forms of management), the evolution of all culture and human civilization. Sleep is determined by a change in the frequencies of psycho-types and the corresponding sociotypes in society, i.e. a change in the structure of his psychofund and sociofund, which, in turn, are determined by microevolutionary changes in the frequencies of "psychoactive" genes in its gene pool and, accordingly, by a certain socio-aggregate of neurotics — a psychophond determined by the economic genotype. This process takes place according to the following scheme: the neurotype genotype is the psychotype of the socio-economic genotype and vice versa. At the level of society as a whole, the integral socio-economic activity of the people is determined according to the scheme: gene pool - neurofund - psycho-fund - socio-economic gene pool and operates according to feedback principle, when the reciprocal interaction of these processes are realized. The relationships shown above made it possible to structure the strategic motivation of economic behavior of social agents operating in society, representing a particular socioeconomic genotype [$Wilson, Lamsden, 2007.P.32^{-}34$]. The following socioeconomic genotypes are distinguished:

1) *Vitalists* — social agents of "vital" motivation with dominance of the energy of a group of vital instincts homozygotes, which are homogeneous in their intentions, capabilities and means of management (accumulated and applied economic experience) socially-economic genotype $z1z1$). The activities of such social agents are primarily aimed at satisfying the basic vital instincts, which determines the choice and development of the most priority areas of social and economic activity for them related to the field of nutrition, self-preservation, and protection of personal territory;

2) *Socialists* — people of "social" motivation — possess high energy of social instincts (homozygotes, socio-economic genotype $z2z2$). The activities of such people are aimed at maintaining and protecting the interests of the social groups to which they belong, which they form as a single socioeconomic genotype, as well as the creation of new socioeconomic formations, achieving the highest hierarchical position in them, protecting the existing territory of its habitat and / or expansion of the boundaries of the economic environment. Such a socio-economic genotype is characterized by high altruism towards members of their social groups, their interests, intentions, willingness to self-sacrifice for the sake of a common cause.

3) *Idealists* — active subjects of ideal motivation, possessing high energy of ideal instincts (homozygotes, forming a socioeconomic genotype $z3z3$ that

is homogeneous in its intentions, needs, and programs of economic behavior). The activities of such social agents are connected with the process of constant search and formation of new practical knowledge. Many outstanding scientific discoveries and achievements are associated with the activities of this particular group of forces, characterized by a high energy of knowledge;

4) *Vital-socialists* — active subjects with a rather high energy of vital and somewhat lower energy of social instincts (heterozygotes; heterogeneous socioeconomic genotype) that forms and implements its own genetically controlled combined (depending on economic conditions and own abilities to implement their genetically determined programs of economic behavior) models of socioeconomic cognition; socio-economic - love and commitment with the given nature and logic of economic behavior, demonstrated by the social agents belonging to it, i.e. changes in the actual methods, methods, means and forms of management that these entities engage in in their business practices and which are represented by the corresponding knowledge and skills that they "inherited" in the process of production. From the point of view of their general economic importance, in particular, in the question of the relationship between socioeconomic genotypic variability (as the basis for the formation and development of the process of productive practical knowledge as such) and production evolution, then. To judge, there is no fundamental difference between how much we can use these types of practical knowledge, why and their combination under the general term "genovariation" is possible. Naturally, all such changes in the socioeconomic genotype resulting from recombination during the exchangeinheritance of the previously tested and retained one or another "bit" of practical knowledge (any of its that), since with no neoplasms it does not work. Those genovariations that have a "transient" character, i.e. after testing, they are not capable of accumulating, preserving and, accordingly, the subsequent distribution by social agents of the production process, are also not interested.

From the point of view their general economic values in particular in the question o the ratio between socio-economic genotypic variability (as basis formation and development process productive practical knowledge as such) and production evolution then how much we can judge principle difference between these types practical knowledge no why and is possible their combination under the general term "genovariations" mystic genotype $z1z2$. Their activity is aimed at satisfaction in the first priority vital a then social instincts

5) *Vital-idealists* — subjects with high energy vital and less energy ideal instincts. The goal of their socio-economic activities is satisfaction first turn vital needs then already ideal instincts. This people loving personal comfort who do various kinds arts research activities or design development (heterozygotes representing mixed social-economic genotype $z1z3$).

6) *Social-idealists* — acting subjects with high energy social and in less degree ideal instincts. Social agents with such motivation behavior possessing additionally creative and organizational capable becomes as rule creators "new" ideologies prophets popular leaders leaders of different levels who dedicate their life realizations ideas and plans associated life support society as a whole (heterozygotes) combined socio-economic genotype $z2z3$)

It is often necessary to meet the opinion that all the numerous socio-economic neoplasms (socio-economic genovariations) that we observe in the process of social reproduction are the result of a deliberate transformation of one form of value into another, i.e. Initiated by professional, rationally organized labor activity. It seems to many, sometimes consciously, and sometimes subconsciously, that the emergence of all these many new formations is the result of the influence of an exclusively "artificial" situation, "laboratory education" *. And that is why, as a result of such a targeted impact on the process of transforming the forms of a product / service / impression, the majority of similarly occurring modifications are usually evaluated as the main only possible way of production evolution (the way to obtain new practical knowledge), which is far beyond the limits of "natural", spontaneously implemented in the conditions of managing the economy. Therefore, those socio-economic genovariations that are formed and develop in our largely spontaneous everyday practice. For example present, various "rationally organizational" methods of interaction between private capital and academic science are actively developing. Along with the traditional forms of integration (consultations, staff exchanges, subsidies, contracts), such forms of cooperation between science and industry that are carried out within the framework of the so-called territorial scientific and industrial complexes: science parks, technology parks, and regional agglomerations are widespread of industrial companies, etc. It is believed that precisely in this way, organized, discovery-oriented research activities should be the foundation of scientific and technological progress and underlie the progressive evolution of social production, which, in turn, represents an indispensable source of its modification.

In the works of the representatives of the Austrian economic economy, there is a UNDERSTANDING of the nature and logic of the production process of acquiring and realizing the subjective non-articulated knowledge demonstrated by social agents. Based on the proposed views, all business entities in their practice are exclusively concepts of entrepreneurship (ie, in our sense, they are socially, economically and genotypically "of the same type"). Consequently, the criteria, indicators, and evaluations of similar activities, to one degree or another and with one degree or another of awareness, were initially set and determined. Since the intentions and opportunities of social rents involved in the production process are sufficient, but unequivocally defined: any active subject (i.e., regardless of its natural and accumulated, genotypically determined socio-economic opportunities and inclinations) has an innate creative ability to constantly generate and to open in each proposed set of circumstances new information regarding the goals to which he or she seeks, and the means that he considers it possible to use to adhere to reach them. Expectations, and is always set to discover and use new profitable opportunities in the process of competition. In our case, the possibility of the emergence, testing, and dissemination of new practical knowledge in society is predetermined by the process of socioeconomic genotypic variability, which exists due to the presence of diverse socioeconomic genotypes in economic practice, the interaction of which determines and limits the entire process of sexual intercourse - knowledge of such knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) and the process of development of

production as a whole. Therefore, to reduce all the goals and means of existing forces to the category of entrepreneurship, no matter how broadly and deeply it is interpreted, in my opinion it is completely legitimate, since such creative activity was initially not peculiar to one degree or another exclusively to all forces. In practice, social agents are quite capable of demonstrating other models of economic behavior that are very far from entrepreneurship in all types and forms of its manifestation, since they tend to proceed from their own genetically defined "mental" qualities and behavioral programs and accordingly formed on this basis socio-economic genotypic environment of its own functioning. That is, outside the specialized organized functioning of innovation, the values in the process of life support of society are perceived and evaluated. Such a view is not entirely true, although it seems to us to refute it as some "deviations" that cannot have any experimental way is rather difficult until a vicious circle forms. After all, to prove that such, sometimes not fully "conscious" spontaneously emerging neoplasm (freely inherited socio-economic genovariation in the process of economic entities performing their own social functions) is precisely the result of economic genotypic variation inherent in the whole process of social reproduction as such, only by subjecting it to a certain economic analysis, and for this it must be carried out at least through testing a new idea , i.e. through a certain "laboratory" upbringing environment, therefore, again, the purposefully organized stage of the experimental experiment is subjected to a coordinated influence deliberately designed from the outside.

But even assuming that it will be possible to convincingly show that in everyday consciously "uncoordinated" economic practice (in its natural social functioning) there is a certain number of socio-economic neoplasms, it's never possible real-economic genotypically defined conditions, whether in this case they are really socio-economic genovariation or whether they appeared as a result of recombination of an existing socially determined practice at that time knowledge reproduced social agents due to accumulated (stored) previously a proven economic experience. That is, it is impossible to prove the very fact of such an occurrence really the environment of their functioning, based on complete freedom of exchange, is inherited by knowledge of social agents (based on their socio-economic genotypically determined understanding of the role of the validity of their habitat. Spontaneously in practice, to every freely acting subject of all-round knowledge that is highly demanded in production (and serves as the basis for its manifestation), which is difficult to say about whether they were the result of proven new knowledge or were already used by other business entities in the course of their own production - venous functions. However, there are a number of indirect considerations that have to deal with such types and forms of brow. Logically lead us to the recognition of the existence of "nature. The natural "business environment", in particular on the market for the formation of socioeconomic genovariates, of exactly the same order that is found in our purposefully formed conditions for their formation and development. First of all, we have to admit that, in general, the sad fact is that we still perfectly, not only cannot fully consciously, deliberately and in a timely manner (i.e., in precisely predicted parameters) call up socially desirable for us, economic gen-

ovariations (therefore, to create them exclusively in a "one-sided" order), but they are also not able to fully identify, evaluate and use their activities all the variety of values produced by us, and therefore, we cannot purposefully control outside to influence and influence the entire production process. And therefore, they are not able to identify and maximally involve in this all available process.

Here the "natural"(economic conditions imply the values of this factor in the course of its own development in society), and therefore the most preferred demanded and natural for them.

It is necessary to clarify that we do not mean the fact that the appearance of a business entity does not lend itself at all to any external education, that is, the process of formation and implementation of certain social functions involved in their own reproduction, It is not subject to the influence of external forces, so, of course, there are certain dependencies of the functioning of the production process (and, correspondingly, realizing the process of cognition of social agents) on the influence of the environment. This is precisely the circumstance that made it possible to develop to a tremendous extent the study of the impact of various external forces on the speed and nature of the production process (in our formulation, productive practical knowledge).

At present, the nature and logic of the development of this process (its structure, permissible limits of modification) are traditionally the central point of socio-economic research. But, what should be noted, and that the question most interesting to us (the question of the emergence of socio-economic genovariation in economic life), is the fact that new "artificial" socio-economic genovariations that are purposefully obtained in the laboratory environment (i.e. EXCLUSIVELY preset and defined by someone from outside new practical knowledge) are non-directional. This means that the nature of the newly arising artificially acquired neoplasm does not consist directly (hereditarily) due to the variability demonstrated by the acting forces in their long process of producer of cognition. That is, there is no unambiguously established and exact connection with the specific nature of the socio-economic genetic and the nature of the changes in any socio-economic gene (the "bit" of productive practical knowledge). Therefore, in spite of the fact that we can influence the frequency of socioeconomic genovariation (for example, using the same but expected correlation between the nature of external influences contributing to their manifestation and mass replication), external conditions, the ability to control this process from the outside in the direction of obtaining clearly defined certain socio-economic genotypically inherited changes and, on this basis, clearly identified production We still cannot fully achieve the results (especially in the long run that is). Since we cannot solely unilaterally form and obtain the characteristics, properties, parameters of thinking and behavior of the subjects controlled by them on the part of the managing subjects that are demanded by the controlling entities due to their (largely) genotypic prescription. Thus, there is no well-defined adequate correlation between external influences on the economic behavior of social agents and the nature of their general response to the proposed circumstances. But, of course, one does not need to understand these words in the sense that we generally deny the existence of adequate variability.

Adequate and, at the same time, “hereditary” socio-economic genotypic variability (that is, variability formed during the long adaptation of the process of cognition in society by the forces involved, their long struggle for their own existence) undoubtedly exists, but it is not primary, but secondary. That is, adequate variability does not arise in the form of a corresponding extraordinary socio-economic genovariation, but is the result of a long selection during the exchange-inheritance, accumulation and dissemination of new practical knowledge by social agents and, on this basis, their corresponding socio-economic there is the labor intellectual potential of the acting subjects. "Not only the implementation of work on the basis of a scientific study of the time, movements and efforts formed with the help of thoughtful coordination from above, but even an additional appeal to such strong socio-psychological forces as responsibility, feelings in the accomplished duty, joint overcoming of difficulties, finally, assistance in the pursuit of self-improvement a number of other more or less consciously applied force "educational" impact. However, if the emergence of new socioeconomic genovariations depended solely on the environment of laboratory experience, then, changing this environment one way or another, we would be able to completely influence and control the entire process of their occurrence, but since the opportunities involved are limited, limited by the very socio-economic genotypic nature of forces (the process of testing, accumulation and reproduction of productive knowledge), then, obviously, there is no absolute influence of a laboratory environment. Genotypes, which as a result of their previously changed during the socio-economic selection of the hereditary structure in a definite way react to the proposed external influences. The traditionally used statement in classical management: “corporate values are educated, not brought in from outside,” is the best proof of this. Thus, the existence of adequate variability is not an elementary (single) genovariational act, but the result of a very complex evolutionary process of practical cognition, essentially having nothing to do with genovariational variability. Due to the presence of a certain social agent representing a particular socio-economic leash genotype genetically defined borders impact on the production process (practical knowledge), defining and limiting the scope and intensity of their participation in it. As a confirmation of this position can preordain current trends in the transformation of the productive forces and relations of production in a society in the course of evolutionary genetic genovariations that ensure the progressive evolutionary development of social production; their appearance does not depend solely on a rationally arranged externally. Therefore, we once again draw the attention of readers, we cannot fully cause the necessary socio-economic and labor order with the help of exclusively laboratory effects. We deliberately leave aside the cases of “artificial” changes in the number of occurrences of socioeconomic genovariations (the number of purposefully formed socioeconomic events that result in the desired transformation of value forms) arising from the successful passage of one or another innovation testing, conducive to its transition from the stage of commercialization to new transformations of the production process aimed at expanding and modifying the boundaries and forms of creating value up of its formation to the consumer. See, for example, in [Prahalad, Ramaswami, 2006]:

1. "Sony Corporation has allowed the use of the Linux operating system in its PlayStation consoles. Having equipped the Linux kit with tools for developing PlayStation application tasks, Sony, together with the system developer, selects consumer competence and expands the capabilities of the PlayStation as a key platform in the entertainment process. (Unlike Eli Lilly, which develops its own product but accepts the help of third-party researchers, Sony directly attracts consumers to develop its platforms)".

2. "Lego Mindstorms also attracts consumers to the innovative process. Its users have created entire software development situations, such as NQC, as well as custom versions of popular computer languages, including Perl and Java. (NQC, Not Quite C) is a simple specialized language for writing programs for some Lego robots. Note L.S.)".

Combined with new consumer experiments with robots, these advances have greatly expanded the capabilities of Mindstorms. The observed state of affairs can probably be regarded as a confirmation of our assumption that it is socioeconomic genotypic heterogeneity and the corresponding variability that underlie the inheritance, accumulation and reprogramming of a high level created by D. Baum with the aim of disseminating socioeconomic genovariation in society and affect all spheres and aspects of the functioning and evolution of the production process, the process of cognition. Stage of mass current production. Here we are dealing with an exceptional form of socio-economic genotypic peak variability: not with individual social change. Economic genovariations ("bits" of knowledge), but only with genovariational knowledge. The difference in the number of their groups under certain conditions of testing and in the subsequent "pre-designed" mass release. This proves that in some certain cases. Such socio-economic genovariations can be called "Artificial". But the very exclusivity of the "purposeful" organization and coordination of the process of converting one form of value into another, initially instructing equally all forces to carry out, in certain circumstances, precisely pre-determined actions, leaves these cases aside from the general and the bulk of socio-economic genovariations that spontaneously and sporadically arise in the "natural test-venous" economic conditions. From the point of view of the emergence of such socio-economic genovariations in everyday economic practice, all these cases are interesting in that the simplicity of the incentives that cause the corresponding transformation of value forms under the conditions of "laboratory education" gives us every right to allow a similar change and "Natural" business conditions, and the facts of finding new practical knowledge in a "natural" state, for example, during the work of independent websites where enthusiasts exchange ideas and the design of countless Lego robots (such as sorting machines,drones, security alarms, etc). Further strengthen our belief that the emergence of this type of socio-economic tenorization does not depend only on laboratory conditions for organizing innovative activities.

But still, the question remains why, in the case of the existence of thousands of socio-economic generations obtained at all stages of a rationally organized production process due to their targeted Search, adaptation and mass application (for example, during the activities of InnoCentive LLC), we know so little

about their existence in our day-to-day ongoing business practices? A large number of verified analyzed facts confirming that even with the help of a professionally organized innovation process, significant problems and difficulties of its full deployment remain? Why is the business experience previously tested and accumulated by companies, even in modern economic conditions, not always in demand and requires significant modification? Why do values begin in modern society?

And, on the other hand, why large-scale multi-purpose studies carried out by manufacturers make it possible to create them everywhere jointly by the consumer and the producer, which inevitably puts forward new requirements, in particular, to search and create the appropriate producer the base, capable of quickly and unobstructed formation and folding, as well as being READY FOR A CONSTANT change in the configuration of the resources involved, selective activation of utilized existing by them competency entities at affordable costs to ensure personalized interactions that are relevant solely to specific ones according to a consumer order, is it easy to expand consumers and specific manufacturers in a particular place at a specific time?

What serves as a key source for such a fundamental change in nature itself and the logic of the formation and development of value in modern society? Obviously, not every social agent (in accordance with their own and / or socially determined assessments that are valid at a certain point in time in society) is ready and capable of this and is expected from other members of this community intellectually - labor activity and, therefore, to maintain appropriate industrial relations. And if we observe very significant problems in obtaining socio-economic genovariations in the course of targeted coordination, then in the daily practice of production, this process of external discovery of new practical knowledge is even more difficult due to its spontaneous and therefore very unpredictable nature. Undoubtedly, one of the important reasons for the rare occurrence in everyday economic practice of a similar kind of socio-economic genovariations is often observed innovations with those obtained on a traditional basis. Therefore, to a certain extent, they have both less competition and, moreover, vitality, as well as their ability to provide for themselves, as well as those obtained on their basic equipment, it is usually unlikely that they will affect the form of the existing method of production. However, we will try to show that some of the neoplasms formed in a similar way can still play a very significant role in the process of production evolution. In other countries, they are quite capable under certain conditions of the basis of production of consumer value for a certain circle of economic entities, and therefore, they are actively involved in their competition and, accordingly, in the process of evolution of all social production. In the course of production activities, we inevitably observe all the imperceptible transitions in the estimate of 0 by active forces tested by them in the process of exchange-inheritance of socio-economic gene variation: from those that have a completely “Normal” value and vitality, through those that will have a more or less lower percentage of goods / services / impressions, to extremely insignificant genovariations up to innovations that are openly “unacceptable” in nature, cast doubt on the very possibility The performance of production activ-

ities based on them. This variety of assessments is a phenomenon, because their existence, first of all, is typical of certain social agents, representing the corresponding socially significant: LIVING socio-economic genotype, and therefore mass manifestation and, secondly, it is sanctioned by society due to the socioeconomic genotypic diversity that exists in it, which is demonstrated by forces, formed during their long-term production single evolution. For example, the production of all types of weapons causes mixed assessments from all forces operating in society. Another example is the modern production of golf clubs. It is usually oriented to different designs of golf clubs (the features of which affect the length of the drive) in order to satisfy the diverse interests of different consumers: from professionals of our task did not include a comprehensive review of the issue. We propose to dwell only on some points, which, in our opinion, are especially important for the correct assessment of the role of our ideas in the general construction of the theory of industrial evolution. There are three such moments:

1. The emergence of a new productive practical knowledge that has typical genetically defined boundaries of definition and modification (hereinafter we will call it "socio-economic genovariation").

2. The role of free exchange in the process of inheritance. the accumulation and dissemination of new productive practical knowledge selection (competition mechanism).

3. The importance under these conditions of socio-economic purchasing, implements the process of productive practical-knowledge.

It is necessary to clarify that the forces who represent a certain production co-knowledge at all stages of social reproduction, including the stage of consumption. By virtue of this category, "production" and "the process of productive practical knowledge" are identical for us and do not imply a definition of the traditionally distinguished stage of production in social reproduction. They relate to all social reproduction, to all stages of its implementation. This implies the manifestation of numerous assessments of their consumer and exchange value on the part of participants in this market. We see the most varied intensity of demand for a gene or other design, and at the same time, different consumers sometimes value their value. Here we meet all the noted gaps in the existing assessments of the proposed value for circulation, both on the demand side and on the supply side (based on the understandings, ideas and capabilities of the forces involved in this production). In particular, the United States Golf Association (USGA) adheres to its own "dominant" standards for the manufacturing of golf clubs. This organization tests clubs for the "spring effect", which is forbidden by its rules (the front part or the head of the club should not create a "spring effect" upon impact). Nevertheless, some manufacturers have developed and are producing clubs, many are creating the forbidden "spring effect", and some people (golfers buy and use them to increase the length of rive. Obviously, based on the interests of American professional golfers, the appearance of such a "non-conformist" club is frankly "harmful" to them of socio-economic genovariation, which undermines the foundations of the development of this sport in society. Therefore, this model not only does not represent any value for

them spite, but it is frankly "unacceptable" (the activities of its manufacturers are assessed by them appropriately). Moreover, the manufacturers who inherit and disseminate this "harmful", according to the estimates of a certain rune of consumers and producers, socio-economic-varization within their own. The production is rated as useful, for foreign golf lovers who are very active in demand for this design outside the United States, the necessary use value is quite significant, and therefore the number of companies specializing in the production of such Kluneck is also determined to be acceptable and legal. Not having any significant significance for the evolution of production. It goes without saying that it is extremely difficult to detect such socioeconomic genovariation in our everyday economic practice, and in general to say that the number of genovariations with reduced ability is much larger than the number where this social demand, and therefore vitality, has not been affected. If you try to analyze the economic experience acquired by any specific actor, we can say that in the conditions of free exchange within the framework of a certain social of the comic genotypic structure of social production, the number of tumors tested and accumulated by him with a "reduced" ability for subsequent use (even though positive, on his part, their assessment is immeasurably greater than the number of actually operating ones. And this is completely typical phenomenon. Hense we came close to the other side of the issue of the emergence of socio-economic genovariations in industrial practice and their significance in the process of its evolution. It is often necessary to meet with the opinion that such non-directionally arising socio-economic neoplasms in natural, freely forming conditions are extremely transient, random in nature. Consequently, once tested socio-economic genovariations are perceived and evaluated by freely exchanging social agents, despite their socially determined nature, only as to one degree or another "annoying deviations" from their traditionally performed economic functions. This leads to a fairly widespread view that all socio-economic changes that have manifested themselves in spontaneously operating market conditions are in fact only more or less sharply expressed "mistakes", "freaks". Therefore, such changes cannot have any meaning in the process of the progressive evolution of production, i.e. can not influence the process of formation and development of its stable forms. Such an opinion, in our opinion, is the result of insufficiently in-depth study of the process of practical cognition ("Neutral", to a certain extent "supportive", not directly calling into question the traditionally implemented, habitual way of life and, accordingly, the existing public order), not to mention the "useful" transformations of nature and - Geeks of produced and consumed value. Indeed, the number of "unsuccessful" and even "harmful" changes, as a rule, is incomparably greater than the number of "harmless", habitual (contributing to the affirmation of viability and the possibility of one's development in society). But such their correlation of subsequent reproduction on a qualitatively new level of perfect adaptation of social entities is quite natural, stemming from the essential conditions of production, which has socio-economic genotypic foundations of education and development. The acting subject in his normal economic environment represents an extremely thin, complex and perfect socio-economic organism, adapted to all the various requirements imposed on him by this en-

vironment. To “spoil” such an organism is much easier than to “correct”. If someone set out to come up with unforeseen changes in the process of the implementation of a certain actor by a certain professional activity and to which, for some reason, he would have to respond and take them into consideration during fulfillment of their own production functions and then began to classify these changes, taking their assessment by the acting actor as the basis, then the result would probably be very ambiguous and not fully predictable: from the group and "undesirable", and therefore "erroneous" in the process carried out according to production social agent through "without of any essential significance", i.e. to a certain extent “indifferent”, to very “useful” and “acceptable”. Moreover, with some certainty, we can say that the first group of innovations acquired in this way by the acting subject would be many times larger than the volume of both other combined groups, and the last useful conversions most likely turned up in. These are realized by our natural, natural, practical knowledge of “deviations” from the general situation, those in the conditions of a constantly operating social, "method-norm” of economic behavior, and therefore there is no fundamental economic variability, and there is no need to consider them for such “mistakes” in the case when they are evoked by unnecessary confirmation of the accidental occurrence, which is completely negligible. In approximately the same proportions,it will come to someone to see in these species occur suddenly as socially-economical s genovariations in social agents, usually they do not have. On the contrary. The true facts can only strengthen our conviction. These value transformations could have arisen and are arising in the production activity, specializing in their implementation, in exactly the same way as they are currently arising in the natural conditions of economic activity. What exists with a clearly-undesirable character of socio-economic genovariation A number of “indifferent” people who are not of fundamental importance in realistic economic practice, and therefore are not subject to active use in the course of the struggle for the creature. The prevalence of genovariations, everyone can be convinced of this, at least once in his life he paid attention and tried to analyze the process of acquiring his own economic experience. It is especially interesting that some of the changes are not so socially significant, and sometimes these geno-variational strataspheres. However, it is erroneous to think that the demand for such socio-economic generations in economic practice depends solely on the strength of the change on their basis of the existing production method, the modification of its morphology itself, therefore the degree of transformation of everything is important to note the fact that it is “indifferent” changes that accidentally arise accumulated, stored and reproduced by members of both in the process of implementation by an active subject of their own procession of economic experience. We see very often that common functions are sometimes quite consistent with axiological functions within the framework of the performance of certain professional activities by other forces, which are “inherited” by social agents in the process of production of socio-economic genovariations, which at first glance seem to have completely “indifferent” meaning (from the point of view of the entities implementing them and / or according to current estimates in society, due to the presence of their inherent socio-economic geno-

typic diversity), in fact, have a significant impact on their viability and life-long on their implementation. The variety of value forms can be illustrated by the example of Lego's production activity, developed by Mindstorms Robotics, the invention system of this public organization as a whole. It contributed to the beginning of experimentation of consumer abilities. during their work with this system, which led to the emergence of a large number of Lego robots. Similar single and spontaneously tested by consumers by socio-economic genovariations are essentially both having gained their unique economic experience, they do not have a fundamental character (from the point of view of ensuring their livelihoods), (at least for most of them), and therefore they are divided as "neutral", to a certain extent "indifferent". For example, the color scheme of the car interior. The implementation of this set of works within the framework of the existing mass automobile production does not have any super-fundamental importance during its functioning and therefore does not make a significant contribution to the competitive process implemented by its participants; whereas for a design bureau, this figure is more creative.

So, for example, a rather common case when a business entity (due to the fact that he cannot remain a person isolated from public relations for a minute) is fundamental to the process of its development. Consequently, such an activity and all the socio-economic genovariations that arise during its implementation are of an "auxiliary" character from the point of view of the functioning of the automotive industry, oriented toward the mass consumer. Being indifferent to the majority of "typical" producers and buyers, under certain conditions, this activity becomes fundamental and therefore quite significant and viable. of view procession, while having a penchant for implemented so demanded in this social order. There are no worries in order to ensure for himself and his family the possibility of a completely different production activity, which has variations and the strength of its demand, which is significant and does not exist in society.

Even if the genovariational variability of the subject is tested, if it is tested within the framework of the current production of new socio-economic genovariation, it can be very significant on the part of the general public (at least for most of the subjects acting in it), most likely it will relate to this "discovery emotionally neutral, only as a necessary (for e having other opportunities) means of his life. Such examples cited by us show that productive practical knowledge affects a wide variety of aspects, types and stages of social reproduction and is characterized by different meanings in the process of a functioning society. Next to the least existing socio-economic characteristics demonstrated forces, when they perform auxiliary types of work within the framework of a particular business process, also change those most important forces. In addition, a number of tested ones are known to the inheritor. During the implementation of any production act. Activities of the initiating economic entities of socio-economic genovariations that "carry" a new view of cookies, cooperatives, which in the current working classics of social production are the main system of differentiation of independent types of economic activity. Therefore, one has to admit the completely erroneous idea expressed by some researchers that socio-economic genovariational variability determines and limits the entire process of practical

cognition, as it glides along its surface, being an exceptionally characteristic form of variability of one or another kind of production, and that besides these there are some "objective sushi-participation" in the development of this process and new opportunities in it, which, however, remain not about. According to the prevailing estimates in society, these genovariations are “unrequited” in nature, but they can undoubtedly become very “useful” and able to ensure that the forces testing them are successful in the competition, given the dominant economic presence of the relevant circumstances. Among other things, there may be cases where some of the very radical innovations tested by the dominant entities within the framework of any production will for some part of the social agents involved in it be very indifferent until a certain time, i.e. do not directly spoil the possibility of their realization of their own preferences and opportunities, but at the same time this is explicit. For some other forces, they are not simply not in demand, but directly, according to their estimates, “harmful”, i.e. hindering further joint participation in it. Proof of this is the presence at the enterprise of various types of resistance demonstrated by the organization's employees (their groups) in relation to those offered by the management of the organism, which cannot change the “Essence”, which is beyond the spontaneously operating socio-economic genotic variability. In view of this, the process of evolution of social production, the process of converting some types and forms of production activity into others could not go on. The problem of determining the “objective essence” of production is particularly clear in the neoclassical direction of economic thought, which is based on the assertion that the universal thinking and behavior. In the concept of an economic school, economic characteristics, as already noted, are limited solely by entrepreneurial activity, i.e. socio-economic genotypic homogeneity. Nevertheless, in real life, as we try to show, we often have to observe phenomena that cannot be explained not only from the point of view of neoclassicists, but also with the subjects presented by Austrian economists to the subject of changes. Thus, there is a direct correlation between the degree of “novelty” of the newly tested socio-economic geno position. In the genovariational way, since everything spontaneously unit of the natural general knowledge of the introduction of innovation does not in any way affect the realizable social forces and profound transformations of the process of producing an active position. They do not have a great deal of social power and public relationship. As a consequence, on the process of inter-fork and inter-fork production differentiation. Figuratively speaking, with all the spontaneously socioeconomic and genetically varying genetically changing changes in our practice, the production of typewriters will always remain a production. Typewriters, and the production of computing on the process of implementation in society is labor-only possible through the long-term accumulation by the active forces of genovariational ones and through the long-term “stratification” of some “deviations” of cognitive knowledge to others. The socio-economic genovariational change-machine-production of computers, and the arbitrariness of the latter in a spontaneous (natural) rush will predetermine the possibility of evading the approbation side of them based on other technical means, in particular personal computers, tablets, etc. Will not serve as the beginning of

a new kind of arbitrariness. Such a modification is possible only within the framework of a rationally organized (by someone's mind) production, and that spontaneous arbitrariness is organized, which develops and arises in the hall of interaction-inheritance of new practical knowledge by millions of freely exchanging social entities in all spheres and at all stages of the cognitive activity, will not have to this process is not something new that was not there before, this is not a new thread of variability of the current mode of production, historical era, when the unit of the hosting family. The socioeconomic structure of production formed under these conditions largely determined the nature of acquired practical knowledge, which was embodied in the process of recognizing consumer values and for the purpose of satisfying certain work with other production operations. Consequently, their general purpose bore the mark their co-economic of those or other means of interacting entities. And social relations, formed from the primitive-tribal era. Ski economy, which is a transition from production to money, in the form of natures there is no relation to practical knowledge in the field of cognition, but here two concepts mix: the variety of constantly emerging socio-economic genovariations and, accordingly, the properties and characteristics of social agents of the sexual being, this process of transformation, and the range of variability, the amplitude of deviation from the generally accepted "norm" of management at the given time. In fact, we see that socially-economic genotypic variability decisively affects all aspects and parts of the socio-productive whole, the whole process of practical cognition (all the socio-economic generation of new ones, the accumulation and reproduction of socio-economic ones, gradually begins to change and new qualitative basis production process. This process of transformation is caused by the modification of all the parameters, elements, and signs of cooperation as a relic of the far-economic genotypical structure of the involved vomer bone agents and their cognition process are formed by new production activities. Therefore, in the peasant new economic era, the peasant family (the traditionally prevailing socio-economic genotype of social orientation) is a self-sufficient socio-economic education and therefore the needs of the family still largely determine the size of its production, therefore, the boundaries and speed of - Rovaniya, accumulation and dissemination of practical knowledge, the modification of productive forces and industrial relations within the framework of this community. At the same time, simultaneously as part of the exchange-exchange society, the peasant farm realizes practical knowledge in the form of a manufactured product, which becomes accumulated in the process of inheritance and accumulation of the detypically determined attributes and properties of its existing forces). Therefore, although socio-economic variability is intermittent, spasmodic, its jumps, of course, cannot be infinitely large; the deviation amplitude is limited and this boundary is determined by the socio-economic genotypic structure.

The most experienced business entities and their achievements. On this basis, a new level of economic development gradually gives them the opportunity to produce consumer values, not only for their own consumption, but for an indefinite and fairly wide range of consumers, interconnected by the market, forming peace and while affirming a new socio-economic tenor. Typical habitat

and predetermining the nascent dominance of the socioeconomic genotype of vitalism. Confrontation of competition between traditional new and emerging new economic forces determines the direction and intensity of the subsequent process of practical knowledge carried out in this society.

It will be shed-pressed until new nascent commodity-money relations replace traditional ones for a given socio-econo. Municipal education methods of managing. Further development of the process of overpopulation, accumulation of socio-economic genovariations leads to the formation and development of society on a new, industrial basis. Practically the Russian knowledge, formulated by the manufacturer, still in a one-sided search, is finally acquiring a new form of its realization - commodity. It is in the product that the values produced within the framework of this community that are put on the market begin to concentrate. A similar focus on the formation and development of productive forces and production relations is suggested by the presence of their dominant goals and means of management, inherent, in particular, to the vital socio-economic genoty (within the framework of the Soviet system, it is socially ideal). Owing to the effect of such socioeconomic genotypic variability in production, the entire social organization is transformed. Transition from social genotypic orientation prevailing at the previous stage of production development, first to socially. Vital, and then to the affirmation of vital behavior in the new industrial space as the dominant, demon. Stringing its "mental" qualities and models of economic behavior, it ensures the formation and development of a new economic ideology, methods, forms of production activity and, therefore, helps to create new living conditions for existing forces and society as a whole. The ongoing and expanding process of practical cognition under the conditions of constantly operating socioeconomic genotypic variability reaches a fundamentally new level in the present, namely, the main path of its evolution, which has existed in all historical eras and which has developed the economic world since its time of education. And if on this path we see only sequential changes, only a slow transformation of some stable forms of production into others, then this will happen precisely because socio-economic genovariational variability can turn one type of production activity (like one action the existing socioeconomic genotype) in another immediately. In one leap, but only gradually, through the accumulation and preservation of individual socio-economic genovariations. On the contrary, to assess and understand the role of socio-economic genovariational variability during the evolution of a socio-productive whole, its speciation, it would be fatal to believe that there are indeed cases of such a sudden transformation of some sustainable forms of management into others. The evolution of productive forces and production relations is a slow process, gradual, and such a sudden transformation of some economic forms into others would testify only to the fact that socio-economic genovariational variability lies away from the evolutionary path of their formation and development, that between her and evolution is an impassable chasm. Fortunately, we know that in reality this does not exist. The general socioeconomic genotypic structure of the ideal-vital and social-vital embassy began its functioning. Here, the consumer and producer, as a rule, are not separated in time and space. Joint production of individual consumer values

is the basis for the formation and development of a modern system of practical knowledge aimed at satisfying individual needs in all their diversity and originality, but having, however, certain socioeconomic genotypically determined boundaries of existence and modification. Such processes taking place within the framework of a similarly functioning socio-economic genotypic environment contribute to the achievement by society of a qualitatively new level of development. Even such revolutionary "deviations-discoveries", such as fire, a wheel, a steam engine, a computer, digital technologies, etc., that fundamentally transformed all economic reality, could nevertheless appear to be in demand only in certain socio-economic conditions progressively formed on a new system of management. In the information society, the traditional market is gradually transforming into a forum, and the process of inheritance, accumulation and reproduction of socio-economic genovariations fundamentally changes its foundation, demonstrating its manifestation within the framework of condemning the issue of the emergence of socio-economic genomic variation in spontaneous, everyday implementation. Our economic practice nevertheless needs to play a huge role of single exchange in the process of inheritance and the accumulation and spread of socio-economic changes, Its "extinct" action should greatly affect the frequency of finding socio-economic generations in natural, spontaneous formations their general business conditions.

Chapter II of this work will be devoted to an analysis of the role of free exchange in the process of evolution of social production. Here, it is only relevant to note the fact that it is conducive to the operation of this mechanism, which provides for the mutual learning and "upbringing" of acting subjects, each reincarnation of a certain act of exchange-inheritance by these entities in a recessive recessive (subordinate) socio-economic gene variation when interacting with the "normal" (dominant. Form of practical knowledge realized in society is, as it were, dissolved in this latter, escapes external detection and, therefore, leaves the public assessment, the one that is stored by the social agents that have tested it in the form of the economic property they have acquired. In a laboratory, rationally arranged environment for the search, testing and mass development of new knowledge, as well as the implementation of this information and, in the final analysis, the awnings are formed proceeding from the "dominant" economic coordination - with forced methods of distribution, etc. Both last powerful forces (complete freedom of exchange and socio-economic selection) and (in the market - a competitive mechanism), those who reduce the number of randomly occurring elitin socioeconomic genovariations observed in the spontaneous production process are eliminated, and therefore cases of the discovery of such neoplasms are observed with an unchanged co-coordination: orders, measure finally, when discussing the issue of spontaneous education - the socio-economic genovariations in the daily activities of business entities, it is necessary to take into account one more consideration. Since the process of the emergence of genovariations (due to the action of socioeconomic socioeconomic genotypically determined by economic economic genotypic variability) has the formation and developmental trends, it is likely that this phenomenon should have a fairly stable dynamics. Thus, to notice (identify) the occurrence

of - a good new socio-economic genovariation in everyday practice in most cases succeeds only directly at the time of its testing by interacting entities in the process of free exchange; B when it has not yet been destroyed by the work of the mechanism of competition (socio-economic selection), or when its external expression has not yet "dissolved" in the surrounding "normal" forms realized by forces who are inclined to adhere to traditional for itself and for this society economic thinking and behavior, in other words, was not absorbed by the action of the free exchange mechanism as whole. Suppose that in the process of productive publicity carried out by forces involved in various socio-economic genes, a certain number of traditionally realized forms of cognition (a certain number of performed and in accordance with accepted standards in the production of production operations) accounts for approximately one individual deviation. If we take this number in the absence of other more accurate data for the usual attitude of unchanged and unchanged (traditional) practice and knowledge, then, assuming the same intensity of the process of introducing socio-economic genovariation under natural economic conditions, one can expect to encounter the same number of "normally" interacting entities one case of the emergence of such socio-economic genovariation, which has the chance to become the basis of the future production of new use value and supported by forces (their socio-economic genotypes) during their implementation of the process of inheritance, accumulation and reproduction of practical knowledge. But at the level of knowledge that we have reached, it is hardly dry. The very possibility of obtaining sufficient fees that corresponds to data on the basis of which it would be possible to wasp. To review the required number of results of similar interactions between social agents involved in the implementation of a certain type of production, with the aim of detecting one single-economic-genetic generation. However, this reasoning has a significant conditional value, since, as it will be shown later, in a spontaneously organized economic life the opposite processes constantly occur: on the one hand, the bowels of the society of socio-economic genovariations are accumulated. another is to eliminate them.

The state of interaction with these two processes determines the existence in conditions of free spontaneous mutual adaptation of social agents of a greater or lesser number of new practical ones.

Chapter 2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC GENOVARIATION IN THE CONDITIONS OF FREE EXCHANGE

The previous chapter briefly showed how of great importance free exchange in the fate of socio-economic genovariations that re-emerge in everyday economic practice (new productive practical knowledge). In this chapter, we consider this phenomenon in more detail. The study of the patterns of inheritance by individual forces of individual socio-economic gene variations has repeatedly served as the subject of numerous studies of knowledge. Thus, it should already be expected that in the economic life usually realized by economic entities, socio-economic genovariations will come to their eyes immeasurably less often than in a laboratory setting.

The coincidence of the actual situation with theoretical expectation is the best proof of the validity of the assumptions made. So, we have no reason to see the process so far. the emergence of socio-economic genovariations is solely the result of purposefully coordinated external influences. On the contrary, the available stock of facts suggests that under spontaneously developing economic conditions this process proceeds as naturally as "laboratory" conditions, but there are a number of reasons that impede the recognition of most cases of the emergence of socio-economic genovariations in our everyday practice. $J.Schumpeter$[1935], $L.Mises$[2005], $K.Menger$[2005], $O.Bem - Bawerk$[2002], $M.Rothbard$[1962], $F.Hayek$[2000], $I.Krishner$[2007]$etal.$, as well as the founders of socio-genetics $C.LamsdenI.Wilson$[1981]$etal.$ thoroughly analyzed all the forces involved in the production process - practical practical knowledge. But in this list of works, for a correct understanding of the role of socioeconomic genotypic variability in the process of production evolution, for us only those that study the fate of separate socioeconomic genovariations in conditions of total freedom of exchange are of importance to us, since the natural state of any social production (of the totality of social agents participating in it) implies precisely the state of a freely exchanging society. Such a definition of the concept of production, based on relations of people who are created by production and its direct result-consumption, and which are realized in the process of free exchange-inheritance of rights. The very meaning of the "freedom" of knowledge, as well as the ways of maintaining it, is determined by the prevailing ideas in society in the framework of the current socio-economic genotypic structure of clinical knowledge by a combination of mutually reinforcing comrades belonging to a single free-bombing industrial complex is more consistent with current ideas. It is clear that such a relationship, and exchange, in some cases depends on both internal and external reasons, either strengthening or weakening it about cooperation, and this interaction is truly free and voluntary. Without any direct or indirect purposefully organized by someone external influence, then from the point of view of modern sociogenetic forces on the tune and logic of the process, all the operating sub-vectors of one common knowledge, the process of PR, are so good. But the whole of nature can freely interacted. In fact, they belong to a single one, without encountering this obstacle in the process of transforming the forms of value (exchange-sharing of practical knowledge), or in the possibilities of its subsequent socio-productive

whole. And on the contrary, if two news of the social community of forces operating within the framework of one type of production, one social production whole, begin to show a certain discrepancy over time as in the field of their definition of the value of the diverse of implementation.

Of deliberately formed boundaries both in the process of general production as a whole and in individual independents. Species that can connect areas of practical knowledge in so far as the above criteria for determining production, the achieved level of practical knowledge in general at one stage or another of its development may not always prove to be applicable. In economic practice, we observe inevitably the most diverse transitions, the spill of methods, types and forms of manipulation available and applied by socio-economic genotypically heterogeneous forces in order to turn the subject into a commodity. According to him, certain types of work can be carried out in various areas of production and have different dynamics of experience exchange during their implementation. There are also cases when forces who traditionally perform production functions within separate, independently functioning types of production begin Under certain circumstances, interact with each other, giving of course, since there is no and cannot be finally produced goods / services / impressions, and in the desire to participate in this the process of cognition, in adherence to it, then, if in this case it is impossible to talk about the presence of two independently functioning varieties of production, areas of productive knowledge, nevertheless, undoubtedly, there was a beginning of the process of its intra-specific differentiation of thriving, the beginning of the formation and development in the society of production polyformism. The jarring definition of production, the process of productive practical knowledge, of course, does not need to be understood in the sense that one or another socio-economic genovariation, which suddenly appeared in the conditions of free exchange, a new form of management, is the starting point of the process of disagreement of existing production, its species-species. Undoubtedly, the emergence of such separation is always preceded by the accumulation by social agents (in the form of economic experience acquired by them in the struggle for their own existence) of pain his or fewer social initiated the formation of the development of new production capacities in the community, new areas of his knowledge and goals and the whole industry independent. But, in any case, if two freely functioning communities of forces, carrying out their activities both within the framework of the implementation of a certain production, and in various related fields, as well as in the process of consumption obtained on the basis of the results, are capable and ready - natural but economic genotypically determined by differences. In a the very fact of the existence of these differences, in whatever form they appear, is not yet a sufficient basis for the formation and isolation on their basis of an independent type of production, a new field of knowledge. From our observations of the functioning of production formations it can be stated that the corresponding social agents can adhere to very peculiar (in their goals and means), from the point of view of the prevailing ideas in society, models of economic behavior, striving at the same time, to realize their own methods of management and their innocence, their socioeconomic genetically functioning

environment, but at the same time be integrated into a single production complex. For example, free exchange is characteristic of any accidentally arising in the process of being distinguished among “normally” functional deviations, even a very sensible one, the architecture of the rapidly dissolving majority of forces, with rents. Thus, the freedom of exchange will “dissolve" and effect on every newly wedged, thereby forming a stable axis for different social and economic genotypes and laboring in different with. activities and in the framework of various social systems. The origin of this factor in the process of industrial evolution should not be underestimated. Indeed, one of the most important values in the development of production was given to this factor by the largest rise of economic thought dating back to the old times. As a result, a very stable idea of the role in this process, namely, that in the course of free volume evasion "of the circulation of the society of necessary goods / they will be satisfied. These considerations lead many researchers to all genotypic ideas about the device. In other words, with free exchange, every, even the most useful, but sporadically emerged economic principle of impressions is more from modern views (based on a socio-eco-friendly component of knowledge, its “beat” will not be able to influence its evolutionary form of knowledge. Since no active business man is born with knowledge of his racial ethnic belonging to the rules of behavior in society, language (including economically i.e.) not having personal (individual) socio-economic experience of survival and reproduction in the socio-economic state. He/she receives and receives information about this in the process of his/her development and formation in the course of joint implementation of production activities with other entities (in the process of educating, accumulating and disseminating practical economic knowledge), which is the basis of his own life support and self-sufficiency injured.

So, there are many examples when children or young people from different regions of the planet (Africa, Central and South America, etc.) received education and upbringing in Europe. Their worldview and economic behavior differed from the socio-economic behavior of their compatriots reputation. Nutrition, education and the accumulation of practical business experience which took place in a traditional environment. Together with their fellow tribesmen, they have the same ethnic origin and close psychological parameters, but their socioeconomic genotypes (behavioral attitudes) and economic horizons are very different because they were formed by different set of cultures. Thus, these diverse socioeconomic genotypes were formed due to differences (despite the universal regularity of human thinking and cognition inheritance, accumulation and repetition of practical knowledge) information and material (individually sub an object of unity, and in order for knowledge to be entrenched and realized in the future process of cognition, it is necessary to organize the production process so that the acting subject realizing it carries out its exchange-interaction with the ready and capable of its inheritance (application) a social agent, which is practically carried out in laboratory conditions of cognition with the purposeful implementation of RD, that is, with the purposeful, external development of new types and forms of practical knowledge. In the latter case, the main tool of the forces is the systematic implementation of their determinations, the

implementation of which initially requires some specific skills (abilities, latent, potential process), skills, abilities. With free exchange, implemented in everyday practice, we are dealing with a random encounter of interacting entities. In this case, the new knowledge tested in this way (economic genovariation) could be preserved and would provide the basis for sustainable reproduction, it is necessary. As of its accidental occurrence not in one active object, but in several social agents at the same time, It is only possible under the assumption that the need for a given change (innovation) arises simultaneously in several flocking agents under the influence of external outlooks common to them. This view, in particular, representatives of the Austrian economic school adhere to the theory of territorial parameters of their functioning that they developed "entrepreneurship process" and the role and significance that these half-holders called for by these carriers, makes us play a significant role in the process of economic development by large, but massive deviations, which are incumbent by real forces in the process of practical development and are now united under the name “innovation. By its definition, by no means can the true source of the evolving process be the unpredictable (and, in this sense, randomly approved) single-occurring changes / transformations of value (socio-economic genovariations). Only mass variability, accessible to most social agents, lies at the basis of arbitrary evolution and separates the possible boundaries of their practical knowledge, independence of their economic thinking and their own organisms, provided by the work of [Piers 2001 and G. Hardy 2000] to establish such a system of doubt and which at the same time would possess the remainder of certain equations and put such considerations. At the same time, in production, this or that kind of debt for that.

So that they can be improved by the limit of the quantitative analysis of the studied quality assurance, the legitimacy of the use of polymeric construction should be especially proved for each part, we took universal principles as energy conservation, manifested, in particular, into the genetically substantiated law it was distributed for in the case of gene, these are at the equilibrium of the exchange milling of the liquid. organisms, and with B not fully applicable to social processes in the process of gene inheritance, turn out to be with them. Behavior, as will be beneficial in the future, such considerations fully correspond to modern ideas about the role and importance of free exchange in the process of productive practical knowledge, if we take into account the presence of a constantly functioning socio-ecoeconomy.

Genetic genotypic variability in society, succumbing to the whole process of production, the whole totality of economic entities participating in it. Nowadays, when we know the laws of genetics that underlie sociogenetic ideas about the structure of social structure, one urgently needs to revise the conclusions to which the majority of modern researchers adhere to the role and significance of the mechanism of free exchange during the evolution of production, in the process of practical distribution of a single factor in a mixed case, we examined n of heterogeneous and two homogeneous forms,[G.Hardy] established what a population is e with random scraping, it quickly comes to a stable state in the sense of establishing a certain numerical relationship between the three forces,

p	$2g$	r
1	2	1
1	4	4
1	6	9
1	8	16
1	20 000	100 000 000
1	$2n$	n^2

Table 1: Caption

whatever this ratio at the beginning. Thus, suppose that it consists of p homogeneous individuals of the same type, r homogeneous individuals of the other type, and di-heterogeneous individuals. G. Hardy found out that with an industrial population, the population will be in a state of equilibrium in the state of this factor until the condition is fulfilled. If this condition is satisfied from the very beginning, the numerical ratio of the forms remains unchanged.

If the initial state is not such, then, as G. Hardy showed, the equilibrium of the established-equal costoresis is one generation and is subsequently retained. The numerical relationships of the three forms satisfying the formula are are extremely numerous, and the population in which they are presented in the ratios given in the table retains their knowledge of their alternating generations. this equilibrium:

Let us begin by trying to study the laws of the formation and development of the process of production knowledge of constructive models modeled on exact natural science. In this connection, we are of some interest. Using this method assumes the existence of structural forms or organizational connections of universal significance. By virtue of;

1. Hardy [2000] is extremely important for equilibrium during the existence of the Mendelian laws of identity and the presence of free crossbreeding of the ORT organ, it can be called the law of balance with free crossbreeding, or Hardy's law. Briefly, this law is formulated in the following way: relate Expressing this law with a tenet formula and denoting + paa, gle. 2c and gob denote the numbers of the corresponding alizable structure of the community by the expression $pAA + 2gAa + raa$, $2g$ and r groups of homogeneous and heterogeneous individuals, the state of which is free. the following condition: the coexistence of homogeneous individuals (both dominant and heterogeneous individuals under conditions of free carvings and in the absence of any kind of other, remains constant provided that the number of homogeneous individuals (dominant to recessive) is equal to half the number of heterogeneous forms :

$$pr = g^2.$$

It is possible To draw a formal analogy between the free inheritance of genes from living organisms and the processes of free socio-economic genovariation during dvans In this case, of course, it is assumed that all three forms are fertile and

that there is no selection that favors the form to the detriment of the other.

In addition, it doesn't matter whether zygotic dominant forms mean or represent recycle forms. The population with an insignificant share of dominant forms and an equally small number of recessive forms is equally the term "dominant" leads in some respects to misunderstanding, because the dominant sign cannot only become predominant from its covered dominance and the detriment recessive dark eyes in a human-sign relatively dominant, but there is no reason to believe that over time dark-eyed people will increase. Under equal conditions, both signs are in the same position. But if selection favors the dominant or recessive trait, then the conditions become unequal, and one can observe how even slightly the advantage found by one form leads to a quick individual of social agents, representing diverse socioeconomic genotypes, and in order to be able to apply G. Hardy's achievements in the field of social phenomena, we first consider a particular case of theoretical interest to us and, as we will see later, revealing and clarifying both the conditions of mobile equilibrium, achieved by this community in the process of productive practical knowledge of the market, and the axes of their modification. To begin with, we allow a methodological simplification, namely, we eliminate the action of the modern credit system, conditionally assuming that it does not exist at all and all analyzing and market processes that reveal the nature and logic of productive knowledge implemented in the market will be embarrassed by another. Absolutely the same formal conditions characterize equal. News of social processes implemented by society in a sociogenetics. Its phenotypic environment is a specifically organized genetic space with characteristic social "gene networks", "co-adaptive complexes of skills" (by analogy with allele genes in biology), the level of their variability, the totality of homogeneous (pure, homogeneous in their cultural characteristics and behavior patterns of social agents) and heterogeneous (combined) genotypes (as dominant. dominant in this social structure recessive, subordinate), the frequency and frequency of their reproduction. The frequencies of genotypes are determined by the formula: $p^2 + 2g + 1$, handicap frequency of dominant tenotypes (dominant action). Realizing the corresponding forms of culturgenes); of subjects, $2g$ is the frequency of heterogeneous genotypes (social agents, realizing combined forms of cultural forms); B g is the frequency of recessive fused genotypes (active suo-entities that implement subordinate patterns of behavior in society). It is good that in genetics (as well as in sociogenetics) equilibrium is statistical in nature. The process of reproduction of living organisms is supported here as a certain constant ratio that is preserved due to the fact that in the process of inheritance of genes this violation in one direction or another is mutually balanced. Equilibrium here is understood as maintaining the correspondence between the parts of a biological system, all of its constituent elements develop and change in strict proportion. The frequencies of cultural agents of social agents representing the corresponding genotypes in society are calculated according to Hardy-Weinberg formulas. The frequencies of culturgens are determined by the formula: $p + g - 1$, where p is the frequency of dominant forms; B g is the frequency of recessive savings for simplicity, we take the following: in a certain market of socio-military selection), there is pro, in all its

parts the floor is controlled by real demand in conditions of elevated freedom of obfuscation (E.C. business entities). Of the home market, strive for production / consumption in the distant periods, especially homogeneous (subordinate) are homogeneous to its traditional form (traditionally), production and consumption in the future. Genotypes that, after testing a new form of the (product to knowledge), and therefore are capable and ready to carry out its production / sale of a certain product, presented both in the traditional form and in the form of modifying the process of cognition the form (exchange-inheritance) of two 4 that is, we assume that the forgiveness and distribution on the market of one or another form of goods (which serves as a peculiar expression of the corresponding practical knowledge) is realized within the framework of the productive sovokutnost of the acting subjects, representing boiling the scope of its production and consumption, and thus belong to diverse socioeconomic genotype We also accept that the number of the productions Noah aggregate remained unchanged over in the process in us.

The production / purchase of the presented forms of goods (exchange-inheritance of the corresponding productive knowledge) is carried out in each continuously reproduced production and trading mark and is implemented by all social agents belonging to this production population as an industrial group representing social agents representing heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes (mixed with economic experience; their intentions, plans, calculations of the non-form of goods in the future to production / consumption, by accumulating what they acquire and reproduce in practice strongly depend on the choice of a particular form of goods, a form of cognition). They are capable and ready after testing a new one, depending on the circumstances, as a modified product and traditional product forms of socio-economic. Some of the forces that have not yet entered into the process of exchange-inheritance of one or another form of product, etc.

These are subjects who did not have time or until they considered it necessary to reproduce one or another form of practical knowledge that they would be able to use to study genetic genovariation. Driven sellers and consumers / buyers. Further, we determine that there is a definite demand on the market for one or another form of goods (the form of knowledge). Let us assume that both forms of goods at the beginning of the production and trading period are completely absent to the least. Earlier, Hardy's law in its purest form, just formed prerequisites must be attached for the considered social processes, presented and produced, appear on the market immediately after drinking effective demand for them and in an amount sufficient to saturate them. At this point in time, we will have the following socio-economic genotypic structure of the process of practical cognition under consideration, more precisely, it implements its production of each group of active forces for another five. The modified form of the product (socio-economic genovariation) we define: the totality of forces:

1. The group of social agents representing the dominant. the socioeconomic genotype that is homogeneous (dominant) in this social structure (homogeneous in its intentions and capabilities and, accordingly, in the economic experience accumulated and applied in practice). These agents after testing the modified.

2. We note that the opposite can be assumed: the entities acting on the

market representing the recessive socio-economic genotype will seek to test the modified form of cognition, and social agents belonging to the dominant socio-economic genotypic formation will be prone to traditional thinking and behavior. At this stage of the analysis, this fact is not significant. the goods produced and marketed ("The new form of knowledge") are not replaceable for them by any other similar goods — the sale price of such goods, as well as labor costs for arbitrariness, does not change throughout the whole process: - each arbiter and each consumer produces over the course of each production and trade-economic period, one or another form of goods of a pair of social agents (producer / consumer) representing a certain socio-economic genotype will inevitably seek (provided that these forces will retain this proven practical knowledge and will be capable and ready for its subsequent use so that for the entire life cycle of this form of cognition there will be low-priced purchases and its repeated production. Only non-related producers / consumers act as sellers and buyers (elimination of special - use value of the goods is sufficiently stable of practically inventive agents (both to the producer, so to transfer to the next pair and the consumer), also capable and ready by virtue of their inherent economic genotypically defined name use in their business practice) form of knowledge further inherited only one piece of the product: managing its approval. However, the opportunities will only happen in the next production and trading. Suppose that similar conditions exist when knocking with social agents that belong to recessive homogeneous socio-economic genotypes and which seek to reproduce a traditional product (a trail form of socio-economic genovariation for those acting on the market subjects representing a socio-economic genotypes, we will accept the therogen-driven marketed traditional goods replace only the new mod its forms of cumulative resale).

Period: a similar process will continue in the following periods of productive practical knowledge within the framework of the existing social structure: the inherited form of the goods (expressing traditionally the Productive or new production) will be successively transferred from one production-trading period to another during the rim exchange to the following forces, predicting both the sphere of supply and consumption. At the same time, it should be accepted that the process of approbation-inheritance is the estimated price of both the new and traditional forms of both of the appealing forms of practical knowledge on the market (both new and traditional), implemented both on the supply side and on the consumption side all social agents exclusively voluntarily, i.e. in conditions of complete freedom of exchange. Consequently, we allow for a while the absence of pressure from any type of socio-economic selection (the action of the competition mechanism), due to which the conditions prevailing in the market will be equally favorable for testing and inheriting a modified form of goods (socio-economic-genetic genovariation), and for the reproduction of the traditional form. This will allow forces to maximally display and engage in the process of productive cognition social and economic genotypically determined ones and vice versa; sale of sales is the same and unchanged; B, respectively, labor costs for their production / sale are also unchanged during the life cycle of a product (all its forms) and do not significantly differ (according to their

estimates) B consumer value of both presented products (forms of productive knowledge) is stable enough so that during the period of their sale there are no repeated everything. Purchases - only direct producers / consumers act as producers / buyers; - each producer and each consumer during the corresponding production and trading period produces / consumes only one quantity (one instance of a certain form of goods.

Since we are dealing with spontaneous mass about their inherent intentions and capabilities. We also assume that implemented (as modified - businesses, then initially tested in a certain way and traditional) form of goods (socio-economic genetic genovariation) immediately "disappears" in the sphere of demand within the framework of the existing production and trading standards of practical knowledge, i.e. then, when no inverse effect is achieved on both the new and the traditional goods that are on the market (the process of cognition) and the level of practical knowledge they have around), their coordination cannot. The same applies to reproducing and inheriting forces (producers / consumers of rhenium and opportunities).

So who will repeat the production / purchase of a certain handicap of goods only in the next economic period, (for some time) within a certain production and trade simplification, we can assume that the implementation of a period of a modified form of goods on the market (a new niche of one or another form of goods), (corresponding to the social conditions that ensure the maximum permissible (on economic and economic heterotypically heterogeneous intentions — the frequency of approbation (the number of production / sales in a single socio-economic genovariation); (the r-frequency of inheritance (the number of sales per unit of time) of the economic-genovariation) any buyer who needs a product actually "encounters the traditional form of goods (of a traditional producer - for a product, for its producer / seller, and vice versa. A great deal of knowledge); of that, since we are dealing with massive and, moreover, verses of the notes of forces (pairs of producers representing exchange-inheritance by the market process, forces who have heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes, can "move" around the market in all possible directions of the consumer), a differentiated form of goods (a new form of productive knowledge) is dominant socio-economic and with the most different speeds. Applying the methods of a statistical genotype; the frequency of recessive subjects of analysis on the market, Maxwell proved that, no matter what the initial information was not inherent in separately acting subjects, a very short period of time would come in half equilibrium, in which the individual deviation of the information from the average, determined by the conditions of functioning with socio-economic genotypes.

It will exactly follow the law of (the law of normal distribution). Based on this and in accordance with the law of normal distribution, each of the presented industrial agents, regardless of their socioeconomic genotypic structure, has the same chance to produce / acquire the corresponding form of goods. In other words, following the Gauss law, the likelihood of a buyer colliding (exchanging inheritance) with the producer / the structure of the entire production community under study (as well as the producer / seller with the consumer) will

correspond to the expression of a different form of goods (the probability of being tested by a pair of social agents of that or any other socio-economic genovariation throughout the entire process of productive knowledge remains constant. In each production and trading period; the frequency of social agents realizing on the market combined forms of cognition (production / consumption of the corresponding forms of goods) and belonging to the hetero soon Then the exchange-inheritance frequencies by the forces of the corresponding socio-economic genovariations (forms of goods) on the market in within the framework of the production population under study will be determined by the formula: .

p - the frequency of approbation (the number of production / sales in a single allele) within the framework of a certain production and trading period of a modified form of goods on the market (new common economic genovariation);

r - the frequency of inheritance (the number of sales per unit time) of the traditional form of goods (traditional producer knowledge)

p^2 - the frequency of the active subjects (pair of productive/consumer) represented by the flow of inheritance-exchange in the modified form of the product (new form of productive knowledge) dominant by socio-economic genotype.

r^2 - the frequency of recessively active subjects on the market, reproduced in each productive- trading period of traditional form of product.

$2pr$ - the frequency of socio agents, on the realizing point of the market combined forms of licensing (the production /consumer of the correspondence product) and to the socio-economic genotype.

Therefore the frequency of inheritance-exchange genovariation (forms of product) on the market that is on the market in the faze of licensing of the whole production formula:

$$p + r = 1$$

Analyzed by socio-economic genotype building licensed by societal production will be the corresponding expression formula:

$$p^2 + 2pr + r^2 = 1$$

(forms of cognition). Then the equilibrium state of such a freely exchanging community of forces in the market at a certain point in time can determine the conditions of the tapes:

$$pr = g^2$$

This law, established by K. Pearson, can be called the law of stabilizing exchange. Briefly, this Pearson law (in genetics, the law of free crossbreeding, or, as it is also called, the law of stabilizing crossbreeding) can be formulated as follows: of this law implies extremely important for us free water: since for any values of p and r it is always possible to increase the number of homogeneous and heterogeneous parents such a value for to satisfy the equality pr, this means that freely exchanging leading to a formal structural analogy of the first crossbreeding within the community of equilibrium is revealing the nature and logic

of social phenomena (homogeneous), and recessive socio-economic the market we are creating under the accepted conditions for the formation of genotypes and implementing the corresponding forms of cognition and the development of productive practical knowledge (i.e. in case of inheritance of one or another. Thus, according to the conditions accepted by us, the presence of complete freedom of exchange is determined, in particular, by certain socially-environmental entities, of a product that corresponds to a certain market in the process of a productive practical form of the organization of knowledge, implemented by a set of functioning subjective entities representing various socio-economic genes and representing a single production set), in the complete absence of any kind of pressure, in the absence of any kind of socioeconomic approach to heterogeneous socioeconomic one (competition mechanism) for a rather long time of moss selection (competition mechanism), not only the classic Mendelian correlation is preserved among social agents, there are hardly any incentives to a change in their standard of living and, therefore, to some kind of 1: 2: 1 (externally manifested as 1: 3), but also the number of one groups of forces (producer / seller pairs the expected and inevitable transformation involved in the seller / consumer), representing a homogeneous genenote with (whether it is dominant or recessive) and supporting the corresponding form of cognition, may exceed the distinctly emerging individual socio-economic populations of another group, realizing a different form of cognition of innovations in our everyday life implemented by the economy 1, 2, 3 or more times, and yet this community will, in practice, only a few receive support from acting in a state of mobile equilibrium, if only Subsequently, the subjects that apply subsequently extend to the market condition, which determines the numerical ratio reproduced within the entire production population. The rest, by the forces of the forms of practical cognition will be fulfilled.

The process of its maintenance of productive forces and social. This is probably why of the vast number of cases in genetics the law was established by [K. Pearson Irson, 2010] and for a long time went unnoticed by virtue of the mastered and inaccessible to most geneticists which was first given to him. This law was reinstalled. In direct connection with the equilibrium of mobile equilibrium that has just been established, Aardi's other eyes are in 1908. In Russian, see [Hardy, 2000], and then for us, the law, also related to the state of equal equals, was once established in different formulations on the inside of a freely exchanged aggregate department of mathematical and genetic considerations. The state of equilibrium pours. Continuing to draw a formal structural analogy between processes related to natural science and processes that reveal the nature and logic of social phenomena, this Pearson law will be relevant for us, since in the market we are studying under the accepted conditions for the formation and development of productive practical knowledge (i.e.), under the existence of complete freedom of exchange – inheritance of one or another form of goods corresponding to a certain socio-economic genovariation, by acting entities belonging to a variety of single socio-economic genotypes and representing a single production set), i.e. in the absence of any type of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), social agents are unlikely to have any incentives to change their

standard of living and, therefore, to any forced and inevitable transformation of productive forces and social relations. This is probably precisely why, out of the huge number of randomly occurring single socio-economic genovariations in our everyday business practice, only a few receive support from existing entities and are distributed further on the market within the entire production population.

In genetics, the law was established by K. Pearson in 1904 (see [Pearson, 2010]) and for a long time went unnoticed due to the extremely abstract and inaccessible to most geneticists wording that was first given to him. This law was reinstalled by G. Hardy in 1908 (in Russian, see [Hardy, 2000]), and then several times was established in a different formulation on the basis of various mathematical and genetic considerations.

As a rule, they inevitably "dissolve" among "normally" functioning business practices implemented by social agents, inclined and ready to reproduce the familiar and more than once proven process of productive knowledge due to their inertia of their own reproduction at a familiar, stable level for themselves (at least at least, in certain areas of the production process they implement, the process of cognition). This is how the law of stabilizing exchange (the law of stabilizing crossing of K. Pearson) manifests itself in the public functioning environment. This law underlies the formation and maintenance of the conditions of simple reproduction. Thus, no matter how disturbed the equilibrium state of a freely exchanging set of forces is from the outside, seeking to realize on the market its inherent socio-economic genotypically determined patterns of economic behavior as a result of the first free exchange – inheritance of a certain form of socio-economic genovariation (we will call it stabilizing exchange) a new state of mobile equilibrium is established inside it, in which a given community of social agents will be to abide until some external force takes it out of this state again. Turning again to genetic designations, one can formulate this law as follows. If there is some freely exchanging set of forces

$$xAA + 2yAa + zaa$$

,

xAA - the number of social agents (both producers / sellers and buyers / consumers representing this production set) that belong to the dominant homogeneous socio-economic genotype and implement the corresponding form of cognition;

zaa - the number of forces representing a recessive homogeneous socio-economic genotype and phenotype exchanging – inheriting a certain form of socio-economic genovariation within the current production population;

xzAa - the number of active agents belonging to heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes and reproducing a certain productive knowledge in the process of cognition implemented on the market.

Derived from the state of mobile equilibrium, i.e. where as

$$xz \neq y2$$

, then as a result of the first stabilizing exchange – inheritance of practical knowledge on the market, the corresponding numbers of social agents be-

long to both homogeneous (homogeneous) and heterogeneous (combined) socio-economic genotypes and implement the corresponding forms of socio-economic genovariations both as producers / sellers and buyers / consumers, they are expressed by the formula.

$$x1^2AA + 2x1z1Aa + z1^2aa$$

so that , and our set of forces will be able to and rolling equilibrium (according to Hardy's law). So, the mechanism that stabilizes the number of entities operating on the market (both sellers and buyers), representing diverse socioeconomic genotypes and seeking reproduction corresponding to their socioeconomic genotypically determined intentions, is laid in the very mechanism of free exchange and the possibilities of forms of productive practical knowledge. Any change in the ratio of these numbers (respectively, socio-economic genovariations) is possible only from the outside and only as long as the external force acts that violates this balance. Of these external forces, in this paper we will focus only on two: socio-economic selection in the broadest sense of the word and the emergence of "new" socio-economic genotypically determined changes, innovations (socio-economic genovariations). We will move on to investigating the role of these latter under conditions of complete free exchange – inheritance of practical knowledge. The next chapter will be devoted to an analysis of the role of socio-economic selection in the process of industrial evolution. In sociogenetics in accordance with the Hardy – Weinberg formula.

In chapter I it was shown that there is absolutely no reason to deny the existence in our everyday business practice of a continuous process of the emergence of new socio-economic genovariations. All economic experience shows that the number of emerging neoplasms seems to be so far growing, and some of the socio-economic genovariations in some cases tend to reoccur with a certain frequency. In other cases, the same practical knowledge (its specific "bit") during the exchange – inheritance changes differently, while giving many possible options for one's own transformation (modification of value forms, recombination of knowledge components). The vast majority of these innovations arose once and the stream of these time-tested changes, single "deviations" has not yet seen any limits. What is the fate of these singularly emerging socio-economic genovariations in the course of a jointly implemented act of exchange – inheritance (production / consumption of practical knowledge) by the forces? Are they really destined to disappear without a trace from our economic life, having "dissolved" in the sea of "normally" functioning social agents, without affecting the further fate of the socially productive whole, the process of evolution of production? We begin the analysis by taking as the basis the previously formulated preconditions for the functioning of the market (the invariable price of the circulating goods, its indispensability, the stability of its use value, the participation of only direct producers and consumers, the acquisition of one copy of the goods) with the clarification and simplification that it initially only one traditional form of goods is produced / acquired in conditions of complete freedom of exchange (the absence of any socio-economic selection). In this case,

let us suppose the sudden appearance in this market, as often happens, of a recessive heterogeneous socio-economic genovariation (structure: Aa) as a result of its testing by a pair of social agents. Since it is the level of practical knowledge that determines the time that is necessary for the realization of a new opportunity, and then agents (manufacturer / seller and buyer / consumer). In other words, an alternative to a traditionally circulating product (a form of knowledge) will be offered on the market, which, under certain conditions, will be able to provide it with a replacement within the framework of the current production set of social agents. Consequently, the use value circulating on the market (as well as the labor costs for its appearance) will undergo changes as a result of testing the new socio-economic genovariation by certain forces. The metamorphosis T – D D – T will be transformed not only quantitatively, since the very structure of a certain form of productive practical knowledge will be transformed and the economic result obtained on its basis, the amount of labor that must be spent on the production, sale, purchase, consumption of a given product, i.e. to complete this transaction during this time by interacting social agents belonging to different socio-economic genotypes, promoting their use value and their specific features of its creation. Based on the premise of accumulation and preservation of one's own economic experience by the acting entity, it is obvious that new socio-economic genovariation (new practical knowledge) always arises in a heterogeneous state as a result of "laying down" on previously tested practical experience (productive practical knowledge). Because of this, two or more identical socioeconomic genovariations realized within the same production set by the forces can occur either after the repeated emergence of identical socioeconomic genovariations during their distribution – inheritance — the phenomenon is quite natural and, undoubtedly, existing in our economic life, or in the accumulation, preservation of them in society in the form of once applied-recessive (subordinate to a given public organization) economic experience previously acquired by existing agents. Therefore, a new socioeconomic genovariation that has arisen in a heterogeneous (combined on the basis of acquired and previously acquired knowledge) state can be reproduced again by the social agents that received it and, due to the effect of free exchange, it is likely to be used by them when interacting with other economic entities representing or other socio-economic genotype. During the development of production and as a result of this act of exchange – inheritance of this practical knowledge, the interacting entities implementing it will gain new experience and thereby have an impact on the socio-economic genotypic structure but its ideological content will change qualitatively. What will be the fate of productive knowledge arising in this way? The emergence of such socio-economic genovariation will upset the state of equilibrium in which community, and its subsequent development. Consider, for example, the case where an agent who has tested this practical knowledge will interact with a dominant homogeneous socio-economic genotype (structure: Aa AA). As a result, the recessive socioeconomic genovariation presented for inheritance by a heterogeneous social agent will be absorbed, and the dominant homogeneous socioeconomic genotype, as well as the existing subject representing a heterogeneous genotype that offers new practical knowledge for

inheritance exchange, will continue to exhibit economic behavior corresponding to the prevailing, accepted by most social agents at a given time model of economic behavior in society. As a result of this interaction, the proven heterogeneous socio-economic genovariation will go into a recessive state and will be stored in the bowels of the socially-productive whole. It is this case that we will consider in the future. There may also be the option of acquiring new experience with a heterogeneous dominant socio-economic genotype (socio-economic genotypic structure of cognition: Aa Aa). In this case, in the conditions of free exchange and the absence of a socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), the previous dominant economic behavior will also be restored in the future. Although, under certain conditions, a homogeneous recessive combination may also occur during the interaction of this heterogeneous genotype and a homogeneous recessive genotype (structure: Aa aa). This will provide the basis for modifying the existing production, since the agents who tested it will show their socio-economic genotypically determined nature and logic of management, and practical knowledge in this form will begin to acquire chances for its further dissemination. The third case: when during the exchange – inheritance of this socio-economic genovariation (new productive practical knowledge) social agents interact who have heterogeneous economic experience and belong to the recessive socio-economic genotype (Aa Aa structure). As a result of such a transaction, practical knowledge will retain its recessive state. Cases of categorical refusal by social agents to carry out similar activities at a certain stage of their management due to their belonging to disparate socio-economic genotypes are also possible in economic practice.

Of this moment, a freely exchanging production set of forces. If the action of this neoplasm is not immediately eliminated by the competition mechanism (and we initially accepted the absence of pressure of any kind of selection) due to its lesser social significance at this stage of its existence or a simple case, then it will be involved (inherited), will enter into interaction with traditionally operating, i.e. belonging to the dominant homogeneous socio-economic genotype (structure: AA), social agents. Moreover, on the basis of the law of stabilizing exchange, in the next production and trading period, the state of mobile equilibrium will be restored again due to the absorption of recessive socio-economic genovariation by the dominant form of cognition, and recessive productive practical knowledge (neoplasm) will turn into a heterogeneous state (structure: Aa) and will be accumulated and stored by the forces who initially tested it. The metamorphosis of the transformation of the value T D - D T traditionally operating in the transaction process will again dominate the market outwardly. Assuming that a couple who initially tested this practical knowledge of social agents (structure: a A) with an unchanged number of forces operating on the market (this condition was also accepted by us initially), the acquired experience, it should be concluded that the composition of the economic population will include two operating entities that externally demonstrate typical (currently dominant in the context of the production population under consideration) economic behavior, but at the same time having different, different from the generally accepted heterogeneous experience, stored and accumulated

them, containing new opportunities for extracting added value in the form of a new combination of available elements of practical knowledge (its “bits”). Then, due to the onset of the state of mobile equilibrium due to the "absorption" by traditionally acting social agents of new productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation), this structure of the process of cognition in the market will continue from one production and trading period to another. As already mentioned, this is due primarily to the fact that in the conditions of complete freedom of exchange – inheritance of practical knowledge, the absence of any kind of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), the conservatism of the existing productive forces and all social relations, as well as existing and the dominant types, methods, methods and forms of production are preserved here by the elemental inertia inherent in the whole living tendency to reproduce itself in constant forms and scales. Because of this, within the framework of this production set, the market will tend to be dominated not by accelerating the development process and dynamically increasing the level of labor productivity (practical knowledge), but by the desire for “simple” reproduction on a stable and externally unchanged basis. A small and simple calculation shows that in these circumstances, the probability of the meeting of two such heterogeneous social agents, as a result of which the initially tested socio-economic genovariation (its heterogeneous recessive form Aa) could occur again, the previously tested and preserved “original” form of it could be re-reproduced, equal to 1 divided by a reduced unit of the number of all social agents operating in the market under the economic conditions that we have adopted. Translating into the language of symbols and taking the number of forces on the market equal to $N + 1$ (of which 1 social agent belonging to a homogeneous socio-economic genotype, and 2 forces representing a heterogeneous socio-economic genotype), we can (p) meet and the reproduction of the “original” form of productive practical knowledge by social agents belonging to a heterogeneous socio-economic genotype, expressed by the equality

$$p = \frac{1}{N}.$$

This equality means that in N successively implemented acts of free exchange – inheritance of a given social agent of economic economic genovariation by the corresponding pairs of forces, one such meeting of social agents acting in this way can occur, as a result of which, within a certain production and trading period, the initial form of productive knowledge will be obtained again. Let us present a concrete example to illustrate. We also take as a basis the previously accepted premises: the functioning of the market for traditional goods, represented by a set of forces belonging to diverse social and economic genotypes, in conditions of complete freedom of exchange and the absence of social and economic selection. Just as before, suppose that in our market at the present time, 1,000,000 + 1 social agents are operating within this production population. Suppose that among them suddenly a producer / seller and a buyer / consumer (belonging to a heterogeneous socio-economic genotype) appeared, who, in a certain case, tested new practical knowledge (capable, in their opinion,

of not only offering new conditions for reimbursing incurred for their production / the acquisition of costs, presented in the value of the product / service they produce / sell and buy, but also guarantee a certain bonus to the standard rate traditionally obtained in this market was), which will be in natural functioning market recessive character. If these social agents will again be capable and ready to participate in economic life in the next economic period (and we have accepted the invariability of the number of forces in the market as one of the prerequisites), then in conditions of complete freedom of exchange and the absence of pressure of any kind of selection, they most likely, they will interact with "normally" (traditionally) functioning agents (in accordance with generally accepted "norms" of economic behavior). Consequently, in this economic period, the state of mobile equilibrium in the market will again be restored. This will be expressed in the fact that in the total mass of traditionally functioning forces of the considered production population from one production or procedure and trading period in another a pair of forces will remain who have acquired and accumulated heterogeneous economic experience (in the form of proven productive knowledge that they store and which they are capable and ready, under favorable circumstances, to apply in their economic practice), but externally demonstrate economic behavior that is quite consistent generally accepted at this point in time "norms" of management, i.e. "Openly" no different from traditionally acting entities, neither in terms of the consumer evaluation they demonstrate of the goods / services offered for circulation, nor in the methods, methods and forms of its production / sale and consumption. The probability that this heterogeneous pair of business entities in conditions of ideal freedom of exchange will meet again in a spontaneously functioning market and will be able to disseminate (i.e., inherit to other forces) new productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{1000000}.$$

That is, it is possible to count on the re-manifestation of the neoplasm that they previously tested and saved as a result of the recombination of the components of practical knowledge once among 1,000,000 that are consistently carried out in the process of practical cognition by the forces on the market of socio-economic events (acts of exchange – inheritance). Practically speaking, the probability of such an event is completely negligible, and in fact, our innovation will be absorbed ("absorbed") by free exchange in the process of interaction between traditionally functioning social agents. But her fate will still be completely different than it seems to our evolutionists. This neoplasm will not die, will not dissolve in the mass of normally acting agents. It will exist in a heterogeneous state in the form of once acquired, saved and accumulated economic experience by the social agents that tested it from one economic period to another, remaining hidden from views, but in the form of a certain hereditary socio-economic genotype. The above considerations provide an opportunity to look deeper and more clearly into the socio-economic genetic system the expression of a freely exchanging socially productive whole. How much is our production (any type

of production activity) homogeneous in socioeconomic and genotypic characteristics? And if we still allow a certain proportion of its heterogeneity, then how can we explain in this case the constancy, uniformity and predictability of economic behavior demonstrated by social agents in everyday spontaneously organized economic practice, which they differ in such a characteristic way from purposefully implemented innovative activity in the conditions of “laboratory education"? We just saw that each newly emerging innovation is absorbed by the bulk of traditionally acting forces, but it does not disappear from economic life and persists and accumulates in the heterogeneous state in the interior of the community. In chapter I it was shown that the process of the emergence of new socio-economic genovariations.

As you know, the focused work on the search, testing and implementation of innovations in the laboratory is reduced to the systematic activity of the managerial staff in the design of the necessary work and the monitoring of their implementation, which implies a certain, pre-determined education of the thinking and behavior of employees involved in or another section of the ongoing production process. This, in turn, implies the acquisition, accumulation and reproduction by performers of similar knowledge, skills and abilities necessary for the implementation of the delegated and assigned functions in strict accordance with the specified parameters for the timely receipt in full of the final result. As a result of a similarly organized division of labor and forms of cooperation, which determine the possibility and necessity of specializing activities, many existing socio-economic genotypic differences (often subtle) that are inevitably inherent in these economic entities (both managers and managed) are becoming more and more characteristic of all more like individuals involved. Thus, the initial production set of interacting entities is gradually divided by functionally specialized features into an increasing number of professionally organized groups that are different from each other, and all this production activity as a whole takes on a different character over time. The situation is completely different with free exchange. Should not be considered by us as a random, transient phenomenon, but as a regular phenomenon, although spontaneously arising, with a constant set of forces that determine this probability, i.e. as quite normal, natural. Thus, in repeated cases of such an accidental occurrence of new socio-economic genovariations, they will again and again be absorbed by the bulk of traditionally functioning social agents, and at the same time a new phenomenon arises that makes it possible to come back to some interesting questions that reveal the nature and logic of industrial evolution. Suppose that there is some freely exchanged set of forces from N + 1 social agents. The probability of manifestation again among her (due to the meeting of heterogeneous forces among themselves) of the previously arisen and saved by them socio-economic genovariation Aa, as was shown, is equal to 1 N, which for significant N is negligible. But let us imagine that in the same production set of forces there is another independent single socio-economic genovariation - Bb, which also goes into a heterogeneous state and is also stored by the social agents that tested it. The probability of its secondary manifestation due to the recombination of the components of the implemented productive knowledge will also be 1 N.

For the third genovariation (Cc), the probability is the same as for the fourth (Dd) and fifth (Ee) genovariations, etc. After all, the process of productive practical knowledge is continuous and always quite concrete, due to which no consumer value, like exchange value, can be eternal and constant. These deviations are inevitable, socially and socio-economically genotypically determined and necessary. All these random socio-economic genovariations, arising among the "normally" functioning social.

Those deviations that are random and transient in nature, i.e. they are not exposed to the storage and accumulation of forces who have tested them, and therefore are not involved in the formation and development of sustainable forms of management, we are not interested.

But of the production whole, they are transferred under the conditions of freedom of their exchange – inheritance into a heterogeneous state and are thus absorbed, absorbed by it, stored inside it in the form of forms of cognition separately tested by certain forces. As a result, we come to the conclusion that a certain type of production, implemented by the production set of forces, like a sponge "absorbs" socioeconomic genovariations that are heterogeneous, while remaining at the same time externally (phenotypically) homogeneous. The probability of meeting $[\frac{1}{N}]$ of two social agents (producer / seller and buyer / consumer, jointly creating a new value and belonging to the corresponding heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes), with the more or less large number of the studied production population of subjects interacting on the market (N) so it's small, that practically it can be ignored. But with the successive occurrences of new individual socio-economic genovariations independently tested by certain pairs of social agents (independent of each other), the probability of the appearance and manifestation of any of them will obviously become more and more determined by the law of summing up the probabilities of independent, equally possible and compatible flows (by counting cases). So, with two previously saved socio-economic genovariations stored, and therefore hidden from the public assessment, the probability of the secondary manifestation of any of them will be almost 2 times higher:

$$p = \frac{2}{N} - \frac{1}{N^2}$$

With three socio-economic genovariations, it will be equal to $\frac{3}{N} - [\frac{2}{N^2} - \frac{1}{N^3}]$ For m absorbed by a "normally" functioning production set of existing forces of innovations arising in the market, the probability (p) of the manifestation of any of them due to n free exchange / inheritance recombination is expressed by the formula

$$p = 1 - (\frac{N-1}{N})^m$$

moreover, the exponent m, equal to the number of possible drains, i.e. the number of socioeconomic genovariations that arose and absorbed (absorbed) by the production population, obviously, can increase ultimately. It is clear that with an increase in the number m this probability may turn out to be very large, and this production set of social agents, as well as the process of managing them

(the process of cognition), will reveal one or the other of the neoplasms contained in it. Here we come to another very important and interesting question. It has just been shown that the production set of operating entities constantly "absorbs" into itself, in the process of implementing a certain type of production, retaining and accumulating, in the form of a certain economic experience, more and more new socio-economic genovariations. Moreover, she always remains outwardly of the same type, i.e. functioning in full compliance with the current "norm"

Management - the well-known socially necessary amount of labor, which determines the average costs required for the product / service / impression produced and sold on their basis to actually realize their product function (to ensure the exchange – inheritance process of the corresponding form of practical knowledge). However, as more and more such hidden socio-economic genovariations accumulate within a given aggregate, more often one or the other of them will be externally detected in their original form (in a heterogeneous state), and this will lead to the appearance of this production and, accordingly, all the socio-production whole we are considering will begin to demonstrate.

The increasing socioeconomic genotypic variability. Thus, an idea is created that is opposite to the existing opinion about the relationship between the "age" of production, the duration of the process of practical knowledge and its variability. It is generally accepted that in the initial phase of its formation social relations have not yet been established, the main characteristics of the productive forces and production relations that can ensure its long-term dynamics in the future are only being formed, and therefore at this stage of its formation there is a strong discrepancy in the intentions and possibilities that realize it forces The entire socio-industrial whole has a large degree of variability and instability, which, according to some researchers, creates the corresponding prerequisites for testing and introducing innovations at this stage of its existence. Only gradually, as the new dominant forces are identified and approved on the basis of these innovations in the development – aging process of production, the goals and means of managing existing entities are fixed, spread more and more during the exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genovariation data and are "inherited". This production set of social agents becomes stable, outwardly homogeneous (homogeneous). It acquires monomorphism and the production process it realizes, the process of productive practical knowledge.

It must be emphasized here that we are talking exclusively about socio-economic genotypic hereditary variation, i.e. variability initiated and implemented by interacting agents during a joint long process of productive practical knowledge. The variability of economic behavior (fluctuating variability) as a reaction of forces to the impact of various external conditions is subject to slightly different laws. This variability is a manifestation of some reactive sensitivity of social agents, and therefore is not directly related either to hereditary variability realized in the process of productive practical knowledge, or to the problem of evolution and speciation of a socially productive whole.

In reality, as we have seen, the situation is most likely quite the opposite. The older the socio-industrial whole (the process of cognition), the more it is

tested and accumulated, the socio-economic genovariations are stored inside it, the more often one or the other of them is found in its original state (they are manifested in practice in a heterogeneous pure form during exchange – inheritance by the corresponding social agents), the more this given social-industrial formation becomes externally socio-economic genotypically hereditary-variable, demonstrating the very different figurative signs of industrial cooperation, i.e. economic polyformism. Generally speaking, if all other conditions are equal, socio-economic genotypic variability grows in proportion to the "age" of production, the process of cognition realized by a certain production set of forces. Analyzing the genotypic structure of a freely exchanging production set of social agents, we also touched on another very important issue, namely, the question of the significance of the size of this set for the manifestation of its socio-economic genotypic variability. Here we are dealing with two opposite trends: on the one hand, the larger the production set of forces, the more chances she has for innovations (genovariations) to arise in her. Thus, the emergence of socio-economic variability is directly proportional to the number of social agents that form a freely interacting socio-productive whole. On the other hand, the smaller the production population (i.e., the smaller the N value), the greater the likelihood of the manifestation in it in its original (heterogeneous) form of socio-economic genovariations absorbed (accumulated and stored) by it earlier. In other words, the incidence of innovations about.

It is inversely proportional to the number of social agents belonging to this population and representing a certain area of production (the corresponding process of testing, accumulating and reproducing productive practical knowledge).

In practice, both of these conditions are usually mutually balancing each other, and what is lost in small production units (in the corresponding types of economic activity realized by them) is rare (in this case, it is necessary to understand not absolute rarity (frequency), but relative rarity (frequency)) the emergence of socio-economic genovariations, then they are won at the frequency of manifestations of the changes absorbed and stored by them previously tested, and vice versa. But in some cases, this equilibrium is violated, namely, when, for one reason or another, freedom of exchange-inheritance of productive practical knowledge that is realized within the given production community is violated. If we imagine that the total number N in the process of this productive practical knowledge was divided into a number of isolated, "local", production formations, then the frequency of the emergence of new socio-economic genovariations within the entire production set of forces in question will not be affected, but the probability of manifestation again, each of such tumors previously tested and stored by it will be significantly increased depending on the smaller number (n) of that locale area of production, within which it arose. Thus, we come to a more in-depth understanding of the enormous role played by the factor of isolation (localization) in the emergence of visible socio-economic genotypically determined variability. At first glance, it may seem that the fact of localization, taken in its purest form, cannot play any role in the process of production evolution. No matter how we isolate the equal, it will always remain

equal. But the whole point is that the socio-industrial whole, as shown above, within itself represents an unlimited variety of socio-economic genotypically determined combinations of the forces of production involved (tested, accumulated socio-economic genovariations), and each such isolation immediately creates it contains conditions that are exceptionally favorable for manifestation in the process of free exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genotypically determined changes, or it's already significant to those who incite it before the onset of isolation (localization) (in case of their uneven initial distribution), or that have arisen after the isolation of individual local socio-economic entities that do not directly interact with each other (areas of productive knowledge). Consequently, isolation (localization) completely automatically leads to the differentiation of the process of productive knowledge both within its individual species and in the whole of social production as a whole. Moreover, the social agents operating within the framework of separate economic entities, local production aggregates of a single social production whole begin to discover over time different (compared to traditionally operating in society) nature of their performance of certain types of work and demonstrate their demand dynamics (i.e. show their inherent socio-economic genotypic diversity of their own intentions and capabilities). This phenomenon can be caught both by a direct study of the inheritance of socio-economic genovariations) during expert observations of their testing, and by econometric consideration of their average values and the size of their variability. So, isolation (localization) in the process of continuous accumulation of socio-economic genovariations (new productive practical knowledge) becomes in itself the reason for the intraspecific (and hence further on interspecific) differentiation of the production process, practical knowledge, giving rise to the transformation of the entire system of the social section - knowledge labor. Of all the forces causing the disintegration (functional decomposition) of a certain production into separate, independently operating production aggregates of social agents, spatial and territorial isolation, of course, must be put in the first place as the most powerful and most common factor of intraspecific differentiation of production, the process of practical cognition. A huge number of examples of the influence of spatial "localization" on the evolution of social reproduction leadership, which determines the accumulation and identification of new knowledge in the context of socio-economic genotypic variability, demonstrated by the production set of forces, is the best illustration and proof of the power of this separating and differentiating factor. So, a small store run by a local entrepreneur is the main form of retail organization in India and many other emerging markets in Asia, South America and Africa. There are more than 200 thousand of such points in India's grocery trading sector alone. On the one hand, these stores, in modern business conditions, represent a potentially huge market for the use of high-tech automation tools to track billions of small trade transactions. However, on the other hand, these same stores are a serious problem for modern information technology companies due to the specific difficulties that their owners face due to the socio-economic genotypic features of the functioning of these regional markets. In the United States, in the context of functioning (spatially separate) American trade, firms such as

IBM have long been offering point-of-sale (POS) systems, which is why there are often traditional POS systems based on personal computers customized for retail trade. However, the cost of a fully equipped POS system for one retail outlet may exceed 3,000$. It's too expensive for budding retailers. The more modest versions of POS, such as the electronic cash registers from NCR and Omron, perform basic functions such as invoicing for amounts less than 1,000$. Stores with annual sales in excess of 30,000$can afford the POS system, but only less than 4% of retail outlets have it in India. Therefore, most traditional POS systems designed for a typically American-style retail environment — a department store or a self-service grocery store with higher prices, limited assortment, and extended working hours — are not applicable within the Indian community. The concept of value for the Indian store owner, as well as for his buyers, is not consistent with the values of the American community, embodied in POS systems.

To enter the Indian market, TVS Electronics was forced to make an attempt to "dismantle" the existing experience of Indian store owners (as well as their own) in order to establish mutually beneficial business contacts by developing a unique solution for local application, taking into account the established business traditions. To begin with, the company "plunged" its employees into the Indian retail environment so that they could get acquainted with the experience of doing business in India and the behavior of local consumers. They discovered a special world, very different from the US retail world. Many Indian stores are tiny, dusty, noisy, jam-packed with shoppers. The store owner himself often stands behind the counter, too narrow to install a traditional POS system on it. The voltage in the power supply fluctuates throughout the day. Many products do not have packaging and barcodes.

Employees, as a rule, are technically illiterate, speak several dialects and adhere to idiosyncratic business standards. TVS has begun working with grocers and shoppers to jointly create a new sustainable system focused on the realities of Indian retail. The company has developed software and hardware for local use, based on the principle of intuitiveness. For example, goods sold more often than others become more accessible due to the fact that the hierarchy of product categories in the system reflects a cognitive approach and uses the user's language. The TVS system keeps track of certain favorite items right down to the rice or lentil variety and helps the owner remind customers of products that they have not noticed. It prints the invoice in the customer's language, making it easier for him to financially plan, and for the grocer, making efficient deliveries. The printer and power supply are combined into one device, almost insensitive to dust, voltage fluctuations and inept handling. These opportunities create an incentive price-experience ratio: access to a situation in which a unique experience is formed for a given retail region,dubbed "e-shop", the testing of which costs 30$. per month.

This example shows and proves that the direction and intensity of the development of the production process (the process of productive knowledge) is determined and limited by the current socio-economic genotypic environment of functioning, with the inevitability of leading to the beginning of intraspecific

differentiation of production activity under the influence of spatial localization. But in no case should it be assumed that the territorial isolation (localization) of productive forces and production relations in society is an exceptional factor of intraspecific production differentiation. At the current level of productive practical knowledge that we have reached, other forms of isolation that lead to the same results — images, can be measured immeasurably less often the knowledge and functioning of separate, "locally" functioning production communities of social agents testing their unique business experience. So, undoubtedly, there is a separation of the production process in time, i.e. the breakdown of the process of productive practical knowledge into a number of time periods of its functioning, leading to the formation of local production aggregates of forces, coexisting with each other in the same geographical region, but isolated from each other due to the mismatch between the periods of testing and inheritance of productive practical knowledge within each of them. The best evidence of the presence of this factor in economic practice is the tendency of a certain part of producers and consumers to jointly acquire economic experience in modern conditions due to the timely coordination of their own intentions and opportunities for economic development, contributing to the reduction or expansion of the period of production they realize, the process of cognition. This allows some forces to more effectively carry out the exchange - the inheritance of practical knowledge in the area of businesses they form due to the timely manifestation of a new socio-economic genovariation under the influence of such a temporary "isolation". Thus, customers of General Electric Plastics take on a substantial part of the task of developing specific plastics for specific applications. By providing its customers access to tools and materials, the company shifts work and risks to them. If the process is successful, both parties benefit. A firm saves development time and is subject to lower risks, while consumers get what they need faster and with more accuracy. At the same time, other agents present in this market are still inclined to adhere to their traditionally used business models. As similar examples show, these individual, isolated in time socio-economic communities of social agents, differing in the moment of their participation in a particular production process, differ in average value of a number of signs of industrial cooperation and some other small and not quite stable features. Using the achievements of modern sociogenetics, we have the opportunity with a very high degree of probability to attribute each actor to one or another specific socio-economic genotype according to the model of economic behavior he demonstrates and on this basis to find the most effective forms of their cooperation. The experience of the Cemex company operating in the traditional industry of the production of building materials - cement, is similar to this example of the mechanism of the "localization" of economic activity "in time". Consumers in this industry (builders and contrforces) require supplies to be made regularly and at exactly the right time. But almost half of these consumers can expect a change in the terms of the order, and most likely, shortly before the time of the originally planned delivery. In such circumstances, relying on the forecast hardly makes sense, and a company like Cemex is not able to influence the work process and the behavior of its customers in any way.

The main difficulty is the inability to respond quickly to changing demand. To solve this problem, Cemex had to revise the principles of its work in the direction of "expanding" its own production period to provide more flexible services to its customers. Having gained the necessary experience, the company was able to become more susceptible to external requests, while continuing to make mandatory and timely deliveries of cement. In order to achieve this goal, Cemex invested in Cemex Net, a satellite communications system that integrates all of the company's cement plants and coordinates their work in a timely manner. Then they installed a logistics system that uses GPS technology (satellite navigation system) and on-board computers that communicate with cement trucks and coordinate their movement. Like FedEx, the system provides transparency of its operations, allowing dispatchers to monitor the location and direction of movement of each cement truck and receive information about weather, traffic jams on the highway, the location of customers and their inventory. Result: you can quickly change the routes of cement trucks and coordinate orders, production and deliveries, thereby responding to momentary changes in customer needs.

On the Cemex online portal, its suppliers, distributors and customers can check the status of the order and make changes to it until delivery. Customers also have the opportunity to refine specifications such as color, strength, texture and elasticity, which are extremely important for the use of finished cement mixtures. Cemex managers and consumers have access to real-time information, which is fundamental to a company's ability to respond quickly to changing circumstances. An example of isolation over time in modern business conditions is also the behavior of social agents initiating a change in the configuration and context of traditionally operating production systems, supply chains and logistics around consumer interaction points, thereby proving once again the spontaneous nature and logic of the emergence of new knowledge in economic practice. So, Honda has invested in flexible global production. Each company is able to manufacture several car models and easily switch from the manufacture of one model to another, thanks to the use of robots with software.

It eliminates the need costly and time-consuming re-equipment required before a new model entered production. Meanwhile, Toyota, a competitor to Honda, contrary to all the rules, began to take orders on the website and supply custom cars within a week. Finally, it is necessary to take into account the possibility of existence and social isolation (and, as a consequence, the class division of society), when a certain production process and the entire social-production whole break up into separate economic entities that represent heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes that function in the same a geographic niche that interacts at the same time, but is isolated from each other in the course of their fulfillment of those socially significant roles that are provided to them about ETS at this stage of their development. So, to the work of the mechanism of localization of this type in the field of separation of production, we probably need, first of all, to include those cases where its key participants successfully use regulatory documents (for example, patents that protect the products / services of a particular production area carried out by them), as well as professional

ethics in the form of self-regulation of professional associations (staff training, licensing, accreditation, etc.) in order to create barriers for other members of the community to enter the market and thus secure a dominant position in the current socio-economic genotypic environment of functioning. Probably, all the well-known “failures” of the market of this kind (as well as the “failures” of the state) can be attributed to the work of this particular localizing factor. The functioning of these professional communities as the social division of labor during the testing, accumulation and dissemination of practical knowledge leads to the allocation in the current social structure of a whole social layer that has its own needs, due to the social role that this layer plays in society, and therefore foreign to the rest of the population. To meet these specific needs, a whole social class of professions (special branches of production) begins to differentiate, whose representatives are more and more detached.

They are transformed into a special category of producers, transforming the nature of their labor, supporting and affirming their own production process, a process of practical cognition inherent only to them. However, the possibility of manifestation of such localization within the limits of traditionally functioning markets, defined by us as the meeting place of the producer / seller with the buyer / consumer, is not excluded. This happens when individual forces, belonging to heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes and included in a single economic population, react to varying degrees (due to their socio-economic genotypically determined intentions and capabilities) to certain external conditions they encounter in the appearance of a particular tumor appearing on the market. That is, when new values “thrown out” on the border of their own existence still have to acquire socially significant status. It is in this “borderline” zone, since it is not a simple mechanical barrier to the further dissemination of practical knowledge proposed by a certain part of social agents, the most intense struggle between the forces for their own existence (for the development and retention of the vital socio-economic space, obtaining the necessary resources). There is no doubt that social agents (representing both the sphere of production and consumption) under these conditions will react differently to the obstacle they encounter in the form of a proposed new habitat. Some of them will go further, trying to test and disseminate new knowledge in society and, accordingly, create the basis for the modification of existing models of economic behavior and subsequent production speciation. And the rest of the social agents of this production population,belonging to other socio-economic genotypic entities, will evaluate this socio-economic genovariation as not so favorable and significant for itself, and therefore will stop earlier in the process of practical cognition, not passing over the barrier encountered in the form of new knowledge and remaining committed for now still prevailing "norm" of economic behavior in society. The transition to a new knowledge space is a difficult task for this group of forces and requires overcoming the existing “vision” of their own economic development. For the most part, such social agents lack appropriate incentives to acquire the necessary practical experience to establish and maintain effective business contacts on a "new" qualitative basis. The same part of social agents, which turned out to be more inquisitive, persistent and persistent in the pro-

cess of practical cognition and development of a new production space, going beyond the restrictions that are created by the dominant economic conditions in society, will be isolated in this borderline area of management (the area of dissemination of new knowledge) from of the rest of the mass of the economic population and will give rise to a new, separately functioning socio-economic formation, which will not be penetrated traditionally forces. Confirmation of this phenomenon, in particular, we find in the existing market commitment of certain consumers to certain communities of manufacturers / suppliers (as well as workers - to their company, etc.), even if they are not completely satisfied with the results (conditions) of their work. The limits upon reaching which consumers realize the advisability of changing the producer / supplier (workers - their place of work) can vary in the widest range. A good illustration of this is the same process of joint creation of value by the producer and the consumer, during which a very significant transformation of the social roles traditionally realized by them takes place. Such, for example, is the development experience of Linux, an open standard operating system that competes with Windows. Like Windows, Linux is constantly evolving as new features and applications are developed. But, unlike Windows, Linux is constantly improving as a result of joint efforts in the process of knowing independent programmers and users who are not controlled by anyone from above. Everyone can take part in the development of the system, observing certain rules and formalities.

The software code is maintained at a transparent and easily accessible level within this local community. Checking it is the responsibility of the expert group. The Linux community accepts any enhancements only after they have been tested and approved by an expert team. These simple formalities allow the community to reliably control their own work. But still it is still not known exactly what proportion of similarly formed economic conditions is truly hereditary (if such a share exists at all), i.e. tested and accumulated by social agents in the process of their long-term exchange – inheritance of productive practical knowledge, and which is simply a reaction to those external changes in which their economic development takes place. But be that as it may, all these forces are as if external to the acting agents and only matter insofar as they do not encounter any opposition on their part. The influence of spatial localization contributes to the supply of evolutionary material in the form of new practical knowledge, which, in turn, during the course of its manifestation within the framework of a certain geographically separate production set of forces, initiates the activation of their productive forces and production relations in society at a qualitatively new level. Separation in time creates the conditions for testing a new and / or identifying previously accumulated and saved by a certain set of social agents of socio-economic genovariation through the formation and maintenance of their own periods of production and trade interactions, providing new opportunities for establishing timely and mutually beneficial business contacts. Finally, the work of social localization predetermines the wide adaptability of forces, creating the basis for a more multifaceted and comprehensive demonstration of their socio-economic genotypically determined intentions and opportunities, their industrial polyphony and polyformism.

As a result of the action of all external and internal forces, a state of mobile equilibrium is reached, which determines one or another degree of freedom of exchange – inheritance the process of cognition characteristic of each production set of forces in the framework of the formed socio-economic genotypic environment of its functioning. Than forcesseparating forces are, the more variability is observed within a particular production area, the field of practical knowledge, the more often in certain economic formations of social agents the socioeconomic genotypically conditioned differentiation of their production activities, their differentiation, should be manifested goals and means of management.

Thus, it can be established that, ceteris paribus, the degree of differentiation within the social production whole is directly proportional to the degree of isolation of its individual parts. In its purest form at the level of the world economic system as a whole, the above law is expressed, in particular, in those existing typologies of socio-economic systems (liberal, state capitalism, socio-market, etc.) that are based on a different ratio of social-state and private-market principles. At the micro level, this law is most evident in the development and maintenance of numerous subcultures within the framework of locally functioning production and consumer communities. But the very same results are obtained when we start a detailed study of the variability of the process of practical cognition, implemented by forces who have extremely weak ability and willingness to transform traditionally operating production, the process of cognition: its philosophy, principles and priorities. Thus, many fishing communities in the villages of India have access to the Internet, which provides them with timely information on weather, schools of fish, current market prices, etc.

And contributes to the profitability of even the poorest members of this community. At the same time, they are mostly focused on the preservation of traditionally tested methods of conducting their own fishing. When comparing, in particular, the dynamics of their production (the process of productive practical knowledge) and the pace of development of such production activities, for example, in the Baltic Sea region, different intensity and direction of its modification will inevitably be observed.

In the same way, the peoples of the Far North living on the territory of Russia are still striving to preserve the original traditional ways of economic life, despite the rapidly developing technologies of information and communication support in society. This is a brilliant example, confirming the existence and significance of the mechanism of isolation (localization) in the process of practical cognition, in the course of industrial evolution in society. But this regularity is most pronounced when external forces of isolation are combined in the most complete way with their own low mobility of forces, which they demonstrate in the process of practical cognition. Similarly equipped production communities of economic entities are not only an illustration of the operation of the above law. This is an example of the extent to which differentiation can be achieved by production activities carried out by such entities (its polyformism), if at the same time fragmentation (localization) of the functioning of the community and the low mobility of the social agents participating in it are carried out. This predetermines the formation and simultaneous coexistence in the bowels

of such a community of many small independently and separately functioning aggregates of forces, manifesting and supporting their inherent socio-economic genotypic environment. The actual side of the above law can be traced as follows. For example, within the entire national economy, as a rule, each of its regional entities has an inherent production structure that is not found in full within other economic territories. Within the boundaries of a single region, each type of production activity implemented in it has its own distinctive technical and organizational characteristics and forms of implementation. Finally, within the limits of a separate type of production, independently functioning groups of acting entities in it strive to form and consolidate their focus of management in practice, by building up their own distinctive competencies, which, with their mutually closer territorial development, are more similar to each other than the process of their acquisition, implemented by two production communities representing remote geographical areas. There are hardly any examples where the indicated pattern of differentiation of the production process in connection with the work of localization under conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability manifests itself more clearly and naturally.

* * *

The analysis of the importance of free exchange in the evolution of social production, which we carried out in this chapter, was built on the assumption of an accidental occurrence in everyday heterogeneous practice (combined) and recessive (subordinate within the framework of an existing public organization) socio-economic genovariations (new practical knowledge). But in the same way dominant (dominant in a given production) socio-economic genovariations can arise. The analysis of all these cases essentially remains the same. The whole difference lies in the fact that the probability of the secondary manifestation of socio-economic genovariations in the first case (i.e., as a result of the meeting of two social agents belonging to the heterogeneous (recessive) socio-economic genotype, and not to the dominant society at a given time) extremely decreases and, in the first place, depends on the frequency of repeated occurrences of identical socio-economic genovariations (reproduction of accumulated practical knowledge) and some instability of our tactical medium. With the advent of a new dominant socio-economic genovariation, of course, as a result of the first stabilizing free exchange, it will not disappear, but will exist in the production set of forces in a pronounced form, representing, in certain cases, a more or less noticeable "change" in the structure of the current process of practical cognition (process about production), a certain "deviation" from the current generally accepted "norm" of management, barely perceptible due to its rarity among millions of "normal", traditionally functioning social agents. The main difference is that such a pronounced dominant form of new productive practical knowledge in a stable production community of operating entities will be continuously, from one economic period to another, directly subjected to the pressure of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), which will lead either to its final elimination, or, on the contrary, to its greater and greater distribution and further reproduction within the framework of the existing social system.

This is a significant difference between dominant socio-economic genovariation and recessive, because the latter, as a result of its very first exchange – inheritance by the relevant social agents, goes into a hidden, unexpressed, preserved state and thereby immediately leaves the socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), despite the fact that its properties can be either very useful or significantly harmful at this stage of development for individual social agents testing. Thus, we naturally approach the question of the role of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) in the process of productive practical knowledge, the production process in a free exchange in the presence of socio-economic genotypic variability. In order to answer this question in such a general formulation of it, let us return to what we examined at the beginning of this chapter. Under the conditions of socio-economic variability, free exchange seeks to maintain and stabilize the existing conditions of production, and isolation (localization) provides evolutionary material for the implementation of new productive knowledge, thereby laying the foundations for modifying the boundaries of the functioning of the production process, its polyformism. Socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) initiates the process of formation and development of the dominant economic standard in society, the process of its cognition at a new qualitative level due to the spread of the mechanism of localization of new socio-economic genovariation (new knowledge) revealed during the work. Special case, which determines the conditions of equilibrium in the market of socio-economic genotypic forces participating in the process of productive knowledge, including in its analysis the work of the competition mechanism. Thus, as will be seen later, some aspects of the evolution of the socio-productive whole and the features of the mechanism of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) will be revealed.

Socio-economic selection and the mechanism of competition are not completely identical concepts, since the action and pressure of selection also covers areas beyond the functioning of private-market principles, and can manifest itself, for example, in the form of the regulatory role of any public or state institutional entities. This is due to the fact that the very concept of "freedom of exchange", as well as freedom of choice of principles, methods, methods and forms of waging a struggle for livelihoods, is inextricably linked with the socio-economic genotypic structure of social production, which was achieved by interacting entities in the process of their productive realization practical knowledge at a certain stage of its functioning. In other words, due to the presence in the process of social production of socio-economic genotypic variability and on its basis determine.

In addition to the inherent socioeconomic genotypic structure (which can be dominated not only by vital principles, but also social and ideal, as well as all possible combinations of them), in practice we observe the predominance of the action of a particular type of socioeconomic selection in one or another a different form of its manifestation, most appropriate to the formed socio-economic genotypic structure.

In the previous chapter, analyzing free exchange, we tried to show the role of this economic force as a factor stabilizing social production. At its core,

this is a conservative factor, "protecting" the achieved level of development of productive forces and production relations in society. In this regard, the direct antagonist of free exchange is socio-economic selection (and generally selection in any form and form of its manifestation, in particular in the market, is a competition mechanism). If free exchange stabilizes social relationships in the process of productive practical knowledge, selection, on the contrary, constantly takes them out of equilibrium. In this sense, we can call the free exchange the beginning conservative, and the effect of socio-economic selection is undoubtedly the beginning of the evolutionary, continuously leading to the modification of production, the process of cognition. It is quite obvious that if selection (competition mechanism) favors one of the forms of value transformation offered on the market (completely indifferent, dominant or recessive, traditionally acting or accidentally arising), then its action aimed at preserving it to the detriment of the other will certainly violate the main regularity underlying the ongoing process of productive knowledge, thereby removing the production community from the achieved state of mobile equilibrium. Thus, both in the ratio of the numbers of forms of inherited practical knowledge (whether newly arising or traditionally reproducing), and in the ratio of the number of social agents testing them on the market, two opposing economic forces will constantly struggle: one - the force of socio-economic selection.

Chapter III SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SELECTION

In the previous chapter, analyzing free exchange, we tried to show the role of this economic force as a factor stabilizing social production. At its core, this is a conservative factor, "protecting" the achieved level of development of productive forces and production relations in society. In this regard, the direct antagonist of free exchange is socio-economic selection (and generally selection in any form and form of its manifestation, in particular in the market, is a competition mechanism).

If free exchange stabilizes social relationships in the process of productive practical knowledge, selection, on the contrary, constantly takes them out of equilibrium. In this sense, we can call the free exchange the beginning conservative, and the effect of socio-economic selection is undoubtedly the beginning of the evolutionary, continuously leading to the modification of production, the process of cognition. It is quite obvious that if selection (competition mechanism) favors one of the forms of value transformation offered on the market (completely indifferent, dominant or recessive, traditionally acting or accidentally arising), then its action aimed at preserving it to the detriment of the other will certainly violate the main regularity underlying the ongoing process of productive knowledge, thereby removing the production community from the achieved state of mobile equilibrium. Thus, both in the ratio of the numbers of forms of inherited practical knowledge (whether newly arising or traditionally reproducing), and in the ratio of the number of social agents testing them on the market, two opposing economic forces will constantly struggle: one the force of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), which violates the equilibrium achieved by a certain set of forces in favor of the selected form of productive practical knowledge, the other is the stabilizing effect of free exchange, which seeks to establish order and balance again in the next production and trading period, which will again be disturbed by the effect of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism).

As a result, the production community will continuously move from one state of equilibrium to another and this process will continue until the work of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) ceases. Obviously, the speed (speed) of this process (modification of productive forces and production relations in society) will be directly proportional to the intensity, or strength, of socio-economic selection. In this regard, it is necessary to define a concept that, in the activity and significance of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), plays a very large role and to which, nevertheless, insufficient attention has been paid to the question of the course of production evolution under conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability. The main fundamental difference between "artificial" selection (purposefully organized from the outside, carried out from above and set, as a rule, unilaterally) from all sorts of forms of socio-economic selection in the conditions of complete freedom of exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genovariations in that the former is personal and strictly targeted, while the second - spontaneous, and therefore, with a sufficient mass of social phenomena automatic. This difference primarily affects those forces that determine the degree of intensity of the

socio-economic selection itself (the mechanism of competition in the market).

That is, in a manner pre-planned, designed and controlled "from the outside", by virtue of which, on its basis, social agents are deliberately selected and selected to participate in any economic process that have the intentions and capabilities that meet the objectives and norms set forth above.

In "artificial" selection, such a factor is, first of all, the person (group of persons) conducting the selection, and the intensity of socio-economic selection is determined by the goal that this person (group of persons) sets for himself in his economic activity. At the same time, this person (group of persons) personally forms the criteria and indicators for assessing the selection / selection of relevant knowledge, skills and abilities of social agents necessary for him (them) and involved to achieve the goal. That is, a person (group of persons) purposefully equips the most favorable for themselves with socio-economic genotypic environment of its functioning. In the case of socio-economic selection, which operates under the spontaneous conditions of complete freedom of inheritance of socio-economic genovariations, its strength, or intensity, is ultimately determined by the value of the selected form of knowledge in the struggle for the existence and survival of social agents within the framework of the existing social structure. While in the first case, the intensity of socio-economic selection can easily be brought (and in some cases actually brought) to 100% (i.e., only active subjects having the validation, inheritance and reproduction of a certain socio-economic genovation in its economic arsenal, the corresponding intentions, opportunities and competencies), in conditions of complete freedom of management, we can say with full confidence that the strength of socio-economic selection (in the market e - the mechanism of competition) and does not remotely approach this limit. Even when the selected form of cognition is extremely important in the struggle for existence in society, nevertheless, in case of socio-economic selection in the conditions of complete freedom of exchange – inheritance of practical knowledge, social agents will coexist side by side and interact as ready-made and capable of its transfer – inheritance, and not inclined to its testing, not considering it possible for themselves to apply this knowledge in their business practice on an ongoing basis and switch to acquire it, the inheritance and the subsequent reproduction only under the threat of their own social "death".

In the end, the viability of forces in society, belonging to different socio-economic genotypes, in the struggle for their own existence depends on such a complex ratio of causes and effects that the value of one or another separately inherited by them is "really" useful in the emerging economic conditions of social economic genovariation, generally speaking, is a matter of chance. We will consider the intensity of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) of this socio-economic genovariation equal to 10, 20, etc. in the event that the probability of success in the struggle for existence among existing entities that have not inherited this favorable form of knowledge or have tested it once, but do not aspire to its practical application (based on their assessments and norms of management) in the future, is 10%, 20, etc. less than the social agents who acquired it and use it in their economic life. Thus, with an intensity of socio-economic selection (in the market - a competition mechanism) equal to

10 of the 100 forces that have tested and applied this productive knowledge, 10% social agents secured their own well-being precisely due to its practical implementation, i.e. they managed to use their advantage in the struggle for life in the emerging favorable economic conditions. Of course, the actual consideration of this ratio is still an inaccessible task (due to the lack of relevant observations and data on the socio-economic genotypic structure of forces in society). But for us in this case the more important is the fundamental aspect of the matter: it is important to establish the very concept of selection intensity and its quantitative change. Based on a similar definition of the concept of the intensity of natural selection acting in an unorganized nature, the mathematician G. Norton calculated a table (cited from [Pennet, 1997]), the consideration of which makes it possible, applying a formal structural analogy between the action of "natural »Selection in accordance with the laws of G. Mendel in the process of inheritance of genes in genetics (cultural in sociogenetics) and the pressure of socio-economic selection during the process of inheritance of productive practical knowledge, per hour Nost on the market, to explore the role of*

p	2g	r	The number of generations (periods) between two states of balance, shown in tables 1-3.							
			A. The case of "domination" the takeaway sign of (predeveloped form of practical knowledge)				B. The case of "recession" the takeaway sign of (modified form of socio-economic genovariation)			
			The intecity of intake,%							
			50	25	10	1	50	25	10	1
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
99,9	0,09	0								
98	1,96	0,008	4	10	28	300	1920	5740	17200	189032
90,7	9	0,22	2	5	15	165	85	250	744	8160
69	27,7	2,8	2	4	14	153	18	51	149	1615
44,4	44,4	11,1	2	4	12	121	5	13	36	369
25	50	25	2	4	12	119	2	6	16	169
11,1	44,4	44,4	4	8	18	171	2	4	11	118
2,8	27,7	69	10	17	40	393	2	4	11	120
0,22	9	90,7	36	68	166	1632	2	6	14	152
0,008	1,96	98	170	33	827	8248	2	6	16	165
0	0,09	99,9	3840	7655	19111	191002	4	10	28	298

Norton's Table

[p - is the percentage of the entire population (the production population of actors) represented by individuals without a selected attribute (not applying new knowledge (its transformed form) in their business practice); 2g is the percentage of the entire population (production set of social agents) represented by heterogeneous individuals (testing new knowledge); r is the percentage of the entire population (production set of actors) that have a selected attribute (implementing a modified form of knowledge). * Here, for simplicity of reasoning, it is assumed that we are dealing with organisms that multiply once in a lifetime (such as insects, annual plants, etc.). To maximize compliance with the genetic processes of gene inheritance, we will accept, as before, that during the production process, an active subject belonging to a certain socio-economic genotype participates (as a seller or buyer) in testing and inheriting new practical knowledge (new goods) distributed under the pressure of socio-economic selection within each production period only once, initially inheriting and then passing on the acquired new knowledge other social agents. At the same time, the product itself (a form of knowledge) has a fairly stable and rapidly renewing mass demand.]

*and the importance of this factor under the conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability. The table shows the calculation of the number of generations (the number of production and trading periods) during which the population (the studied production set of interacting enti-

ties), consisting in conditions of free crossing (free exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genovariation), passes from one state of mobile equilibrium to another (from one level of productive knowledge to another) at different intensities of positive selection (socio-economic selection, favorable certain forms of knowledge (forms of the product) to the detriment of other current forms) as in dominance, and in recessive trait bleed. Columns 1-3 of the table show, according to the Hardy formula (in sociogenetics, the Hardy – Weinberg formulas), the percentage ratios of the number of individuals (market entities producing / selling and buying / consuming both new and / or traditional, depending on the social -economic genotypic structure of the product (a new form of cognition and / or outdated) under various conditions of the mobile equilibrium of the community (production set of social agents) that satisfy the requirement that the product number of homogeneous forms (forms of productive knowledge on actions)and the importance of this factor under the conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability. The table shows the calculation of the number of generations (the number of production and trading periods) during which the population (the studied production set of interacting entities), consisting in conditions of free crossing (free exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genovariation), passes from one state of mobile equilibrium to another (from one level of productive knowledge to another) at different intensities of positive selection (socio-economic selection), and certain forms of knowledge (forms of the product) to the detriment of other current forms as in dominance, and in recessive trait bleed. Columns 1-3 of the table show, according to the Hardy formula (in sociogenetics, the Hardy – Weinberg formulas), the percentage ratios of the number of individuals (market entities producing / selling and buying / consuming both new and / or traditional, depending on the social-economic genotypic structure of the product (a new form of cognition and / or outdated) under various conditions of the mobile equilibrium of the community (production set of social agents) that satisfy the requirement that the product homogeneous forms (forms of productive knowledge) on actions. For this purpose, for simplicity of presentation, we will use the previously considered example and accept the conditions for the sale of a new product (new knowledge) in the process of replacing a traditional product in the market, including in the analysis the effect of socio-economic selection.

That is, depending on the direction and intensity of the work of socio-economic economic selection (competition mechanism), economic conditions will be formed that provide such a structure of the market flow (process of cognition) in which all the conditions listed above are met, necessary for the process of market saturation (exchange – inheritance of socio-economic genovariation) to be embodied in economic life in its purest and simplest form (product irreplaceability, price constancy, stable consumer value, the need of the vast majority of buyers in one piece of goods, lack of resale and etc.). |Who are the subjects belonging to homogeneous socioeconomic genotypes that are homogeneous in their economic intentions and capabilities) was equal to the square of half the number of heterozygous forms (socioeconomic genovariations) used by social agents belonging to heterogeneous, mixed socioeconomic genotypes (i.e., depending on

the prevailing market conditions, prone to production / acquisition of both a new product or a traditional product):

$$pr = g^2,$$

where p are the alleles belonging to the dominant homogeneous socio-economic genotype and implementing the form of cognition corresponding to their own socio-economic genotypically determined goals and means of management;

r - social agents representing recessive homogeneous socio-economic genotypes and testing their own, different from the dominant socio-economic genovariation;

g - a set of heterogeneous both dominant and recessive socio-economic genotypes that inherit both dominant and recessive (depending on the prevailing economic conditions) form of practical knowledge, contributing to the expression of their inherent socio-economic genotypically given nature and logic of economic behavior within current social structure. The right side of the table indicates how many generations must pass (economic periods of approbation – inheritance by acting subjects of practical knowledge) so that, at a certain intensity of selection, this community (this production set) moves from one state of mobile equilibrium to another when (by analogy with the processes gene inheritance in genetics) under the pressure of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) the process of saturation of demand in the market due to the distribution of a new product The training of this production set of social agents in the course of a complete replacement in the market of the old obsolete form of cognition of a new, more socially significant one) will be fully implemented. Under the letter "D" for data are provided for the case when the attribute undergoing positive selection (we have a new product, a new form of productive practical knowledge) is dominant, and under the letter "P" it is recessive (tested transformed form).

A table of G. Norton, upon closer examination, makes it possible to present the work of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) in the context of a freely operating socio-economic genotypic variability in its purest, most explicit form. First of all, it is noteworthy that in both cases (and when the form of socioeconomic genovariation (productive knowledge)) chosen by the actors is dominant, and when it is recessive based on the accepted assessments in society, the process of completely replacing the old form of new knowledge in the current economic conditions in the market is almost complete. This process of complete transformation (transmutation) of one form of productive knowledge into another proceeds even with the weakest (1%) intensity of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) and the only difference is in the speed of the process. Moreover, if we consider the process of transformation of the trade flow (and on its basis the type of production, this field of knowledge) as a whole, then its duration with a small intensity of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), as this is most likely most often in "natural" practice and it happens that it goes about equally fast in both cases. Only with an increase in the intensity of socio-economic selection (up to 25%) does the difference in

the rate of transformation of this type of production, the realized forms of its knowledge, depending on the recessiveness or dominance of the selected socio-economic genovation, become noticeable. With an intensity of socio-economic selection of 50%, the transformation of this type of activity in the case of a positive selection of the recessive (in accordance with current estimates in society at present) form of cognition proceeds 2 times faster than with its dominance. We also note that the fastest process of transformation of the forms of cognition is when the average state of the mobile is weight, i.e. when the number of homogeneous recessive and dominant forms on the market and, accordingly, social agents distributing – inheriting both new and traditional goods is approximately equal to each other (by formal analogy with the classic Mendelian ratio 1: 2: 1), t .e. in the framework of the classical business cycle, - the state corresponding to the current production of the final phase of its heyday and the beginning of the transition to crisis. Here, with an intensity of socio-economic selection of only 10%, 16 + 11 = 27 production and trading periods are enough (in the case of recessiveness within the existing public organization of the cognitive form) to get out of a state of mobile equilibrium when the number of actors representing a recessive homogeneous socially -economic genotype and distributing – inheriting a new product corresponding to their structure (new recessive knowledge) was 4 times less than the number of social agents belonging to dominants homogeneous socio-economic genotype and offering traditional goods for exchange – inheritance, traditionally dominating the market in the form of value conversion (44.4 AA and 11.1 aa), go into a state with an inverse ratio of their numbers (11.1 AA and 44, 4 aa). That is, the number of social agents who managed to sell / buy a new product (acquire – inherit a recessive form of productive practical knowledge) during 27 production and trading periods, increased by 4 times under the pressure of positive selection, only 4%. Almost similarly, a similar transformation of the forms of marketable values proceeds during a dominant assessment by existing actors of a new product (a proposed new form of cognition) (12 + 18 = 30 business periods). And only then, when we come to consider the extreme phases of the entire production process (the process of cognition), the difference in the dynamics of its transformation, depending on whether the selected modified form of socio-economic genovariation, will be revealed in accordance with the formal analogy of the biological processes (new product) recessive or dominant. So, with the dominance of a favorably selected product (practical knowledge), the process of replacing existing actors its less demanded form proceeds very quickly from the very beginning of its approbation and application (i.e., from the formation and revival of this production). For example, at a 10% intensity of selection (competition), 305 periods of distribution of a new product (new socio-economic genovariation) on the market are enough to transfer a freely exchanged production set of operating entities from a state where 99.9% of them are deprived of a new product (do not possess selected new knowledge), in a state where, on the contrary, 99.7% of the subjects will possess this product. Practically speaking, this is the time during which the entire set of social agents involved in this production will completely change towards a more perfect, progressive (according to current estimates in society)

social adaptation in the struggle for life. Even with a negligible intensity of socio-economic selection of 1%, this process of almost complete transformation of the entire production process (all phases of the transformation of value forms) is carried out in a relatively short time - about 3000 productionnno-trading periods. On the contrary, with the recessiveness of the newly emerged favorably selected new product (the newly emerged form of cognition), the initial phase of its distribution (the beginning of the transformation of this production activity and, accordingly, the entire set of actors involved in this process) proceeds slowly to extremes. With the same selection intensity of 10%, at the end of almost 18,000 periods, still 99.7% of the social agents involved in this production will not be able and ready to participate in the proposed activities on a new qualitative basis (they will refuse to participate in this competition), i.e. they will not show noticeable signs of transformation and will be prone to distribution – inheritance of traditional goods (outdated knowledge). In other words, they do not outwardly show a desire for the transition to the next, more progressive stage of their own economic development and, as a consequence, the current mode of production. With even weaker degrees of selection (competition) work, the process should be delayed to hundreds of thousands of productions trade and commercial periods of the implementation of this production (it may take several generations of actors).

And this is even if, at the initial moment of our calculation, we assume that 0.09% of the active subjects belonging to heterogeneous genotypes have already tested the proposed new product (new knowledge) within the framework of previous production and trading periods. The probability of the meeting of two such heterogeneous social agents and, therefore, the probability of the repeated reproduction of new knowledge in the form of a product, its modified form is almost 1/1000. And we saw earlier that when individual, single socio-economic genovariations (the onset of a socio-economic event corresponding to the production / sale of a new product within the framework of existing production) occur, the probability of meeting such social agents (both on the demand and supply side) belonging to heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes and accomplished this discovery, depends on the size of the whole freely exchanging production set of actors and usually must be much smaller than just indicated. The picture changes dramatically if we turn to the end of the process, which completes the complete transformation of the entire process of cognition (production / acquisition of a new product instead of an outdated one). With the recessiveness of the selected product (practical knowledge), this process of complete and final assimilation of a new modified form by the entire production set of social agents proceeds and completes extremely quickly - in several dozen production and trading periods, whereas when selecting a dominant new product (a new form of practical knowledge) the process of the final eradication of traditional goods by him on the market, the complete "purification" of the existing process of practical knowledge of obsolete recipe civic knowledge, dragged on almost to infinity. So, with the intensity of socio-economic selection, even at 10%, almost 20,000 periods are needed just to increase the number of social agents who have managed to buy a new product (to master the dominant and finally

become a homogeneous form of this knowledge), from 99.7 to 99.9% and final the transformation of forms of marketable values, the complete destruction of all heterogeneous forms of this type of knowledge, the complete disappearance of recessive socio-economic genovariation (form of goods) is possible only with hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of economic periods. What conclusions leads us to consider the table of G. Norton as the basis for a formal structural analogy between the processes of reproduction of annual organisms according to the law of G. Mendel and the process of productive practical knowledge realized by interacting entities within the framework of a certain production set of actors acting on the market during socio-economic selection? First of all, it can be assumed that thanks to the activity of free exchange and socio-economic selection (the mechanism of competition in the market) in the process of free exchange – inheritance of productive practical knowledge (under conditions formally corresponding to similar Mendelian "heredity"), every, even the slightest improvement (from the point of view of the "prevailing" rate of management) in the implementation of any type of production has a certain chance to spread to the entire process of economic development, m to identify him. More precisely, to spread to the whole mass of social agents that make up a freely exchanging community, and on this basis to modify the whole process of their productive practical knowledge, increasing the level of the productive forces involved in them in society. Here, traditionally existing views on the role of the competition mechanism as a key transformative factor of all farms The development of this development is represented by the approach we have presented, which is based on the process of testing, accumulating and disseminating socio-economic genovariations and implemented under the conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability, a completely unexpected and powerful ally. One of the significant difficulties of these traditional ideas about the role and importance of the mechanism of competition in the process of economic development, in our opinion, is that it is difficult to imagine a process due to that end, those minor improvements in our daily economic activities can be carried out, the value of which in the course of the competition for survival is, generally speaking, completely insignificant.

A social agent during his individual economic life is exposed to such an infinitely varied environmental impact (both unorganized and organized social nature), so many times is faced with real danger from a variety of reasons, that among the thousands of social "deaths" that threaten him everywhere, it would seem that the small advantage that a small improvement in the process of practical activity implemented by him (about process of knowledge). Let this improvement allow him to avoid the specific danger of A, but he is still at risk from danger of B, or C, or D, etc. Thus, an extremely favorable set of circumstances is necessary for the acting subject to retain the level of knowledge achieved at a certain point in time within the framework of an existing public organization and to pass on the legacy of his previously tested and accumulated personal small competitive advantage to other actors. And in the subsequent economic periods of practical knowledge, all the actors who took the initiative and inherited this socio-economic genovariation face the same struggle

for the formation and retention of their own socio-economic space and the same chance of survival. Now, due to the application of the achievements of genetics and sociogenetics to social phenomena, our idea of this process can be slightly changed.

Due to the peculiarities of the mechanism of free exchange – inheritance of productive practical knowledge, nothing is lost from the economic experience acquired by social agents. No matter how small the improvement of their productive activity (the process of productive cognition that they implement) will take place, maybe hundreds and thousands of production and trading periods (and not one generation of actors) will pass, but in the end, within the implementation of this type of production, it has every chance, due to its accumulation and preservation by social agents, to "break out", be re-inherited and, gradually spreading under the influence of socio-economic selection and free exchange, be communicated to all actors. Another important conclusion from the consideration of G. Norton's table is that the transformation of a freely exchanging production set of actors in the process of replacing them with a less popular form of productive knowledge with a more socially significant, and therefore more adapted form, in a word, the process of adaptive production evolution always goes on the end. It doesn't matter whether a more socially significant form of cognition, presented in the form of a certain product / service within the framework of the functioning of a certain production, is dominant or recessive, is the selection intensity of 50% or 1% expressed, once the transformation has begun, once the production community is in a jointly implemented process of productive practical knowledge has moved forward, the process "automatically" in conditions of complete freedom of exchange goes further until all this production, all that implements its community interacting entities, acquiring new economic experience does not change entirely or until no further activity of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism). This conclusion is very important for a correct understanding of the role of individual factors in the evolutionary production process. In conditions of free exchange, i.e. as long as localization (isolation) in the development of productive forces and production relations in society (in one of its above forms) does not work, the struggle for existence and vital resources and socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) can continuously change the physiognomy of this type of production and spread more and more new most demanded in the current economic conditions, and therefore more adaptive socio-economic genovariations for the entire mass of actors can improve any features of its technical and organizational structure, but never under these conditions this type of production one activity will not give rise to a new species, there will never be a splitting of its production set of operating entities into two independently functioning production communities, and the process of production speciation will never take place. The whole production, the whole mass of social agents realizing it will change, evolve, become more and more perfect in their adaptation to the social and economic genotypic environment of their existence, which is under pressure from the socio-economic selection. In the process of historical development of this type of production, we will observe how one of its technical and organizational forms, less socially

significant, will be completely replaced by another, more perfect and socially necessary, i.e. we will observe the process of adaptive evolution, the process of the formation of true productive practical knowledge, when one of its entire forms in the adaptive evolutionary process is replaced by another. We give a hypothetical example. So, let's say that a certain production set of actors, characterized at this stage of their development by the dominance of vital social principles and the corresponding types and methods of productive labor used in practice, is represented by the following frequencies of forms of socio-economic genovariation36: pz1 (vitality) = 0, 4; gz2 (sociality) = 0.5; rz3 (ideality) = 0.1. The frequencies of socio-economic genotypes having their own genetically determined intentions and possibilities for conducting this economic activity within the framework of the studied production population are as follows: p2z1z1 = 0.16 (vitalists - 16%); 2pgz1z2 = 0.4 (vital socialists - 40%); g2z2z2 = 0.25 (socialists - 25%); 2prz1z3 = 0.08 (vital-ideas|*

The frequency of manifestation of one form or another of productive practical knowledge can be fairly accurately established, since its application involves the use of a certain combination of means of production and labor involved in the performance of a certain type of work on its basis, which makes it possible to accurately determine the boundaries of production operations, fixed and performed by a specific social agent in this production.

*|sheets - 8%); 2grz2z3 = 0.1 (social-idealists - 10%); r2z3z3 = 0.01 (idealists - 1%). The frequency of social agents with "social" motivation in this production community is 25%. Suppose further that socio-economic selection acts in favor of productive practical knowledge that has "social" principles (that is, it is oriented toward the predominance of "social" principles during the implementation of a certain type of production).

That is, it is with equal force directed against the spread of other forms of values offered by existing agents within this production set, which are alternative to the distributed and belong to the homogeneous (homogeneous) vital socio-economic genotype - z1z1 and heterogeneous (mixed) vital-ideal - z1z3, in which vitality dominates (i.e., private and household methods). The selection coefficient is s = 0.9. The change in the frequency of approbation – inheritance of the dominant form of socio-economic genovariation z1 for one production and trading period is determined by the formula: g = - spr2 / 1– s + sr2 = - 0.9 0.4 0.01 / 1 - 0 , 9 + 0.9 0.01 = = - 0.033. Let us determine the number of business periods during which there will be a decrease in the practical application of the value form demonstrated by the vital socio-economic genotype z1 from 0.4 to 0.05 using the formula: t = rt - r0 / g = = 0.05 - 0 , 4 / 0.333 = –10.6 periods. The decrease in the use of the form of practical knowledge of z1 has led to an increase in the relative frequency of reproduction of the socio-economic genovariation z2, which "controls" sociality, from 0.5 to 0.85. The new frequencies of application by productive actors of productive practical knowledge having a given socio-economic orientation can be as follows: pz1 (vitality) = 0.05; gz2 (sociality) = 0.85; rz3 (ideality) = 0.1, and the frequencies of the current socio-economic genotypes can matter: p2z1z1 = 0.0025 (vitalists - 0.25%); 2pgz1z2 = 0.085 (vital socialists - 8.5%); p2z2z2 = 0.7225 (socialists - 72.25%); 2prz1z3 =

0.01 (vital idealists - 1%); 2grz2z3 = 0.17 (social-idealists - 17%); r2z3z3 = 0.01 (idealists - 1%). The frequency of active agents who adopted a social model of behavior within this production population increased from 25 to 72.25%. Thus, a fairly strong pressure of socio-economic selection aimed at eliminating vital models of economic behavior in practice, after 10 production and trading periods, can provide an adaptive evolution of this production activity towards its social orientation with the dominance of social agents,and more actively supporting this transformation. Consequently, we can, using quantitative approaches to determine the intensity of socio-economic selection, predict the dynamics of the process of productive cognition with different focus and pressure in a constantly functioning socio-economic genotypic variability with complete freedom of management. Fortunately, this process of replacing one socio-economic genovariation with another is known not only on historical material and not only on hypothetical examples. It is happening before our eyes, in the modern era, despite the fact that the process of productive practical knowledge underwent dramatic changes in the course of its evolution, testing and using on an ongoing basis all new sources and methods of their own development, aimed at finding and developing a new type of economy down to the virtual one by including in the sphere of impressions and the development of digital technologies, thereby creating new incentives for a relatively rapid increase in the level of productive forces of the general vita. From the data known to us on this issue, two examples can be given, which undoubtedly testify to the ongoing process of transformational evolution of the modern process of productive practical knowledge under the influence of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism). Other researchers of our economic life, probably, can give similar examples from their field. The first example concerns the improvement of the agricultural management system, which is undergoing radical changes at the present stage of development. Among the companies involved in this transformation include Deere Company, a manufacturer of agricultural machinery with a century of history. The company in modern conditions is experimenting with navigation satellite systems and biosensors mounted on combines. This innovation, presented in the form of a new form of productive practical knowledge, can replace the driver. It can measure the oil content of grains and also distinguish weeds from crops. In addition, farmers can determine how many herbicides are required depending on the nature of the soil in a particular area. Management using the navigation satellite system ensures consistent accuracy, eliminates over-cultivation of crops and soil and makes it possible to work on hilly terrain, which allows actors to save time, fuel, chemicals and labor. Less effort is spent on preparing the field, cultivating the land and spraying the plants. Using this productive knowledge, farmers have the opportunity not only to produce more products, minimizing the cost of 1 ha of land, but also to monitor all equipment, including the condition of the engine and the location of the machine. By integrating remote diagnostics into the system, Deere can warn farmers of potential problems by eliminating costly “surprises” during sowing or harvesting. The system, called Deere Trax, is suitable for almost any type of equipment. It can track the status of even small cars, such as cars. Its “enclosure” capabilities allow the

farmer to identify areas in which his equipment is capable of functioning. If the machine leaves the zone set for it, it "warns" the farmer, thereby preventing its unauthorized movement. By testing this productive knowledge in his business practice, Deere seeks to make life easier for the farmer and to increase his productivity by providing him with access to extremely important information. Because of this, the company and the farmer are able to interact and compete at numerous points of this production system, and not just at points of exchange of products, which can it extends the accumulated experience to which both consumers and other companies have access. Despite the fact that a typical form of agricultural behavior, focused on traditional methods of production, is still quite widespread in modern economic practice, this new productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) is finding more and more supporters around the world and is gradually becoming "dominant" in relation to the traditionally implemented model of economic behavior in the framework of using social production entities. There is evidence that this new kind of practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation), which arose in the last quarter of the 20th century. in the USA, at first it was extremely rare, but gradually there was information about its increasing distribution in other countries, other geographical areas and public entities. Everywhere it displaces and replaces the main event, this socio-economic genovariation is the dominant form of management in most parts of North America (and sometimes even an exceptional form of value creation). A similar case of the dissemination of new knowledge under the pressure of socio-economic selection is demonstrated by Tesco, offering to disseminate new knowledge, formed not by transforming the product itself, but by modifying the situation in which it is formed during the operation of the localization (isolation) mechanism. In today's business environment, Tesco is a global food retailer focused on finding a harmonious combination of local customization and standardization cost effectiveness. The company provides each actor with the opportunity to order on-line groceries that are delivered to his home. Thus, it successfully expands the space of jointly formed experience through the use of the existing infrastructure of the company.

At the same time, company employees perceive the stores in which they operate as warehouses designed for quick receiving and fulfilling orders. Consumers, in turn, are gradually introducing into their practice new technologies for the joint formation of experience, contributing to the replacement of existing traditional methods of sales / purchases. In this area of knowledge, we also observe an extremely intensive replacement of the main form of economic behavior with a new one, and this process is so vigorous that after only 25 years have passed in some remote regions of the United States, up to 70% of the population uses this modified form. Both of our examples are a living "page" of a genuine adaptive evolutionary process. Before our eyes, within the framework of a certain production set, a "dominant" socio-economic genovariation arises and strengthens. Free exchange conditions do not stabilize the size of its reproduction; on the contrary, it is spreading rapidly, and the number of social agents that have inherited and use it is becoming more numerous every year. Just a few decades after its inception, a whole series of socio-economic

formations were captured by it, in many of them it became the dominant, dominant form of productive practical knowledge, sometimes completely replacing the former, traditional, which became rare there. We see how an accidental, personal deviation from the traditionally operating within the framework of a certain social structure "norm" of management, individual productive knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) gradually assumes the dominant character, capturing a certain habitat and gradually displacing the original, root form from its distribution area is knowledgeable. Before us, under the pressure of socio-economic selection, the process of adaptive evolution of production is unfolding. Obviously, such a substitution of one form of practical cognition of the other in the framework of the implementation of a certain type of production could occur only due to the fact that in some way we do not know for sure this form is better adapted to the proposed conditions of existence than the basic, typical one. Having relevant data and using the table of G. Norton, you can try to determine the intensity of socio-economic selection in each case and, accordingly, the entire process of transformation of this production activity.

But, however, on the basis of the data in the same table, we know that in the future the process of substitution and "purification" of production from the traditional form of cognition should slow down under the pressure of the spread of a new, dominant form, and for a rather long time among the actors involved in this process two forms of productive practical knowledge will coexist and appear from time to time: new and obsolete. The case of evolution described above has not yet ended. Under the pressure of socio-economic selection, a similar process of transforming values began to spread further, beyond the limits of a locally functioning production population of existing actors. Cases of applying this practical knowledge are becoming more numerous, and gradually it displaces the typical socio-economic genovariation.

Currently, this new knowledge has been ascertained in almost all of Europe, it is rapidly spreading and gaining ground in Asia, and there is no doubt that after some time, under appropriate circumstances, it can become dominant and traditional in Russian practice, repeating the same process that and in America is repeated. Having the necessary data, one can even make an attempt to predict the further development of this process. It will gradually spread throughout our country, including in its orbit of influence all relevant geographical and functioning socio-economic genotypic formations. Everywhere the traditional basic form of practical knowledge will be replaced by a more viable and socially significant, clearly demonstrating the position that production is really a single, freely exchanged complex of interacting entities. The time will come when the case of applying the previous, basic form of this practical knowledge will be considered as a rare event, as the new form was recently considered.

Only in isolated socio-economic formations (production aggregates), where the traditional mode of production is still being realized and dominates practical knowledge (approbation – inheritance of socio-economic genovariation), if the case does not bring new knowledge there and circumstances do not contribute to its dissemination, the old, typical form of productive practical knowledge will be preserved and reproduced. Then it will be for us the last remnant of the

once widespread traditionally operating production process. But the same data given in the table of G. Norton show that it will still take a long time until this dominant practical knowledge finally passes into a homogeneous state, acquired and applied by all the actors involved in this production. All the time during the implementation of this type of production activity, a certain percentage of heterogeneously acting entities will be preserved, which, externally demonstrating economic behavior similar to the generally accepted one, under certain appropriate conditions, will tend to reproduce the socioeconomic genovariations that existed earlier as the main forms. For social agents who no longer have experience in its production and consumption in the initial state (that is, operating in a socio-economic space already transformed on its basis), this will be the case of a sudden discovery of recessive socio-economic genovariation.

Therefore, if within the framework of certain local production aggregates a similar, unmodified process of practical cognition is still being implemented, which is still the main one for them, then such cases of its sudden reproduction, for example, somewhere in Europe, represent an example of an individual repetition of features characteristic of it is a very distant and universally dominant model of economic behavior. And modern business practice knows hundreds of similar examples when such traditionally reproducible practical knowledge (for example, based on the specific national characteristics of the implementation of any type of production), inherited from previous generations of social agents, underlies the formation of individual distinctive competencies, demonstrated identified by certain actors in the course of conducting modern competition.

The given case demonstrates a picture of the evolutionary process of production as it occurs under the pressure of socio-economic selection and the struggle for existence. The most characteristic feature of this process is, *ceterisparibus*, completeness, complete replacement of the previous form of practical knowledge with a new, more adapted and, as a result, more socially necessary within the framework of the socio-economic genotypic structure of society transformed during its implementation. But what will happen if the action of socio-economic selection is interrupted before the complete transformation of the production process of practical knowledge and, as a result, the complete transformation of the entire production set of existing actors? What if, during its course of action, for example, that key factor in the competition with which a known device was specially selected disappears? Based on the second (stabilizing) law of free exchange – inheritance, we know that in the next economic period a state of mobile equilibrium will be established, and in all subsequent production and trading periods a relative number of forms (both dominant and recessive) of productive practical knowledge reproduced by existing actors (socio-economic genovariation) will remain, other things being equal, unchanged. This production activity will fall apart, but not into two separate types of production or varieties of socio-economic activity, but into two forms of its manifestation, polyformism will become inherent in it. As before, all social agents involved in this type of production and applying one or another form of socio-economic genovariation in their practice will form a single production aggregate, freely interacting with each other. From their socio-economic genotypic structure, formed in the

process of testing, inheritance and accumulation of practical knowledge, it will depend on whether the process of productive practical knowledge led by them of the same type (with socially and economically homogeneous from the point of view of the economic experience applied in practice during its implementation within the framework of this public organization) or in the course of its production and implementation, both forms of productive knowledge will be encountered (both currently prevailing according to estimates of most actors and previously tested, its traditional form). It is very likely that at least in some of the cases of such polyformism of economic activity that we often encounter now, we are dealing with precisely this kind of stoppage of the action of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), although it is possible that in some other cases the observed production polyformism is only a temporary state of transformation of production with a relatively weak intensity of socio-economic selection.

As shown by the data in G. Norton's table, under such conditions, it may take more than a dozen business periods (and even generations of social agents) to completely eradicate the recessive, outdated form of practical knowledge from current economic practice, and the period of our observations is too short. To detect a noticeable change in the relative number of reproduction of both forms of this production in the course of their implementation by social agents. Finally, the third important conclusion that can be made on the basis of the analysis of the data of G. Norton's table is that socio-economic selection (the competition mechanism), like free exchange, contributes to the accumulation in economic practice, carried out by a certain set of actors, of recessive productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation). When analyzing a hypothetical example of a positive selection of dominant practical knowledge, we saw that almost complete replacement of its recessive form of dominant can occur relatively quickly. But the study of the corresponding department (D) in the table of G. Norton teaches us that this process of cognition is finally completed to extremes slowly and that it takes a long time, not one dozen production periods (and possibly more than one generation of actors) in order to transfer all the dominant forms of its reproduction into a homogeneous (homogeneous) state even with relatively intense competition. Until then, as a result of activities in the market of socio-economic selection, the production set of actors will still store (in the form of previously tested economic experience) a certain number of heterogeneous (mixed) forms of cognition, which, under favorable circumstances, as a result of interaction like acting social agents they can give rise to, as it were, re-emerging recessive socio-economic genovariations (productive knowledge) of an atavistic nature. If we measure the percentage of the intensity of positive socio-economic selection, then in the same way we can measure the intensity of negative socio-economic selection. Not every unfavorable (based on the prevailing in the society "norms" of management at a certain point in time) change in the process of practical knowledge, the current mode of production is inevitably fatal for the actors testing it. Only with a very sharp socially "harmful" deviation from the current "norm" of production will the intensity of this negative socio-economic selection reach 100%. In a large number of cases, the

strength of its action will be less and there will often be cases when the intensity of negative socio-economic selection will be 10%, or even 1%. This means that social agents with less than socially significant practical knowledge (based on the dominant estimates in society) will not immediately be removed from the arena of social struggle, and it will take more than a dozen years (dozens, and sometimes hundreds, of socio-economic events) so that socio-economic selection can finally eliminate these forms of productive knowledge from our daily economic practices. And here again, the difference between dominant and recessive (within the framework of the current socio-economic genotypic environment for the functioning of production) socio-economic genovariations sharply affects and again in favor of the accumulation of the latter.

As was shown, with recessiveness favorably selected by socio-economic selection of productive practical knowledge, in other words, with the dominance of practical knowledge undergoing negative socio-economic selection, selection ultimately eliminates the less adapted form of its production within the existing production set of social agents and this happens relatively oh fast. On the contrary, with recessiveness of not so socially significant (from the point of view of the preferences dominating in society, intentions and opportunities demonstrated by the majority of existing actors) productive practical knowledge in the first economic period after its testing and inheritance by interacting entities, this socioeconomic genovariation will turn into heterogeneous, an implicit state, will get out of the controlling influence of socio-economic selection and, thus, preserving in its bosom in a heterogeneous state recessive form of knowledge, less socially important at this stage of development of the productive forces and production relations in society. And in this case, the socio-economic selection entails a relatively rapid removal from the economic life of the actors that are not so socially necessary for them, although so far dominant within their social structure, the forms of socio-economic genovariation and, conversely, the accumulation of recessive "bits" of genes. Finally, even in the case of favorable (from the point of view of economic conditions being formed on the market) recessive socio-economic genovariations, they are exactly the same when they are first applied by acting entities belonging to subordinates (recessive within the framework of the existing social structure) of social economic genotypes, in the course of their exchange – interaction with traditionally functioning social agents that implement the dominant forms of production, become hidden, hetero the fiery state and, thus, also “slip away” from the action of the socio-economic boron, and it is necessary to wait 1 / N of economic periods, so that socio-economic selection can again apply its action to strengthen and disseminate in the prevailing circumstances a favorable form of productive knowledge. Thus, both free exchange and socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) lead to one final result, namely, the accumulation and preservation of recessive socio-economic genovariations (recessive “bits” of genes) in a heterogeneous state in production the proportion of which may be associated with adverse social agents, from the point of view of the prevailing conditions of competition, signs of industrial cooperation. Our analysis leads us to understand at first glance the extremely strange fact that the number of known recessive socio-economic

genovariations (productive practical knowledge) is many times greater than the number of dominant ones. This is especially pronounced in those actors who carry out the process of production of practical knowledge in the conditions of complete freedom of its exchange – testing, i.e. then, when they receive material for carrying out production activities "out of their will" at the expense of their own trial and error, directly scooping it from everyday at their own peril and risk of the economic practice they implement in all aspects and forms of its manifestation and implementation, that is from experience, which, in our opinion, is "saturated" with recessive heterogeneous practical knowledge. There is no doubt that most of these recessive "bits" of knowledge genes were accumulated and stored by actors during their long and varied economic life and only then they were identified and involved by other actors in "laboratory" conditions with the help of more or less about.

Since not a single manager of any company (also limited by his own socio-economically genotypically set intentions and practical knowledge acquired by business experience) is able to identify and use in full the volume really tested and accumulated by his subordinates throughout their long economic life productive practical knowledge (socio-economic) their proper inheritance. Moreover, due to the random selection of interacting pairs of social agents in the market, the manifestation of "hidden" practical knowledge accumulated by them earlier can stretch over a number of economic periods, and then distinguish cases of the emergence of a new socio-economic genovariation from the simple identification of an already existing heterogeneous state from a previously tested on their own and the economic experience saved by social agents becomes virtually impossible. It was noted above that free exchange in the process of industrial evolution plays a conservative role, trying to maintain the status quo, while socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) acts as the opposite, evaluative factor. But if we introduce into the circle of our analysis the process of the continuous emergence of new socio-economic genovariations, implemented in all areas and at different stages of the implementation of economic life in the conditions of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability, then this idea will have to be changed and supplemented. Free exchange, absorbing and preserving all newly emerged socio-economic genovariations within a certain production set of actors, thereby gradually shakes the main conventional and currently implemented traditional method of production and makes it less stable, predetermining its intraspecific production differentiation. Socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), on the contrary, maintains the stability of this type of production (productive knowledge) and provides it with monomorphism, gradually eliminating and destroying all those socio-economic genovariations that ultimately turn out to be unclaimed within the framework of the current socio-economic genotypic environment function genetic genovariations), as well as to activate and use for their own needs all their creative potential. Therefore, during the organization of the production process, the manifestation of this kind of recessive subjective knowledge is also very random and can stretch over a number of periods of production and commercial activity.

Nations, not so socially significant, and sometimes simply "harmful" to main-

tain and approve the existing method of cognition. Socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) “cleans” this production from “clogging” with the accumulating varieties of productive knowledge, and in the case of “useful” demanded it society (with its corresponding socio-economic genotypic structure) changes are disseminated during testing and inheritance on all social agents, thereby informing this process of production (the process of cognition) again monotony. Thus, within the current production, a certain production set of social agents implementing it, two processes struggle: the process of accumulation of productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariations) and the process of their destruction. The result of the interaction of these processes ultimately determines the direction and speed of production evolution.

* * *

Using the examples of the process of productive practical knowledge implemented by modern companies Deere Company and Tesco, we analyzed the case of adaptive evolution. But are non-adaptive evolutionary processes even possible in economic life? This is a question that still remains open and controversial. A more careful analysis of the economic experience accumulated by each social agent, one can find many examples where certain types of production activities carried out by him (as well as the results obtained on their basis) differ not in adaptive, but in “socioeconomic” sense. Try to look for all of them adaptive characteristics and meanings unproductive and ungrateful work. Thus, for proponents of exclusively adaptive production evolution, the last “refuge" remains - relative variability - and you have to resort to it every time you try to explain the process of evolution of production and its speciation solely on the basis of the struggle for existence and socio-economic selection (competition). The fact that correlative variability exists and that it is the process of productive practical knowledge in the course of its very long inheritance, accumulation, preservation and dissemination within the framework of a certain society in the context of constantly operating socio-economic genotypic variability determines the possibility and necessity of its existence in our economic life, thereby ensuring the formation and disclosure of new incentives for existing actors to a relatively rapid increase in productive forces and the modification of production relations in society, there can be no doubt, and the success of modern sociogenetics allow us to take a fresh look at this problem. But nevertheless, to explain all the numerous cases of “indifferent” (according to current estimates), non-adaptive distinguishing features demonstrated by social agents in the process of practical cognition, in the production process, only by its variability of this kind, means to explain nothing, and to be satisfied each time with an unprovable hypothesis.

It was previously shown that due to the presence in our economic practice of socio-economic variability manifested in the process of productive knowledge, the inevitable process of intraspecific differentiation of production activity should not be accompanied by an necessarily adaptive change in the differentiating forms of productive practical knowledge. What is adaptive change possible in some cases, it is quite easy to imagine, but there is no reason for f intraspecific

and interspecific differentiation of production exclusively to adaptive evolution. Such cases are only particular cases of a more general process of species differentiation of production, its disintegration, under certain economic conditions, into independently functioning types of activity during the action of socio-economic genotypic variability inherent in its implementation.

Actors representing various socio-economic genotypes. The phenomena of strict correspondence between the intensity of intraspecific (and, ultimately, interspecific) differentiation of production and its breakdown into separate, separately functioning processes, isolated from each other aggregates of social agents representing independent localized production formations, is a process that (in in another form, in one form or another) is so often directly observed in practice - they definitely indicate that in the process of industrial decay the dominant The important role does not belong to socio-economic selection (the work of the competition mechanism), but to localization (isolation), which finds materials for activity in the enormous heterogeneity of the economic experience that we acquire and maintain throughout our diverse and sometimes quite long economic life, and existence, the meaning of which we tried to show above. Of course, one cannot think that with these factors the whole essence of the phenomenon of production differentiation is exhausted, in the implementation of which a number of other processes not considered here take part. But it is absolutely necessary to clearly realize that never an adaptive change associated with the pressure of socio-economic selection in the struggle of social agents for their own life support and existence, but not related to localization (isolation), can be the beginning of differentiation of either another type of production activity. The true source of speciation of the cognitive process and the reason for the appearance in our economic activity of one or another independently functioning types of production (areas of cognition) is not social and economic selection, but localization (isolation of economic interconnections, the process of productive practical knowledge).

Finally, even in those cases when we are able to establish the existence of truly adaptive differences between independently functioning areas of practical knowledge, types of production, we must be very careful in assuming that these differences are primary in nature, i.e. in recognizing that they caused decay, splitting the initial form of productive practical knowledge into two, "led to" the process of speciation and laid the foundation for the formation and development of new spheres of economic activity. We must not forget that (as we have just seen) every production process implemented by a certain set of actors, during the period of its existence in the event of a favorable (socially necessary according to the current estimates in society) socio-economic genovarization, is necessarily completely adaptive transformation and, thus, in the course of its distribution – inheritance, acquires adaptive distinctive features of practical application that are absent e earlier. A new process of transforming the form of value is established, which has its own adaptive characteristics, but it does not cause differentiation of close forms of productive practical knowledge, the production process, but, on the contrary, its species character is a consequence of the previously established inter-specific differentiation formed and implemented

actors in a constantly functioning socio-economic genotypic variability in society. In fact, this process should be carried out quite often, since it is difficult to imagine that during the more or less continuous functioning of a certain type of production activity no favorable socio-economic genovariation (more socially significant practical knowledge) would arise, which would thus give rise to adaptive species distinctive features of the implementation of production. It is in this way that the vast majority of adaptive differences in the types of production activities that are similar in nature are realized. The longer the evolutionary path traversed by one form or another of productive cognition after the differentiation that occurred during its implementation, the more adaptive differences should accumulate regarding the most diverse aspects of the formation and development of this type of production. And we really see that when establishing differences between higher levels of generalization of any production activity (at the level of large corporations, corresponding existing markets of goods / services, etc.) differences in their adaptive distinctive features of functioning are increasingly coming to the fore. So, in the evolutionary development of the socio-economic world, two processes proceed side by side, sometimes crossing their paths, but still strictly delimiting both for their reasons and for the consequences arising from them. One process is differentiation, the "collapse" of the process of productive knowledge, which ultimately leads to speciation of productive activity. The basis of this process is localization (isolation of economic relationships). Another process leads to adaptation, the progressive evolution of production life, and its cause is the struggle for socio-economic existence and vital resources and the resulting socio-economic selection.

3 CONCLUSION

To summarize.

1. In our everyday economic practice, the process of productive knowledge, socio-economic variability occurs in the same way as it occurs in specialized units of corporations professionally engaged in research and development. Only a number of specific conditions makes it difficult to detect in "natural", spontaneously operating conditions of managing.

2. Among the continuously and spontaneously functioning process of the emergence of new practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) in our everyday economic practice, a very large number of such neoplasms are not always in demand (respectively, viable) from the point of view of the implementation of traditional ("normal" in accordance with the prevailing "norm" of management) models of economic behavior. But this in no way can be considered a general rule, since, undoubtedly, there are also such neoplasms, the social significance of which, in the framework of existing social production, is in great demand.

3. The production set of operating entities that implement a certain type of production activity under conditions of complete freedom of exchange – inheritance of productive practical knowledge is a fairly stable aggregate within which, under the very conditions of free exchange, an apparatus is established that stabilizes the numerical relations between the tested existing actors by new socio-economic genovariations and traditionally realized forms of cognition.

4. Each emerging new socio-economic genovariation is "absorbed" (absorbed) by those testing CONCLUSION its existing actors, is retained in the form of economic experience acquired by them, and (in the absence of work of socio-economic selection) continues to remain in this form in society, unlimited time without changing its numerical ratio.

5. As social agents move from one economic period to another, new and new socio-economic genovariations are formed and tested, either unambiguous in comparison with previous (traditional) forms, or completely new. At the same time, they are "absorbed" by the current production process, which outwardly retains its invariability all the time. This heterogeneity of the process of cognition "saturates" this type of production in all directions and forms of its existence, combining and spreading according to the laws of chance (insofar as individual "bits" genes of knowledge acquired by acting entities are not linked to each other), gradually modifying the economic the behavior of most social agents, modifying and transforming the entire socio-economic genotypic environment of their functioning.

6. With a sufficiently large number of cases of the emergence of new productive knowledge tested by social agents in the framework of a certain type of activity (and this is directly related to the duration of its implementation in economic practice (the age of this production)), almost all actors will be "infected" with a different number of recessive and heterogeneous socio-economic genovariations, will gain their own economic experience.

7. By the law of addition of probabilities (although the probability of manifestation of a certain type of new knowledge within the production set of actors

implementing a particular type of production will usually be extremely small), the possibility of manifestation and final fixation in practice by all social agents belonging to heterogeneous socio-economic genotypes of any new genovariation is growing in proportion to the number of socioeconomic genovarias previously tested and "absorbed" by them s. Thus, with sufficient accumulation of this production image knowledge will increasingly begin to detect inherited deviations (inconsistencies) from the traditionally implemented process of productive practical knowledge, and will begin to become shaky in its properties and characteristics, i.e. will start to "age".

8. The most favorable conditions for the manifestation of socio-economic genotypic variability in the process of productive cognition are created when the large number of social agents involved in this production process breaks up into a number of small isolated production formations.

9. Localization (isolation), together with the ongoing socio-economic genotypic variability, is the main factor in the intraspecific (and therefore interspecific) differentiation of the production process, the process of cognition. As a rule, this localization is carried out in space, but sometimes it occurs in time, and maybe in the conditions of existence (social localization).

10. Socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) is essentially an antagonist of itsvigorous exchange. This is a beginning evolutive.

11. The statistics summarized by G. Norton show that any evolutionary process caused by socio-economic selection, the mechanism of competition (it doesn't matter for dominant or recessive forms of productive knowledge) always goes all the way to the complete replacement of one less demanded form of socio-economic genovariation another, more socially significant and competitive. From the same data it follows that socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) identifies (picks up) and distributes (finally fixing in the economic practice of the actors) every, even the slightest improvement in the production process, the process of productive knowledge.

12. Adaptive evolution outside the conditions of localization always leads to a complete transformation (transmutation) of the production process, its progressive development, but can never lead to its disintegration into two independent processes, to its speciation.

13. Stopping the pressure of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) leads to the formation of production polyformism, which is constantly functioning in economic practice.

14. The work of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), like the work of free exchange, contributes to the accumulation in the bowels of social production in implicit (saved) form of a new recessive (subordinate in accordance with the current "norm" of economic behavior, and therefore less socially necessary) productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation).

15. The significant predominance in the structure of the economic experience acquired by social agents of some recessive forms of practical knowledge over dominant is explained by the continuous process of accumulation during the implementation of a certain type of production under conditions of complete freedom of exchange of recessive productive knowledge (socio-economic

genovariations), which is due to the specific action of both free exchange, as well as socio-economic selection (competition mechanism).

16. In relation to the new productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) that is re-emerging in the new productive practical knowledge (socio-economic genovariation) that we daily practice in business practice, the significance of socio-economic selection (competition mechanism) and free exchange is very different from the generally accepted one: by accumulating social actors within a certain production set economic neoplasms, free exchange leads to differentiation of the forms of their practical knowledge, the process of production Islands, while the socio-economic selection (competition mechanism), destroying socially "harmful" genovariatsii, "clean" this type of production from excessive volatility and leads to its monomorphic (uniformity and stability of economic life).

17. There is no reason to deny the possibility of non-adaptive evolution. On the contrary, in many cases it can be assumed that the existing adaptive differences between similar forms of cognition and types of production were not the cause of the discrepancy between the latter, but rather a specific character of these adaptive distinctive features is a consequence of the earlier separation of forms. The more "ancient" (longer in its existence in economic life) the discrepancy has occurred, the more adaptive features will be some forms of practical knowledge, forms of production in comparison with others. Consequently, the mechanisms of socio-economic selection (competition), free exchange and localization (isolation) that underlie the formation and development of productive practical knowledge and, on this basis, productive forces and production relations in society together determine and limit the process of its evolution, the entire social production in general.

* * *

In conclusion, it should be said that the analysis of some aspects of the evolutionary process that we carried out from the point of view of modern sociogenetics will cause some economists to object. Do we have the right to simplify the task in such a way?

Isn't such a "grabbing" of individual evolutionary moments, analysis in parts of a complex and unified evolutionary production process a blunder? After all, our life, including economic, does not fit into the framework of mathematical formulas. And do we have the right to build a regular process of the evolution of production on the random appearance of socio-economic genovariations? Undoubtedly, our experience is only the first, relatively crude attempt to approach the understanding of some evolutionary points in accordance with modern sociogenetic views.

It is impossible to approach such a complex phenomenon as the process of evolution of production, except by first decomposing it into its constituent elements, dividing it into individual moments, conducting an analysis in parts and bringing this analysis to its logical end. We still have no prospects, we are not yet able to give a comparative assessmentthe power of each individual factor participating in this complex process. It is too early to talk about

a synthetic understanding of the evolutionary process. Only after we understand the basic principles and patterns that lie based on the evolution of a certain type of production activity, in the broadest sense of the word, and the phenomenon of speciation, then only we can begin to recreate the final building of economic evolution and consider its individual parts and smaller details. The idea developed in this work about the activity of free exchange and socio-economic selection is an elementary analysis of the significance of these factors from a genetic point of view. This analysis is based on the idea of the ideal regularity of both processes, recognition of the complete independence of the implemented socio-economic genovariations (tested "bits" of knowledge), and the assumption that it is possible to draw a structural analogy between the processes of gene inheritance in genetics and the inheritance processes of productive practical knowledge in our business practice in the strict implementation of the Mendelian laws of splitting. In fact, we know that in a spontaneously organized economic practice, these processes do not proceed as smoothly and naturally as it was presented above. Nevertheless, it is precisely these regularities that underlie those "irregularities" that we actually encounter in everyday economic life. Many of these "irregularities" are now understood by us, and we are firmly convinced that in the very near future the remaining, much more of them will reveal their secrets to us. But this will happen only after we understand the basic principles, the principles of both speciation of the production process, and its entire evolution.

Only then will it be possible to begin to take into account all these deviations and apparent irregularities. There is nothing fundamentally unacceptable in the fact that we based the random process of the evolution of production on the random appearance of socio-economic genovariations, since probability theory teaches us that chance obeys the same laws as everything else. To build a regular process of production evolution on a random game of separately emerging socio-economic genovariations is no less logical and logical as to build a regular theory of gas elasticity on the game of random gas molecule impacts on vessel walls. And do not forget that in our reasoning we were always dealing with mass phenomena, with huge numbers. And then the law of large numbers comes into force, formulated by J. Bernoulli at the beginning of the XVII century. This is the same law that underlies the constancy of many physical and social processes. Here, statistics will already show that the conclusions we have drawn do not exist only on paper, but they are just as real and legal, and they are based on the same statistical regularity.

4 Literature

1. Bazarov V. Capitalist cycles and the restoration process of the USSR. Moscow: Politizdat, 1925.

2. Böhm-Bawerk O. Criticism of the theory of K. Marx. Chelyabinsk: Socium, 2002.

3. Bergson A. Sobr. op. M .: New publishing house, 1954.

4. Vernadsky V.I. Transactions on biogeochemistry and soil geochemistry. M .: Progress, 1985.

5. Vernadsky V.I. Living matter and biosphere. Moscow: Progress, 1985.

6. Vernadsky V.I. Philosophical thoughts of a naturalist. Moscow: Progress, 1991.

7. Veselovsky I.N. Christian Huygens. M .:Prosweschtschenije , 1959.

8. Wilson I., Lumsden C. The Fire of Prometheus: Reflections on the walking of the mind. M .: EKSMO, 2007.

9. Ivaschenko NP Production and economic systems in the industry of Russia (transformation, formation, development). Moscow: Dialogue, 2010.

10. Kapelyushnikov R. Philosophy of the market F. Hayek // p IMEMO . 2009. No 12.P. 103–107.

11. Clark S. Conditions of Economic Progress. SPbU .: Economics, 1957.

12. Kleiner G.B. Mechanisms for making strategic decisions at industrial enterprises. M .: CEMI, 2008.

13. Kondratyev N.D. Big Business Cycles: A Review of Economic Statistics. Moscow: Progress, 1926.

14. Kondratyev N.D. Big cycles. New York, 1984. Konovalov V. The innovation saga. M .: Academy. project, 2010. 128

15. Coase R. Firm, Market and Law. M .: Higher. shk., 2003.

16. Kritsner I. Competition and Entrepreneurship. Chelyabinsk: Society, 2007.

17. Marks K. Capital. T. I - III. Moscow: Progress, 1975.

18. Menard K. Economics of organizations. M .: Thought, 2006.

19. Menger K. Selected Works. Moscow: Territory of the Future, 2005.

20. Mises L. von. Human Activity: A Treatise on Economic Theory. Chelyabinsk: Socium, 2005.

21. Neprintseva E. Firma in a market economy // RER. 2011. No 2.P. 22–27.

22. Newton I. Mathematical principles of natural philosophy / Per. A.N. Krylov. M .: Nauka, 1989. (Series “Classics of Science”). Onoprienko V.I., Simakov K.V., Meyen S.V. and other Development of the doctrine of time in geology. Kiev, 1982.

23. Leibniz G.V. Compositions. In 4 volumes.Vol. 1.M .: Mysl, 1982.

24. Prahalad K.K., Ramaswami V. The future of competition: Creating unique value together with consumers. M .: CJSC "Olymp-business", 2006.352 p.

25. Pearson K. New Philosophical Encyclopedia. In 4 volumes.M .: Mysl, 2010.

26. Pennett R.K. Mimicry in diurnal butterflies. SPbU .: Peter, 1997.

27. Sergienko L.V. On some points of formation and development economic genetics // RISK. 2016. No 4.P. 218–223.

28. Sergienko L.V. The emergence of new knowledge in economic practice // RISK. 2016. No 1.P. 85–91.

29. Sergienko L. Sociogenetics and Economics: "Productive" Practical Knowledge and "Productive" Labor. M .: Ru- sains, 2017.

30. Strumilin S.G. On the study of the level of productive forces. SPb .: Economy. shk., 1932a.

31. Strumilin S.G. Measuring the welfare of the people. SPbU .: Economy. shk., 1932b.

32. Hayek F. Using knowledge in society. M .: Izograf, 2000.129

33. Hayek F. Competition as a product of discovery // IMEMO. 2011. No 12.P. 51–59.

34. Hardy G. Analogy of mathematics. Izhevsk .: Research Center "Regular and Chaotic Dynamics", 2000.

35. Khotyasheva O. Organizational forms of management of innovative activities of American companies // Problems of theory and practice of management. 2007. No 6. P. 95–99.

36. Shastitko A.E. Neo-institutional economic theory. M .: INFRA-M, 2008.

37. Sheko P. Mechanism of innovative economics // Problems of management theory and practice. 2009. No 2. P. 11-19. Schumpeter J. The theory of economic development. M .: EKSMO, 2007.

38. Euler L. Mechanics. Basics of point dynamics. Moscow:

39. Gostekhizdat, 1938.

40. Rothbard M.N. Man, economy and state: A treatise on economic principles. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962.