The Philosophical Basis of Life in Sociology

Ma Hongbao, PhD

Queens, New York, USA

Phone: 718-404-5362; Email: mafornewyork@gmail.com

Abstract: Sociological immortality does not claim that all deaths can or should be eliminated, nor does it assert that societies can achieve perfect justice. Its scope is explicitly limited to deaths that are **predictable, preventable, and institutionally produced** under existing technological and economic conditions. By defining its domain narrowly, the framework avoids utopian assumptions while remaining normatively rigorous.

Keywords: Sociological; immortality; justice; technological; economic

This paper makes three specific theoretical contributions to sociological and political philosophy literature.

First, it introduces the concept of **sociological immortality** as a normative baseline rather than a utopian ideal. Unlike theories that seek optimal justice or maximal equality, sociological immortality establishes a minimum institutional requirement: the systematic prevention of avoidable, socially caused death.

Second, the paper provides a **clear analytical distinction between natural death and socially caused death**, reframing mortality as a partially institutional outcome rather than a purely biological or individual phenomenon. This distinction allows mortality to be evaluated as a function of social structure, policy design, and institutional responsibility.

Third, the paper shifts responsibility for survival outcomes from moral judgment to institutional accountability, contributing to debates on structural violence, social sustainability, and the legitimacy of political systems.

Together, these contributions position sociological immortality as a testable and policy-relevant criterion for evaluating modern societies.

I. From "Individual Mortality" to "Societal Sustainability"

From a biological perspective, individual death is inevitable; it is a fundamental law of nature. Society, however, is not bound by the same limitation.

The central question facing human civilization is therefore not whether individuals can achieve biological immortality, but a more foundational inquiry:

Can a society prevent unnecessary deaths caused by its own institutional design?

The concept of *sociological immortality* emerges as a direct response to this question. It does not deny the natural inevitability of death; rather, it rejects the assumption that deaths resulting from social systems, policy failures, and structural inequalities are unavoidable.

II. The Philosophical Distinction Between Natural Death and Social Death

1. Natural Death

Natural death arises from conditions beyond institutional control, including:

- Biological aging
- Irresistible natural disasters
- Diseases that cannot be treated with existing technology

These deaths represent the recognized limits of human intervention.

2. Socially Caused Death

By contrast, social death is not natural. It is produced by institutional arrangements and policy choices, including:

- Loss of basic living conditions due to poverty
- Death from treatable illnesses caused by lack of medical coverage
- Systematic abandonment through unemployment, exclusion, or identity-based restrictions
- Exposure to life-threatening conditions despite legal compliance
- Death resulting from public insecurity
- Death caused by adherence to unreasonable or harmful regulations

The philosophical foundation of sociological immortality is simple but uncompromising:

If a death is caused by social structure, it is not fate— it is responsibility.

III. The Minimum Standard of Justice in Civilization: Preventing Avoidable Death

Across the history of ethical and political philosophy, a shared principle has emerged:

A civilized society must, at minimum, prevent deaths that can be avoided through institutional design.

- Aristotle held that the purpose of politics is to enable people to live well
- Hobbes grounded state legitimacy in the protection of life
- Rousseau viewed the social contract as a safeguard against systematic harm
- Rawls argued that justice must render the condition of the least advantaged acceptable

Sociological immortality does not reject these traditions. It clarifies and operationalizes them into a testable minimum requirement:

The primary function of social institutions must not be to produce death.

IV. Institutional Responsibility Takes Precedence Over Moral Instruction

Historically, societies have explained failure to survive in terms of:

- Individual laziness
- Moral deficiency
- Personal misfortune

Sociology fundamentally rejects this framing.

When death is **structural, predictable, and large-scale**, it ceases to be a personal matter and becomes an institutional failure.

This implies that:

- Personal responsibility cannot excuse systemic collapse
- Governments cannot shift structural risk onto individuals
- Moral exhortation cannot replace institutional guarantees

This represents a civilizational shift—from a morality-based society to an institution-based civilization.

V. The Right to Life as the Foundation of All Rights

Within the philosophy of rights, one principle is non-negotiable:

Without the right to life, all other rights are meaningless.

Freedom of speech, movement, and occupation presuppose survival itself.

Sociological immortality does not seek to expand rights endlessly. It establishes a non-negotiable baseline:

- No death due to poverty

- No abandonment due to illness
- No elimination through institutional indifference

This is not a "higher-order" right; it is the foundation upon which all rights rest.

VI. Society as a Self-Sustaining System: A Systems-Philosophy Perspective

From a systems perspective, society is not a one-time project but a continuously adaptive structure.

A society that:

- Constantly consumes its members
- Systematically eliminates law-abiding individuals
- Maintains order through suffering

is not strong—it is unsustainable.

Sociological immortality therefore requires society to minimize internal, unnecessary human depletion. This is not radical idealism but rational conservatism: preserving civilization by reducing avoidable loss.

VII. Sociological Immortality as the Minimum Rational Value

Idealism seeks the best possible world.

Sociological immortality demands only that society not produce the worst.

It does not guarantee equal success, universal prosperity, or the elimination of competition. It sets a single bottom line:

Society must not function at the expense of human survival.

This principle respects social complexity while ensuring civilizational continuity.

Conclusion: Sociological Immortality as the Existential Bottom Line of Civilization

Sociological immortality is not a slogan. It is an existential judgment:

- Individuals die, but society must not depend on death
- People may fail, but institutions must not abandon them
- Civilization may contain injustice, but it must not allow avoidable death

A society capable of sociological immortality is not necessarily perfect—but it is worthy of long-term existence.

One of the core objectives of my candidacy for Governor of New York is to advance sociological immortality: to ensure that New Yorkers do not die for social reasons, that life is secure and dignified, and that New York grows stronger, richer, and more sustainable as a result.

References

Classical Political & Moral Philosophy

1. Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885.
2. Hobbes, T. *Leviathan*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1651.
3. Rousseau, J.-J. *The Social Contract*. Translated by G. D. H. Cole. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1913 (original 1762).
4. Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Sociology, Social Structure, and Institutional Harm

5. Durkheim, É. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. New York: Free Press, 1951 (original 1897).
6. Weber, M. *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
7. Galtung, J. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research*, 1969;6(3):167–191.
8. Farmer, P. "An Anthropology of Structural Violence." *Current Anthropology*, 2004;45(3):305–325.

Rights, Justice, and Human Survival

9. Sen, A. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.
10. Arendt, H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1951.
11. United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris, 1948.
12. Shue, H. *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Systems Theory & Social Sustainability

13. Luhmann, N. *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
14. Meadows, D. H. *Thinking in Systems*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.
15. Parsons, T. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press, 1951.