

**LOMONOSOV MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY  
THE FACULTY OF GLOBAL PROCESSES**

**Alexander N. Chumakov**

# **PHILOSOPHY OF GLOBALIZATION**

**Selected articles**

**Moscow  
2010**

**Chumakov A.N. Philosophy of Globalization. Selected articles.** – M.: MAX-PRESS, 2010. – p. –  
ISBN

The volume is a collection of articles by a prominent Russian philosopher Professor Alexander N. Chumakov. For many years he has been researching the global problems of modernity and globalization processes. The volume includes selected articles and presentations at international congresses and conferences, as well as tables of contents and resumes of the two latest monographs by Chumakov. The volume is intended for English-speaking scholars, professionals, students and a broader reader, for everyone interested in the issues of modern globalization, its origins and various consequences of it.

ISBN

©Chumakov, 2010

---

## CONTENTS

### Preface

<b>Roland Robertson.</b> Introduction .....	
<b>An Qinian.</b> Foreword .....	
<b>William McBride.</b> Opening address .....	
<b>William C. Gay.</b> The philosophical research of A. Chumakov ...	
<b>Igor I. Abylgaziev, Ilya V. Iliin.</b> Word to the Reader .....	

### Articles

On the Subject and Boundaries of Global Studies.....	
Recognizing Globalization .....	
Globalization as a Natural Historical Process .....	
An Anthropological Dimension of Globalization .....	
Dialog and Conflict of Cultures in the Global World .....	
On the Way to a Global Society .....	
The Challenge of Globalization and Philosophical Responsibility for the World Future .....	
China in the World System of Coordinates .....	
Globalization of the World and its Consequences: Russian Vision .....	
Philosophy as an Indicator of the Openness of Society: Russian Context .....	
Human Values: the Key to Solving Global Problems .....	
Globalization and Cosmopolitanism in the Context of Modernity Globalization Studies .....	
Articles from Global Studies Encyclopedia .....	

## Appendix

**Alexander N. Chumakov.** *Globalization. Outline of the Holistic World* (Moscow, Prospect, 2005; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2009) .....

**Alexander N. Chumakov.** *Metaphysics of Globalization: Cultural-Cum-Civilizational Context* (Moscow: «CANON +», 2006) .....

**Yuri Mikhailov.** *Book review* (Symposion: a Jurnal of Russian Thought) .....

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

The publication in the English language of a number of Alexander Chumakov's papers is to be greatly welcomed. The Russian contribution to the study of globalization, more generally global studies, has had relatively little impact in the West. Therefore intellectual work on the world as a whole has suffered from having little awareness of, or input from, a major global region and rich intellectual tradition. Much of this lack has undoubtedly been a consequence of the Cold War. Any serious attempt to repair this circumstance is highly commendable.

It is only since the 1980s that globalization has been an explicit focus of study and for many scholars the concept of globalization has unfortunately been limited to so-called neoliberal economic change – free trade, deregulation, privatization and marketization. On the other hand, a few Western social scientists took important steps toward what is best called a multidimensional approach to globalization as long ago as the early 1980s. In the UK, the USA, Australia and a few other countries globalization, in the multidimensional sense was, for the most part, confined to sociologists, anthropologists and students of religious studies. It was not until later, in the early 1990s, that globalization became a central topic in the form of an economic ideology promoted by political leaders in the US and the UK. This had the effect of making the study of globalization unnecessarily complicated, in the sense that there were two main general approaches to globalization which were at odds with each other. On the one hand, there was the multidimensional perspective of which I have already spoken. On the other hand, there was the newer and much more prominent neoliberal perspective. There was, in addition, the world-systems perspective, which while also having the limitation of being economically reductive, was not capitalistic. (Indeed, from within this perspective a few writers have foreseen the coming of global socialism.)

Thus, when movements opposing globalization arose in the late 1990s, that which they actually were resisting was the economic globalization advocated by leading Western politicians, sustained by such organizations as the World Trade Organization, the World Bank and the

International Monetary Fund. The ironic twist in this respect came to a head with the militant anti-globalization demonstrations against the WTO in Seattle, USA, in 1999. The irony lay in the fact that even though the protesters claimed they were against globalization – meaning capitalistic globalization – they were actually **participants** in globalization in the multidimensional sense. Recognition of this irony soon led to a distinction being made between globalization from below and globalization from above. In other words, the more people coordinated their protests across various countries, the more they also came to recognize that they were involved in a global social movement and were also attempting to reconstitute global culture.

Precisely because the neoliberal approach involved proclaiming the triumph of capitalism, many scholars have dated the beginning of globalization to the collapse of Soviet-style, command economies. This has proved particularly problematic, in the light of a great deal of historical scholarship that has considered globalization to have begun virtually at the same time as the beginning of «civilization» itself. Indeed, there still are quite a large number of Western scholars who appear to think that globalization began in 1989, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union and the attempt to apply «shock therapy» to former Soviet-type economies. The severe limitations of the latter approach, with its inattention to cultural, social and, to some extent, political factors have been clearly exposed. Indeed, the obvious absurdities of the shock therapy approach actually contributed to the rise of approaches that have taken other factors, including the historical and ecological aspects, very seriously.

Along with the development of theories of globalization and applications thereof there grew a wider interest in global studies. In the USA global – sometimes called international – studies began as long ago at the high school level in the early 1980s. The funding of these was almost entirely from those who were concerned about the economic performance of the USA in the global economy. At that time there were only a few university centers of global or international studies. However, there was a rapid growth in these educational foci in the late 1980s and 1990s. It was during the 1990s, more particularly the first decade of the twenty-first century, that intellectual work on «the

global» accelerated immensely, resulting in what some have called a global network of global studies.

Even so, there have been some extremely significant global regions which have not been accorded the attention that they warranted. Undoubtedly, Russia is one of these. On the other hand, the work of Professor Chumakov and his Russian colleagues has not by any means received the recognition warranted by its contributions. If only for this reason the present volume deserves a wide distribution and readership, meaning that the less that we are informed about Russia the poorer the condition of global studies. To this should be added that the recent acceleration of interest, particularly among British and German scholars, in the East-West connection has been deficient in its neglect of historical and contemporary connections between Russia and China, not to speak of Japan, South and North Korea, and the southern republics of the former Soviet Union.

As the study of globalization and – much more generally – the practice of global studies has rapidly expanded it has come to be regarded as a site of disciplinary mutation. Given the large number of conventional disciplines that have become involved in global studies some have argued that global studies should now be regarded as **transdisciplinary**, a word that denotes the demise of the established disciplines and their transcendence by much more inclusive and new forms of academic pursuit. There have been numerous attempts to conceptualize the circumstance, including the use of such descriptions as post-disciplinary, anti-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary and, most unfortunate, inter-disciplinary. (I reject the latter because it actually has the consequence of consolidating disciplinarity, rather than overcoming it.)

**Philosophical** interest in the global arena, as proclaimed in the work of Professor Chumakov, has been more or less absent in the West. On the other hand, his philosophical approach does deal with globalization multidimensionally. The Russian intellectual tradition has tended to be much more inclusive than that which has obtained in the West. In this sense the difference between the approach of Chumakov and the latter is less than might appear on the surface. In any case, there are two overlapping strands to the articles contained in this book. First, there is

the concern with the specific topic of globalization and the prospects for a global society. A second consideration is the more general area of global studies (which is sometimes called globalistics in Russia).

Whichever of these strands of Professor Chumakov's work one inspects one finds at the center a number of continuous themes. Among these are the significance of civilizations, the salience of culture, long-term, historical aspects of global change, conceptions of democracy, cosmopolitan trends and societal openness, as well as the importance of inter-cultural dialog.

We should all be in debt to Professor Chumakov for his important and thoroughly insightful efforts to make Russian contributions central to the global project of self-understanding. In the extremely fragile condition of humanity at this time – not to speak of the rapidly increasing problems associated with climate and related changes – the inclusion of the vast Russian region is vital.

***Roland Robertson***

Distinguished Professor of Sociology Emeritus,  
University of Pittsburgh, USA

Emeritus Professor, University of Aberdeen,  
Scotland Honorary Guest Professor of Cultural Studies,  
Tsinghua University, Beijing, China



---

## FOREWORD

Professor Alexander N. Chumakov is the most active and influential philosopher in contemporary Russia studying globalization and its possible consequences. He started publishing research articles in this field already in the beginning of the 1980s and became, after the death of Academician Ivan T. Frolov (1999), the central activist and researcher in the sphere of global studies. Since that, he has done a lot in this new field of interdisciplinary knowledge as a theorist and organizer.

In 1996 his book «Philosophy of Global Problems» was translated into the Chinese language and published in China. Together with Ivan Frolov's book «The Prospects of Man» it had great influence on studying global problems by Chinese philosophers.

Alexander Chumakov's research works in the field of global studies are characterized by the following:

First, he not simply explores globalization theoretically but makes effort to find ways and methods of practical solution for various global studies facing the humankind;

Second, his central idea with regard to global studies is that globalization should be seen, on the one hand, as interaction of various social and natural factors and, on the other hand, as a process of historic development. This allows the reader of his works to feel tremendous unity and historicism of world events.

Third, he pays serious attention to explaining the phenomenon of globalization and its essence, its connections with cultural and civilizational development, stressing, at the same time, the importance of human spirit and morality for solving global problems.

One can find in these characteristics of Alexander Chumakov's research work some influence of Marxism; at the same time, one can see interconnection with traditional Russian philosophy and culture. Chumakov's research work has inherited traditions of Frolov and Berdyaev, of Soloviev and the other great Russian thinkers. For the Russians not material utility is the most important thing, but spiritual freedom; not individual happiness, but destiny of the humankind. For this reason

a critical vision of industrial civilization has become traditional for Russian philosophy. Chumakov's studies continue this tradition under the new historical conditions what makes him a prominent Russian philosopher.

15.07.2010.

*An Qinian*

Ph.D., Professor at the Renmin University of China,  
Chairman of the Chinese Society of Russian Philosophy Studies  
(Beijing, China)

---

## OPENING ADDRESS

I feel honored to have been offered the opportunity of contributing a few prefatory words to this collection of Alexander Chumakov's writings in the English language, prepared by his colleagues to honor him on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. I have known Alexander Chumakov for some years now and have always been enormously impressed by his energy, his commitment, and his cleverness as an organizer. In particular, the Russian Philosophical Society, which to an outsider like me looks so enviably active and productive, is heavily indebted to him for its present condition. And his strong encouragement of Russian philosophers' participation in the last two World Congresses of Philosophy, the one in Istanbul in 2003 and the most recent one in Seoul in 2008, was extremely gratifying to me, as a member of the Programme Committee for the former and as Secretary General of the sponsoring organization, the International Federation of Philosophical Societies (FISP), for the latter.

The essay collection in this book, on the other hand, illuminates Professor Chumakov's achievements as a scholar rather than as an organizer. I find these achievements equally gratifying, if not even more so. His focus on problems surrounding the phenomenon of globalization, including the massive *Global Studies Encyclopedia* that he co-edited, is very well known not only in Russia, but worldwide. And since «globalization» – setting aside for the moment all the problems of defining it, which Professor Chumakov analyzes so well – names the single most important cluster of issues for philosophers, certainly for social and political philosophers, in today's world, this ensures that he truly is, as our English expression would have it, «on the cutting edge» of contemporary philosophy.

From these essays one may learn a great deal about the broad historical context, going back many centuries, within which the current globalization process is to be understood, and one may also achieve new insight, as I did, concerning the evolution of life and thought in Russia over its turbulent recent decades. The analyses are lucidly written, well informed by generally sympathetic but critical readings of a

number of writers from both Russia and the rest of the world (the United States, France, Iran, and so on), and guided by a clear worldview and set of judgments that the author is unafraid to express in a firm, straightforward fashion that is never strident. Professor Chumakov's prognoses for the future are hopeful but tempered by a down-to-earth realism. And his insistence on the importance, unfortunately overlooked by some in power, of employing philosophical acumen in diagnosing aspects of the current situation and developing policies to cope with them is to me both very welcome and, like so much else of what he has to say, right on target.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity warmly to congratulate Alexander Chumakov, not just on all of his professional achievements, but also on attaining this important milestone in his life.

*William L. McBride,*  
Arthur G. Hansen Distinguished Professor of Philosophy,  
Purdue University,  
and President of the International Federation  
of Philosophical Societies

---

## THE PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH OF A. CHUMAKOV

Scholars who read Russian generally know very well Alexander N. Chumakov's work on topics of globalization and Global Studies. In addition to well over 300 research works, Chumakov has published seven books in these fields. Beyond his foundational contributions to Global Studies, he has addressed issues of democratization in general and in relation to Russia in particular. He also has shown special concern for issues of «global dependency» and «ecological crisis.» However, for far too long, only a few of his articles have been available in English. Now, with the publication in English of Chumakov's *Philosophy of Globalization: Selected Articles* many of his leading essays in these areas of globalization and Global Studies are available in English. Of the fourteen chapters and three appendices, the only ones to have appeared previously in English are the two essays «On the Subject and Boundaries of Global Studies» and «An Anthropological Dimension of Globalization» and some of his brief entries listed under «Articles from Global Studies Encyclopedia».

The essays included demonstrate how the research of Chumakov is interdisciplinary in nature. From a historical perspective, he addresses a broad range of problems related to the formation of Global Studies as a special area of academic research directed toward resolving theoretically and practically the acute issues of modernity. Moreover, within Global Studies, he has developed very seminal concepts and insights concerning the social and cultural foundations of globalization. His analyses focus on axiology, environmental enlightenment, global justice, human rights, and the formation of global consciousness.

For Chumakov, the economic and political development of Western civilization led to globalization that, in turn, gave rise to global problems of modernity in the second half of the 20th century. From his systemic approach to understanding social processes, Chumakov sides with the view that a multi-dimensional world has replaced a linear and flat world. In order to develop his position, Chumakov formulates basic categories and fundamental propositions that provide a philosophical

basis for Global Studies as a specific branch of philosophical knowledge. He employs categories such as «globalization,» «global problem,» «global equality,» and «anti-globalism.» In his treatment of these categories, he delineates propositions that trace their influence on human socio-political activity. In so doing, he also ties Global Studies closely to concern for human rights and the quest for a global democratic social and political order.

In a very distinctive position, Chumakov maintains that morality and common law can become the main social regulators. Consequently, in his judgement, human rights are values of primary importance. However, given the pervasiveness and complexity of global interdependence, he stresses that human rights should be defined more precisely and complemented by specification of adequate responsibilities. Chumakov argues that while every nation should be able to retain its own traditions, beliefs and values, for the sake of the future each nation also should make universal human interests a top priority. In making these arguments, Chumakov also provides support for the concepts of global democratic governance and global justice.

In his recent research, Chumakov has focused on the development of a general globalization theory. This research is especially prominent in his books *Globalization: The Contours of the Holistic Society* (2005) and *Metaphysics of Globalization: Cultural and Civilizational Context* (2006), both in Russian. By reviving a holistic picture of the world, he presents globalization as a natural historical process and a sphere of relations and confrontations of various forces and interests. Chumakov delineates how the logic of development of objective events engenders globalization across geological, biological, and social spheres and uses the term «triosphere» for the unity of these three spheres.

Chumakov's most significant contribution to Global Studies has been the creation of a language for interdisciplinary communication acceptable for different sciences. In the creation of such a language, he has developed and upgraded several fundamental concepts and categories. Beyond terms already noted, other new and important ones include «demographic explosion,» «world community,» and «the new humanism.»

Currently Alexander N. Chumakov is the Head and Chair of Philosophy at the Financial Academy of the Government of the Russian Federation. Since 1991 he is also the First Vice-President of the 6.000-member Russian Philosophical Society. Furthermore, he is the Editor-in-Chief of the journals *Vestnik RFO* (in Russian) and *The Age of Globalization* (in Russian and English). His most extensive work in English is the seminal *Global Studies Encyclopedia*, edited by I. Mazour, A. Chumakov, and W. Gay. This encyclopedia has numerous articles by Chumakov, some of which, as previously noted, are included in the present volume. Taken together, his works make him a leading figure in Russia and a key figure internationally in the fields of human rights, global studies, global justice, and global democracy.

#### **Prior Works in English by Alexander N. Chumakov**

Chumakov, A. (2008). On the Subject and Boundaries of Global Studies. *Age of Globalization. Studies in Contemporary Global Processes* 1, pp. 6–16.

Chumakov, A. (2009). An Anthropological Dimension of Globalization. In N. Omelchenko (ed) *The Human Being in Contemporary Philosophical Conceptions*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge, pp. 237–244.

Mazour, I., Chumakov, A., and Gay, W. (eds) (2003) *Global Studies Encyclopedia*. Raduga, Moscow.

**William C. Gay**  
Ph.D., Professor,  
University of North Carolina at Charlotte (USA)

---

## WORD TO THE READER

Contemporary world rapidly evolves in the direction of unity, wholeness and the tightest cooperation between people from different countries and continents. Under the influence of economic, cultural and social globalization peoples of the whole world increasingly acquire both common destiny and growing responsibility for the present and the future of life on the Earth. These objective processes leave no choice for any people, any inhabitant of our planet, but to see themselves as citizens of a tightly interconnected, small and fragile word and to act accordingly.

Besides, social development is not necessarily predetermined and its direction depends a lot on our understanding of contemporary trends and on our activity. At the same time, too many conditions should be fulfilled to reach consensus with regard to paths of development and to get the desired results. It seems difficult to resolve this task in the modern world divided into «national compartments» and «zones of influence», where often the spirit of distrust and suspicion prevails engendering severe confrontation and armed conflicts. But there is no alternative to such a resolution.

General situation, direction, nature and trends of development, as well as social and political processes taking place in the largest, system-making states of the world are of special significance. Russia is, no doubt, one of such states. One can hardly question seriously the principal importance of its place and role in the making of the new world order, in the formation of the open, stable and sustainably developing world community. They are predetermined and not just by geopolitical or historic circumstances. One should also not underestimate cultural, military, technological and political influence of Russia on the world situation.

In this regard the collection of selected articles about the most topical issues of modern globalization written by Professor of the Moscow State University Alexander N. Chumakov is a good opportunity to make the reader outside Russia acquainted with Russian achievements in this principally new field of interdisciplinary studies.



Of course, articles presented here do not reflect the whole spectrum of global studies being conducted in Russia during the last decades. Their main value is, however, that they are written from the viewpoint of philosophy – the most important component of global studies, and reflect traditions and the most important findings of the Russian philosophical thought, which has within the last forty years contributed significantly into researching globalization processes and the global problems of modernity.

The volume is interesting also because of being written by a person belonging to the famous Russian academic school of global studies created from a scratch by efforts of such prominent scholars as I.T. Frolov, N.N. Moiseev, A.L. Yanshin, Yu.A. Izrael, V.I. Danilov-Daniliyan, G.S. Khozin, I.V. Besouzhnev-Lada, etc. The formation of academic position and creative development of Alexander Chumakov took place in the course of intense communication with them.

We hope that this volume, written by a prominent Russian scholar, will help an interested (broader) Western reader not simply to understand many issues of contemporary world development better, but also to acknowledge modern Russian social thought, where the topic of globalization occupies the most important position.

***Igor I. Abylgaziev***, Doctor of History, Professor,  
Academic supervisor of the Department of global processes  
of the Moscow State University

***Ilya V. Ilyin***, Candidate of Geology, Assistant Professor,  
Dean of the Department of global processes  
of the Moscow State University

## ARTICLES

---

---

### ON THE SUBJECT AND BOUNDARIES OF GLOBAL STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

The origins and formation of Global Studies as an interdisciplinary sphere of academic knowledge refer to the last quarter of the 20th century. Its emergence was the result of the process of integration of different disciplines in attempts to solve complicated and complex problems of the planetary scale. At the same time the notion 'Global Studies' itself, though being in use already in the 1970s, was not widely spread then. Its content has started to be discussed seriously since the end of the 1990s only when the main attention of researchers switched from global problems to comprehension of the globalization phenomenon. By that time, a considerable theoretical and factual data had been accumulated in the sphere of planetary processes and phenomena, and the terms 'global studies', 'globalization', 'global world', 'antiglobalism', 'global problems' etc. became common, having become widespread not only in academic literature, mass media and political vocabulary but also in everyday vocabulary, too. So, the necessary conditions for the formation of a new research field have appeared, although it is not accepted unambiguously by all even today.

The matter is that the basic meaning of the mentioned above definitions at the level of general idea seems to provoke no special difficulties, however in the academic sphere their content remains a subject of serious discussions and needs to be defined more precisely, as different researchers quite often interpret them differently. Thus, for in-

---

<sup>1</sup> Age of Globalization. Studies in Contemporary Global Processes. Scientific Journal. # 1, 2008.

stance, some consider global studies an academic discipline<sup>2</sup>, others see it as a sphere of social practice<sup>3</sup>, while yet others as a supradisciplinary branch of academic knowledge<sup>4</sup>, and someone completely denies its right for existence. There are no less discrepancies with respect to globalization which is sometimes interpreted either as a cause of global problems or on the contrary, as its direct consequence. At the same time some scholars believe that globalization is an objective process, and global studies aim at investigating this process and its consequences, others view globalization as a result of the action of definite social-economic structures or political forces in the international arena, what also assigns a fundamentally different prospective in understanding of global studies.

Noting such a wide spread of opinions on the interpretation of both global studies and its basic tenets, it is important to emphasize that it is quite a regular phenomenon, as the matter concerns a new actively forming branch of academic knowledge. Consequently, this is not a scholastic notions game what is taking place in this case but the process of formation of a unified and quite definite language of interdisciplinary communication. In this respect it is necessary to bear in mind that the term ‘global studies’ has for the first time appeared due to quite active discussions and numerous publications concerning the dangers of global problems, which came into serious notice only after the publication the first reports of the Club of Rome. Originally, this term meant the sphere of science connected with researches only in the field of global problems. Let us notice that it had happened a few decades before globalization started to be discussed. And, for instance, the word ‘antiglobalism’ at all came to everyday life quite recently when in dif-

---

<sup>2</sup> See: Cheshkov, M. A. Globalistics as Academic Knowledge. Essays in Theory and Conceptual Apparatus (in Russian). – Moscow, 2005; Barlibaev, H. General Theory of Globalization and Steady Development (in Russian). – Moscow, 2003.

<sup>3</sup> See: Vasilenko, I. A. Political Globalistics: Text-book for Institutions of Higher Education (in Russian). – Moscow: Logos, 2000; Panarin, A. S. Temptation by Globalism (in Russian). – Moscow: ECSMO-Press, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> See: Globalistics as a Branch of Academic Knowledge: Proceedings of Permanent Interdisciplinary Seminar of the ‘Global World’ Club of Scientists (in Russian). Vol. 3. – Moscow, 2001; Chumakov, A. N. Globalization. Outlines of the Entire World (in Russian). – Moscow: TK Velby, Publishing House Prospect, 2005.

ferent countries the international movement of so-called antiglobalists manifested themselves with extravagant protest actions.

To arrange all this terminology in a certain system becomes an urgent task nowadays, as the matter of the global studies status, categories, principles and approaches is fundamental. Without this it is difficult to expect a success in proper understanding of contemporary world tendencies and withstanding global threats.

Without an opportunity to go into details, let us notice that globalization is a centuries-long natural-historical process; global problems are a determined result of this process; and global studies is the sphere of theory and practice that focuses on globalization and global problems.

Global studies firstly arose basing on the investigation of global problems, i.e. on the analysis of the consequences when the term 'globalization' had not simply existed yet, and this fact misleads some modern scholars when the cause and the effect are concerned.

In this respect, let us turn to the term 'globalization'. It is used as a rule to characterize the integration and disintegration processes of a planetary scale in the field of economy, politics, culture and also anthropogenic environmental changes that have the universal character in their form and in the content they touch the interests of the whole world community. At the same time it is significant to note the two extreme points in the interpretation of both the phenomenon of globalization itself and the history of its appearance. One of them consists in the improperly broad interpretation of the planetary character of social links and relations in the attempt to discover them already in the primitive society. From this point of view, even the early stages of the development of humanity are characterized as global ones.

Another extreme point is to treat globalization too narrowly when modern processes of social development are considered apart from their fundamental causes and genesis, i.e. history and dynamics of the formation of the international structures and transnational links are not taken into account. Within such an approach globalization is quite often connected with the events of the 20th century only, and moreover with the last decades. Besides, it is often viewed as a deliberately defined and controlled process, as a purposeful fulfillment of someone's

policy, and they even speak about globalization as a subjective reality, someone's guileful intention, realized in the interests of a certain circle of people, transnational corporations, or definite states.

The above-mentioned extremes in the views on globalization do not cover the whole range of the existing standpoints on the question, and their diversity can be explained not only by the complexity of the subject, but also by the insufficient development of the issue. From this some negative consequences result. In particular, mutual understanding between people is getting embarrassed, the interdisciplinary interaction is hampered, and serious obstacles are created on the way of understanding the true reasons of globalization and global contradictions it brings. The reasons of misunderstanding of many conflicts are rooted here too, determined by the fact that the world in its certain aspects and relations is increasingly becoming unified, integral and mutually dependent while at the same time no mechanisms effective enough to regulate social relations at the global level are available. It is quite obvious that without a profound analysis and quite a clear understanding of the essence of processes of globalization it is difficult to expect a successful overcoming of the problems mentioned above.

Thus, today the necessity has come to a head to define the status of global studies, which has already compiled rich material, acquired a sufficient development and is represented by a variety of schools, directions, different associations, creative collectivities, research groups, etc. A complicated nature of the object of investigation and inevitable in this case interdisciplinarity complicate considerably the establishment of clear boundaries of the subject we are interested in, as they quite often merge with other fields of knowledge: futurology, culture studies and philosophy. Moreover, the theoretical knowledge received in global studies is very often connected with the necessity of concrete decision-making what leads to enlarging of the subject under discussion's boundaries. For better understanding of the assigned problem we will make a short survey into the history of the formation of the global world and process of its comprehension.

As has already been mentioned, the formation of global studies begins when they started to speak for the first time about the arisen threats to the whole humanity and began to discuss new issues which as-

sumed the name of 'global'. It was the period of the late 1960s – early 1970s. In the context of our discussion the circumstance in point has a fundamental meaning, as nowadays the discussions on globalization are weakly correlated or are related in no way at all to the global problems and the beginning of their systematic study about forty years ago. As a result global studies is quite often or predominantly correlated with the investigation of processes of globalization, at best declaring it the incipient discipline counting no more than one and a half decade, i.e. the period when global studies is in the focus of scientists' attention.

However, one should emphasize that although since the end of the 1960s scientists focus their attention not on the processes of globalization but on the consequences (global problems), already at that time there emerged an integrative field of interdisciplinary research aiming at a theoretical research and practical coping with fundamentally new dangers urgent for the whole humanity. At that time it became evident that alongside with the differentiation of scientific knowledge accompanying science for centuries, the urgent necessity appeared to integrate theoretical and practical knowledge aimed at studying new phenomena that were noted for the scale, integrity and complex system of mutual relations both inside the global problems themselves and in their connection with economic, social and political spheres.

Therefore, global studies initially started to form both as a fundamentally new scientific trend with integration processes coming to the forefront and as a sphere of social practice including international policy, economy and even ideology. Its emergence was a peculiar response to the challenge of time. It is at that period that first in the industrially developed countries and then in other countries the ecological situation deteriorated as a result of increasing misbalance in the relations of the humans and the environment. Soon it became clear that ecological problems were closely connected with other contradictions of the planetary scale. Beyond the discovered unexampled pollution of the environment, the threatening tendencies of the uncontrolled growth of population of the Earth have revealed themselves, as well as the limits of exhaustion of natural resources and the mortal danger of the impetuous arms race that meant a serious danger to the advancing social development and even the existence of life on the planet.

The quantitative and qualitative changes in various spheres of social life and in the interaction of society and nature gradually accumulated during a long period being reflected not only the complexity, variety and dynamics of modern epoch, its particular technocratic, scientific character, but also in the expansionistic moods directed at the absolute conquest of nature. Almost immediately after the recovery from the horrors of World War II the humanity was drawn into new confrontation that caused the unexampled arms race; the ecological equilibrium on the planet was completely undermined. At the same time the inhuman essence of the unrestrained growth of non-ecological industrial production and in no way limited technological progress became evident quite soon. The misbalance in the society-nature relations reaching by that time the maximum permissible meanings and also the fragmentariness and disunity of the humanity in the face of global problems became obvious not only for specialists but also at the level of mass consciousness.

Here, however, one should note that some tendencies in the formation of the integrated world and changes taking place in it got into the focus of scientists and philosophers' attention much earlier than those changes had become evident for everybody. So, to the first attempts to comprehend the arising world tendencies and caused by them fundamentally new and common to all mankind problems, one should refer T. Malthus's ideas about natural regulation of population, I. Kant's reflections concerning the eternal world or, for instance, J. Lamarck's speculation on the role of humans. Undoubtedly K. Marx and F. Engels's universalistic views presented in their 'Manifesto of the Communist Party' and a number of other works must also be placed in this line. Organized on their initiative in 1864, 'The First International' reflected the arising necessity in the consolidation of different political and professional forces at the global level and became per se one of the first prototypes of a great number of international organizations which since then started appearing all over the world in increasingly great number. Nowadays such organizations become a concurrent part of the world community's life and their number has increased manifold.

As applied to the theme of our discussion, it is important to emphasize that the appearance of international organizations in the second

half of the 19th century was an answer to the developing economical and sociopolitical relations which exceeded the limits of national states and generated an obvious necessity in cooperation and coordination of the intergovernmental efforts in solving principally new transnational tasks. The First and particularly Second World Wars gave a powerful impulse to international organizations' creation. Their end was accompanied by an attempt to prevent the repetition of the experienced horrors and the wish to build an effective system of international security. So, in 1919 the League of Nations was established, the international organization whose proclaimed main goal was the development of collaboration between peoples and providing a guarantee of peace and security. And in 1945 there was accepted the United Nations Charter created to maintain and support the world security and development of collaboration among states in the post-war period. The essence of the new situation consisted in the fact that the world having completely divided into two ideologically opposing parts was more and more involved into arms race, caused by 'the Cold War', and so the increasing tendencies of globalization dropped out of sight for decades.

At the same time in the theoretical aspect a crucial role in the comprehension of global tendencies, when they were not yet that obvious, was played by the works by V. Solovjev, E. Le Rois, P. Teilhard de Chardin, V.I. Vernadsky, A.L. Chizhevsky, K.E. Tsiolkovsky, A. Toynbee, K. Jaspers, B. Russell, J. Somerville and others. These thinkers worried most of all about fundamentally new tendencies distorting the natural balance of nature and social systems and they attempted to explain them, basing on the knowledge available at that time. By their works and discussions on 'the population of the Earth', 'eternal world', 'world integration of proletariat', 'the united god-mankind', 'noosphere', 'world government', 'cosmopolitism' and 'nuclear omnicide' etc. they prepared philosophical, scientific and broad public consciousness to the comprehension of the fact that for the humanity as a single whole that is inseparably linked with the natural conditions of its existence – biosphere, geographical sphere and space – the common fate and common responsibility for the future of the planet is prepared.

In particular, V.I. Vernadsky developing the conception of noosphere as early as in the 1930s made a conclusion about the cardinal



change of the face of the Earth as a result of unexampled scales of human transforming activity and warned that if the society did not develop according to the rational principles and in accordance with laws of the nature, the death of all the living thing on the Earth would be inevitable. In his essay ‘Scientific thought as a Planetary Phenomenon’ he pointed out: ‘For the first time a human has really understood that he is the inhabitant of the planet and can – and should – think and act in a new aspect, not only in the aspect of an individual personality, family or kin, states or their alliances but also in the planetary aspect’<sup>5</sup>. K. Jaspers keeping to the similar views as early as in 1948 used for the first time the term ‘global’ in the present days meaning and expressed serious anxiety concerning the fact that some day the globe would become tight for the humanity and the resources available on the planet would become scanty. Understanding clearly such a prospective for the humanity he wrote in particular: ‘Our historically new situation, for the first time having the decisive importance, represents the real unity of people on the Earth. Due to the technical facilities of modern means of communication our planet has become a single whole entirely available for a human, it became «smaller» than the Roman Empire used to be in the old days’<sup>6</sup>. And then further, pointing a really global character of World War II, after which these lines were written, he made a conclusion of fundamental importance: ‘From this very moment starts the world history as history of a single whole. From this point of view the whole previous history seems a range of scattered independent from each other attempts, a great number of different sources of human abilities. Now the world on the whole became the problem and the task. Thus a fundamental transformation of history takes place. Nowadays the conclusive is the following: there is nothing beyond the sphere of happening events. The world has enclosed. The globe has become indivisible. New dangers and opportunities are revealed. All essential problems have become world problems, the situation – has become the situation of the whole humanity’<sup>7</sup> (my emphasis – A. Ch.). While read-

---

<sup>5</sup> Vernadsky, V.I. Philosophical Ideas of a Naturalist (in Russian). – Moscow: Nauka. – 1988. – P. 35.

<sup>6</sup> Jaspers, K. The Origin and Goal of History (in Russian). – Moscow, 1991. – P. 141.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

ing these lines one cannot help agreeing with the fact that although global studies has been formed quite recently its foundations have been laid by the works of some scientists much earlier.

Processes of globalization that came to the forefront and sharply enforced in the second half of the 20th century, and also increasing in this connection interdependency of different countries and peoples determined a new level of understanding of the present topic. Still more new international structures and organizations appeared, among which there were quite a lot of those whose activities were aimed at comprehension of global problems and their reasons. We can give as examples the Institute of Future Problems, founded in Vienna in 1965, International fund 'Humanity in 2000', founded the same time in the Netherlands, 'World Future Society' organized in 1966 in Washington, etc. The increasing number of other similar organizations grew in the course of time. However, a true interest in global problems appeared after the first reports of the Club of Rome, founded in 1968<sup>8</sup>. Its research projects: 'The Limits to Growth' (1972), 'Mankind at the Turning Point' (1974), 'RIO – Reshaping the International Order' (1974), 'Beyond the Age of Waste' (1976) and others were world-renowned and became a theoretical basis of modern global studies. They did not only fulfill the necessary heuristic and methodological function while forming a principally new branch of interdisciplinary knowledge, but played a significant enlightening role.

So, we can say that global studies as a specific sphere of academic research and integral world-representation has formed generally by the end of the 1980s, and it has been developing later due to the rethinking of globalization processes which at that time still remained out of sight of those working in that sphere. The events provoked by the socialist system's collapse what determined the new arrangement of forces in the international arena, served as the main impulse for turning the scientific and public thought from studying consequences to the analysis of their true reasons. And this happened only in the second half of the 1990s when the world had basically recovered from fundamental

---

<sup>8</sup> See: Globalistics. Encyclopedia / Editors-in-Chief I. I. Masour, A. N. Chumakov (in Russian). – Moscow: Raduga, 2003. – Pp. 893–896.

changes and started to comprehend the new situation. At that very period there came 'the second wave' of interest in global studies which gained the so-called 'second wind' due to the active comprehension of globalization processes.

At the same time it should be emphasized that for many contemporary researchers who have joined global studies during this (second) wave of the interest to it; what had been worked out before to a great extent appeared to be out of sight mostly because that almost ten-year gap between the two 'waves' was accompanied by breaking of the former foundations and ideas which are nowadays quite often taken as rudiments of the past unworthy of serious attention. As a result, a lot of publications appeared whose authors form up their ideas as if global studies is a very recent research trend that still has no results deserving serious attention. Nevertheless, before the appearance of the term 'globalization' quite clear ideas about the tendencies of the formation of world-economic links as an indivisible system and global problems caused by it had formed in this sphere of research. The nature and genesis of global problems, the criteria of their choice were also discovered and approaches to their systematization defined, a deep interrelation of not only natural and social processes but also of the contradictions following from here, their conditionality by the social, economic, political, ideological and scientific-technical consequences were revealed.

The significant achievements in global studies in the first two decades of its development are: the elaboration and formation of language of interdisciplinary communication acceptable for different sciences, from this point of view the elaboration and improvement of the key notions and categories such as for instance 'global problem', 'ecological crisis', 'ecologization of production', 'population explosion', 'nuclear winter', 'global dependence', 'world community', 'new thinking', 'new humanism', etc. As a result, people's worldview changed sufficiently, their understanding of the fact that a human depends on nature to a much greater extent than it had been realized before, surrounding him terrestrial and space environment and also on the developing relations and arrangement of forces in the world scene. At that very period it became obvious that interdependency of all

spheres of social life in the world is steadily increasing, in particular, the influence of different states on each other is increasing, when defending their particular national interests and sovereignty – under the conditions of globalization they provoke fundamentally new contradictions in the international relations. It has also been established that the appearance and sharp aggravation of global problems in the second half of the 20th century is not a result of some miscalculation, somebody's fatal error or a purposely chosen strategy of socio-economic development. Neither are these the whims of history or a consequence of nature's anomalies. The global changes and panhuman problems provoked by them became a result of the centuries-long quantitative and qualitative transformations both in social development and in the 'society-nature' system. The reasons for their appearance are rooted in the history of formation of modern civilization which provoked an extensive crisis of the industrial society and technocratic-oriented culture in general. During the post-war period this crisis covered the whole complex of people's interaction with each other, fundamentally changed the relations between the person and society, society and nature, and touched directly the vital interests of the whole world community.

The result of such a development was not only 'population explosion' and globalization of economy but also degradation of the environment which outlined the tendency of human degradation. The human behaviour, ideas and the way of thinking failed to change in due time adequately to the changes which started to occur around him with an increasing speed. As has already been shown by the first research into the field of global studies, the reason for the accelerated development of socio-economic processes turned out to be the human being her/himself and his/her purposeful transformational activity, reinforced by new achievements in the field of science and engineering. In the meantime it was established that only within a few decades as a result of the impetuous growth of scientific technical achievements in the development of the productive forces of society more changes than during a number of previous centuries took place. At the same time the process of changing took place with a growing speed and was invariably accompanied by more profound and substantial transformations in differ-

ent spheres of social life. By the end of the 20th century with the appearance of the Internet, email and radio-telephone they had become unexampled, and the unique technique and modern transport had enormously increased the mobility and transforming abilities of people whose number still continues to grow with threatening tempos. As a result there is left neither an unexplored place on the Earth nor even practically pure territories, water and air space on which natural state the human activity would not directly or indirectly affect. All this gives grounds to call our planet now 'a common home', 'world village', to call the processes and problems which have turned out common for all the people – the global ones, and the sphere of academic knowledge about all these things – global studies.

Speaking about different spheres of social life and touching directly people's interests, the global studies with the necessity becomes closely connected with politics and ideology. In this aspect it is rightful to speak about different trends and schools of global studies which have revealed themselves clearly already at the first stages of its formation, when the confrontation of the two ideologically hostile socio-economical systems predetermined its development in two directions one of which got the name 'western' and the other – 'Soviet global studies'. During the last decade the ideological resistance gave place to economic, cultural, religious and national discrepancies which underlay the division of the world into a number of large regions – the original subjects of international relations. At the same time cultural civilization differences of countries and peoples came to the forefront and that predetermined somewhat different approaches to the understanding of modern world processes, in particular Western, Eurasian, Oriental and Islamic, etc. Taking into consideration a definite conventionality of any classification, let us mark only some approaches and directions typical of modern global studies in which we will distinguish foreign and Russian components for more clearness.

In the non-Russian global studies two directions have formed initially: the 'technocratic' one within which the positive influence of science and technique on social life was obviously exaggerated, and the 'technopessimistic' one making the technological progress, international capital and transnational corporations responsible for the nega-

tive consequences of globalization<sup>9</sup>. Later their positions became closer and at the same time were differently corrected under the influence of different estimation of the prospectis for the world market development; so, the indicated division is quite relative now. As for the Russian global studies, in the Soviet period when it was under a strong ideological influence, a moderately optimistic mood was characteristic of it. At the same time from the very beginning there appeared some directions among which (quite relatively) the following can be distinguished<sup>10</sup>:

- philosophico-methodological: within its framework the philosophical principles, nature and genesis of the global processes are studied, the most important socio-political and economic transformations necessary for successful solution of the global problems and underlying processes are analyzed;
- socio-natural: it covers a wide range of problems the most important of which are produced by ecology, supply of raw material, energetic, water, land and other resources. Within this trend representatives of natural, technical and social sciences, politicians, production workers and public people work in close contact. Their efforts are focused on the elaboration of principles and methods of optimization of the interaction between society and nature, ecologization of industry and rational nature management;
- culturological: it focuses on the problems of globalization appearing in the sphere of scientific and technological progress, population, public health service, culture, law, education and other fields of social life.

Recently both in Russia and abroad the attention to political, social, ideological, cultural and civilizational aspects of globalization has increased considerably what has essentially enlarged the scope of global studies and notably influenced the nature of the problems it solves. The spheres of material production and spiritual activity, ecology and lifestyle, culture and policy – all of them are included now in

---

<sup>9</sup> See: Globalistics: International Interdisciplinary Encyclopedic Dictionary / Editors-in-Chief I. I. Masour, A. N. Chumakov (in Russian). – Moscow; St. Petersburg; New York: Elima, Piter, 2006. – Pp. 875–878.

<sup>10</sup> See: Globalistics. Encyclopedia. – Pp. 199–209.

the sphere of global studies which, taking into account the aforesaid, should be determined as the interdisciplinary field of scientific research aimed at discovering the essence of processes of globalization, causes of their appearance and tendencies of development, and also at the analysis of the problems it generates and the search for the ways of maintenance of positive and overcoming negative consequences of these processes for the humankind and biosphere.

In a broader sense the term ‘global studies’ determines the whole totality of scientific, philosophical, culturological and applied investigations of different aspects of globalization and global problems including the received results of such investigations and also practical activity on their realization in economic, social and political spheres both at the level of separate states and in the international scale.

To avoid improper analogies and methodological confusion it is important to emphasize that global studies should not be understood as a separate or specific discipline which as a rule appears in multitude as a result of differentiation of scientific knowledge or at the edge of adjacent fields of science. It was born by the opposite phenomenon – by the integration processes typical of modern science and represents a sphere of investigations and knowledge within which different scientific disciplines and philosophy analyze all possible aspects of globalization, suggest these or those solutions to global problems, considering them both separately and as a holistic system in a close interaction with each other, each from the position of its subject and method. Here follows a significant consequence. One could raise the question of the subject, matter, method, goal and conceptual apparatus, etc. of the global studies, as some researchers suggest. However, one should keep in mind that answers to these questions concerning the global studies lie in a different plane as compared to this or that concrete field of science. In particular, its subject cannot be determined unambiguously though in a simplifying way, one can define its subject as the world integrity, humanity as a whole or the whole biosphere with its basic element – the human being. The same is referred to the conceptual apparatus of global studies which (at the philosophical-methodological level) will be indivisible to a certain extent only, in other respects it becomes ‘diffused’ in separate sciences dealing with the appropriate investigations. Speaking about methods or goals of

the global studies, attention should be paid to the fact that besides defining some basic approaches, one should enumerate not only separate sciences and their contribution to the research of the appropriate problems but also reveal the way philosophy, culture studies, politics and ideology are involved in the global studies what makes the solution of such a task admittedly almost unachievable.

One more significant difference of the global studies from concrete scientific disciplines consists in the fact that the comprehension of global tendencies and a principal overcoming of the problems caused by them requires not only theoretical investigations but corresponding effective practical activities. The global studies thereby, impartially fulfills the integrative role in the sphere of science and practice making many scientists, politicians and public people consider the contemporary world in a new way and realize their involvement into the common fate of the humanity. It makes think that globalization and problems it causes do leave no other choice to the humanity than through overcoming the fragmentation and difficulties to come to its unity saving the originality of cultures, century-old traditions and basic values of separate nations and peoples whenever possible. But such a unity and co-ordination of actions can be provided only by the appropriate understanding of processes and events happening in the modern world whose knowledge is developed and formed in global studies where the short-term aims and long-run prospectives are considered in close interconnection.

In the end, it is necessary to point out that a number of conclusions based on the analyses of objective tendencies of social development can face grounded objections on the part of those who view globalization first of all as the fight of interests and purposeful activity of separate clans or states at the cost of ignoring interests as well as violating the rights of the rest. The remarks of the kind will be fair and they should be taken into account both in theoretical research and in practice, when the matter concerns globalization and its consequences. However, speaking about the problem of the global studies' status as well as while determining its subject and scope we deal with solving a different task and face not the subjective factor but, as a rule, the subjectivism and predilection of certain researchers whose opinion must not substitute the analysis of the objective tendencies of the world-scale processes.



---

## RECOGNIZING GLOBALIZATION<sup>1</sup>

The term «globalization» was introduced by R. Robertson in 1983. Nevertheless, it remained unnoticed by the epistemic community. Even the database of the Library of the US Congress contained no books using this term in their headlines till 1997. Only in the first half of the 1990s when the new power balance was emerging on the international arena, interest to globalization processes came to the foreground. The number of books and articles about it started to grow quickly and this growth have become uncontrollable by the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Globalization has become one of the most topical issues of modernity – this statement is confirmed by the fact that last 20 years world philosophical community during its World Congresses was paying extended attention to global problems. As for the last congress that took place in August 2003 in Istanbul, it was fully dedicated to the topic of «Philosophy Facing World Problems».

Thus, by now both separate countries and humankind as a whole have accumulated significant theoretical and practical material allowing to understand problems common for the whole of humankind. This interest to the issue of globalization remains high. Nevertheless, even now not many scholars are able to provide a precise definition of this complex phenomenon. Most are unable to approach globalization not only as a collusion of interests and a struggle of various international actors but as an objective process dating back to past centuries. The latter approach seem more adequate because globalization did not begin in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when globalization-engendered global problems became a real threat to humankind and attracted universal attention. It began much earlier, at the intersection of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the era of the Great Geographic Discoveries. The first circumnavigation undertaken by Magellan had finally demonstrated that the Earth was orbicular and that man's living-space was limited. Since that moment the world land and the world ocean had become accessible, first of all,

---

<sup>1</sup> Europa Forum. Philosophie. Bulletin № 58, avril 2008.

for Europeans and then for all people of the planet. The fact that globalization is a universal phenomenon was rather obscure in the beginning but from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century it was becoming more and more visible. The actual force and multifacedness of globalization have become apparent only by the very beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Now this phenomenon is discussed throughout the world.

The first attempts to understand the world as an organic whole may be found already in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Of course, at that moment no one spoke about globalization. Everything said in this regard was rather premonition than clear understanding of the world's holism and interconnectedness. In the works by Lamarck, Malthus, Kant, Marx, Engels, Danilevskii, Spengler and others one may only find intuitive insights regarding the universal interconnectedness of the animate, the inanimate and the social. They stood at the threshold of the concept of the world as an organic whole.

In this regard one may point to Thomas Malthus's idea of natural regulation of population numbers, to Immanuel Kant's idea of everlasting peace, to Lamarck's concept of biosystemic evolution and man's role in it. Apart from targeting specific problems and separate trends trespassing national borders this period is characterized by the first attempts to represent the whole world history as a self-regulating and progressively evolving process. Such position was typical for Kant with his universal history concept. However, only Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were able to make full use of this approach in their materialistic historical constructions.

Karl Marx was the first one to undertake an attempt of deeper analysis of economic, political and cultural globalization in various countries and communities. He did it in the period when globalization was not as visible as nowadays and its results impacted separate spheres of social life only indirectly.

Talking about pioneer works in the sphere of global studies, there is no doubt that Karl Marx is, in fact, the first scholar, theorist and systemic thinker who tried to embrace historical process in its wholeness and unity. He studied it from the viewpoint of economic transformations of society. His theory of socio-economic formations is nothing else but the first historical attempt to cognize a pattern of social devel-

opment from its primordial prehistoric forms to the emergence of a united, holistic, planetary society embracing all peoples. Marxism presented this attempt as a theoretical plan of building a Communist society where all countries and peoples would finally make an organic whole free of antagonistic contradictions.

The issue of who realistic this plan was is beyond the scope of this presentation. It is important to emphasize that as early as in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Marx and Engels understood not only that economic relations were becoming global but also that international relations and even the sphere of spiritual life were becoming universal. They did not use the very term «global relations» but, in fact, wrote about them. Already in 1848 in the *Communist Manifesto* they stressed the universal nature of capitalist relations: «The bourgeoisie has, through its exploitation of the world market, given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. <...> In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature»<sup>2</sup>. It took 100 years for this thought revealing the essence of globalization to become evident for broader public consciousness.

The issue of globalization is so controversial now that methodological principles of approaching historical process formulated by Marx and Engels acquire special significance. They urge to understand globalization as, first of all, an objective consistent pattern. Marx mentioned that not human consciousness determines human existence, but human existence determines human consciousness<sup>3</sup>. Of course, collusion of various interests and struggle of various social forces strongly impacts the nature of globalization and its specific forms. It is important to stress that no efforts and wishes of private citizens (or states, or other social actors) will be able to reverse globalization or to redirect it in ac-

---

<sup>2</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels. Sochinenia. Moscow, 1956. Vol. 4. P. 427–428.

<sup>3</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels. Izbrannye proizvedeniya v 3 tomakh. Vol. 1. P. 537–536.

cordance with their demands, because globalization is a necessary result of the historical process and an essential feature of social development from the moment of the emergence of capitalist relations.

One may conclude, that globalization is underlined and determined not by the subjective factor, but by the objective trends of world development. They are, of course, influenced by the subjective factor but this influence is not arbitrary and limitless – it occurs within limits determined by given historical and concrete socio-political circumstances. In the other works, globalization is, essentially, no less an objective process than sunrise. When the Sun rises, it makes the one staying in the shadow feel comfortable; the one who happens to be unshaded feels uncomfortable and even bad. Still, no one dares to be «for» or «against» such a development because the celestial body is not responsible for who and why has happened to be in worse or better conditions. These are problems of another type: social problems related to the issue of equality, social justice, etc. Therefore, one should confront not natural developments but unjust social relations. At the same time, one should have in mind that, in spite of the objective and the subjective to be interconnected into the organic whole, the subjective factor is not able to dominated natural development. It, nevertheless, play an important, sometimes even decisive role in human destiny.

The role of the subjective factor in the above-mentioned developments is, thus, rather substantial. However, it is performed in different ways and is, in the end, essentially determined by the objective course of natural events, which human beings are not able to reverse arbitrarily. For the same reason, they are not able to reverse globalization.

In this regard the idea that globalization has been planned and implemented by someone, that it has been initiated by someone, that it can be stopped, reversed and so on seems to be beyond serious criticism. Such ideas may be found, nevertheless, not only at the level of mass consciousness but also in serious academic books. This only demonstrates that people discussing such issues are nothing but amateurs in the sphere of global studies.

What are aims of sunrise, of a lightning, of environmental pollution? There are no aims here, only natural course of events. Aims are formulated by human beings and most of them are tightly connected

with the objective reality that becomes transformed, changed as a result of human rational activity. That is why it is so important to define what is a cause and what is a result, what results from human conscious activity and what happens regardless of human will and wishes.

There can be various opinions about Karl Marx himself and about his theory, but in the context of this presentation one may not help recognizing his undeniable merit of being the first one to demonstrate the objectivity of historic development, to show how capitalism becomes a universal (global) phenomenon. He managed to do it in the period when capitalism to a great extent meant small patriarchal businesses. He was the first one to envision the future of humankind as a united, indiscrete whole. Thus he provided methodological foundations for systematic globalization studies based on understanding the patterns of human development in the past.

It is also worth mentioning that in accordance to their principle of uniting theory and practice, Marx and Engels wrote in 1849 the *Communist Manifesto* clearly demonstrating the international nature of the communist movement. They ended this document with their famous call: «Workers of the world, unite!». In its form and contents the *Manifesto* was the first attempt to unite a small part of the humankind – those involved into manufacturing labor – but based on a very firm ground. Before no one understood that such unity was now achievable. In spite of this call being essentially destructive because of its intention to unite only the members of a single social class to fight irreconcilably the other social class, it already embraced general trends and contradictions of global processes in the sphere of both economy and politics.

Marxism always called for unity of theory and practice. This unity was realized in the First International initiated by Marx and Engels in 1864. This organization resulted from an imperious need for consolidation of various political and economic actors at the global level. The International was one of the first forerunners of numerous international organizations that would multiply later, especially from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Now these organizations are an integral part of the international community and their number continues to grow. Being a product of globalization, they are, at the same time (as well as states), active par-

ticipants of global relations studied with the framework of a new branch of scientific knowledge – global studies.

Global studies as a specific field of knowledge have emerged within last 30 years and by the moment they have become relatively clear-cut and well-defined sphere of knowledge. In the narrowest sense global studies are an interdisciplinary sphere of scientific research aimed at understanding the meaning of globalization, finding its causes and developmental trends, analyzing globalization-engendered global problems and finding ways to sustain the positive and to overcome the negative circumstances of globalization from the viewpoint of men and biosphere. In a broader sense the term «global studies» refers to the whole complex of scientific, philosophical, cultural and applied research dealing with various aspects of globalization and global studies. It also refers to the results of such research and to the practical activity aimed at carrying these results into practice in economic, social and political spheres, both at a state level and internationally.

To avoid misleading analogies and methodological confusion it should be stressed that global studies are not a specific science or scientific discipline like numerous new sciences emerging as a result of differentiation of scientific knowledge or at the intersection of nearby disciplines. It is not a systemic knowledge in the sense, for example, physics, chemistry or mathematics are. Global studies have been born thanks to integrative processes typical for modern science. It is a sphere of research and knowledge where various scientific disciplines and philosophy tightly interconnection with one another analyze various aspects of globalization and problems it engenders (each from the viewpoint of its subject matter and methodology). Global studies should also provide solutions for global problems studied both separately from one another and as a holistic system.

Finally, we should stress that this new interdisciplinary sphere of scientific knowledge is a domain for specialists from all disciplines. This principally differentiates global studies from specific disciplines where «specialists» speak a language often understandable only for a limited group of the like professionals. Under the umbrella of global studies specialists in various theoretical and practical spheres study world processes and problems engendered by them from the position of

this or that natural or human science. This predetermines diversity of opinions about what globalization is. Scholars of natural sciences are often carried away by details and separated facets of this complex process, while scholars of humanities mostly concentrate on subjective factors and struggle of various interests.

Cultural and civilizational specifics of various countries also influences our understanding of contemporary world developments. One may distinguish between Western, Eastern, Eurasian, Islamic and other approaches to globalization. Differences between them may be found in their primary theoretical principles, values, established traditions, etc.

For example, a specific feature of the Western approach is understanding globalization as a positive development, after all. It is explainable because the most developed countries, in comparison with less developed countries, benefit more from the current situation. They dominate practically all spheres of social life. Countries of the East, especially the most prosperous of them, also benefit from globalization and, as a result, do not oppose it. Nevertheless, they are sensitive to events and phenomena undermining their traditional lifestyles.

The Eurasian approach is slightly different. Market relations here are not firm enough and that is why globalization provides many opportunities for illegal business activities, capital outflow, international crime. Attitudes to globalization vary from unequivocal acceptance to full denial. As for the Islamic world, it experiences serious pressure from the mass culture, values and way of life of the Western civilization and has no chance oppose it in the period of information revolution. It considers globalization, first of all, a source of threats to its values, beliefs and even independence.

This only strengthens interest to what globalization is. Different authors define it in different ways: some as a **process**, some as a **situation**, some as a **phenomenon**; some equalize globalization with **modernization**, some consider it a **myth**. There are numerous discussions between opponents and supporters of globalization.

With regard to the above-said, I define globalization as a multi-aspect natural historical process leading to the emergence of planetary holistic structures and connections. Globalization is immanent to the world community and covers all basic spheres of human life. It be-

comes the more visible, the more humankind moves along the way of scientific and technological progress and socioeconomic development. Globalization is a process having no time limits. It connects the past, the present and the future. Today we are passing through a new stage of globalization. It not just becomes visible, but requires corrections made via rational human intervention, i.e., people should take responsibility for the nature and consequences of globalization that remains an objectively evolving process.

Such intervention, however, requires, at minimum, resolving some principal issues related to the essence of globalization and the nature of its evolution. One should mention that modern scholars are far from common opinion with regard to these issues. For example, some prominent scholars (I. Wallerstein, A.I. Utkin, V.I. Pantin and others) think that globalization has stages or waves, that it becomes sometimes more and sometimes less intense. This position seems too narrow. Globalization may look like this in case we observe this complex and multiaspect process from one side only: for example, from the viewpoint of economic globalization which is, indeed, uneven. Sometimes it becomes more intense (in the periods of economic booms) and sometimes – less intense (during large-scale crises of the majority of national economies). Thus, viewing globalization exclusively as an economic process we necessarily find waves, periods and stages.

In reality, however, things are not so simple. Globalization occurs not only during economic booms but also during recessions when it may seem that it slows down. It does not. During recessions additional impulse is given to the other elements of this complex process, such as political, socio-cultural, ecological, informational and the other aspects of globalization. All of them, taken from different perspectives, make globalization multiaspect. Some of them periodically increase and step to the foreground in order then to slow down. Thus, it is not the objective process of globalization what has waves, but some of its aspects. Globalization as a whole only increases and constantly strengthens.

Humankind was ruminating on the issue of globalization for a long time. We can point out at several stages of such reflections. Basing on problems being in the focus of attention in a given historical period an on the sphere of life fully dominated by globalization in that period,



one may distinguish between five stages in understanding globalization. Three of them are already over; the fourth stage is taking place at the moment. As for the fifth stage, it has not yet come but is expected to begin in the foreseeable future (to the best of our knowledge).

The first stage was the longest one; each subsequent stage happened to be shorter than the previous one. This fact correlates with the law of acceleration of socioeconomic development that has become most visible during the last two centuries. Concentrating on the most significant distinguishing features of the above-mentioned stages, one may say the following:

The first stage covers the period from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to the 1920s. It was, first of all, concentrated on understanding social problems of the world that had finally become an organic whole geographically and then (generally speaking) economically and even politically. We have already pointed out that K. Marx and F. Engels, as well as Th. Malthus, N.Ia. Danilevskii, O. Spengler and others played the most important part in understanding globalization at this stage of historical development.

The second stage in understanding global trends took place in 1920s – 1960s. It was characterized by theoretical focus on the issues of interrelations between society and nature. By that moment the world had been economically and politically «closed» and became to shrink ecologically. Here one should mention the concepts of biosphere and noosphere worked out by E. Leroit, T. de Chardin and V. Vernandskii, the authors of the famous Manifesto (B. Russell and A. Einstein) and the scholar of civilizational problems A. Toynbee.

The third stage lasted from the end of the 1960s to the end of the 1980s and may be regarded as a period of «discovering» and studying global problems of modernity. At this stage the world was «closed» ecologically and a trend towards its informational «finalization» emerged. What was the most important were well-publicized reports of the Club of Rome founded by A. Peccei and numerous studies conducted under the aegis of the UN (for example, the report prepared under the leadership of G.H. Brundtland or the report of the Brandt Commission).

The fourth stage began in the end of the 1990s and continues up to now. It is focused on understanding globalization as a process. By

now the world has already been «closed» informationally. It seems logical to suggest that it will also be «close» in the civilizational sense.

The fifth (hypothetical) stage is still invisible in terms of external symptoms. But it seems justified to theorize that it will also come with time. The term for it already exists: it is «post-globalization». One may theorize that in this case the world will become «closed» ideologically, then socio-culturally, morally and, finally, grow into an organic whole as a truly global humankind.

The world will become global in the full sense after it becomes «closed» in terms of all basic spheres of life. Then globalization as a process will «exhaust» itself as well as by the beginning of the 1960s it has exhausted itself geographically. Of the above-mentioned spheres of life the most important are: geography, economy, politics, ecology, information, civilization (law), ideology, culture, spirituality (morality and ethics), mentality (globalization of consciousness). In some of these spheres (apart from geography where globalization is already over) the process of globalization has mostly finalized. In the other spheres this process has a long distance ahead before its finalization.

Of course, there are many other spheres in which the world should finally be «rolled up», i.e., become united, holistic. It is important to stress that «closing» of the world in this or that sphere of life and real unity of humankind in the same sphere are not the same. «Finalization» refers to spreading over the globe, to embracing the world as a whole regardless of whether it leads to reconciliation of different outlooks, positions and interests of various peoples or to their greater confrontation and collision. Real unity implies true reconciliation or, at least, tolerant co-existence of various outlooks and positions typical for various peoples conditioned by balance of interests and consequent social stability and sustainability. For example, in 1948, after the world had been politically «closed», K. Jaspers mentioned that political unification of the planet is a question of time. He was right because he took into consideration historical reality.

It also explains why even after «finalization» of the world globalization continues in all spheres of life, except geography. It provides dynamic transition from formal unification achieved to real unity of humankind. The latter, we should mention, so far may not be found in

its final shape in any sphere of material or spiritual existence of the global community. Moreover, while «finalization» of the world is practically beyond doubt (or is a question of time), the possibility of genuine human unity (even in some separated spheres of life) remains disputable. At the moment it would be overoptimistic to suggest that such unity will be necessary achieved in the future.

We would like to stress that globalization in this or that sphere of live is not over after «finalization» of the world in the same sphere. It continues to achieve real unification of humankind in a given sphere. One may suggest that following the achievement of new levels of integration and unity, the intensity of globalization will exhaust. The more the above-mentioned unity becomes reality, the closer to zero that intensity is.

At the same time, even being an integrated system the humankind will remain internally contradictory. It will always experience inherent problems and contradictions, conflicts and threats of both external and internal nature.

Nevertheless, humankind as a whole, as well as separate communities or separate individuals, always wants to get rid of its problems (or, at least, to make them less noticeable). If we distract from details and look at the past to find what people always lusted for in the recent 20<sup>th</sup> century or even earlier, we will find a very simple thing – they always and first of all lusted for Paradise on Earth. Or, otherwise, they lusted for ideal state of society.

Many centuries ago, when people directly felt their dependence on nature, they providently placed their «golden age» in the past. Thus they were able to preserve their ideals and not to set a task of bringing them into real life. However, growing achievements of technological civilization have enhanced human self-esteem, our clandestine desire to build Paradise on Earth. From approximately the Renaissance, we see not sporadically emerging social utopias (like in the Antiquity) but a series of ideal constructions of an earthly Paradise presented by Th. More, Th. Campanella, Th. Muenzer, etc. Utopias of the period of bourgeois revolutions may be found in the works by J. Meslier, G. Mably, Morelli, A. Saint-Simon, F. Fourier, R. Owen, etc. One may well include into this list the Communist ideas by K. Marx and F. Engels if we un-

derstand these ideas not as a theoretical ideal of social relations but as goals and tasks achievable through revolutions and social cataclysms.

A new outburst of utopian projects may be found in the beginning of the era of «conquering» space. People enthusiastically ruminated on «beautiful and fantastic worlds» supposed to exist on the other planets, on limitless opportunities for colonization of outer space, etc. Such ideas originate from «Russian Cosmism» represented by N.F. Fedorov, K.E. Tsiolkovskii and others. For example, Fedorov thought that the problem of overpopulation on Earth would be resolved through settling people on the other planets. He believed that outer space might become a source of minerals and energy for the growing population and that Earth would be reshaped into a space ship «Earth-mobile». Tsiolkovskii also thought that outer space is a «bottomless storehouse» of various resources for humankind and that in the future the next generations would be settled there. He believed that having exhausted Earth resources people would «conquer» all perisolar space to build there «islands of ether» or «space colonies».

So, in spite of many disappointments in the possibility of building Paradise on Earth by human efforts, people always had an illusion of some heavenly, supernatural Paradise or of some pleasant conditions for human life in outer space. Now it is time to acknowledge that humankind has too little historical time left for enjoying fruitless dreams while it needs conscious and responsible actions. We should openly declare that people have always been misled and, moreover, deceived dreaming about better life somewhere outside our planet...

There has never been and never will be in the whole Universe any other Paradise apart from the one we already have on Earth. Our earthly world is that very Paradise – a Paradise for each real, living and not imagined human being. It ideally satisfies all vital human needs (material and spiritual), all human wishes and hopes, caprices and whims, dreams and the most brave fantasies. It is the only world where human beings may feel themselves comfortable and wealthy.

If this world turns out into a hell for people, it is not a problem of nature but a problem of people. They, intending to build an ideal society, mistreat those who disagree, mistreat natural environment. As a result, the output is something contrary to what they lusted for. The larg-

est philosopher of the 20<sup>th</sup> century K. Jaspers mentioned in this regard, that we could look for the heavenly city in the past or in the future, we could call «back to nature» or «forward to the world of love and beauty» but all these things would appeal to our emotions, not to our reason. Even the noblest desire to create Paradise on Earth might turn it into a hell that only people are able to make for their fellow creatures<sup>4</sup>.

Human beings don't need building Paradise on Earth. It already exists because here, on our planet, even without human creative and transforming activities, we have everything what we need for happy and joyful life: abundance of water and fantastic choice of foods; rich energy and mineral resources and, finally, the broadest variety of climatic and natural conditions. The latter, if needed, may be maintained at the ideal level for any time needed with the help of modern scientific and technological achievements. What human beings should have done (and what they will have to do, if it is possible in principle) is to sort out their own feelings and their relations with the other people and with the environment to make full use of what earthly nature has given to us so bountifully.

Nowhere in the world we would find conditions equal to what we have on Earth, not to mention any better, truly paradisiacal conditions that would allow human beings to fully realize themselves as biological (feeling) and social (thinking) creatures. Human beings are products and children of this nature; they fully correlate with its natural conditions and parameters. And vice versa: human beings ideally «fit» the environment. People, «cut out» or «sculptured» of natural material, not only descend from nature but also return to it...

One of the largest modern specialists in global studies E. Laslo mentioned, that the emerging paradigm of social sciences correlates with the newest discoveries in physics and biology. This new paradigm testifies that there are constant connections and communication between cosmic and biospheric objects and that human consciousness is an evolving part of this network of interconnections covering our planet. Laslo suggested that we are inseparable from one another and from the environment. All of us participate in natural activities: inter-

---

<sup>4</sup> K. Popper. Otkritoe obshchestvo i ego vragi. T. 1. – M., 1992, P. 211.

acting with one another we influence biosphere that, in its turn, is uprooted in the Universe<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, even here, on Earth, each person feels most comfortable where he or she was born and grew up, where he or she passed through childhood, maturity, personal growth. For example, for a Bedouin hot climate and desert are much more attractive than frost and snowy winter. At the same time, Northern people prefer chill to warm climate and snow to hot sand.

Any attempt to resettle human beings into «better» environment would mean, in fact, inevitable worsening of the environment that used to be familiar and, thus, comfortable. At best any change of environment should be followed by adaptation period. As a rule such adaptation is unwelcome and has some sequel for any living organism; it also has limits beyond which one faces, at minimum, discomfort or degradation, or even death.

Of course, like any other living organism, both separate human beings and whole societies always had, have and will always have problems. Elimination of these problems is only possible at the expense of the life of a living organism. Therefore harmonization of human relations with the environment and minimalization of problems and difficulties is the major task for separate individuals and for society as a whole. It still needs to be studied whether this task is achievable and what is «the golden middle» of human satisfaction.

Today we should not ignore that human domination on Earth and human increasing activity undermines natural foundations of our own existence and of the life on the planet as a whole. This problem is not new. As early as in the 19<sup>th</sup> century F. Engels has said what is now stated in any textbook on ecology. He wrote, that people who unrooted forests in Mesopotamia, Greece or Asia Minor in order to get arable land never dreamed that they thus laid foundation for current desertification of these areas, because centers of collecting and preserving water had disappeared with the forests. Neither they understood that by doing this they would for the most of the year leave their mountain springs without water and that as a result these springs in the rain period would pour to valleys fervent streams of water<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> E. Laslo. Makrosdvig. M., 2004, P. 163–164.

<sup>6</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sochinenia*. T. 20. P. 496.

Since this had been written a century and a half ago these words were not once repeated and seemingly grasped. Our vision of interaction between nature and society has changed and human ability to transform nature has substantially increased. However, our attitude to nature, to those foundations of life which may not be restored anywhere apart from the Earth in case of their destruction, has not changed. Or, within this period of prolonged dynamic evolution humankind has not made necessary conclusions, has not learned its lessons. A well-known Russian scholar I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada writes ironically, that «In the course of human history, up to the latest years, people mostly treated their mother – earthly nature – as little kids treat an evil step-mother. They were afraid of her, they asked her for mercy but they tried to win a small victory over her wherever it was possible. It is right that nature has not always pampered people with pleasant surprises. Often she mercilessly eliminated whole villages and cities, whole tribes and peoples<sup>7</sup>».

Concluding this presentation, we should mention that human problems are changing and dynamic. Human evolution, growing complexity of social organization and exploration of territories changed the nature of these problems. Population grew, new territories were discovered and involved into economic activity, social power grew as well as its technological capabilities. Consequently, the nature of problems changed as well. At the same time, current difficulties and concerns are still here. Moving towards global condition humankind will by definition have new problems, now of world significance. In the prehistoric times, when people lived separately, they had local problems. Regional problems emerged after social networks and relations had embraced whole regions. Now global humankind has global problems and to set a task of their elimination as some scholars and politicians still do means not to understand what goes on.

«To overcome global problems», «to eliminate global problems», «to get rid of global problems» – these calls are not realistic. These wrong formulas are responsible for subsequent misunderstanding of the situation and for insufficient program of practical actions. Finally, this delusion may happen to be not so harmless. It not just leads to no posi-

---

<sup>7</sup> I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada. *Mir nashego zavtra*. M.: Misl, 1986, P. 171.

tive achievements but entails losing precious time, disappointment and loss of belief in ourselves because in this case we set a task having no decision in principle. It is no surprise that many authors who stick to this position often write about a «dead-end» for modern humankind, about a «trap» of global contradictions we should get out of. But it is not humankind but our consciousness who has found itself in a dead-end. Our consciousness, nevertheless, is able not only to explain but to reshape the world making it more or less acceptable for normal human life. Whatever this world may become, it will never be conflictless, free of contradictions and problems, including universal ones.

These conclusions are based on our analysis and fully correspond with the most important methodological principles formulated by Marxism: a) human beings should not only explain the world but change it as well; b) all social processes, as well as human interactions with the environment, are contradictory by nature; human beings have to acknowledge these contradictions and, at minimum, not to exacerbate them by their thoughtless actions; c) human strength means knowing objective laws and acting in accordance with these laws.

It is important to understand that neither globalization can be eliminated, nor global problems engendered by globalization can be resolved once and for all. Having once emerged, they will always accompany world community and we will have to solve them constantly. We should learn living with it because insufficient attention to global problems entails great troubles, if not a catastrophe. This is a new reality, a new condition of humankind transformed (new). Even those who resist need to acknowledge that global humankind will necessarily deal with various problems including global ones. The point is to make these problems not threatening and not undermining the foundations of life on Earth. This is a performable task, but not for separated communities or states but for humankind as a whole.

Concluding our analysis of the topic in question we would like to say that the main question for globalization is not to be or not to be, but what it should be like; who plays and who will play key roles in globalization.



---

## GLOBALIZATION AS A NATURAL HISTORICAL PROCESS<sup>1</sup>

Our modern world is characterized not only by revolutionary changes in the spheres of science, information, technology, communication but by a rapid growth of the planetary population increasing anthropogenic impact on the environment; enhancing the threat of violent conflicts, technogenic catastrophes, international terrorism and so on. This is directly linked to globalization that existed potentially already in the age of the great geographic discoveries but became visible only in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. Th. Malthus's ideas about natural regulation of the population number, Kant's reasoning about the perpetual peace, the universalistic concepts of K. Marx and F. Engels expressed in the «Communist Manifesto» and some other works were the first attempts to understand the emerging world trends and the entirely new universal problems they engendered. The «First International» created in 1864 by Marx and Engels was the herald of countless international organizations that from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been mushrooming in growing numbers and are now an integral part of the modern world community. From the theoretical point of view the major role in acknowledging global trends in spite of their being not so evident in that time was played by the works of V. Soloviev, Leroi, Teilhard de Chardin, Vernandskii, Chizhevskii, Jaspers, Russell, etc. These thinkers were primarily concerned about the new trends of social development and their theories on «the Earth population number», «perpetual peace», «unity of the workers», «the united God-Humanity», «noosphere», «world government», «cosmopolitanism», etc. have helped philosophical, scientific and broad public consciousness to accept that humanity as a whole has shared destiny inextricably connected with the destiny of its natural environment, including the outer space.

Last years global problems engendered by globalization became the issue attracting special attention and special research interest, in-

---

<sup>1</sup> XX<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy «Philosophy Facing World Problems». Abstracts. August 10–17, 2003. Istanbul. Turkey, 2003.

cluding philosophical interest. For example, although at the last three World Philosophy Congresses in Brighton (1988), Moscow (1993) and Boston (1998) it was not directly talked about globalization, nevertheless, their Programs always included panels and roundtable discussions on world problems. Now, at the 21<sup>st</sup> Congress in Istanbul, this topic not surprisingly becomes central.

The term «globalization» born in the beginning of the 1990s has not yet been properly defined and its contents remain highly debatable in spite of its universal spread. These debates became especially sharp in the last 2–3 years when the antiglobalist movement sprang and conducted some serious public protest actions. As a rule, the term «globalization» is used to characterize the planet-wide integrative and disintegrative processes in the spheres of economy, politics and culture, as well as anthropogenic environmental changes, which are formally universal and essentially important for the entire world community. There can be two extreme positions concerning both the phenomenon of globalization as it is and its history. The first one is characterized by too broad vision of the planet-wide social connections and relations, which are found already in the primordial society; even the earliest stages of human development are described as global. The second extreme position implies an overly narrow understanding of globalization, when modern processes of social development are thought of without considering their genesis, i.e. the history and the dynamics of evolution of international structures and transnational linkages. This difference in views and opinions about globalization is justified not only by the complexity of this problem but by underdevelopment of this very concept. As a result, human mutual understanding is impeded, interdisciplinary communications are hampered and serious obstacles arise in the way of understanding the genuine causes of globalization and those global contradictions it gives rise to. This also causes many conflicts provoked by the fact that at the same, while time the world is becoming more and more united, holistic, interconnected, the mechanisms that have to regulate global relationships (world government, world state, united international order preservation forces, etc.) are absent. It is evident that without a thorough analysis and a clear vision of the modern devel-

opments, globalization can hardly count on overcoming the above-mentioned problems. Science and philosophy play the key role in solving these tasks.

Particularly, as far as our vision of historical processes is concerned, philosophy can and should rethink the established approaches that up to recently have reflected more or less satisfactory the social dynamics typical for the fragmented humankind. What is meant is notions like *socio-economic formations* (K. Marx), *culture* (O. Spengler), *civilization* (A. Toynbee), *cultural-historical types* (N.Ya. Danilevskii). These established terms are not enough to express adequately and to describe the modern globalization processes engendered by controversial development of the united planetary socio-natural system. Although such attempts are constantly made, they can, at maximum, to demonstrate the strongest connection of the globalization processes with the phenomena defined in terms of «culture», «civilization», «socio-economic formation».

Unfortunately, when the globalization phenomenon focusing academic and public attention in the second half of the 1990s is discussed, it is often overlooked that analyzing globalization was preceded by at least twenty years of active studying of global problems of modernity being a child and ultimately a result of the globalization processes not yet revealed and not understood at that time. Having initially focused on environmental degradation, uncontrolled population growth, the threat of violent conflicts, uneven social and economic development of various countries and so on, scientists and philosophers carried away by their search of the ways to escape the emerging threats did not pay enough attention to the integrative trends of social development. As a result, their attention was distracted from the fact that though the terms like «culture» and «civilization» do reflect the essential characteristics of historic development, they should not, however, be absolutized and considered the only possible tools for understanding the contemporary social processes. Being very broad and profound they, nevertheless, do not allow to describe and to express all the deepness and the essence of social phenomena when the humankind acquires global dimension making possible the emergence of new categories able to express this principally new elements of social life better.

Thus, what is traditionally defined as cultures and civilizations is, in fact, not fully described in terms of the same-sounding categories taken separately. For example, the notion of culture dating back to the Antiquity and reflecting, first of all, the existential facet of social body, makes possible to distinguish the artificial from the natural, the hand-crafted from the indigenous, the human from the native and always stresses the uniqueness, unrepeatability of that what constitutes the contents of a given category. In each specific case it fixes the state, the level achieved, the degree of perfection, etc. but does not allow to express the deepness of social transformations in their historical development. For well-known reasons, philosophers for about two thousand years were more focused on social statics than on dynamics until the need for understanding society as a process in its becoming and development brewed and become visible in the Age of Enlightenment. Exactly in that period the term «civilization» was introduced that added something, figuratively speaking, external to the characteristics of social body. It was something like a form, an external framework of what is expressed by the notion «culture» and it made possible more correct description of society from the viewpoint of its governing mechanisms, its functional connections and relations where the most important part is played by contemporary morality and law. Historically it was directly linked to the human transition to settlements, to state-building and, finally, to the emergence of a society with complex economic, social and political structure. Virtually all peoples follow this pattern of development but the changes can be slower or faster. Variations of state systems and forms of government, differences in legal and ethic norms among various peoples hardly change anything and play no important role in our understanding of the trends and the dynamics of social development as a whole.

Thus, one can conclude from the above-said, humanity is immanently characterized by, on the one hand, cultural diversity, and, on the other hand, civilizational unity. Having this in mind, to study the contemporary globalization processes we should introduce and fill with appropriate contents a new synthetic category – «cultural and civilizational systems» – that would make our perception of social body more holistic and let us understand the dynamics of its development as a

regular process. Then, considering globalization and the global problems of modernity it engenders as an objective historical process, we would legitimately talk about the emergence of a *single world civilization* in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. It can also be called the emerging *mega-civilization* or a *macro-*, a *hypercivilization*, or, what is better, a *geo-civilization* transforming but not eliminating the world's cultural diversity and creating the single cultural and civilizational context of the world community. It should be stressed, however, that this emerging unprecedented world system does not renounce the historically established separate hearths and types of civilizations as well as the indigenous national cultures and their diversity. Rather, it grows out of them and relates to them in the same way as a big system relates to the subsystems within it or as a megalopolis relates to the satellite cities, on the basis of whose merging and organic association it has grown. At the same time, this new global cultural and civilizational body more and more insists on keeping to the norms, rules, taboos and prescriptions shared by the entire humankind and will soon strictly require from various types of local civilizations built within the fragmented world and from the various (numerous) cultures constituting it to do the same. Realization and bringing this requirement into being will be, I hypothesize, the substance of historical development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; it, of course, will not run smoothly and will engender numerous principally new clashes and contradictions within the world community. Philosophy should do its best to anticipate and to soothe if not to avoid their negative consequences.

---

## AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION<sup>1</sup>

The contemporary process of globalization is a concern to the lives and interests not only of humankind in general but also of individuals, independent of their social or racial status. That is why there is now a reason to add one more concept to the multitude of philosophies and scientific theories where man and his problems occupy priority positions connected with the philosophical understanding of nature and the trends of globalization. We already have a corresponding sphere of interdisciplinary fields of knowledge that emerged in the last quarter of the last century, collectively termed global studies. As a result, the contemporary world is seen as a complex dynamic system where human economic activities based on achievements of science and technology (but not nature and the development laws of the biosphere) have become the main acting force.

Besides the growing understanding of how scientific and technological progress changes our living conditions, we are also becoming aware of the many dangers this poses, not only for human health but for the existence of life in general. The times have passed when science could be regarded as value-neutral and an indisputable human good, beyond good and evil. Of course, science gives people the fruits of its revolutionary discoveries and attracts them by the new perspectives, but it also causes deep trouble for their future, demanding timely and adequate actions of scholars, philosophers and politicians. Having the ability to complexly study the world, society and human beings, contemporary science orientates politicians and scholars towards a «dialogue,» the co-evolution of society and nature. This is the science way where it acquires a new–human–dimension when the interests of people are directly connected with the sustainable development of the biosphere and an analysis of human activity begins to occupy a priority position in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Human Being in Contemporary Philosophical Conceptions / Edited by N. Omelchenko. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. P. 237–244.

understanding of the contemporary world and its most important characteristic—globalization.

It is important to note that globalization is a result of centuries-old quantitative and qualitative transformations, both in social development and in the system «society-nature.» That is why in trying to understand the essence of contemporary globalization, many scholars connect it with cultural and civilizational changes; by this, the terms «culture» and «civilization» find themselves in one line with the term «globalization.» Being the most important categories of social philosophy, these terms are links of one chain, trends of the developing living language when it tries to reflect the human mental and material world, an endless diversity and essence of social relations as well as relations of society with nature. Supplementing one another from various sides, they describe social organisms and reveal the most important stages of their historic development.

The concept of «culture» occupies a special position in this line, since it first emerged back in Ancient Rome, to distinguish the artificial and the natural; the term «civilization» is of later origin, dating back to early Modern Times when more complex social practices developed and internal and external links of the emergent nation-states demanded more correct language and, respectively, a new notion for their description. The deep understanding of the phenomenon of civilization started later, at the end of the nineteenth century, when the processes of globalization started to become more and more defined. They were not realized directly but guessed at in the theoretical works of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Soloviev, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Vladimir Vernadsky, Karl Jaspers, etc.

Globalization fully revealed itself only in the mid-1990s, having generated an additional interest in the phenomenon of culture and civilization. It is important to emphasize that globalization leads to the formation of one culture and one civilization which, however, does not cancel either cultural diversity or the peculiarities of civilizational development of this or that region. The notion of «culture» expresses the internal, essential characteristics of a society; in its turn, civilization is a form, an external framework of culture, representing a society from the viewpoint of the mechanism of its management, its functional links and

relations. Since civilizational unity and cultural diversity are immanent for humankind, we could propose a new synthetic category «*cultural-civilizational systems*» to designate contemporary realities: this would provide an integral vision of the different social systems (national, local, regional) as well as the world community as a whole and give understanding of the dynamics of their development as a necessary process.<sup>2</sup> Then, considering globalization and global problems as an objective historical process, into which all the really existing cultural-civilizational systems are included (objectively involved), one may say about the formation from the middle of the twentieth century both all-human culture and the united world civilization which before revealed itself only on local and regional levels.

Culture embraces—more precisely, penetrates—all the spheres of mental and material life of a society and so it finds itself this or that way to be involved into the process of globalization. In this connection, there arise a lot of the cultural problems which take on more and more an international and even global character. As examples of that, difficulties and contradictions are generated by the increase of influence and broad expansion of «mass culture,» periodically emerging crises of morality, the growth of apathy, the sense of abandonment or defenselessness, etc.

The influence of globalization on culture begins in the epoch of the great geographic discoveries when, for the first time in human history, cultural communications reached a planetary level; although they were in the beginning fragmentary, limited to contacts with sailors, traders, and conquerors. From that time we see the first signs, if not of unification then of borrowing and global spreading of material and spiritual values, as well as cultural achievements, which, as a result of expansionist aspirations of the Europeans and through increasing world trade throughout the world. Together with the items of material culture, the broad opportunities for spreading throughout the world were given to various elements of spiritual, mostly European culture, such as, for

---

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Chumakov, *Metafizika globalizatsii. Kul'turno-tsivilizatsionnyi kontekst* [The Metaphysics of Globalization. The Cultural-Civilizational Context] (Moscow: Kanon+, 2006); Alexander Chumakov, *Globalizatsiya: kontury tselostnogo mira* [Globalization: The Outlines of the Integral World] (Moscow: Prospect, 2005).



example, the language: first of all Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, and religions—Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism, whose missionaries came to previously unknown regions and corners of the world.

Even greater opportunities for the wide spread of material and spiritual values emerged at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, when new means of transportation were actively developed: railway, automobiles, and aviation. The contemporary means of mass communication were also invented during this period: the telephone, radio, cinema, television. As a result, the mutual penetration and assimilation of various cultures, being an objective and necessary sequence of globalization, have in the twentieth century led to the formation of all-human, planetary culture, the outlines of which are rather clearly seen today in all countries and continents.

By this, the globalization of culture reveals itself not only in the fact that while keeping to their original traditions, living standards and peculiarities of everyday life, different peoples at the same time use the same cell-phones, radio, television, transportation means, etc. It reveals itself also in the fact that, for instance, the design of this or that car, item of clothing or home appliance, as far as external qualities and composition are concerned, as a rule do not bear the seal of the national culture of those who made the products—they differ from the design of other examples only by the label indicating the manufacturing country.

In the conditions of globalization of culture, there are practically no borders for spreading mutual influence of the various ideas, doctrines, beliefs, etc. In fact, all the most significant scientific discoveries and outstanding literary works are immediately translated into many languages of the world, popular songs and melodies; the best examples of fashion and dramatic art expand with amazing speed across the planet. Most are easily subsumed into the context of traditional cultures which accept and assimilate such elements of world culture and at the same time give new impulses for it: for instance, it was officially reflected in the 1990s slogan «China for the world and the world for China.»

In the context of globalization of culture, one can point to the increasing spread in the world community of the *unified norms of behavior*, which are free from religious and other ideological foundations.

Such conduct may be found in airports, railway stations, supermarkets and other public places where individuals behave «like everyone else,» independently of their beliefs, ethnic and cultural origins, etc. In this sense, youth is the best environment for the spread of global culture, because youth is less grounded than the elder generations in the influence of traditional cultures and stereotypes of thinking and behavior formed in a community. Due to this, youth also becomes a main object of manipulation by mass media, political, religious, criminal and other groups, which, under the conditions of globalization, acquire additional opportunities for influencing both separate groups and mass consciousness as a whole. Pointing out to this fact, one of the leaders of «the new left» – the mass social movement of the end of the 1960s – Theodore Roszak wrote that politics, education, leisure, entertainment, culture as a whole, subconscious symbols and even the protest against the very technocracy becomes an object of a purely technical control and purely technical manipulation.<sup>3</sup>

Now, in the conditions of total globalization, the problem of the ability to manage world processes, including world culture and world public opinion, becomes one of the central objectives of humankind. The examples of Turkish immigrants in Germany or Africans and Muslims who have become a part of French society show very well how the actual task of finding generality in separate national cultures, as well as defining the points of their interaction where they mutually assimilate, becomes impossible. In this connection, the question arises: to which culture should one relate the assimilated emigrants and their children whose biographies do not place into the accepted categories? The problem is that the new waves of immigrants, although they try to keep to the norms and principles of behavior established for the society which they enter, nevertheless, in everyday life and in their customs they reveal and reproduce as a rule the traditions and stereotypes of the way of life adopted from their childhoods in previous cultures. And although at the meeting point of these different cultures some opportunities emerge for mutual understanding and mutual action, first of all, due to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1969), 7.

globalization and unification of culture, nevertheless, a state of conflict and contradiction increases—which specialists pay particular attention to both in the West and in developing countries.

Here it should be mentioned that although globalization has at first sight economic forms and political consequences, it is in fact increasingly revealing of the primary place of culture at the global level. Due to this fact, the influence of culture on globalization and of globalization on culture, as well as a combination of the global and the local, becomes the subject of special attention for many scholars. Previously this led to the coining of a new term – *glocalization*, which was created by means of superposing of the words «globalization» and «localization» and became widespread as a word reflecting a complex process of binding of the local peculiarities of the separate nation cultural development and the global trends in the world community development.

Thus, cultural globalization exerts an increasing influence on the human world outlook, thereby provoking serious trouble, first of all for the representatives of underdeveloped and developing countries. Understanding globalization more as the «Americanization of culture,» as the imposition of Western standards and customs, and, finally, as a modern form of cultural colonialism, they see it as a means of transformation and destruction of the traditional values, of changes of the traditional way of life and, hence, as a threat to national identity and cultural diversity. In other words, since globalization is uneven, the majority of traditional societies react defensively against it in the form of counteracting the process of integration as well as conducting the policy of localization and support to local cultures in every possible way.

Some scholars, especially from Islamic, Arab and other countries of the Third World, consider globalization a specially designed plan or a strategy aimed at invading other parts of the world threatening local cultures through their unification. By this, the main threat to cultural identity is, as a rule, seen in the expansion of the influence sphere of mass media, the activity of international foundations, transnational corporations, etc. Such concerns are not entirely groundless since globalization is indeed not only the flows of goods or shortening of distances, deletion of the borders or unification of the production processes. This also tends to the formation of a single system of values, to the crea-

tion of universal culture, which are called to provide effectiveness in world economics, openness and objectivity of information and, at last, tolerance in world policy and intercultural communications. Thus, the changes and transformations in the sphere of culture adequate to globalization acquire priority, while the economic factors turn out to be less meaningful.

Here arises the question of the trends of global processes and of the human future. Already we have the term *postglobalization*, which is used with regard to the future condition of the global world. Also, a fully new term may possibly emerge to provide a name for the future world when the theme of globalization will be replaced with another, more actual topic. Now we can make the following suppositions. In about 10 to 15 years «a stratum of scientific researches» under the title «globalization» will be entirely «worked out» and intellectual and emotional discussion of the topic will become fatigued. As a result, the creative interests of the scholars in global studies will be transmitted to the sphere of *the world constitution and search of practical steps of building the really new world order*. This follows directly from the fact that global studies objectively play an integrative role, making many scholars, politicians, public figures and the broader population take a new look at the contemporary world, stimulating them to understand themselves as a part of the integral world. That is why the transition from understanding global problems to the real processes of globalization, which we now observe, must, it seems to me, sooner or later be replaced with the primary interest in the question *how to form a new international order in the integral interdependent world in order to make it at last safe and stable*. However, the solution or even right setting of this task is ahead, since it is interlinked with another, much more difficult task – the problem of human being and «new humanism.»

Thus, the further development of global studies will have to end sooner or later in understanding *the nature and essence of man himself* as the main cause of all his problems and difficulties: what in the history of philosophy has not been mentioned once, in the works of all the great humanists from Antiquity to modernity. As Nikolai Berdyayev remarked, Philosophers constantly returned to the understanding that to unriddle a mystery of man means to unriddle a mystery of being. Know

thyself, and through this you will know the world. All attempts of external understanding of the world, without dipping into the depth of man, gave just knowledge of the surface of things. If we come from man to the outside, we will never reach the meaning of things, for the understanding of the meaning is concealed in the very man.<sup>4</sup>

Recalling in this connection Protagoras' words «*homo mensuras est*,» one should note that man is also the main cause of increase and escalation of the global problems of modernity.

From here it follows that human reason alone is the single hope to overcome the mentioned contradiction, for the human thinking and creativity are not genetic but cultural properties. People have no other way but to carefully build and insistently form a new thinking, way of life and an appropriate strategy and tactics of action, for, as some scholars believe, future evolution will be determined not by survival of the strongest but by the wisest. This fact provides a reason to consider *the human nature and essence* as a main theme which with time should take the first place in global studies.

---

<sup>4</sup> Nikolai Berdyayev, «Smysl tvorchestva» [«The Meaning of Creation»], in *The Philosophy of Freedom. The Meaning of Creation* (Moscow: The Pravda Press, 1989), 293.

---

## DIALOG AND CONFLICT OF CULTURES IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

Culture embraces, or, to be more precise, it literally penetrates all spheres of spiritual and material life of a society. That is why it is by this or that way fully involved into the process of globalization. Many culture-connected problems emerged from this fact, and they more and more acquire international and even global character. Difficulties and contradictions engendered by increasing influence and broad expansion of «mass culture», periodically emerging crises of spirituality, increasing apathy, feeling of being lost, insecurity, etc. are the examples. In this situation interaction, dialog and mutual understanding of various cultures become more and more significant, although the modern world is not ready for such things. A special role is played by uneasy relations of the modern Western culture and the traditional Oriental cultures. Indigenous cultures of the developing Asian, African, Latin American cultures, relations built between the Christian world and the Islamic world, value orientations and socio-cultural patterns of which are radically different, are also a serious factor of the international insecurity and confrontation to the process of globalization of culture.

We can trace real influence of globalization on culture already to the era of the Great geographic discoveries, when cultural connections and communications first time in human history became, in fact, planet-wide, although in the beginning they had been fragmented and limited to contacts between sailors, traders, conquerors. Since that period the first signs emerge if not of unification, but at least of loaning and spreading globally material and cultural values as well as cultural achievements, which, as a result of expansionist aspirations of the Europeans and increasing world trade, expanded throughout the world. By this, the best scientific and technical achievements of separate countries and nations, the most convenient and daily useful samples of manufactured goods, utensils and cloths, many agricultural crops started to expand over the world more and more actively, taking root in the other cultures.

It was how gun-powder and guns, mechanical clock and navigation equipment, silk and porcelain, tea and coffee, potatoes and corn, tomatoes and many other things, being initially born by local cultures, were step by step winning admission from the other nations and eventually became elements not of their cultures but of the cultural heritage of the whole world community. Along with objects of material culture, various elements of spiritual, basically European, culture were granted opportunities for being expanded world-wide, for example, language (first of all, Spanish, Portuguese, English, French), religions (Christianity, Islam, Buddhism), whose missionaries started to penetrate regions and corners of the world unknown before. Thus, as a result of the beginning globalization, which had opened principally new opportunities for communication and provided the ability to spread various ideas throughout the world, the religions, mentioned above, acquired their, in the full sense, universal meaning and became to be known as «world religions».

Even more opportunities emerged for broad expansion of material and spiritual values in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when new transportation means started to develop: railways, autos, aviation; the modern mass communication means were invented: telephone, cinema, radio, TV. As a result, mutual penetration and mutual assimilation of various cultures, being an objective and necessary consequence of globalization, have led in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to the formation of the universal, planetary culture. Its contours can be relatively well seen already in every country and continent, where the established way of life, traditions and daily peculiarities coexist, basing on complementarity principle, with the newest domestic appliances and mass consumption goods, sometimes manufactured somewhere in the other corner of the planet.

But cultural globalization is not limited only to using the same cell phones, radio, television, transportation means, etc. by various nations. It can also be seen in the design of auto, aviation or home appliances being practically indistinguishable from culture to culture. Their design and production, as a rule, already has no sign of any national culture of their manufacturers and differ from their analogies only by labels with country-manufacturer on them. It is the same for production manufactured by transnational corporations, having their filiations in

many countries of the world, where some factories produce completing details while assembling of the manufactured goods is done in some other place.

So, although in the human history one can find examples of existence of cultures being self-sufficient and practically not contacting with the outside world, it would be, nevertheless, a rare example, not a normal case. In fact, nearly each culture has an imprint of other cultures influencing it, mostly neighboring cultures, but, may be even in a greater extent, of the ones being the most developed and, due to this fact, more attractive from the viewpoint of exchanging experience, results, achievements. It is especially clear if we take loans typical nearly for all languages, having, as a rule, words of foreign origins, as well as parables, sayings, phrases, borrowed from the other cultures. Broad expansion and transmission into the other countries and nations of ideas, inventions, scientific discoveries, religious beliefs, material and spiritual values, techniques and technologies, born by some separated culture, also proves cultural interdependence, typical for all world history.

It seems evident, that interdependence plays an important role in cultural development. It has, in fact, universal character and can be realized in various forms. It can be uninterrupted when we take, for instance, development of everyday life culture, language, and interrupted as it took place in case of the Renaissance, when material values and socio-cultural traditions of the past (the Antiquity) became visible after a significant period of obliteration.

Cultural interdependence can also be direct, in case of loans taking place as a result of a natural evolution through choice and preservation of the most valuable and vivid elements, or indirect, when transmission of achievements is done not immediately but some time hence via additional intercessors. It was so, for example, with typography that initially emerged in Germany and expanded eventually throughout the world, or with ideas and cultural values resurrected by the West European Renaissance and later adopted by other countries and nations.

It is important to mention that such loans are not always creative and taken easily; they often engender some social strains and critical evaluation. For example, a famous Russian philosopher Ivan A. Il'in mentioned originality of Russian culture and theorized that we should



not mechanistically loan spiritual culture of the other nations and imitate them thoughtlessly. He wrote, that «Each nation creates what it can, basing on what was given to it. But it is a bad nation that does not see what was given exactly to it and panhandles at the doors of the others. Russia has its own spiritual and historical gifts and is called to create its own spiritual culture: culture of heart, of contemplation, of freedom and objectivity. There is no «Western culture» obligatory for everyone, comparing with which all the rest are «obscurantism» or «barbarity». The West is not our law and not our jail. Its culture is not the ideal of perfection... And we have no need to pursue it and to make it our ideal. The West has its own misconceptions, illnesses, weaknesses and dangers. Westernizing is not salvation for us. We have our own ways and our own tasks»<sup>1</sup>. It should be mentioned that Western culture has also experienced many problems and even shocks caused by intercultural antagonisms. Numerous religious wars in Europe or stubborn French defense of the priority and purity of their language under the pressure of English, which has already replaced French internationally as a language of diplomacy, evidently confirm the correctness of our statements.

Moreover, the history of nations of the other continents tells the same. In particular, the hard experience of establishing cooperation between the European countries and the countries of the Orient can be and should be a good basis for discussing a principle possibility of mutual influence and interaction of various cultures, as well as for finding principal and irremovable differences between them, underestimating which may engender, in some circumstances, misunderstanding, strain or even a conflict situation. A well-known incident with a British ambassador in China Lord McCartney who in 1793 was refused an accreditation at the court of Jiànlóng can serve a good example. The Emperor of China wrote in this regard in his letter handed to a British king George III: «We have everything and your ambassador can confirm it. I don't pay much attention to exotic or primitive things and we don't need the goods of your country».<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Il'in I.A. Nashi Zadachi. M., 1992. P. 327–328.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in: Toynbee A.G. Postizhenie Istorii. Moscow: Progress, 1991. P. 83.

Less than 200 years have passed since these lines had been written, and now China is not just open for the external world but has literally flooded the whole world with its goods. These facts confirm irrepressible force and communicative direction of modern globalization forcing even the most closed societies to open in the end. The idea is that China itself is not the point, but the objective globalization processes. One can study the practice of other countries, such as Japan, which has completed nearly the same way from full self-isolation to aggressive expansionist policy in the 20th century. Japanese military policy has finally failed but it became really effective in the sphere of manufacturing, especially in electronics, high technologies and motor-building. the sphere of manufacturing, especially in electronics, high technologies and motor-building. Contrasting experience in modern history, for instance, North Korea and Cuba, is also of great interest because it clearly demonstrates that poverty and backwardness in socioeconomic development are, in fact, inevitable in case under global mutual dependence a country chooses the way of self-isolation from the rest of the world.

And, nevertheless, the problem of intercultural interaction and even confrontation, antagonism of various cultural traditions and systems has not become less important. Moreover, it acquires new depth and new forms, intensively moving to the foreground the necessity for dialog and cooperation based on mutual understanding and mutual respect of all the numerous cultures representing modern humankind. It is just to mention that not only in the East but also in the West it is more and more understood that the Eurocentric vision of the world order and world events, being so wide-spread in the previous centuries, has evidently withered away on condition of increasing globalization process. One of the most well-known scholars of the problems of contemporary world, an American political scientist Samuel Huntington also admits, that «the West has conquered the world not due to superiority of its ideas, values or religion (into which some members of the other civilizations were converted), but due to superiority in using organized violence. It is often forgotten in the West; it is always remembered in the non-Western civilizations»<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Huntington S. Stolknovenie Tzivilizatzii? // Sravnitelnoe Izuchenie Tzivilizatzii. M.: Aspect Prospekt, 1999, P. 510.

Our position is confirmed by another, different vision of the Western culture, its values and generally of the capabilities of dialog and cooperation between significantly different cultural, political and religious systems. Now we talk about the position of the Islamic East, represented in the book by the former president of Iran Mohammad Hatami «Islam, Dialog and Civil Society». Here he writes: «Rejecting the West, we want to liberate ourselves from its political, spiritual, cultural and economic domination, for, being Muslims, we initially differ from people of the West in terms of our worldvision, our values»<sup>4</sup>. Western civilization, Hatami wrote, is based on the ideas of freedom and emancipation. He suggests that generally it has had positive impact on the European culture after its liberation from many superstitions and prejudices enslaving thinking, politics and society. But the West, he mentioned, has generally wrong vision of freedom, humankind and the world as a whole. Hatami added: «We really disagree with the West on the issue of freedom. We don't think that the definition of freedom, accepted by the West, is perfect. Western vision of freedom cannot guarantee happiness for the humankind. Historically constructed organization of life and thinking of the West is so concentrated on it itself that it is unable to see disasters caused by its wrong vision of the humankind and freedom»<sup>5</sup>.

The above-brought examples seem enough to conclude: relations of dialog and conflict between various cultures are their natural attributes and even needful forms of their existence, like, for example, political struggle and political agreements being inseparable part of any political system. The nature of this interconnection is based on natural laws, one of which – unity and struggle of the opposites – for a long time has been a subject of philosophical speculations and can be applied to the sphere of culture, literally woven of the opposites and contradictions.

On the one hand, cultures cannot do without interaction, without mutual positive influence. It is so, because communications, existing for ages between nations in the sphere of trade and commercial ex-

---

<sup>4</sup> Hatami M. *Islam, Dialog I Grazhdanskoe Obshchestvo*. M.: ROSSPEN, 2001. P. 217.

<sup>5</sup> *Op.cit.* P. 218–219.

change, always contributed into broad expansion not only of material values, but also spiritual, aesthetic norms, partly being by this or that way loaned and assimilated by other cultures, becoming eventually their elements. Political relations also cannot be effective and cannot even be established without dialog and mutual understanding of the contracting parties, independently of their culture. From this viewpoint, contemporary world situation deserves special attention. It is characterized by increasing globalization principally correcting the very idea of dialog and the forms of its existence.

Globalization has not just suddenly sharpened contradictions accompanying the humankind for ages and millennia. It has brought them qualitatively and quantitatively to the new level, having transformed formerly regional problems into world ones and, at the same time, having engendered principally new, never existing problems and disagreements. The sharpness of modern contradictions is mainly caused by a clash of two trends – integration process, including the area of culture, and a wish of national, local cultures to defend their originality and independence. One can conclude that any «oppression», imposition or coercion in intercultural interaction cannot be successful.

In this regard dialog as a form of relations between individuals, communities and groups of people, between nations, states and, more broadly, between cultures (for example, West and East, Islam and Christianity) becomes not only an objective demand, but an absolute necessity. A Professor from Jerusalem M.V. Ratz speaks about it, discussing the issue of tolerance and dialog in the modern world: «If we still keep our optimism and believe in the force of reason, we should not only count on tolerance, but to develop our dialog ability. Tolerance is necessary, but not sufficient. Dialog is not a panacea either, but, unlike tolerance, at least it provides a prospect for development»<sup>6</sup>.

Nowadays, when there is a significant number of countries having nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons in the world, dialog between these countries (it always takes place in a specific cultural, political and historical context) is the only possible way of resolving inevitable contradictions to avoid catastrophic consequences

---

<sup>6</sup> Ratz M.V. Dialog v Sovremennom Mire // Voprosy Filosofii. 2004, № 10. P 30.

for both the conflicting parties and for the humankind as a whole, because increasing intensity of globalization processes just leaves no other choice for people.

Apart from this, globalization not only expands opportunities for making policy of dialog, but creates new conditions, engendering phenomena, being obstacles to it. For example, every dialog implies clearly defined goal, distinctness and clarity of the positions of the parties, and, consequently, the presence of personal element and rationally based conduct of those, who participate in this dialog. Such qualities are possessed by separate persons and responsible representatives, public and state figures, having relevant authorities for negotiations in question. At the same time, unorganized groups of people, spontaneously formed mobs, and, more than that, a mass of people being the basis of the «mass society» is not sensitive to dialog. Conditions providing existence and reproduction of «mass culture» do not also contribute to dialog. A respected scholar of this problem José Ortega y Gasset wrote, that «dialog is the highest form of communication allowing to discuss the fundamentals of nowadays. But for a man of the mass to accept discussion is to fail inevitably, and he instinctively refuses to accept this highest objective authority»<sup>7</sup>.

Thus, globalization, creating conditions for the emergence and expansion of mass culture and demanding, at the same time, increasing and more effective dialog, produces a highly contradictory situation. Another words, it plays a double role – on the one hand, it contributes into developing of dialog, on the other hand, creates additional obstacles to it, engendering principally new contradictions and conflicts, the most of which directly affect the sphere of culture.

Cultural disagreements and contradictions, in fact, mostly explain the fact that the modern globalizing world, implying transcending borders and eliminating obstacles to communication and human contacts, is still characterized by political, economic, spiritual and even material walls and barriers. Here we could point not only to trade and economic wars permanently waged between, for example, Japan, the US, and the EU, or to political and diplomatic conflicts emerging peri-

---

<sup>7</sup> Ortega y Gasset J. Vosstanie Mass // Voprosy Filosofii. 1989, № 3. P. 144.

odically with various pretexts, but also to real walls still constructed in the modern world, what seems to be contradicting common sense.

For example, the Berlin wall that used to be a result of ideological disagreements and a symbol of contradiction of different cultural and political systems, was in the course of time destroyed, but it has not become the last example reminding that in the global world it is impossible to be separated by either real or virtual wall from «inconvenient» or «incompliant» neighbors, whom, as we know, one cannot choose. And already in the 21<sup>st</sup> century Israel, after desperate constant war against terrorism, starts to build the same wall to be separated from the Palestinian territories, while in the US, on the basis of the increasing flow of illegal immigrants, the issue of building a wall at the Mexican border is seriously discussed.

Pointing to these rudiments of human antagonism, we should also emphasize that some obstacles to building constructive and effective dialog between people can be found in the contradictory nature of human beings themselves. «People value external form higher than internal essence, they more value what differentiates them from the others than what unites with them. That is why I think that *dialog of culture has limited abilities*» – A.A. Guseinov wrote<sup>8</sup>. Having in mind the above-mentioned circumstances, one can conclude that dialog between cultures cannot do without contradictions and even conflicts. And it is so both because of multi-faceted human essence, and of the contradictory nature of culture itself – differentiated, dynamic phenomenon, and also because of inevitable originality and difference of any given culture from the others, with whom it establishes any contacts. And these conflicts not necessarily should be evident, having open or even exacerbated form; they are sometimes of a hidden, obscure or covered nature, appearing in the foreground only under certain circumstances. Sometimes they remain not actualized, losing in the course of time any ground for open manifestation.

One can bring limitless number of examples of such conflicts, but war has always been the most bright expression of intercultural confrontations. As a rule, it is an external manifestation, an apogee of con-

---

<sup>8</sup> Guseinov A.A. Globalnyi Etos kak Problema // Etos Globalnogo Mira. M.: «Vostochnaya Literatura» RAN, 1999. P. 20.

traditions, which were ripening for a long period covertly. When they become evident, they take various forms of violent struggle. Internal or hidden conflicts inevitably accompany all cultures, as well as intercultural relations (sometimes they are perceived as interethnic), and they can be externally displayed through, for example, an ironical attitude to some ethnic way of life, ignoring its material and spiritual achievements, rejecting specific traditions and norms, becoming subject to jokes and mockery, etc.

*Counterculture* is one of the forms of a conflict manifestation inside a culture itself, which by this or that way becomes its antipode. Counterculture emerges, as a rule, on a basis of unresolved problems, accumulated contradictions and confrontation of various interests; it is fed by them and mostly becomes opposed to the accepted norms, established «traditional» values, principles, ideals, calling for their new understanding, rethinking on the other grounds. Such movements directed towards modernization of cultures existed nearly at every historical period, and they always generated new ideals, providing impulse to changing previous ideals. They performed, thus, on the one hand, an important function of renovating previous forms, relics of the past, overcoming everything what was stagnated, dogmatic, non-viable. On the other hand, they performed a destructive function becoming extremist and violent. Counterculture becomes particularly strong in a period of social crises, accompanied by revolutions – social convulsions, affecting the deepest foundations of culture, which is, at such moments, normally in a deep crisis.

Countercultural examples can be found already in the ancient times, and the most bright of them is, we think, the Greek philosophical school of cynics, rejecting the accepted moral norms and living principles and challenging the society by extravagant behavior of its representatives. The very term «cynics» (meaning «dogs» in Greek), used by them with pride, is characterizing for their lifestyle and behavior, based on neglecting traditional norms of living, denying laws of polices and a wish to live in accordance with natural laws, rejecting Fatherland and proclaiming themselves cosmopolitans. The essence of this counterculture is reflected brightly in many stories and fables about a legendary representative of cynical philosophy Diogenes of Sinope, who demon-

stratively lived in a barrel (piphos), having limited his demands to the minimum, thus expressing his aspiration to finding natural freedom and full independence from external events.

Very recent, wave-like movement of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are, definitely, countercultural, such as hippies, Hóng Wèi Bīng, «New Left», as well as demonstrations of sexual minorities, various reformist or schismatic movements emerging periodically in this or that church or religious confession; in particular, Protestantism, baptism, *duhobory*, Wahhabism, Krishnaism and many others used to be countercultural phenomena. Counterculture is also represented by varied protest movements directed against various forms of violence, exploitation, unjust relations in the sphere of economy, politics, social relations, etc. These are political parties and social movements of the «Greens», international organizations like «Greenpeace» and «antiglobalists», widely known nowadays, who, in fact, are not against globalization as such. They actually protest against unjust relations, becoming more visible and acute in the modern world under the influence of the objective globalization process<sup>9</sup>.

In this regard one curious phenomenon deserves attention. Since the moment of «discovering» in the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century of the global problems of modernity and active searching of the ways to overcome them (meaning, until it was talked about global threats to the whole humankind), there have been, in fact, no principal disagreements between parties interested in their resolution. Actually, all countries and peoples of the world were interested in it, because global problems represent an equal threat for all people of the planet. Now, when we talk about globalization, no similar opinion can be heard. It is not the point that here in the most evident form one can see true role and «personal contribution» of this or that country into the emergence and enhancement of specific global problems. The point is that, having found the main causes of their emergence, we necessarily came to another question: who and how should make efforts for resolving these problems. And this tackles interests of some certain countries, or organizations, industrial groups they represent.

---

<sup>9</sup> See.: Chumakov A.N. Globalizatsiya. Kontury Tzelostnogo Mira. M.: Prospekt, 2005.



All of this means only that in the foreseeable future we should expect only increasing confrontation and struggle between various interacting actors in the contemporary global world. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that «every world actor now has no permanent and «faithful» allies, they only have constant national interests, not coinciding with or contradicting interests of the others»<sup>10</sup>. In fact, M.V.Ratz means the same, writing that «It is of special important to find proper names for everything. We should admit that peaceful coexistence so far remains an unachievable ideal. Rationally thinking people long ago understood that it was not achievable practically. It is more difficult to agree that it is not grounded even in minds. It seems that it cannot be grounded theoretically...»<sup>11</sup>. Another words, universal consent and mutual understanding are so far away that seem to be principally impossible.

But the history of many different social systems demonstrates that cultures, being, for some reasons, isolated, as well as those who oppressed multiculturalism, are prone to stagnation, poverty, monotony, decline of creative activity of the significant part of the population. In the end they inevitably degrade. In human history we can find many examples proving that the most intense social, economic and cultural development took place in cases of promoting cultural diversity and where trade ways crossed due to favorable geographic conditions, expanding transnational cultural ties. There is no doubt that contacts, interactions, mutual influence and exchange between various local and national cultures were, for a long time, one of the reasons of active development, prosperity and progress of cultures at terrestrial cross-roads like the Middle East, or at the sea shore, like in the Mediterranean, or at the coast of the Indian ocean.

Evaluating modern situation, one should stress that the role and meaning of dialog of cultures have grown up even more for universal interdependence in the global world is so high that any attempt to resolve international conflicts and social problems by violence (physical,

---

<sup>10</sup> See: Tancher V.V., Kazakov V.S. Problema Deinstitutionalizatsii Sotzialnykh Konfliktov v Kontekste Globalizatsii // Sotzialnye Konflikty v Kontekste Protzessov Globalizatsii I Regionalizatsii. M.: LENAND, 2005. P. 65.

<sup>11</sup> Ratz M.V. Op.cit. P. 30.

spiritual, psychological, ideological, economic, etc.) or even «pressure», on behalf of, for example, of the «directing culture» should be excluded. I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada is right, when he writes: «Sword is the worst tool for resolving the global problems of modernity»<sup>12</sup>. The only result guaranteed by such methods is exacerbation of the past conflicts and emergence of the new ones, often more sharp. The reason for this is the essence of culture that cannot be changed quickly and, moreover, by force. «In real life neither religious decrees, nor fruitless dreaming can prevent the advancement of Western culture. But neither memorandums, nor doctrines can also log the tradition off», M. Hatami mentions<sup>13</sup>. And this seems a serious argument in favor of multiculturalism and dialog of various cultures, the only alternative to which is, having in mind nuclear potential of a significant number of independent states, self-destruction of the whole humankind.

There are many historical examples of resolving disputes through dialog, but so far we can see no trend towards such relations between people and various communities to become deeply rooted and durable. Acute conflicts emerging here and there to be resolved by force, threats and various forms of pressure demonstrate that attempts to dialog are still more episodic than consistent.

For a stable dialog and, moreover, for its becoming the main method of human communication, we need to replace the power of force by the power of spirit. It is in principle impossible without a certain level of development of spiritual and material culture. The past epochs, for fully objective reasons, not just could not provide such level of cultural development, but «paid» although sever but not mortal price for relatively low level of this development. The age of globalization has made the problem of dialog having no alternative, otherwise the humanity has no chance to survive.

---

<sup>12</sup> Bestuzhev-Lada I.V. V Preddverii Strashnogo Suda ili Izbezhim Li Predrechnogo v Apokalipsise? M.: FON, 1996. P. 80

<sup>13</sup> Hatami M. Op.cit. P. 162.

---

## ON THE WAY TO A GLOBAL SOCIETY<sup>1</sup>

Last years the attention of the world community is focused on globalization process that expands each year embracing more and more spheres of social life, making all dwellers of the planet members of one global society. Under the influence of globalization process social time and space have diminished and ceased to be obstacles to conversations and operative communication of people independently of their place of settling. The world became not just interdependent, but fragile, sensitive to scientific, technological and military achievements of the humankind. Moreover, from the beginning of the last century the world community more and more experiences the negative consequences of globalization, of which one should first of all name the global problems of modernity representing a serious threat for the whole humankind. This allows us to conclude that by nowadays the global society on the planet has generally emerged. Closeness of geographic space, universal interdependence and common threats, as well as world system of information, transportation means, etc. are its distinguishing characteristics.

It is important to say that by the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the humankind had developed, so to speak, in separate compartments, local civilization relatively weakly influencing each other or, in fact, not interacting at all. Now the **universal world civilization** is being formed. Its basic contours were clear already in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the First World War was the first step to it. The League of Nations founded in 1919 in order to promote cooperation between nations and to provide «peace and security» guarantees was the first attempt of the world community (it was in that period on the stage of formation) to regulate interrelations in a civilized way. The beginning of the Second World War did not reverse the trend towards the formation of the universal humankind but only provided a new (barbarian) form for it, which was replaced with peaceful, civilized cooperation in making principally new structures of managing world economy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Global Symposium «Towards a New World Civilization» (8–11 December, 2006, Lucknow, India), 2006.

In the period from 1945 to mid-1960s the majority of still existing international organizations was built up, for example, the UN, NATO, OPEC, UNESCO, etc. In the same period the universal world economy emerges where transnational corporations play the key role. Finally, the emergence and acuteness of global problems by the beginning of the 1970s has shaped the contour of the formal process of unification of humanity. From this period one can speak about real formation of *global society* or universal world civilization demanding different countries and nations to follow norms, rules, bans and prescriptions universal for the whole humankind. One should mention, however, that world civilization does not devalue the now existing national cultures and specific features of living and activity of various nations. It embraces them as its composing parts and is related to them in a way a megalopolis, for example, is related to self-sufficient polises on which it is based.

Thus, global society is a principally new page of the humankind's history. And it is evident now that, unlike previous pages, this one will be dedicated to a new topic and written in another language. This new topic is the *finishing of the external globalization process, the formation of its wholeness and unity*, when integration processes dominate all spheres of social life. Another language means not only new communication means, such as Internet, e-mail, satellite television, cell phones, etc., but *adjusting morality, ethics and law to the global changes*. This, in its turn, means the formation and acceptance by the absolute majority of world community of such values that would be adequate to the new reality engendered by globalization.

That is why not only academics, politicians, public figures, business professionals but also broader population strata in various corners of the planet discuss the nature of globalization, trying to understand its essence, prospects and development goals. Some of them see globalization as mostly an objective historical process, which naturally transforms fragmented, dispersed humanity into a global community of people. Others see some pattern of globalization, specially planned activities of some states, transnational corporations, etc., pursuing their narrow, egotistic interests.

While practically no one questions the idea that under the influence of globalization a global society is being formed on the planet, there are different opinions about how it is managed and about its future.

For example, there is a viewpoint that modern world is «unipolar» because at the international arena, according to this viewpoint, the US unequivocally dominate practically all spheres of social life. The others disagree with this, and support the idea of «multipolar» world. They think that world policy is a result of, at minimum, several centers of socioeconomic, political and military power. S. Huntington and his followers suggest that the emerging global society will face serious difficulties due to being torn apart by deadly contradictions caused by the clash of different civilizations. Those who support the idea of sustainable development, put forward in 1992 during the World Summit in Rio-de-Janeiro, are of different opinion. They think that the main task of world community having entered the era of global interdependence is to provide, first of all, harmonization of interrelations between society and the environment and optimization of the use of natural resources.

In spite of this broad spectrum of opinions related to global community, it is important for us that practically no one questions its existence. However, to judge properly about the global society it is important to understand that its corresponding processes, as well as globalization itself, are primarily and first of all, of objective nature. That means, they in principle don't depend on will and subjective aspirations of private citizens or social groups, of state policy, etc. Globalization processes, as well as global problems, emerged not due to someone's mistake or evil will, not accidentally. They are the result of the objective, consistent social development and changing relations between society and its environment. That is why although at the first glance the modern world has changed literally within the last decade, it is not so in reality.

Here one should mention that the transition from fragmentation, comminution and dissociatedness of the world social relations to its unification, wholeness and globality, was a focus for the most clever minds already in the first half of the last century. One can recall works by Teilhard de Chardin, Vladimir Vernadsky, Mahatma Gandhi, Carl Jaspers, the Manifesto of Russell-Einstein, etc. Nevertheless, for broader public consciousness these changes became clear only in the

last decade, mostly due to the beginning of the information revolution. It takes place so quickly and impetuously, that humankind simply has no time not only to react adequately but also to theoretically think over the essence of what takes place.

This happens mostly because people try to explain the new changed world with the help of the established, familiar concepts and categories such is, for example, «*civilization*», «*democracy*», «*sovereignty*», «*universal values*», etc. No one pays attention to the fact that each of the terms, as well as the established system of values, ethical and legal norms, has been formed and acquired its contents under the conditions principally different from those taking place now.

The same thing happened with the principles of democracy, which had been formulated in the era of bourgeois revolutions and became the basis for contemporary democratic institutions. They took firm shape only in several countries and need new understanding to be acquired and spread to the whole planet. This is, may be, one of the most important tasks for the humankind to be resolved in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Why? The fact, that world community now has «common house», common destiny and common responsibility for what happens in the world does not yet mean that democratic values and principles of organization of social life, according to which so far only the minority of humankind lives, will be automatically accepted by the rest of world community. At least, active pushing of democratic values into the other cultures, unequipped for them, often provokes unrest, non-understanding and back-reaction.

At the same time, the growth of interdependence as well as understanding that no one is able to skip taking part in resolving common issues, only makes discussions about the share of participation and the measure of responsibility of parties in case the situation worsens more acute. Moreover, disagreements increase and become the sharper, the more contemporary world divided into «national apartments» moves towards globalization. At the same time, the gap in living standards and socioeconomic development of various nations grows. This fact is a serious obstacle to democratic transition and to the emergence of global civil society, which in the future should be formed as a result of transcending fragmentation and of the emergence of the holistic world.

It is no doubt that inaction or non-adequate steps will only worsen the situation. The more needed decisions are postponed, the higher the price will be for the world community to pay for returning to its normal condition, when at least the environment does not degrade.

The above-said seems evident. Nevertheless, an opinion is widespread that global problems touch different countries in a different way and, hence, their consequences are different too. That is why some countries, the advanced ones, first of all, try to redistribute the load of responsibility on the others, to wait for the other countries' and peoples' actions. But this seems to be a dangerous illusion due to one important issue. In case common action is not undertaken, no one will be able to avoid the influence of the negative consequences of global problems, because the former are outcome and result of the objective globalization process.

So, there is no alternative to universal humankind and in order to preserve civilization on the planet there must be not just common principles and rules of common living established but common responsibility for the destiny of each human being. In the global, culturally and civilizationally interconnected world not only global problems as such represent a serious danger but even individual outcasts, not talking about pariah states. Can such a society become a reality? It is not evident and depends on the fact whether humankind is able to transcend from understanding its unity to real unification and to become, finally, while preserving national identity of single communities, a world sociosystem of an open type, or, at least, to enter the way of democratic transition. This will depend on many factors, mostly connected with the clash of interests in the global world.

It is different goals and different interests what creates problems and tensions between civilizations. This does not contribute into overcoming a whole complex of global problems. First of all, we mean division into «national apartments» and everything what accompanies this (for example, *sovereignty and non-interference into domestic issues of separate states, special positions of different civilizations with regard to basic human rights and freedoms*, etc.). It not only remains nowadays; it is being defended actively, in spite of the fact that this situation already seriously contradicts basic principles of functioning of the global society.

Thus, there is no way to avoid in the foreseeable future a confrontation between states. The question is: what will be the rules of this confrontation, who is going to prescribe these rules and to play the role of an arbiter?

Now the US pretends to be such an arbiter. One can refer to frank observations of Z. Brzezinsky, P. Buckennan and some American presidents, where hegemonic US plans to build a unipolar world can be seen clearly.

Neither Russia, nor India, China, not even Western Europe, not mentioning the other countries and regions, will voluntarily agree with such approach to the building of the new world order. In the world full of nuclear weapons, forceful interference into at least one civilization's business may provoke a chain reaction and is principally unacceptable. What remains is a way of negotiations, agreements, mutual concessions and covenants in behalf of common interest. At the same time, one should remember that different peoples, due to their cultural heritage and traditions, would always see the world differently from their neighbors, not talking about more distant communities. This seems to be understood already even in the US. George Soros writes, that «on September 11<sup>th</sup> the Americans were shocked, having found out that the others might see them in a different way than they see themselves. Now they are more ready to reevaluate the world and the US role in it than in better times»<sup>2</sup>. Evidently, it is not yet that evolution of opinions needed for both American society and the whole humankind to overcome global threats. Nevertheless, without such reevaluation humankind will not provide sustainable social development at the global level, and, hence, will not preserve itself as a global society.

Can this task be fulfilled? The answer to this question is not at all evident. Considering growing economic and social problems, the absence of good and effective laws both at the domestic and international level, favorable conditions emerge for the growth of nationalism, separatism, corruption, criminality, various forms of violence and extremism. As a result, nihilism and decadence increase, pessimism and social demoralization grow. Voices are heard that *universal values, human rights, com-*

---

<sup>2</sup> Soros Dzh. O globalizatsii. Moscow: Rudomino, 2002. P. 10.



*mon destiny of humankind*, etc. are only a «screen for the West» to cover its aggressive politics and protection of its interests. On the wave of such feelings some public figures vote for isolationism and dismantling of negotiation processes. For example, in Russia there are people thinking that we should not accept or even support «the values of the Western civilization». They see the alternative in the uniqueness of Russian society and re-orientation to the East (as juxtaposed to the West).

We agree that each country needs to find its own path of development based on nationally oriented values, but we should mention the dangers of this path. Under the condition of global interdependence the big, system-forming (at the world scale) countries, such as, for example, Russia, India, China, Brazil, must be very flexible not to enter the path of confrontation not only with the advanced West, but with the rest of the world. One should have in mind that the limit for large-scale social experiments is practically at the end. It may happen that in case of a failed experiment the leadership of a «cornered» country may decide to use the last «argument» in its discussion with uncompliant adversary – the «nuclear stick» – or to support international terrorism. There is no need to discuss the consequences of such a step because they are evident.

We can only count on common sense, enlightenment and renovated humanism, the formation of which is also in the domain of philosophy. We need to rethink ourselves and the world where we live in order common morality and common law to become the main regulators of social relations in the new century. We should value human rights connected with human responsibilities above all and to acknowledge ourselves as one-world citizens to act in the same way. Each nation and state, supporting and developing its traditions, culture, customs, should, at the same time, put universal interests and values higher than national, corporate, religious or ethnic ones to provide survival and wealth for themselves too.

We, representatives of humanitarian knowledge, educators, are particularly responsible for the formation of global consciousness and such world outlook that would make all of us members of one global society.

---

## THE CHALLENGE OF GLOBALIZATION AND PHILOSOPHICAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WORLD FUTURE<sup>1</sup>

While the world is becoming more and more interdependent, holistic and global engendering at the same time new challenges and dangers, philosophy is being transformed from just an intellectual game into a tool for overcoming these problems. It should be mentioned that philosophy has always been this or that way a reaction to the threats to humankind and that it made attempts to confront these threats. One can refer to the glorious Russell-Einstein Manifesto that emerged after the first nuclear tests or the efforts of an American philosopher John Somerville who created in 1980s, when two antagonistic systems were ready to destroy one another in a nuclear war, an international philosophical organization called «International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear Omnicide» (IPPNO). Now the situation has changed. And though the nuclear threat, thanks to ideological detente in relations between the main nuclear powers, is not as acute as it used to be, the world generally has not become less dangerous.

This is so not just because of the increasing threat of international terrorism but also because environmental degradation, a huge gap in socio-economic development between the rich and the poor countries, an uneven and uncontrollable population growth and the other global problems have brought up a totally new philosophical issue never existing before – the one of globalization of all spheres of social life and of the dangers it gives rise to.

So, what philosophy can and should do within this new situation? Which steps should be made and what sort of responsibility should be taken by the international philosophical community? A short answer to these questions I see as following:

- Since the influence of philosophy on human minds via training and education is rather strong, philosophers, first of all, must learn thinking in terms of a holistic and united world and take a

---

<sup>1</sup> Europa Forum: Philosophie / # 48, 2003.

share of responsibility for the adequate understanding of the fundamental globalization process. This means, philosophers from different countries, representatives of various cultures and religious groups should reach such a level of mutual understanding and mutual relations that even representing the West and the East, Russia and the other areas of the world they would strive towards intercultural dialogue and build a common value system for every nation to find its dignified place within the single world community.

- There is no need and no possibility to unify thoughts, cultures and probably ways of life, but one can not help seeking common foundation for joint living on our planet enjoying tolerance and mutual understanding. In the future there will be no way to avoid global problems, private disagreements and conflicting interests, but there should be civilized methods of reconciliation found. Philosophers, who, unlike politicians, can not afford using double standards, are the best candidates for fulfilling this task. At minimum, they could coordinate their efforts related to teaching philosophy and accomplishing its worldwide mission of enlightenment.
- To have this done, the issue of the status of philosophy must be brought up for a broad discussion and international experience of teaching philosophy must be exchanged. Importance of this task was confirmed at the 20<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy in Boston being a good starting point for this debate. Although this topic is important for the whole world, it is especially significant for the countries there authoritarianism is still dominant or strong enough.
- The time has come to establish an international (multilingual) e-journal for broad international exchange of experience, information and ideas. It should be less theoretical than organizing scholars and aiming at establishing and expanding academic contacts and cooperation of philosophers from various countries. This would allow to start a direct dialogue of different cultures and ways of thinking, to provide creative on-line communication of philosophers from various countries. This,

of course, does not prevent emergence of narrower, purely theoretical electronic and conventional publications but it is better to begin with simple and easily accessible things whose utility is self-evident.

- National philosophical conferences and congresses with broad international participation can be and should be an important step in achieving mutual understanding and expanding international philosophical contacts along with World Congresses. National philosophical societies could have closer partner-like relationships. There is already such experience in Russia. For example, the Association Internationale des Professeurs de Philosophie and the Russian Philosophical Society held a joint conference in Kaliningrad (Russia) in October 2001. As for the Third All-Russian Philosophical Congress held in September 2002 in Rostov-na-Donu, among its one thousand delegates there were foreign participants from the US, China, Iran, the CIS countries as well as German representatives – Professor Lenk and Professor Bechmann.
- Finally, to unite philosophers and other scholars from various countries a publication of joint international edited volumes would be useful, which would reflect the positions of various philosophers concerning the most acute issues. Such volumes could be multilingual and widely advertised in the philosophical press. The Russian Philosophical Society already has some positive experience in this field as well. For example, to meet the 21<sup>st</sup> World Congress of Philosophy in Istanbul (August 2003) an International Global Studies Encyclopedia is being prepared. It will be published in Russian and English languages. More than 400 scholars from more than 23 countries have already become the contributors of the Encyclopedia. This is an example of successful creative cooperation at the international level that has become possible only recently thanks to modern informational technologies and electronic means of communication as well as to the growing solidarity and responsibility of philosophers and other scholars from various countries for the world future.

---

## CHINA IN THE WORLD SYSTEM OF COORDINATES<sup>1</sup>

China occupies a particularly important place in the system of modern international relations and in the visible future its role and influence in world affairs will steadily grow. This fact is supported by both the established structure of international relations and the basic trends of development of the global world, where economic and political influence of China becomes more and more significant. The growing role of China became especially visible from the mid-20th century when multiaspect globalization began and involved all countries and peoples into the situation of total interdependence and unprecedented competition. This nearly fully coincides in terms of timing with 60 years of history of the People's Republic of China. During this time period this country became fully open for the world and acquired the status of a world power. Another words, China has fully entered the community of main world actors according to all basic parameters, including territory, population, science, education, volume and pace of economic development, military and technological potential, nuclear weapons possession, space explorations, etc.

An objective consideration of Chinese historic development allows to conclude that this country, being even now relatively tightly connected with its national traditions and the past can, at the same time, quickly and adequately react to fundamental changes taking place in the outside world. In the conditions of increasing globalization combining the global and the local, the national and the universal in the domestic and foreign policy of the country has let establish control over the demographic «explosion», provide balanced and quick economic development, and, finally, achieve social and political stability. This has made China during the last decades one of the main leaders defining the architecture of the global world.

---

<sup>1</sup> 60 Years of People's Republic of China. Humanities and Social Sciences Forum in China 2009. Paper (Outline) Compilation. – Beijing, 2009.

Economy tightly connected with international trade and, at the same time, actively regulated by state, and hard national currency – Yuan – allow China effectively enough to withstand negative results of the world systemic crisis. This is another confirmation of the above-made conclusions.

The context of the whole world history where China with its unique culture and ancient traditions has its own face demonstrates that the modern world with Chinese special position in it has reached the actual status not accidentally. We can speak about it indeed from the very beginning of the real history of humankind. This history started from the «Neolithic revolution» meaning the transition of human beings to a settled way of living about 7–10 thousand years ago when humankind finally entered the way of cultural development and opened a principal possibility of civilizational development for itself.

From that moment the world community survived several cardinal transformations, of which everyone opened new chances for the emergence of the global world. Every time, apart from external conditions, human worldview in various regions of the planet was also principally changing. That means, the destiny of the whole humankind was renovated every time. And this is especially surprising if we take into consideration that before developed states emerged the humankind lived under conditions of communities organized locally and before the age of the Great geographic discoveries it was represented by several autonomous regions.

Now if we consider history through the prism of the above-mentioned transformations we can mark out three of the most important turning point of world development. And China, without which one can not imagine world history, played its own, special role during each of them.

\* \* \*

The first of such cardinal turns in human history that K.Jaspers called «the axial time» began in the 6th century B.C. and lasted approximately 500 years. It was marked by the beginning of the rational exploration of the world and the emergence of philosophy, as well as by transition from polytheism to monotheism and the growth of world religions. The emergence of the Roman Empire at the meeting point of

Europe, Asia and Africa and of the united Zing Empire in China was the result of this «axial time» and the most significant event of the structural reconstruction of the world. They were the largest regional structures of their time and became, in fact, the prologue to the future global world, having blueprinted two basic directions of movement towards it – from the West and from the East.

Starting from this point, intercultural interaction dramatically grows and starts to involve more and more countries and peoples. In particular, a tradition of transferring of ideas, inventions, scientific discoveries, religious beliefs, material and spiritual values, techniques and technologies born by one of the cultures to the other social systems.

For example, European culture is grounded in the achievements of the most ancient civilizations of the Middle East, Egypt and the Mediterranean. Long ago, when contacts between separated regions remained still very weak, about 7 thousand years B.C. the art of pottery emerges there and spreads throughout the Middle East, the Phoenician coast and in Egypt. Hieroglyphic writing invented in the Middle East (in Mesopotamia) in the 4<sup>th</sup> millennium B.C. was loaned and improved by Phoenician tradesmen who transformed it into an alphabetic-syllabic one. When, through the Mediterranean, Greece and Rome, it reached the Europeans. In the period of relatively vivid trade contacts having place in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the Europeans loaned compass, gunpowder, paper, separable prints, silk, porcelain and even exams from China.

But from the viewpoint of the emerging globalization processes, the junction of the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries is of the most interest, when the largest empires of that time reach their highest development: the Roman empire embracing the whole Mediterranean; the Parthian empire spreading over the Middle East, the Kushan Empire dominating Middle Asia and India and, at last, the Hang empire, which had united China and conquered lands located near «the Great Silk Way» and the lands of the Southern Huns.

At that moment the four empires embraced, in fact, the whole Eurasian ecumene from the Pacific ocean in the East to the Atlantic ocean in the West, including also North Africa. They were connected by the famous international transit trade way. It functioned from the

end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. to the 16<sup>th</sup> century until more effective sea routes, being the result of the Great geographic discoveries, became its serious challengers.

This trade corridor being, up to the Renaissance, the longest in human history, was called «the Great Silk Way» because silk from China was mostly valued in the West. It has played an important role in widening cultural and economic ties between countries and peoples being significantly different from one another in terms of their level of economic and cultural development and never before interacted peacefully and constantly. Spices, silk, paper, lacquer, ivory, precious stones were brought by this way from the East; handicraft works and other goods produced in the West moved in the other direction. As a well-known specialist in the Ancient East G.M.Bongard-Levin mentions, «In the first ages of our era trade ties between India and China, accomplished through the Great Silk Way and by sea, increased. Indian embassies and Buddhist missions were sent into China...»<sup>2</sup>.

Later on, after the dissolution of the above-mentioned empires and because of constant wars for controlling highly profitable caravan trade, the Great Silk Way many times changed its direction, choosing new safe ways to Europe through South Caucasus and Constantinople or at the Northern coast of the Caspian and Black seas.

\* \* \*

The second cardinal turn in human history that lasted about 300 years is related to the Great geographic discoveries, the emergence in the Modern Time of science as a separated form of social consciousness and the beginning of the scientific and technological progress. At this time the emergence of the largest regional structure in human history – the British Empire – was the most significant event in the reconstruction of the world. It was a new step towards global world undertaken by the West.

From the Eastern side the movement towards global world at that moment of historic development was headed by the Russian Em-

---

<sup>2</sup> Bongard-Levin, G.M. Drevnyaya India. Istoria i Kultura. – St.Petersburg, 2001. P. 274–275.



pire, which emerged simultaneously. After in 1552 and 1556 Russia conquered, respectively, Kazan and Astrakhan, a trade route through Volga and the Caspian sea emerges bordering with the Great Silk Way and the other caravan trade routes what opened an opportunity for trading of the North European territories with the countries of the Middle East, India and China.

At the same time China, governed by the Zing dynasty, conducted self-isolation policy and, due to this fact, provided no significant influence on the development of world trends.

A well-known incident with a British ambassador in China Lord McCartney who in 1793 was refused an accreditation at the court of Jiànlóng can serve a good example of Chinese self-sufficiency and self-isolation in that time. The Emperor of China wrote in this regard in his letter handed to a British king George III: «Considering the fact that your Ambassador and representative have made a long way with their memorandum and gifts, I granted them the highest honor having allowed them to attend an assembly... As for you request to accredit them at my divine Court with a purpose to control trade with China... it is... hardly manageable... Our ceremonies and laws are so different from yours that even in case your messenger learns some of them, you will not be able to root them in your soil strange for us. Therefore, in spite of your messenger being educated enough, nothing will come out of it... I am not interested in strange and costly goals... We have everything and your ambassador can confirm it. I don't pay much attention to exotic or primitive things and we don't need the goods of your country».<sup>3</sup>

Not more than 200 years have passed since these lines were written, and now China is not just open for the external world but has literally flooded the whole world with its goods. In 2001 China entered the WTO and this meant additional lifting of many restrictions for foreign capital flows into the country. Five years after entering the WTO China opened all its territory and the whole economy for foreign capital. These facts confirm irrepressible force and communicative direction of modern globalization forcing even the most closed societies to open in the end.

---

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in: Toynbee A.G. *Postizhenie Istorii*. Moscow: Progress, 1991. P. 83.

The idea is that China itself is not the point, but the objective globalization processes. One can study the practice of other countries, such as Japan, which has completed nearly the same way from full self-isolation to aggressive expansionist policy in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Japanese military policy has finally failed but it became really effective in the sphere of manufacturing, especially in electronics, high technologies and motor-building. Contrasting experience in modern history, for instance, North Korea and Cuba, is also of great interest because it clearly demonstrates that poverty and backwardness in socioeconomic development are, in fact, inevitable in case under global mutual dependence a country chooses the way of self-isolation from the rest of the world.

\* \* \*

Thus, we have reached the third and the last cardinal turn in human history. This turn began since the second half of the 19th century and lasts up to nowadays. It has finally made the humankind global in the literal sense of this world. It is characterized by the fact that world community has acquired a single economic space and financial interdependence. Scientific and technological progress has reached the stage of scientific and technological revolution. Nuclear energy was domesticated and nuclear weapons made able to destroy life on the Earth. Principally new transportation means emerged and space exploration began. Finally, the creation of electronic technologies, unique communication means, planetary communications and the Internet gave birth to informational revolution and created a single informational space having now everything but borders. All of this has eventually made the modern world a single holistic system as far as basic parameters of world life are concerned.

As a result, relatively separate regional structures were replaced with global humankind united into a single whole not only by the world market economy and finance freely moving throughout the world, but also by mass culture, single ecology, common principles of civilizational development.

Here we have reached an important point of modern globalization which is widely discussed in the whole world. The point is how

globalization changes human live and influences cultural development of various peoples.

It should be mentioned in this regard that the most essential manifestation of globalization takes place in the sphere of culture, both material and spiritual. Additionally, the sphere of spiritual life, which is most hardly globalized, last years becomes more and more involved into worldwide processes. For example, now there are, in fact, no borders for spreading and mutual influence of various ideas, teachings, beliefs, etc. All the most significant scientific discoveries and outstanding literature works are practically immediately translated into many world languages; popular songs and melodies, best examples of fashion or theatrical art spread throughout the planet with phenomenal speed. They mostly easily become part of the context of traditional culture, accepting and assimilating such elements of world culture, giving, at the same time, new impulses for it.

China is a good example in this regard. Last years here and abroad a problem of the Chinese national model of globalization is widely discussed. It is well-known that China tries to approach all problems basing on its national peculiarities and interests. For example, at the 17<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of China (October 2007) one could once again hear a loud slogan «Socialism with Chinese specifics». Such approach has sufficient grounds because numerous foreign influences and even interventions always ended up with acquiring Chinese coloring.

It is important to stress in this regard that China not only follows the rules set by the leading Western countries but wants to say its own word, to change these rules in its own interests. It does not open doors widely for foreign capital until internal preconditions for it are not prepared and the reforms needed completed. Another words, the country's leaders try to support organic interconnection of external openness and internal reforms.

A Chinese scholar Yangsang Yang pays attention to this issue in his study. He writes, that «localization of foreign culture and local approach to the imported culture is actually the key for understanding current cultural globalization in China, because most of the Chinese have active and positive regard to the imported foreign culture. Officially it

was reflected in the slogan of the 1990s «China for the world and the world for China»...»<sup>4</sup>. He also mentions that not only Western influence is the factor of globalization but also mass cultural production made in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and Japan, which, contrasting to Western culture, is easily adaptable for Chinese environment. The natural conclusion is that cultural globalization has universal character and is not initiated by any single center – supposedly, the US or even such mass culture production center as Hollywood.

It is actually a big mistake to suggest that globalization is a result of someone's reasonable, purposeful activity or that it is governed from some single center. There can be a position that this mistake is insignificant. But it is not so. Our understanding of globalization often influences strategy and tactics of the actions of various forces and actors of international relations. A well-known Chinese philosopher Ang Xingang mentions in his article «The problems of globalization in China», that although Chinese government supports political multipolarity and cultural diversity, it, nevertheless, «has high respect to economic globalization» considering it an objective, historically inevitable trend, which it not possible to resist to. He writes, that «due to strong influence of practical rationalism there is no antiglobalist movement in China, which is common in the developed Western countries. Current success of Chinese economy is mostly connected with the fact that China has managed to grasp really and to use the most effectively the chance provided to it by globalization»<sup>5</sup>.

Thus, since globalization itself is an objective reality, universal characteristics of the world society expressing its quantitative and qualitative features, one should understand it as one of the fundamental dimensions of the global community. Studying this dimension allows to see the whole world social system not only from the position of culture (contents) and civilization (form) but also in its dynamic development, when both culture and civilization spread extensively and sort of fulfill the whole global space by themselves.

---

<sup>4</sup> Yangsang Yang. Gosudarstvennaya Vlast I Izmeneniya v Kulture Kitaya // Mnogolikaya Globalizatsiya. Moscow: Aspect Press, 2004. P. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Ang Xingang. Problemy Globalizatsii v Kitae // Vestnik RFO. 2005. № 4. P. 147.

However, one should admit that there are objective grounds for worries about globalization. Growing influence of the global processes on human worldview is a serious concern of, first of all, representatives of less developed and developing countries. They suggest that globalization results in dissolving their original cultures in the new economic and trade processes and, basing on this reason, they reject globalization considering it dangerous. Understanding globalization mostly as «Americanization of culture», as imposing Western standards and behavioral patterns, and, finally, as a modern form of cultural colonialism. They see globalization as the means of transformation and elimination of traditional values, changing the established way of living and, as a result, as a threat to national identity and cultural diversity. Another words, since globalization is uneven, the majority of traditionally formed societies has protective reaction against it resulting in opposing integration processes and conducting localization policies, and full support of local cultures.

Some scholars, particularly from Islamic, Arab and other countries of the third world consider globalization a specially elaborated plan or strategy, aiming at intervening the other parts of the world and creating threats to local culture through their unification. Expanding sphere of influence of mass media, the activity of international funds and transnational corporations is, as a rule, seen as the main threat to cultural identity.

This position is hard to disagree with because globalization is, indeed, not only flows of goods or diminishing distances, eliminating borders or unification of manufacturing processes. It is also a trend to the formation of a single value system, the creation of universal culture having to provide effectiveness of world economy, openness and objectivity of information. Finally, globalization presupposes tolerance in international politics and intercultural interaction. Thus, under increasing globalization, the changes and transformations in the sphere of culture adequate to it become the priority. At the same time, economic factors turn out to be less significant, secondary in comparison with culture.

This conclusion is additionally confirmed by the fact that the problem of intercultural interaction, opposition, or even contradictions between various cultural traditions and systems does not become less

significant. Moreover, it acquires new meaning and new forms and the necessity of dialog and cooperation based on mutual understanding and mutual respect of all the numerous cultures characteristic for modern humankind goes urgently to the foreground. This position is common and widely supported in Russia, China and many other countries.

To be just, one should mention that in the West it becomes more and more understood that eurocentrism in considering world structure and world events, which used to be widely spread in both Western elite environment and at the level of mass consciousness, now, under increasing globalization processes, now has to wither away.

\* \* \*

The problem of interaction and mutual complementation of culture and civilization has always been and remains one of the most serious and vividly discussed problems. And while there is a fully formed mutual consent related to the issue of what preceded what (as a rule, culture is seen as preceding with regard to civilization), positions of various authors on their mutual conditionality not often coincide. Currently a position is widely spread (it is also close to the author of this article) that culture expresses the essential, internal characteristics of a society, while civilization, so to say, models it externally, being sort of a shell, a form of culture.

Kant was one of the most prominent authors who paved the way to this approach. He represented civilization as a pragmatic, technological «shell» of culture, while culture (morality) is the «core» of civilization. Demonstrating tight connections between culture and civilization, Kant, at the same time, was the first one to differentiate these concepts, thus substantially clearing up the problem. He defined culture as what serves human good and what is essentially humanistic, because outside humanism and spirituality, he suggested, there were no true culture. Basing on this, Kant juxtaposed «cultural skills», «cultural education» to a purely external, «technical» type of culture, calling the former «civilization». He anticipated turbulent development of civilization and was concerned about it, speaking about the gap between civilization and culture, because civilization moves forward faster than culture and the disproportion emerging conceals serious dangers for peoples of the

world because civilization, deprived of its spiritual contents, leads to human degradation.

And nevertheless, in spite of Kant's first attempts to distinguish between culture and civilization, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century they were nearly always seen as synonyms. For example, having invented the term «civilization» the French Enlightenment authors from the very beginning used it actively along with the notion of «culture» and gave similar meaning to them. A famous German naturalist and geographer A. Gumboldt also relatively often used both terms – «culture» and «civilization» – in his works, not stressing significant difference between them. An outstanding English ethnographer and researcher of primitive culture E. Taylor also had similar vision of the balance of the notions in question.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when culture and civilization became the objects of undivided attention of many scholars and specialists, scholarly literature dedicated to studying these phenomena counted tens and even hundreds of books. It became common and natural to draw a distinction between the above-mentioned notions. But, nevertheless, an alternative position existed. It was most clearly formulated by a famous German physician and thinker A. Schweitzer. He wrote, that «stressing differences in the meanings of both terms is not justified either linguistically, or historically. One should speak about ethical and non-ethical culture or about ethical or non-ethical civilization and not about culture and civilization»<sup>6</sup>.

Being not agreed with such full equation of still different notions, I would like to stress that last century was signified by differentiating if not opposing culture and civilizations seen as contradictory notions rejecting each other. In this case civilization is often understood as a particular stage of self-destruction of culture in the process of its genesis, when the emergence, development and existence of civilization is directly tied to degradation of culture and constantly correlated with its dying and, finally, elimination. At the same time, this approach understands the emergence and development of culture as only taking place in a space, free of the «chains» of civilization. Such vision of relations

---

<sup>6</sup> Schweitzer A. *Blagovenie Pered Zhizniu*. Moscow: Progress, 1992. P. 56.

between culture and civilization is typical for the followers of irrationalism in philosophy, represented, first of all, by Nietzsche, Spengler, Berdiaev, etc.

Rejecting both equation of civilization and culture and their complete disjunction, I would like to stress their dialectical unity and difference. Culture is, most likely, an internal characteristics of a society, disclosing its essence, while civilization is the form, the external framework of culture characterizing a society from the viewpoint of its forms of government, functional connections and relations. At the same time, both terms – «culture» and «civilization» have common subject but different, although interconnected objects, because they reflect and describe one social reality from different sides. They are always inseparably connected, tightly interwoven and mutually complement for one another.

Thus, culture and civilization are the most important characteristics of social systems, allowing relatively fully express their external and internal conditions. At the same time, one can conclude, culture is sort of a code of the social organism fixing also the main peculiarities of its civilizational development, transmitted from generation to generation thanks to cultural heritage. That is why, having understood the phenomenon of culture, one can learn a lot about the internal condition of this or that society and even about the humankind as a whole as about a holistic self-developing system. But this approach does not allow to understand the historical logic of their development, to explain the diversity of the forms of social organization and, finally, to find out how human society can and should be organized to correspond with the human nature optimally and not to violate natural human rights as well as ecological balance. This task can be partly resolved by using the notion of «civilization», what, evidently, expands the research diapason but still provides no holistic vision of the social system as a whole allowing to analyze cultural similarities and differences of various social groups existing within a single civilizational area.

This collision can be resolved, in my opinion, by introducing a new term «cultural and civilizational system». By the way, there are many phrases connecting culture or civilization with various sides of a social organism, historical process, or social dynamics. These are such



terms as «sociocultural context», «sociocultural dynamics», «cultural and historical type», «sociocultural connections», «civilizational and historical aspect», etc. It seems strange, however, that a collocation consisting of two words («culture» and «civilization»), namely, «cultural and civilizational» has not yet become a scholarly category what it, beyond doubt, deserves, because we have a basis for talking about principal inseparability of culture and civilization.

Now we can also speak about a single world culture and about a single world civilization using such expression as «the world cultural and civilizational system». This expression is fully legitimate because it reflects reality adequately but not in separated terms like now – only from the viewpoint of culture or civilization – but in «two dimensions» simultaneously, from the viewpoint of the form and the contents, without dividing or equating them.

The formation of the first cultural and civilizational systems dates back to the earliest stages of development of relatively advanced state structures and urban technologies. In that period the foundations of the Chinese, Indian, Egyptian and then Antique, European, Russian and the other cultural and civilizational systems were laid. There, in the ancient history of the humankind, one should look for the contours of the first cultural and civilizational ecumenes that emerged as a result of tight connections between countries and peoples having much in common in their cultural and civilizational development. For three thousand years of the existence of such ecumene systems they, in their essence (from the viewpoint of organization and functional principles), had not principally changed, and after the Great geographic discoveries, i.e., from the beginning of real globalization, they also became a planetary phenomenon being fragments of a single whole, which was the emerging global cultural and civilizational entity.

This meant, first of all, world religious and religio-philosophical systems: Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, Islam. Although they had emerged before the real globalization began, nevertheless, they became planet-wide not earlier than globalization became fundamental. Having acquired new qualities, these conglomerates became, speaking figuratively, a connecting fabric between various ecumenes. For example, the Christian cultural and civilizational conglomerate embraced a

number of self-sufficient ecumenes (West European, East European, Russian, North American, Central American, Latin American); the Islamic one – Middle East, North Africa, the Gulf, Central Asia, Russian (partly), Pacific (partly); the Buddhist one – Indian, Chinese (partly), South East, Japanese ecumenes.

The rest of cultural and civilizational conglomerates also, basing on another foundations, connect different ecumenes, often spatially distant and sometimes looking unlike one another. For example, the Socialist conglomerate used to connect into a single system such different cultural and civilizational ecumenes as East European, Chinese, part of South East. The Capitalist one makes related to one system such different cultural and civilizational ecumenes as, for instance, West European and Japanese.

Now, under multiaspect globalization, the above-mentioned connections and relations have become an inseparable component of the global world, which is networked by them through the length and breadth, openly and secretly, externally and internally and which thus represents a rapidly emerging single global cultural and civilizational system. Those who don't take this fact into consideration doing their national, domestic, foreign, or international policy, do not react adequately to the emerging threats or create them when they could have well been avoided.

It is important to stress, that the more open is cultural and civilizational congruence of various peoples, the easier and the more actively their interaction goes. For example, Europe, America, or, even more, Japan or rapidly developing countries of South East Asia being different from one another culturally have high level of civilizational development, what makes their cultural and civilizational systems easily associated by many parameters. As a result, these substantially different countries demonstrate relatively effective and fruitful interaction and cooperation. Last years one can also observe how China, India, Russia or Brazil, having original cultures, but increasing their pace of civilizational development, also join the ranks of countries improving and enhancing their cultural and civilizational connections and constructive cooperation.

However, the world is characterized not only by mutual interest and cooperation but also by disputes, competition, confrontation sometimes having violent forms. The world crisis, connected commonly with economy and finance, that has exploded recently is a bright example of such conflicts.

But is it possible in our strive to confront the crisis to restrict ourselves by the sphere of finance and economy even on a scale of the whole humankind? How harmless is a wide-spread opinion that global crisis is just a result of wrong policy of separate countries, peoples, corporations, or even concrete persons?

Without diminishing the role of subjective factor in global processes and disavowing responsibility of the officials having necessary authority and acknowledging a significant part of the fault of separate states for the emergence of the crisis, one should also take into consideration at least two facts. Firstly, the process of history is characterized by objective course of events, directed by logic of development of capitalist relations. Secondly, the emerging of the global world as a holistic system is a reality principally not only changing forms and contents of international relations but also directly influencing domestic life of nearly all countries and peoples more or less involved into the world economic system.

It should be stressed that market relations naturally are of spontaneous nature and that the state obliged to prevent «war of everyone against everyone» should directly and indirectly provide regulatory pressure on the market. This state function performed better or worse depending on specific circumstances always increases or even becomes decisive under conditions when a system of market relations is unbalanced and prone to crisis. However, the abilities of this or that state to influence the course of events are always limited by its real resources and capabilities. Therefore, each separate country, as well as the humankind as a whole can and should not only set manageable and really significant tasks for themselves but also correctly define the priorities of their solving.

Most analysts and specialists speculating about the modern crisis inevitably stress its global and systemic nature. However, at this point they, mostly, stop. Concentrating basically on the issues of economy or

finance, on the problems of separate states or even regions, they leave the world as a whole, the humankind as a single system unattended, i.e. they analyze separate aspects of social life or some fragments of a holistic system but they never think in holistic categories. As a result, many of them honestly admit that they don't understand the genuine nature of what goes on and can not predict either the depth of the recession, or the moment when the crisis ends, or concrete contours of the post-global world.

In this situation the right diagnosis, presupposing the nature and order of concrete actions based on the resources of the international community, becomes the priority. Another words, to understand nature and causes of the crisis means to solve half of the task.

That is why now the humankind, as never before, needs global vision and systemic thinking, allowing us to estimate the situation. This approach, being coherent and finalized, would leave no doubts that the crisis exploded not accidentally and abruptly. It was a result of the limited egotistic policy of nation-states and transnational corporations, orientated towards getting maximal profit. The crisis is also a result of the wasteful way of life of the «golden billion» and, finally, of the corresponding worldview. That is why it was only a matter of timing.

When the events turn out so that you have no strength and reason to control the unnatural course of events, the crisis explodes emerging contrary to anyone's will and wishes. Destroying the wicked order of affairs and clearing space for the new structures and different relations, it becomes the means for recovery, restoring balance, and normalization of the whole social organism's development. This means, in spite of all its negative circumstances, the crisis becomes, finally, a good, a salvation from inevitable degradation, if, of course, the situation was evaluated adequately and correct conclusions were made in time.

Returning to the nowadays reality, we should clearly state that modern world is principally different from the preceding situations and even from the world existing just 25 years ago. Under the influence of the globalization processes it has nearly fully become, according to all the basic parameters of social life, a singly, holistic system, while no mechanisms have emerged to govern this new, qualitatively changed world. **This is the main contradiction of the modern age.**

It is important to understand correctly: what is the cause of such situation? What is the way out of here?

Further developing the above mentioned logic of turning points of history and taking into consideration the increasing pace of social development one can suggest that the humankind has finally reached the border where the global architecture should change once again. This idea is supported by the main contradiction of the modern age. Its essence is that globalization processes that have formed by the beginning of the 21st century a holistic system of world economy, has not lead to the emergence of integration processes in the sphere of politics that would be adequate to the global world. Another words, political globalization catastrophically falls behind economic globalization. As a result, modern world being global according to all the basic parameters of social life has found itself without a corresponding system of government.

But without solving this task humankind as a holistic organism has no chances for happy future.

It is important to mention that none of the international organizations existing at the moment is principally suitable for solving this task. For example, the UN was established to prevent the horrors of the new world war and, one should mention, it more or less fulfils this task up to nowadays. Its function is to resolve international conflicts, to eliminate acute contradictions, to provide assistance in solving particular world and regional problems, but it is not able to resolve the tasks of governing world processes. As a result, the world community once again faces an often discussed problem: how we can and should govern economy and other spheres of social life under conditions of global interdependence of all countries and peoples?

There is a growing understanding among scholars and specialists that modern global crisis can be surmounted only by a radical transformation of international relations because it principally differs from all crises taking place before. Now it is not simply a result of spontaneous market development, but a result of increasing globalization. And this is the cause, why the crisis that was typical for separate countries or even regions, now tackles the whole humankind. Having started in the

sphere of finance and economy of separate countries, the global crisis rapidly achieved another countries and new spheres of social life. It has, thus, become, not only global, but systemic.

This means, we need a new vision of the modern world, another version of the events that happened. For example, recent discussions about the unipolar world we should consider seriously misleading, born by Western, particularly US, euphoria from the victory in the «Third world war» (cold war). Now, against the background of the growing global financial and economic crisis, it becomes more and more evident that governing global system even only in the sphere of economy from a single center (however mighty) is not possible.

World community, represented by nation-states (having in mind their belonging to various blocs and alliances) has always been a multi-polar system. Hence, the main task now is to find consensus on the principal issues of governing the global world. And for this we need new approaches, new vision of contemporary events. It will be hardly possible to find solutions in the past.

Attempts to draw analogies or historical parallels between the modern crisis and the Great Depression of the 1929–1933 are not constructive because modern processes are of similar, but, in fact, different, nature and of another scale. The crisis was systemic then and now. But these systems differ principally. In the past it was a system representing a complex of financial, economic, social and political institutions of North America and several countries tightly connected with this region. At the same time, other countries, for instance, the Soviet Union, China or India, not connected with this region, were relatively free from the shocks of that period. Another words, that crisis was a *regional* one and the efforts of one state (the US) were, finally, enough to overcome it.

Now (and it is the first time in human history) the crisis is *global*, when multiaspect globalization leaves no chance for any country or people to watch the current events calmly. The Asian financial crisis of 1997–1998 when the existing mechanisms influencing the world financial system (the IMF or WTO) have revealed their ineffectiveness was the first manifestation of a really global crisis. But in that period the situation improved and stabilized. But it did not last for long. Now everything is more complicated. The crisis is really systemic and this sys-

tem is the whole world with its basic structural elements: nation-states, international financial institutions, transnational organizations, etc. All of them were tightly interconnected and interdependent as different elements of one chain. Therefore, even if somewhere and even generally the situation improves for a while, we should not relax because this does not change the essence. In our radically changed world no one so far is ready to reconstruct international relations cardinally to create a system of governing, at least, world economy (not mentioning the other important spheres of social life). This task can not be resolved by a single state (be that the US, or «G8», or even «G20» of the most developed countries). It can only be resolved by the absolute majority of the humankind.

In such situation separate countries have to build their domestic and foreign policy balancing between national interests and international obligations they have. The one who is better than others integrated into the global processes, wins. China, celebrating on October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its People's Republic, during the past 30 years conducts the politics of reforms and openness and in general reacts to the challenges of globalization constructively, what was already said in the beginning of this article. And we have serious foundations to suggest that after the global crisis is finished and the new world architecture is formed, China will play even more important role in this world than the one it plays nowadays.

---

## GLOBALIZATION OF THE WORLD AND ITS CONSEQUENCES: RUSSIAN VISION

People in Russia, like everywhere in the world, are today deeply concerned about the process of globalization taking place in various spheres of social life that has become especially noticeable in the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. During the last decades these trends and changes became evident even to the general public. A particularly challenging and even shocking feature of the given process is the organized antiglobalist riots in different parts of the world and the increasing threat of international terrorism, as it has been demonstrated by the terrible events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 in the US. This engenders among the epistemic community not only justified concerns but also additional interest in the above-mentioned processes. The number of conferences, seminars, disputes, media publications, academic literature has grown significantly last time. Even a brief analysis of these sources allows one to conclude that there are many different opinions about globalization of the modern world; there is no general approach to globalization studies and no common position on this process.

Some scholars think that globalization is an objective process, independent on human will and intent, which began long ago and will not end in the near future. Such Russian philosophers like V.S. Stepin, V.A. Lektorskii, I.V. Bestouzhnev-Lada and others (including the author) think that gradual evolution of scientific progress, modernization of its achievements, naturally evolving transnationalization of social life are preconditions for globalization. Another words, they think that globalization is a result of an objective and long-term historical process characterized by cyclical increases and slowdowns of the tempo of its evolution and accompanied by qualitative breakthroughs in scientific and technological development, which in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has led to the scientific revolution grown by the end of the century into information and computer revolution. World economic and political interdependencies have, thus, begun to merge into a single entity especially as far as transportation, trade and energy supply flows, mass media, internationally-based regional conflict resolution,



etc. are concerned, and these developments allow to define globalization as an objective process.

Some other scholars, and there are relatively many of them in modern Russia among both academics and politicians, think that globalization was initiated by the Western developed countries and multinationals who had envisioned it pursuing their self-interests and who now controls it extracting profits from the growing interdependence of various countries and regions of the world. The backers of this position suggest that «the Kapellmeister» of globalization, first of all, the US and developed Western countries, are using the idea and the slogan of human rights, universal values and so on to win the ongoing struggle of globally-defined interests. Thus, the supporters of this position question the future of democracy under the new conditions. There are some grounds for their concerns due to the fact that this problem is especially acute in the absence of democratic tradition and in the face of underdevelopment or non-existence of corresponding institutions. The most typical representatives of such a view in Russia are philosopher and political theorist A.S. Panarin who has written several books on Eurasian issues, of which *The Temptation of Globalism* (2000) is especially noticeable; well-known philosophers V.V. Iliin and A.S. Akhiezer who have expressed their Neo-Eurasianist position in a collective work *Russian Civilization* (2000); a politician D. Rogozin; a Professor of Economics A.V. Bouzgalin who is one of the leaders of antiglobalist movement in Russia, etc.

Western, especially European, social thought up to nowadays have not concentrated so much on the process of globalization. But it seems that the threat of international terrorism, the events in Yugoslavia and Afghanistan attract Western public consciousness to these issues more and more and make it return again and again to the problem of values and the formation of the new world order. In connection with this the issues of intercultural and interconfessional relations become especially acute and the necessity to stop the continuing widening of the socio-economic gap between rich and poor countries becomes more and more evident. The issue of convergence of the East and the West has once again become discussible and concerns grow about the future of democracy in the developed countries; the very possibility of democ-

ratic transition in the traditional societies, including those of the East, of the Islamic World and of the African continent, becomes questionable.

So, the modern world evolves dramatically and raises to the world community as well as to particular countries very difficult questions including the one of the future of democracy in the globalizing world. Russia, having after the USSR dissolution declared its adherence to democratic principles and facing great difficulties in building democratic society, now as never before needs philosophical basis for these ideas adjusted to local conditions. This is one of the explanations of the above-mentioned interest of Russian scholars in exploring modern trends and searching for new forms of world order.

But regardless of one's approach to analysis of the issues mentioned, one can not help saying that entering the new century means opening a totally new page of human history. It is evident now that, unlike the previous pages, this one will be dedicated to a new, different topic and written in a different language. This new topic is the end of the world globalization process and the formation of the world's wholeness and unity. Different language implies not just the new means of communication, such as Internet, satellite TV, etc., but also morality, ethics, law being changed in accordance with the global transformations; this means different terminology implicating re-consideration of the previous values and accepting by the absolute majority of the international community those of them relevant to the reality transformed. The contour of this reality is already clearly dawning being defined by the following circumstances.

Firstly, the formal process of globalization of social relations which has begun in the age of the great geographic discoveries, has been in general complete by the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. That means, on the planet there is no place free from anthropogenic impact; the allocation of territories is more or less finished and sovereign nation-states have emerged. At the same time, economic, political, cultural and informational flows, relations and connections have irreversibly poured out over the borders of separate countries and peoples and ceased to be their prerogative. But as far as the essence is concerned, the humankind is still awaiting to become the international community

which would necessarily require a serious transformation of the world-views, established cultures and values.

Second, the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was accompanied by both fundamental structural changes in the former socialist countries and tectonic displacements in world affairs resulted in the new balance of power on the world arena and the new vision of the current developments. For a while the collapse of the world socialist system has distracted our attention from the process of globalization and the global problems it raises. Nevertheless, now these developments are more and more clearly understood as two sides of one coin.

In front of our eyes the world becomes holistic, what raises totally new concerns. Endless confrontation and armed conflicts keep the humankind on the verge of self-distraction. An it would be a great fallacy to think that after the collapse of the USSR and the relative softening of the nuclear powers' confrontation this threat has been left behind. Weapons of mass destruction are now accompanied by unlimited forces of the technogenic civilization. They, along with globalization, have transformed the local problems and dangers into transnational, global phenomena. For example, terrorism was always a feature of human history but it is modern means of communication and transportation, technical achievements and new technologies what makes it the most dangerous phenomenon for the whole humankind. That is why to fight successfully not only these phenomena but their causes one should see behind the new threats, including the unprecedented terrorist attacks on the US, first of all, the objective foundations and patterns.

Thus, at the first glance, modern world has dramatically changed virtually within the last ten years. Is it really so? Do not we witness the culmination of a more complicated, long-lasting process? The transition from atomistic, disperse and fragmentary international social relations towards their unity, wholeness and globality has attracted the attention of the most sagacious minds already in the first half of the last century. One can mention works by Vladimir Vernandskii, Pierre Teyard-de-Chardin, Karl Jaspers, the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, etc. But for a broader public consciousness these changes have become visible not earlier than within the last decade, in the age of information revolution. This revolution is so fast and sweeping that the humankind does not

manage not only to react adequately but even to think over the current developments theoretically. The antiglobalist riots, their destructiveness and unwillingness to see the objective patterns of world development, is nothing but another argument in support this conclusion.

This largely has happened because some people try to explain the new transformed world using the established familiar terms and categories like, for example, «civilization», «democracy», «sovereignty», «universal values», etc. Somehow they do not pay attention to the fact that each of these terms, as well as the established system of values and ethical and legal norms of the modern time, has been formed and acquired its meaning under the conditions radically different from the present ones. The same is true for the general fundamentals of democracy formulated in the age of industrial transformation and constituting the foundation of modern democratic institutions, which have so far taken firm shape only in a limited number of countries and need a new conceptual understanding to be applied and disseminated throughout the whole planet. The reason is that the fact that the international community has a «shared house», shared destiny and shared responsibility for what is going on in the world does not yet mean that democratic values and the organizational principles of social life typical up to now for the minority of the humankind will be automatically accepted by the rest of the international community. Moreover, the hard pressure implantation of democratic values into non-Western societies not accustomed to them often causes dislike, bewilderment and sometimes even backlash. It would be wrong, not to say dangerous, to turn our blind eye to these developments.

This is not a secret that in the fragmented world the growth of understanding that no one can avoid participation in dealing with our common concerns is only a catalyst for the debates about each country's share of participation and responsibility in case the situation worsens. Moreover, this discontent grows and becomes the more acute the farther our world being still divided into separate «national houses» moves along the road of globalization towards a greater interdependence. It is important that this constantly widening gap in levels of living standard and socio-economic development of various nations causes, in one part of the world, the feeling of security, satisfaction and even

some sort of superiority and, in the other part, the feeling of insecurity, injustice, deprivation and exclusion. All this is a serious obstacle in the way of democratic transition and creating global civil society which should necessarily be formed in the future as a result of overcoming fragmentation and disintegration. Thus, if there is no alternative to the united humankind there must be not only common principles and rules of living established on the planet but also common responsibility for each human being's fate; for in the global technogenic world not only well organized transnational criminal groups or terrorist organizations but even a separated individual outcast poses a danger, not to mention the rogue states.

But can this global society become a reality? Will the world community be able to transcend from the concept of unity towards real unity, to become an open society or at least to step firmly in the way of democratic transition while preserving national identity? There are no evident answers to these questions so far. Anyhow, this will not happen on its own without our conscious effort.

Modern world is a «quilt» covering a relatively small body of our planet, where separate states still not so much cooperate but compete, rival, confront and fight; they apply giant efforts to preserving sovereignty and independence, conduct selfish foreign policy pursuing, first of all, their narrow national interests. And this confrontation manifests itself not only through the «rich North – poor South» opposition but through the clash of cultures, values, religious beliefs, traditions of the West and the East, what already in the beginning of the 1990s Samuel Huntington paid attention to in his well-known article *The Clash of Civilizations*. Nevertheless, the subsequent decade does not allow in spite of the increasing due to satellite communications and Internet homogeneity of the global fabric to assert that the outlooks of the East and the West become equally homogeneous or that the mutual understanding between rich and poor countries grows.

It is important to mention that now the developed Western countries acting collectively (more or less) as a single body play the main part in world affairs. Apart from the details of their strategic partnerships and private interests, one should admit that their mutual understanding is based on common democratic principles and foundations

worked out and implanted into public consciousness in the Age of Enlightenment. The Age of Enlightenment was different for each country reflecting specific features of each nation but it pursued actually the same goals and solved the same tasks – **development of civil society and formation of democratic institutions**. As a result such principles as personal freedom, private property, rule of law became commonly accepted norms deeply rooted in public consciousness.

The East, due to well-known reasons, have not passed through such transformation. As for Russia, the Age of Enlightenment was to begin here several times but have never begun in reality. Should not we consider it the reason why in Russia, as well as in the East, not to mention Africa and many other parts of the world, not just basic categories but even the terminology of the Western civilization is so badly understood? And the West, vice versa, can not or does not want to understand different, non-Western outlook and especially the difficulties caused by a clash between this outlook and Western culture, values and technology. Is not it because, according to one saying, «the one living in a palace thinks differently from the one living in a hut»? But can one still leave unattended the fact that this dynamic and even aggressive intrusion of the technological civilization and Western culture into traditionally living countries and regions distorts them and unifies decreasing cultural diversity and engendering discontent not only among the nationally oriented but among broader society strata provoking backlash and new international tensions? May, thus, the well-to-do West continue to underestimate the dangers emerging at the fault lines of these contradictions? May it ignore the growing development gap between different countries and regions and the growth of apocalyptic and extremist feelings engendered by poverty and ignorance of the majority of humankind without endangering itself as well? Nowadays, when technological civilization becomes more and more complicated and its capacity to destroy as well as to create grows, while the forces of destruction have proven able to unite worldwide, these questions sound rhetoric.

Now, as, metaphorically speaking, we are all sitting in one boat, where mutual understanding and cooperation are needed, one should refer to the positive lessons of history. And particularly to the connections between the industrial transformation in the West and the Age of

Enlightenment because the new economic reality demanded adequate thinking, new outlook and adequate modes of behavior. The greatest merit of the Enlightenment was asserting the concept of a sovereign individual created by the Enlighteners. This sovereign individual, his/her social position, the problem of freedom and responsibility – these were the main questions occupying the minds of the Enlighteners. They were thinking on one of the most important contemporary problems: how to organize a society in a way that duties and responsibilities, norms and rules of common sense would define the nature of social relations? How to make state guard a citizen and guarantee his or her rights?

Centuries ago Hegel wrote about the French philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment: «It is easy for us to reproach the French for their attacks on religion and state; one should have in mind the picture of that terrible social condition, affliction, vulgarity reigning in France to understand these philosophers' merits...». In connection with this, one should understand that the Enlightenment that had appeared several decades before the French Revolution and paved the way for it, was aimed in overcoming what Hegel was talking about and set a task to sanitize social situation. For the citizens of developed capitalist countries this seems to be not of so much interest, because it relates to the outlasted and left behind long ago. For the absolute majority of them the above-said became self-evident many years ago. And until one talked about the formation of the united, holistic, interdependent world this situation remained acceptable and unchanged. However, in the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the environment has changed dramatically. Western countries can no more remain indifferent to economic and socio-political development of the other countries because instability and backwardness of some states against the background of global interdependence pose a real threat to the others.

There is no need to prove specially that the socio-economic tasks many of which have been solved by the West with relative success are now to be solved by Russia and the other countries that have stepped or intend to step in the road of capitalist transformation. However, there are huge obstacles in this road and, first of all, those of ideological sort. In the countries mentioned public consciousness is far from being free from previous stereotypes and concepts, where categories of the recent

past are still alive and actively used by people's consciousness. Here the task of reconsidering previous views and concepts is as acute as never before. While doing this, one should have a clear vision not only of the future but of which part of the inheritance should be rejected. To do this job an Enlightenment is required and the responsibility for its success could partly be taken by the West possessing needful knowledge and historic experience.

There are, however, two important things one should have in mind talking about the necessity to transform international relations:

Firstly, it becomes more and more evident that Western civilization and its inherent values are not a panacea for the global problems challenging the humankind in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Paraphrasing Churchill, they are bad, but the point is that the others are worse. This, however, does not make the West free from critical analysis of its system and the search for the ways to improve it. Besides, the East playing more and more significant role in world affairs not just does not want but is not able to change its fundamental core in a short period of time and to accept the rules of a game and value system of the West in the present form. Even Russia, which is culturally and socio-economically much closer to the West than its Eastern neighbors, is unable to do that. That is why, independent from their wishes, Western countries will have to look for compromises, first of all, with Eastern countries and Russia, which in their turn should not avoid searching for the same compromises. Apart from that, non-Western countries sooner or later will have to admit that universal values, individual rights and freedom provided by the institution of private property are not a Western propaganda but the essential, inseparable features of the Western way of life and action.

Secondly, one should not forget (even being ultimately altruistic) that the world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is not less severe and even cruel than that of the past. Economic and political interests will henceforth be the ground for discontents, sometimes the most acute (there should be no illusions about it) but the absence of common approaches and principles, values and commonly accepted language will always be an insurmountable obstacle in the way to unity and mutual understanding of peoples in the globalizing world. That is why no one can refrain from



dealing with this task because it can only be solved by the international community together, with moderation and patience, demonstrating respect to different nations' cultural heritage.

Let us dwell on the main conclusions from the above-mentioned.

First. Globalization that has become the specific feature of the contemporary world demands, apart from serious structural changes, the reconstruction of international relations and, hence, undivided and primary attention towards regional policy especially there where the interests of many states with substantially different socio-political and economic regimes, culture and religion collide. This means rooting in public consciousness democratic values and outlook that would adequately reflect the wholeness of the world and the humankind' common destiny should necessarily be based on regional specifics and the mentality of people living in these regions. Another word, if establishing democracy and forming globally orientated outlook is the dictates of the time and a necessary precondition for the world civilization survival it can be successful only when at least national peculiarities and cultural diversity of peoples living together or nearby are taken into consideration. If Western countries do not want to be accused of using double standards they must take this into consideration when resolving international conflicts of high complexity. One can bring many examples of politically biased interpretation of democratic principles if not double standards, including Middle East and Yugoslavia, and Chechnya and the treatment of international terrorism consisting not only of openly aggressive actions of this or that group but of numerous structures, organizations, social and political movements supporting terrorism ideologically and financially, which often find shelter and sometimes protection in some states, including Western ones.

Second. Promoting maximally the basic principles of democracy producing common morality and law in order to make them the main regulative forces of social relations, one should have in mind that human rights are the most important thing among the other values. But under the condition of global interdependence they must be clearly defined and accompanied by appropriate responsibilities. For example, the Universal declaration of human rights might have been complemented by the Universal declaration of human responsibilities. Any-

how, for the world community to survive nations and states if not individuals must be able to prevent by common effort armed conflicts and to suppress any extremist action able to cause catastrophic damage. World community should demonstrate interest in every human being's getting proper education and learning to think in global categories or, at least, to accept them being aware of him/herself as a universal citizen. Every nation, every state while supporting its traditions, values and beliefs is simply obliged in the name of preserving the future to put universal human interests first. And then the well-known slogan of the Club of Rome «Think globally, act locally» must be re-considered. Another slogan – «Think globally, act together» – is more appropriate for the era of global civilization.

People are unable to predict the future with confidence, but they are able to influence on it through their actions which should be more and more grounded on acknowledging common moral principles and global values, formulating and acceptance of which becomes the most vivid task of the international community. People of academia, social scientists and, first of all, philosophers of different countries can undertake collective effort to bring their contribution into solving this task, and seems that they already do it. For example, summarizing the 20<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy «*Paideia: Philosophy Educating Humanity*» (Boston, US, 1998), international philosophical community came to the conclusion that present humankind badly needs the Paideia principle developed in Ancient Greece reborn as a fundamental principle underlying upbringing, education and formation of a holistic and harmonious human personality. According to American and Russian philosophers, uniting their efforts within the framework of a long-term «Paideia» project, Paideia must prevent dissolution and degradation of high culture and become one of the central principles underlying new, globally oriented, outlook. The first steps made in this direction – a hearty distant discussion, a joint conference held in January 2002 in Vienna, some planned long- and short-term common actions – offer some optimistic vision that humankind, in the beginning at the level of scholars, then at the level of politicians and society leaders and in the end at the level of the general public, will manage to resolve the above discussed issues collectively. At last, there is no rational alternative to this.

---

## PHILOSOPHY AS AN INDICATOR OF THE OPENNESS OF SOCIETY: RUSSIAN CONTEXT

The protracted crisis and profound upheavals which our country has suffered in the course of the past decade have made the problem of further societal development extremely acute and have put the possibility of democratic transformations themselves into question. There is no doubt that this is the reason behind the increased interest in Russian as well as foreign philosophy, particularly in those areas which address social, political and spiritual spheres. It is in this area that scholars as well as politicians, political figures and even pragmatists are trying to find (not without reason) answers to questions of utmost importance. They enter into spirited debates on such problems as axiology, totalitarianism and democracy, individualism and collectivism, market and «planned» economies. Recently, the issue of the «open» and «closed» nature of society has been raised and stimulated increased interest in the concepts of Karl Popper. The most complete expression of his ideas is found in his book, *Open Society and its Enemies*.

Popper's ideas came to Russia relatively late and became available after the publication of the work in Russian in 1992, almost fifty years after it was written. The philosophical treatise of Popper, which exposed the essence of totalitarianism and the backward market economy, was fated, like other works of its type, to remain forever «under wraps», away from the eyes of the Soviet reader. This book contained a powerful charge which the ideologues of the Soviet system had reason to fear: a fundamental criticism of the basic principles of Karl Marx. Some of these claims include: demands for an open and correct understanding of the «objective laws» of history, the attempt to radically transform society on a «scientific basis», etc. These concepts, which reflected the essence of the sociological determinism of Marx, were considerably influenced by Hegelian historicism. However, as Popper convincingly demonstrated, his roots go all the way back to Plato, «the first political ideologue, thinking in terms of classes and creating the con-

cept of concentration camps» (K. Popper. *Otkrytoe obshchestvo i ego vragi*. Moscow, 1992, v. 1, p. 7).

This is the reason why, at the beginning of *perestroika*, at a time when there was not even a mention of physical freedom but rather of freedom of speech (and under the pretext of free speech), *glasnost* was permitted by a decision of the Politburo of the Communist party. In an unspoken way, 'glasnost' prohibited any serious criticism of the basic principles of Marxism. The work of Popper, which had long been a classic in the West, still remained unavailable in our country. It could not be published as long as the Soviet Union continued to exist. Even if the «theoreticians of *perestroika*» were willing to change 'something', that would be anything but the ideology which remained an important part of their «natural environment» and had formed and «fed» them. For them, it was like the quality of water in which a fish lives, the cleaner the better. Yet it still remains water. Hence emerged the «novelty» of «new thinking», which found expression in the attempt to purify Marxism from the «mistakes made», «distortions» and «defects». They desired to give it the qualities of «new humanism», to enrich it with common human values etc. With some small qualifications, it can be asserted that the leaders behind *perestroika*, who looked to Marxism as to a guiding star, adhered to Marxist ideas as to Ariadne's thread. They swore their undying allegiance to the ideas of communism and socialism. They feared any criticism and accusations of apostasy and betrayal of «the sacred ideals». Even the most pioneering of them acted in exactly this way (perhaps for pragmatic reasons), even if they did not think this way. The most that they were willing to do was to give socialism (read: Marxism) a human face.

Popper's book uncovers the true face of Marxism. It demonstrated that Marxism was unfeasible not only as an economic theory, aiming at the elimination of private property but also was a dangerous social theory because it called for a class struggle and for social upheavals. These appeals in no way justify the aspirations of the Marxists to build a «paradise on earth». The reason was that no one, including them, had any basis to give themselves the role of «the saviors of civilization» without considering that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Popper writes,

«The apologists of Marxism do not realize that, in fighting for their own interests, they are fighting progress. They do not see that the danger of any movement like Marxism lies in the fact that it begins to reflect all of the interests which are inherent to it and that, in addition to material interests, there are also intellectual ones.» (ibid., v. 2, p. 211).

Therefore, the book was very topical and essential for a new and thorough treatment and a critical analysis of our socialist past. The book only saw the light of day in Russian in the second half of the eighties due to the declining power of the communist party, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the discredit of Marxist ideology. We should note that its fate was presaged by other books considered dangerous to Marxism, including *Our Problems*, *On the Future of Russia* selected articles by I.A. Ilin, *The Sources and Idea of Russian Communism* by N.A. Berdyaev, *The Revolt of the Masses* by Ortega y Gasset, *Landmarks*, *From the Depths*, *What is Democracy?* by Hal Coque, the works of Milton Friedman, F.A. Hayek and works of many others written and published in the West at the end of the twentieth century. Many of them were written during times of serious social upheavals when democracy was undergoing serious trials. As a result, some began to doubt the ideals and feasibility of democracy.

The above-mentioned works were the product of thorough reflection on this crisis. These books had a wide circulation and were frequently on store shelves in the middle of the nineties. It is only regrettable that these and similar works did not have the time to have a visible influence on the public mindset on a large scale, as they exposed the essence of totalitarianism and demonstrated its specific manifestations under conditions in Russia. They provided some insight into ways to overcome totalitarianism. These texts remained practically unknown or were essentially misunderstood even by those political figures who would be subjective and willing to embrace them. These figures had an objective need for such literature, even more than others, because they were the impetus of democratic transformations. However, they had too simple a conception of the ideas behind these transformations. The revolutionary events of 1991 and 1993 so sharply altered the progression of events that the geo-political sphere was transformed. As a result, all economic, political, and social life changed within the territories of

the former Soviet Union. The affect was so great that there were material and spiritual upheavals, often accompanied by mass and individual shock. This is a typical picture of the events taking place in the first half of the nineties in Russia. During this «time of troubles», people who had been accustomed to constant care and total patronage from the state, uniformity, predictability and extreme regulation of their behavior, suddenly found themselves faced with new, confusing problems. For many, particularly humanitarians, were not involved in material production and were isolated from the initial division of property (which bordered on basic pillaging), the basic struggle for survival generally went hand in hand with a serious breakdown of ideological positions. During this struggle, things often occurred by «trial and error». This struggle left one with essentially no spiritual or physical energy with which to seriously reflect on the theoretical basis of the events taking place in a society of changes.

While the ideas of an open society became disseminated, they still did not become the subject of philosophical analysis or theoretical discussions. Moreover, entire groups of the population were not given the opportunity to become acquainted with ideas. Without the participation of major segments of the population, there could be no question of creating an open society. The conditions required for such an undertaking, or more exactly, their prerequisites, began to appear about five years later, toward the middle of the nineties. It became evident to the majority of the people that the country was making rapid strides toward the formation of new political constructs (which would have been superficially obvious) but was also moving toward new economic and social transformations. The ‘new’ realities of Russian life, which embodied (sometimes in a grotesque form) the elements of an «open» and «closed» society, democratic freedoms and authoritarianism, nascent capitalism and the «socialist» past, proved to be an unpleasant surprise for many. The «new Reality» not only lost its attractiveness to the proponents of democracy but also turned out to be a disappointment for many active participants in the recent events of the «romantic period» at a time when totalitarianism seemed to have been overcome and the transition to a democratic society seemed to have been completed.

One pays a high price for a poor knowledge of history, a neglectful treatment of it, and the inability to learn from experience. However, there were many warnings, some of which were convincingly and lucidly expressed by the notable Russian thinker I.A. Ilin at almost the same time when Popper had just finished *Open Society*. Some factors, for the reasons stated above, had influence on the thinking and behavior of those responsible for the chain of events in Russia at the beginning of the nineties. In 1945, I.A. Ilin clearly sympathized with the plight of society when he wrote:

«It would appear that experience of history would teach them (doctrinists A.C.) something: In 1917, democracy in Russia started with complete freedom and brought about **real destruction**. But do doctrinists really learn from History? More than thirty years have passed – years filled with catastrophes. Yet once again we are looking at the same question and are hearing the same solution and the same answer: **democracy immediately and at any cost, counting on nothing, at any price** because it is the air of existence, the light of life, the joy of existence, a guaranty of any justice, the meaning of creation etc. (I.A. Ilin. *O gryadushchej Rossii*. Typeset by Hermitage.» 1991, p. 145–146).

In the early nineties, almost a half century after we received the first warning (which brought about much bloodshed and immeasurable suffering) everything is happening as before, as if we did not learn from our history or from our experience. The repercussions of this hasty and premature «entrëe» into democracy were quick in coming. They were easy to predict especially considering the wealth of experience we have gleaned from history, including that of our country. Through careful nurturing, we understand that democracy is really about people, their ideology, and not the existing social system. The renowned Danish philosopher Hal Coque looked at this problem some 150 years ago in his analysis of one of the world's most advanced democracies – Denmark. After Rousseau, he notes, people believed that evil in the world was not caused by people but by the social system. This way of thinking (that society is «naïve in its blind faith that a new social system will solve every problem») was characteristic of the Social-Democrats who attempted to use the social system to make

the social system more just. However, herein lays the greatest danger to democracy. Hal Coque wrote:

«The system is important because we are constantly working to find the correct democratic form of government. However, even if we are successful in making society more democratic in terms of politics and the economy, it will be far from enough if we do not make the people more democratic. We must form them and reeducate them. People are vastly more important than systems and articles. For this reason, it was not enough to say what democracy is and what is the model democratic system. It was just as necessary to talk about less tangible things such as freedom, rights, and humanity» (Hal Coque. *What is Democracy?* Sistaime. The Danish Institute of Culture, 1993, pp. 87–88.).

In addition, these principles are not created in isolation, without specific and directed efforts and without the systematic and arduous work of certain people. I.A. Ilin made his position quite clear. When asked, «What do people do with freedom when they are not mature enough to understand it and see it as pure **licentiousness**?» He commented on what transpired in 1917. He stressed:

«We observed and studied. We studied and we learned. We ask: How can someone make use of his political rights after thirty or forty years of revolutionary slavery. What can someone, who has abused every form of freedom, give his country? What can he do when he makes duplicitous choices, votes by using bribes, decides matters of the State by resorting to thievery, vengeance and is motivated by greed? What can be done if he himself proves to be the greatest enemy to universal freedom and that of others?» (I.A. Ilin. *O gryadushchej Rossii*. Typeset by Hermitage. 1991, p. 146.

The events of years in the Post-Soviet sphere grew into military conflicts and other types of hostilities. They lead to a violation, and infringement of human rights, mass deception and major scandals, including ones connected to the election of certain mayors (with a criminal past) in Leninsk-Kuznetsk and Lower Novgorod. Recent events created the conditions for people from the criminal underworld to work in government bodies. They were a concrete illustration of Ilin's words.

Against the backdrop of privatization on an unprecedented scale, the Great Divide of municipal property, without rules and «safety



mechanisms», the vast majority of the population (particularly older people but also law-abiding citizens with scruples) became by-standers of the process and not participants. This was due to the fact that they lacked the necessary legal training and requisite psychological make-up as well as legislative and administrative support. These are ideal conditions for breeding corruption in the criminal world. As a result, corruption soon became a presence in virtually every area of social life and reached such proportions that the question arose, «What society are we becoming and is it at all possible to have a democracy and an open society like the one Karl Popper described in his famous work?»

It should be noted here that Marxist ideas came to Russia in an ultimately logical, if not always direct, way. When the October Revolution took place, Marxist thought already had a theoretical foundation in society. While it was partially adapted to Russian conditions, much of Marxist thought taught a great deal about the revolutionary struggle. This knowledge already existed and played an active role in creating an ideologically «armed» political party which only needed to grow in numbers given the correct circumstances. Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the Communists attempted to put their deep-felt ideas into actual practice when they came into power (making changes when necessary). These efforts, to a significant degree, ensured the success of their initiatives.

At some point, the unprecedented adoption of Socialism turned into an essentially revolutionary exodus from Socialism seventy years later. The people who made the decisions (and are making decisions now) in the government as a result of these events, as well as the leaders of essentially poorly organized political and social movements, lacked a proper theoretical basis, experience, and, as noted above, even the knowledge of a crucial aspect presented in the literature. History had been progressing according to the principle of «trial and error» and in our country it moved in the direction of «errors».

Now, in analyzing the events of the recent past, it can be said that virtually no one attempted to develop scenarios which could help society to emerge from a totalitarian state; the ideas of an open society became permissible in Russia only in the past 5–6 years. At present, a careful distinction is not made between the terms «civil», «de-

mocratic», and «open» as they are applied to society. However, this issue is now discussed a great deal. People maintain, and correctly so, that none of these three concepts have been fully developed in Russia. Therefore, the question which should be asked still is, «Can the ideas of an open society be realized in Russia and, if so, how and with what time frame?»

It should be emphasized that the basis of an open society, as Popper understood it, is democracy. Both theory and practice have shown that, in order to achieve democracy, i.e. the power of the people, at very least a civil society must exist. This civil society is the opposite side of the coin of democracy. When speaking of the formation of a civilized society, it is a good idea to use the terms «person as subject» (dependant) and «person as citizen» (free). In the second case, the people are prepared to take responsibility for decisions made by the government. The government leaders are elected by a majority of the people in a truly democratic process. This responsibility should not only mean agreeing with decisions but also showing one's disagreement actively and openly (also by offering opposition) by every means necessary. The ability to do so presupposes the presence of certain legal norms and laws as well as the corresponding social and political institutions to implement them. Their ideological foundation should be a sense of morality, a type of ethics of social relationships. In this system, the things most valued are the individual, their inalienable rights, and the primacy given to the «person as citizen» in their relationship with the state. There should be a «critical mass» of people in society (if we can use that term). The people are the ones that possess these values and they should therefore be the absolute majority at any level where decisions are made.

There was nothing of the sort in Russia. If there had been, there would have been no conflict in Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968), Afghanistan and Chechnya. It should also be noted that several of the obstacles that prevent us from becoming a civil and democratic nation (and as a result an open society) are brought about by our traditions. Some of them include: *a lack of proper respect for the law in social consciousness, a general disregard for the law in general and for those that embody the law in particular.* We also underestimate the role

*that private property plays as a factor in forming a system of universal values* in which *freedom* is most prominent. This concept, in turn, provides an interpretation of other key concepts such as *equality* and *justice*. Private property plays a fundamental role. To a significant degree, it is the chief value system of democratic society. As the Nobel Prize laureates Friedman and Hayek have demonstrated, when private property is guaranteed and protected by the law, it becomes possible for citizens to gain freedom and independence (within the framework of the democratic norms adopted by society). In this case, economic freedom becomes a means achieving political freedom.

Friedman writes:

«Past experience has clearly shown the relationship between political freedom and a free market. I am not aware of any society anywhere at any time which had a significant degree of political freedom and at the same time did not have something resembling a free market as a means of organization of most economic activities.» (*Friedman and Hayek on Freedom*. Cato Institute, 1985, p. 12)

This was the very idea advanced by Ilin when, in discussing ways of overcoming the legacy of Communism, he wrote: «It is not enough to reject the vileness of Communism and the depressing and ruinous idiocy of Socialism; we must legitimize and affirm private property...» (I.A. Ilin. *O gryadushchej Rossii*. Typeset by Hermitage. 1991, p. 196). However, the issue of property is primarily an issue of power. This is the reason why an intense battle is now going on to determine the orientation, nature and timeframe necessary for the transformations taking place in our country. Here lies the main reason why the problems connected with private land ownership are still unresolved.

This fact is a basic obstacle in the process of transition to a true market economy, and, subsequently, to an open society.

The opponents of legalizing private property argue that such a move would have many serious repercussions. One must agree with them. However, we must acknowledge that fact that societies who tried to eliminate private property (and made some actual progress in doing so) encountered even greater difficulties and ultimately lost the even greater battle to compete with countries with a market economy. As Hayek wrote in his analysis of the problem in the eighties, «The institu-

tion of property in its present form is far from perfect; in fact, we are hardly in a position to say how it can be perfected» (F.A. Hayek. *Pagubnaya samonadeyannost*. Moscow, 1992, p. 64) One can dispute this statement and even disagree with it, but it must be taken into account and certainly not ignored.

The attempt to find the optimal way to achieve societal development is admirable, if it is a matter of a theoretical search. However, the real problems emerge in attempts to implement theory in actual policy, where one must frequently choose the lesser of two evils. Because the laws of nature (and of society) do not permit a vacuum in any area, rejecting one choice or attempting to take more time in the hopes of finding an alternative often results in the selection of the worst scenario or even a bad (but relatively good) choice. This is the law of self-organization. Specific types of effort as well as carefully planned and directed actions are needed to avoid such an outcome.

Thus, in terms of prospects for building an open society, Russia is in a difficult position because it lacks, as mentioned above, the appropriate traditions. There is also concern about the Orthodox Church (which has grown more powerful) and Islam, (which is extremely influential in our country). Both of the entities must adapt to new ideas. However, the question is to what extent are they willing to do so and whether they are even capable of making such changes within the conservatism which they so vividly demonstrate. This is a serious question. At very least it can be said that the actual situation (aggravated by the fact the secular authorities occasionally «play up to» and even ingratiate themselves to the church) does not give one reason to be optimistic about the long term prospects of building an open society in Russia. Moreover, it would be quite naïve and erroneous to think otherwise. Instead, the topic of discussion today should be on particular trends as well as the means necessary for the formation of a civil and democratic society. For actual results to be achieved, persistent efforts directed at overcoming the crisis in economic, social, and spiritual areas are in order. All aspects work hand in hand. However, even philosophers do not always consider the fact that, while crisis conditions may shape social and individual consciousness, that altered consciousness to a significant degree perpetuates these very condi-

tions. The stronger hold they take and the more deformed they become, the more they paralyze consciousness and suppress the will, making it more difficult to reverse the process and to overcome these forces. The first symptoms of a recovery must first occur within the state of consciousness. This occurs at the point when consciousness turns away from the past and focuses in the direction of the future. It is necessary to overcome feelings of pessimism and can create the conditions needed for positive changes in society.

The turning point in social consciousness has not yet occurred in Russia, but some signs of recovery are visible. The first traces are discernible, as might be expected, in *philosophy*, the one form of social consciousness which, by definition, is less vulnerable to the influence of emotions, the state of affairs at the moment, and the pressures of daily life. The condition of philosophy provides a great deal of insight about what a society is like and from what maladies it suffers. Philosophy can also shed light on the nature and orientation of the changes developing in society.

From this perspective, the process of change which philosophy has undergone in Russia in the past decade, particularly in the past 5–7 years, is of interest.

Before going into greater detail, we should note that, in Russia as everywhere else, the vast majority of philosophers are teachers of philosophy or are employed in disciplines with some philosophical content in universities. The remainder work in research institutes, publishing houses, foundations etc. and frequently have a second job as a teacher. Often, those who are both the most active and the most creative (and their numbers are few) are the ones to produce serious philosophical studies and important philosophical texts.

Moreover, all of them (whether they just write or just teach or do a combination of both) have several things in common: a creative and professional commitment to philosophy and the desire to study a universal set of problems. The discipline of philosophy unites them. Everyone's emphasis is in philosophy but many are only indirectly involved in the creative process of writing a philosophical text. An essential ingredient of philosophy is interpersonal communication between professionals. Such a forum provides the opportunity to compare vari-

ous views and ideological positions, and have meaningful dialogues. Conferences and symposiums dedicated to the study of philosophy can fulfill this essential function of the profession of philosophy. Of greatest importance are national and international conferences. They are important milestones in the development of philosophical thought which allow the participants to draw conclusions and evaluate achievements in their area of study. They are also a forum to plan immediate tasks and to discuss basic problems which warrant a philosophical analysis.

Russia's recent past is particularly interesting in this regard. Until the end of the eighties, there were approximately 150 philosophy conferences held in the USSR annually and there was a philosophy congress every five years. Then, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, there was almost none. A possible exception could be the XIX World Philosophers Congress which, for the first time in the one-hundred year history of philosophy conferences, was held in Moscow in 1993. It should be noted, however, that the decision to hold the conference in Russia was made in Brighton at the XVIII World Philosophy Congress in 1988, at a time when the USSR and the world was still fascinated with the developments of *perestroika* and everyone was eager to contribute to this movement. The congress took place as if «by inertia», in completely different conditions, after the Soviet power had crumbled. Not only had the Soviet state apparatus collapsed, but also the value system and ideology which accompanied it, including the Marxist philosophy.

The World Philosophy Congress took place at a time when the events of August, 1991, which were to free philosophy from the ideological stronghold, were already in the past. The events in the fall of 1993, which put an end to the crisis of political power and made it possible to return to a stable system, had not yet taken place. For this reason, the congress had the status of a «world» conference but also served as the final milestone in the period of Soviet history. By this time, Soviet philosophy had run its course and was in a condition of profound crisis. It did not undergo any notable changes as a result of this international forum.

Many philosophers were simply struggling to survive at this time and were in no position to advance the cause of philosophy. However,

philosophical thought did not cease during these difficult times. Another two years passed, when, at the beginning of 1996, we saw the first signs of a philosophical revival in our country. There is a connection between that phenomenon and the general situation in the country. At this time, political and, to a lesser degree, economic and social spheres clearly became more stabile, which allowed an increased interest in philosophy.

First of all, the former social parameters had become meaningless. Therefore, new points of reference and new value systems were needed to take their place. Without the help of philosophy, it would be impossible to determine what form these values would take. It was impossible to speak of a common national idea, even though there was a particularly acute need at the time. Philosophy had a new social function – the rediscovery of values. Second, the most radical changes in education were required in those disciplines which had been associated with the former ideology. It is only natural that philosophy would be called on to help in these matters.

Several indicators are quite typical and can give a general picture of the state of philosophy in recent years. One is the process of teaching philosophy in universities. Through the mid-nineties, teaching remained in a state of atrophy or was done using the process of «trial and error». By then, old programs and textbooks were out of date but there was nothing to take their place. In 1989, the last textbook on philosophy in the Soviet period *Introduction to Philosophy*, edited by I.T. Frolov was published. Until 1995, that book was used almost exclusively in philosophy courses. Students and teachers only had a new choice in philosophical literature in early 1996, when the first «raw» teaching materials appeared. They were written in lieu of new programs but incorporated the Federal Educational Standards (adopted in August of 1994). During the next two years, the numbers of teaching materials and reference works increased and their quantity continues to grow today. Progress has also certainly been made in the quality of this material. It reflects the pluralistic views of its authors and is no longer independent on an external ideology. However, it sometimes has the superfluous tinge of Marxism. Quite often, literature of this kind is given the traditional designation of » philosophy textbook«, as opposed to «teaching materials». This is in keeping with Marxist philosophy, which claims to

have the status of a science. Nonetheless, this is a contradiction in the subject matter and spirit unique of *philosophy*, where a lack of agreement is the norm. Nonetheless, the increased publication of teaching materials, reference works on philosophy, monographs, and translated works is an important indication that Russian philosophy is emerging from the crisis.

This trend became clear in 1996 when a Russian conference entitled «Problems in Teaching Philosophy at Universities» was held. Some 200 participants came from many regions of Russia and the event became the most major happening in Russian philosophy in the past ten years. The conference was particularly notable because it demonstrated the real need to consolidate all of Russia's resources in philosophy and the necessity to hold large forums on philosophy. It was suggested that the different regions should be instrumental in creating local forums of philosophy.

It is of fundamental importance for Russia to solve this problem because the extreme centralization during the Soviet period put Moscow in a unique position, including in the area of philosophy. Much of what was done outside of Moscow was often seen as being of less consequence and was often labeled provincial or underdeveloped. It stands to reason that such circumstances often caused animosity toward Muscovite scholars on the part of their colleagues from the provinces and were the reason behind the unspoken antagonism between the regional intelligentsia and the one in the capital. To a certain extent, these sentiments existed between philosophers in the two capitals (former and current) Saint Petersburg and Moscow.

For this reason, when it was suggested that the First Russian Conference on Philosophy be held in Saint Petersburg, with the State University as the base, it was seen as a gesture to move away from centralism and *diktat* and met with wide approval in Russian philosophical circles. The congress, with the title «Man-Philosophy-Humanism», took place in Saint Petersburg from June 4<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup>, 1997. It immediately proved to be a unique event on the opening day. The very best facilities in the city were the site of a plenary meeting with more than 1,200 participants from most regions in Russia and countries from both the «near» and «far» abroad.



More than a year has passed since this congress was held. It can be said that it was an event of primary importance in the spiritual revival of Russian society, not only by its scale, level of organization, depth and breadth of issues discussed, and full program, but also because of the resonance and affect it had on social consciousness (particularly in the area of philosophy). For this reason, it is completely comparable in stature to the XIX World Philosophy Conference. There is a symbolic quality about the fact that these two conferences took place only four years apart but were essentially held in fundamentally different eras.

Recent trends and changes in Russian philosophy of the second half of the 1990s not only brought about the need to hold the First Russian Congress on Philosophy but also ensured its success. The congress provided a new stimulus for these trends. Proof of this can be found in the statistics on events dedicated to philosophy in Russia in the past few years. If, in the beginning of the 1990s there were only a few of conferences and round tables in the entire country (according to the annual report of the Russian Philosophical Organization [RFO]), in 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 there were 18, 26, 52, 61, 70, 138, and 104 respectively. In 2002 there will be approximately 116. A slight decline in the number of conferences might be justified by the fact that their quality has increased significantly both in terms of preparation and implementation.

Philosophy congresses have become the most important events of the last years. First of all, the XXst World Congress on Philosophy (August 10–16, 1998, Boston, US). It was the first congress of this kind where over 60 Russian philosophers – an unprecedented number – were presented and, unlike in the past, not as a single team with a leader determined back in Moscow. Second, the Second and the Third Russian Congresses on Philosophy. The Second Congress was held in Ekaterinburg in 1999 (June 7–11). Its central topic – «XXIst Century: Russian Future in the Philosophical Dimension» – was reflected in its plenary and special sessions and more than 50 panels and roundtables, which philosophers from CIS countries and foreign philosophers actively participated in. The Third Congress will be held in Rostov-on-Don in 2002 (September 16–20) and it seems that this one will be in many aspects of higher quality than the both of the past.

Another indication that philosophical life in Russia is changing is the number of periodicals on philosophy. Until the mid-nineties, there was essentially only one specialized journal of philosophy, *Voprosy filosofii*. In 1993, the journal *Filosofskie issledovaniya* was added, followed by the journal of the Russian Humanist Society *Zdravyy smysl* in 1996. Nowadays, a number of new publications appeared, including the *Vestnik RFO* and the journals *Filosofiya i obshchestvo* and *Kategorii*, as well as the theoretical journal of the Orenburg regional division of the RFO *Credo*. There is also *Mysl*, the weekly of the Petersburg Association of Philosophers. Works on humanist issues include *Otazheniya* of the Kostroma division of the RFO as well as others, appearing one after the other.

In conclusion, in overcoming its own crisis, philosophy is opening up new vistas for interpreting the reality of Russian lives and helps promote the development of an «open society» in Russia in the meaning, as Popper understood it, that is, as a juxtaposition between a «closed» society and an «open» one. The road to such a society will not be short nor will it be an easy one. However, if this process is to begin, it must have its impetus in the sphere of social consciousness and, in part, in philosophy. Only time will tell how accurate this claim will be. The same is true for the attempt made in this study to interpret the objective changes in Russian philosophy from this perspective. We can only hope that such a time will not be in the too distant future.

---

## HUMAN VALUES: THE KEY TO SOLVING GLOBAL PROBLEMS<sup>1</sup>

The twentieth century and the United States are synonymous with achievements in the spheres of science and technology along with the attendant positive and negative circumstances arising from these developments. Not surprisingly, therefore, when philosophers from all over the world gathered in Boston in August 1998 for the 20th World Congress of Philosophy to discuss the most important contemporary problems the majority of these problems were bound up with the revolution in the spheres of science and technology. Since morality is closely intertwined with social and technological achievements, I want to underline the necessity of moral reevaluation and the need to be flexible and tolerant concerning value orientations if we wish to avoid global instability.

Undoubtedly, contemporary global problems find their roots in the consequences of scientific and technological progress. The most important of these problems are the threat of global nuclear war, ecological imbalance, unsustainable population growth, and a growing developmental gap in the socio-economic conditions among countries intertwined in this unprecedented global economy. Yet, the reason for many of these problems is pedagogical because only through education (which facilitates a realization of our role in the existence of global problems) does the human race have a chance to minimize, if not eliminate, the negative consequences of science and technology.

Despite constant efforts and urgent attempts to overcome these global problems the best we have are only some moderate results. Important decisions have not been made and important actions have not been taken. Serious reasons exist to think we are proceeding in the wrong direction in trying to find solutions. Our efforts aim to influence effects, not causes. As a result, we disclose new unintended problems even as we overcome some difficulties. And like a person trying to remove weeds by their leaves without removing their roots we go on

---

<sup>1</sup> Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy. Abstracts of Invited and Contributed Papers. Boston. USA. 1998.

wondering why the weeds continue to grow thicker and richer. So to seek the roots of our global problems one should first attempt an active beginning. This beginning should start with the human condition including relations with others and the environment.

In the last decade, science and technology have abruptly changed the human condition. Prior to the twentieth century, a nation's habits, norms, values, and social relations tended to be resistant to external influences and to be conservative in character. Under the pressures of science and technology, especially influencing a nation's economy, the modern world began transforming into our more global contemporary world. As this transformation continues, every aspect of the human condition alters. For example, transnational corporations turn the sphere of trade among countries into a global common market. Communication advances create a common space of information (which increases the speed while decreasing the time for social relations). Alterations in our spiritual life, also, go hand-in-hand with these changes in culture, science, and politics. Thus, all of these transformations which influence our human condition create a smaller planet in which people become more interdependent.

This context of rapid transformations helps to explain the recent changes in Central and Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union. Closed societies (to use a term of Karl Popper) and totalitarian regimes strive for self-isolation. Such isolationist policies attempt to remove a country and its people from global interdependence. However, as the Soviet Union's disintegration exemplifies, the open societies of the West turn out to be in a more favorable position to derive benefits (not the least political stability) from the transformations associated with the advances in science and technology.

Despite the pressures of global interdependency (which impels social, political, and economic change), the world remains divided into highly developed and underdeveloped nations with the gap between these two groups ever-widening. Only one billion (called a golden billion) among the six billion inhabitants of our planet currently live in conditions which sustain, promote, and guarantee quality of life. The majority of our planet's inhabitants lives in poverty and sees no prospects for themselves.

Thus, at the same time that an integrated world community is forming with a common abode, a common fate, and a common responsibility for everything that takes place in the world, the realization comes that no one can escape participating and sharing in the responsibility for discussing and attempting to overcome our common problems. Such problems will become more aggravated if the world continues to be divided by nationalistic policies which encourage a continual widening of standards of living among various populations. This situation of ever-perpetuating socio-economic inequality is a serious barrier to the interrelating of diverse populations globally. Can such an interdependent society become a reality? Can the ideal of a world community be transformed from an ideal into an actual open society? The answers to these questions are not obvious at all.

Our contemporary world still represents a mixed picture of sovereign national states. Some of them are rich and successful. The majority lag hopelessly behind in their socio-economic development. All of them undertake immense efforts defending their national sovereignty and carrying out politics exclusively on the basis of national interests. Such a nationalistic approach is unacceptable in our new context, when acknowledgement of global interdependency and the maintaining of a balance in social and environmental relations become the most important conditions for the advancement and survival of human beings.

In other words, our given circumstances leave us no choice but to seek to achieve a coordination of our actions, a unity in our aims, and an overcoming of the nationalistic separatism in our world. A necessary consideration, in overcoming such nationalism, is the recognition and acceptance of the diversity of cultural traditions which currently exist in various nations and among people. Although the contemporary transformations wrought by science and technology implicitly prescribe recognition of and respect for diversity (which in earlier times was ignored), this prescription is extremely difficult to accomplish because the socio-economic and political stability currently existing is based on an international economic interdependence which is supported by military complexes. By having military armaments as the foundation for international interdependence humanity is put on the brink of an impending disaster.

However, imposing a value system (which respects diversity) on the basis of force or decree is unthinkable. Only two ways exist of regulating social relations in a civilized manner – by morality and by law. Yet moral development and legal processes take time to develop and renew slowly. Moreover, people need to respond now while they have time. We should not nourish illusions that we can guarantee our security by only banning and/or eliminating the proliferation and use of our nuclear arsenals. While such acts are necessary steps, they are insufficient to removing us from our dangerous situation.

People live not only in a nuclear century, but in an epoch which poses numerous possibilities and means by which we may eliminate ourselves on a global basis. For example, the destruction of the ozone layer of the planet's atmosphere, the possibility of chemical or biological warfare or terrorism, and the destruction/meltdown of nuclear power stations offer similar fates as nuclear warfare. Of course, we should continue to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons, but people must recognize that no comprehensive solution exists, and hence there is no secure future for humanity.

Although knowledge of these techniques may not be eliminated (because we still depend on science and technology for our survival), the primary effort of people should be directed away from destroying each other (militarily and especially socio-economically) and our environment and toward the creation of moral, just, peaceful, and sustainable social and environmental relations. In order to reach these goal, we need to reinterpret and reevaluate ourselves and our world and alter our behavior and value orientations. Human values must reflect the idea that all of us live as one large family on one small earth. We have nowhere to go and cannot change this awful aspect of our existence.

What we can and must do is reevaluate our values, promote a global oriented morality, and implement appropriate international laws. In this case, human rights legislation becomes of utmost importance. Yet prior to such legislation is the necessity that everyone receive an education which facilitates an understanding of our current global situation along with a respectful appreciation for diversity and otherness. All human beings must recognize themselves as inhabitants of one world and act accordingly. Hence, all nation-states, despite their traditions,

beliefs, and values, are obligated to give priority to the common interests of human beings in order to preserve all life on earth. No one can with certainty forecast the fate of humanity or of our planet. But the degree to which we are able to influence conditions of life on our planet requires each of us to acknowledge global values and our responsibility for acting on such values.

---

## GLOBALIZATION AND COSMOPOLITANISM IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERNITY<sup>1</sup>

First of all, it needs to be mentioned, that the World Philosophical Congress first time takes place in Asia, whose role in the global politics and economy last decades constantly grows, and many problems and foundations of social life, for example, Western values, look from here a bit different. It needs to be stressed, because globalization and cosmopolitanism are broadly understood in the world: from nearly full coincidence of their meaning to serious confrontation. And relation to them is varied from positive to strictly negative.

Positive evaluations are typical for a specific kind of world outlook, endemic, for example, for many philosophers and scholars and for people associated with the «golden billion», who due to their mentality and world vision is cosmopolitan already because of the way of life and broad opportunities for using the goods of the global civilization.

However, the most of the Earth population is at the low level of socioeconomic development. Poverty, misery and absence of perspectives move the majority of countries and nations to the roadside of world processes, when their role, meaning, position, their dignity, at last, are mostly not interesting for anyone. This is the most important reason why negative evaluations of globalization and, at best, cautious relation to cosmopolitanism evidently prevail practically in the whole world.

*Globalization* is usually seen as a threat to national interests, first of all, in the sphere of economy, politics, culture, language. In *cosmopolitanism* its separated facets are often emphasized and exaggerated what is harmful for general humanistic direction of the idea of world citizenship.

Of course, those, who receive benefits from globalization by word and by deed promote it, while the others, remaining objective observers or feeling themselves the objects of manipulation, undertake all

---

<sup>1</sup> XXII World Congress of Philosophy. Abstracts. Symposia 2: Globalization and Cosmopolitanism. July 30 – August 5, 2008, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea.



sorts of attempts to oppose globalization, proclaiming demands to make it governable and held in the interests of the whole humankind.

The same situation is with *cosmopolitanism*. It is confronted, as a rule, by nationalists of all sorts and practically by all authoritarian, totalitarian and despotic regimes. Cosmopolitanism is proclaimed «rootless», torn from real life; the supporters of such ideas are often treated with suspicion or, at best, with indifference.

The weak side of the existing approaches is the prevalence of subjective evaluations and politically engaged statements. As a result, the fact remains neglected, that cosmopolitanism and globalization are not someone's invention, but reality, which from various sides reflects a single human nature and general patterns of human evolution.

That is why to understand modern situation and the prospects of social development it is important to define properly and to correlate adequately these notions, having find for each of them its own place in the system of categories reflecting the modern world. It is a principal and, moreover, needful step on the way to understanding globalization not primarily in the negative light and to replacing fear for it with constructive analysis of objective and subjective factors, being the foundation of the global processes and their consequences.

There is no doubt, that the ideas of cosmopolitanism, their directness towards understanding the common destiny of humankind will also become more attractive and acquire broader audience if we concentrate attention not on the extravagant behavior, for example, of the first «world citizens» – cynics or contemporary «antiglobalists», but on their concern for reduction of human rights and dignity. That is why if we analyze the performances of antiglobalists as protest movements, what they deserve, we should admit, that in their essence the participants of the antiglobalist demarches are no less cosmopolitans than those whom they confront. The difference is that both look at the same phenomena from different positions and conduct themselves differently.<sup>2</sup>

To resolve these problems we can only analyzing what exactly are globalization and cosmopolitanism. And first thing to pay attention to is

---

<sup>2</sup> See: Global Studies Encyclopedia. Ed. by. Alexander N. Chumakov, William C. Gay, Ivan I. Mazour. Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 2003. P. 27–29.

the fact that although these phenomena are seen as tightly connected, they are, nevertheless, related to different spheres of social being.

For example, if *globalization* is, first of all, an objective historical process, *cosmopolitanism* is a philosophical position. Besides, if *globalization* looks like universalization of all connections and relations, the emergence of single structures in various spheres of social life at the planetary level, *cosmopolitanism* is a state of mind, ideology, creed, or, finally, a specific system of philosophical vision of the world and human place in it.

Let us also mention, that globalization and cosmopolitanism emerged in different historical epochs. They are engendered by different reasons and express different sides of social life.

*Cosmopolitanism is a cultural phenomena*, characterizing human world outlook, while *globalization is a trend of social development*, directed towards the emergence of the holistic world.

And still there are serious reasons for speaking about real interconnection and mutual correlation between these phenomena. It is especially clearly seen in contemporary conditions, when humankind faces global problems and looks for ways of overcoming them; and tries to formulate philosophical principles, on the basis of which different nations and states could act in coordination. Due to this fact we need shortly analyze the nature and reason for the emergence of cosmopolitanism and globalization.

Cosmopolitanism, as rejection of national isolation, as broadening the idea of fatherland to the whole world and striving for the world without state borders emerged in the Ancient Times. People in that period did not know real construction of the Earth and the limits of the inhabited world they correlated not with a globe but with a cosmos. That is why the emergence of the cosmopolitan ideas in that time we can and should understand as the first symptom, first sign of globalization, which at the level of rationality revealed itself when in reality there was, of course, no globalization.

Ancient India, Ancient China and the Ancient Mediterranean, where the first philosophical schools emerged, lived in that period exclusively within the borders of their eucumenas. But the strength of philosophical reflection means that it penetrates the essence of things,

sometimes being many ages and even millennia ahead of its time. For example, together with the ideas of cosmopolitanism, the Ancient philosophy engendered another absolutely not evident in that time speculative constructions, such as, the idea of atoms (Leucippus, Democritus, Epicure), ruminations about the universal interconnection of events and phenomena (Heraclites) and even guesses that the Earth is a rotating globe (Eratosthenes, Philolaus, Nikita of Syracuse, Ekphant).

It should be specially emphasized, that the cosmopolitan ideas have been formed not accidentally and not on the empty place. Their emergence was determined by both the historical development itself and the rational type of thinking of that era, which was called «axial time» by K.Jaspers. It was the period of emergence of the world religions and philosophical teachings, of the famous campaigns of Alexander the Great and the dissipation of the traditional world order, when mass migrations of large numbers of peoples, coming into interaction with other peoples and cultures, led to the loss of the customary way of life, engendering the crisis of the Antic polis. As a result, the philosophical conceptions of the Hellenes, passed on the system of values of a polis, were being destroyed and penetrated the limits of the isolated city-states. Man, thus, found himself in the world of uncertainties, where the future already not corresponded the past well known for him. Deprived of the customary way of life, the Ancient Greeks tried to find support in their belonging to a single humankind, feeling and proclaiming themselves the citizens of the cosmopolis – world state. Late, in the Roman epoch, the universal nature of the Roman state itself contributed into the spread and development of the cosmopolitan ideas.

Socrates, Antisphenes, Diogenes, Cicero, Seneca, Epictet, Mark Aurelius, and many others are bright representatives of the Antique cosmopolitanism, which took different meaning in dependence on concrete historic conditions and philosophical position of this or that thinker. For example, while the term «cosmopolitan» was invented by Stoics, the very idea of world citizenship was produced earlier by their predecessors – Cynics. They were the first to proclaim themselves «world citizens», because they felt their belonging not only to the polis isolated in its space, but to the open and endless «cosmos», the whole world, the laws of which they put higher than the conventional laws of a polis.

In the next centuries we will find also many bright thinkers, whose outlook and basic ideas were in their essence cosmopolitan. These are representatives of Christian Philosophy: Tertullian, Eriugena, and Humanists of the Renaissance: Dante, Erasmus, Thomas More, Monten, Campanella and many others, whose names we can list up to modernity.

But the topic of my presentation requires to pay special attention to the rise of interest to cosmopolitanism in the epoch of Renaissance. It was an important historical boundary for understanding the problems in question, because from here *real globalization* begins, and cosmopolitanism becomes really planetary, i.e., not cosmic already, but global.

There is no doubt, that such a turn of events was provoked by re-thinking the Antique heredity and discovering real scale of the real human environment. And the most important role here was played, of course, by the «Copernican revolution» in the understanding of the world and the Great geographic discoveries, which firstly confirmed that the Earth is a globe. By this the fundamental corrections were made in human outlook, when the final sphere of interaction between man and nature not «cosmos», but «globe» was. With a share of conventionality one can say, that from that period the notion of the «globe» changed what the Ancient Greeks associated with the «eucumena», or, more generally, with the «cosmos».

At the same time the discovery of America and then the first circumnavigation of F. Magellan put a beginning for real globalization, which, having began from discovering and exploring new territories, i.e., in the sphere of geography, very soon pulled into its orbit the spheres of economy, politics, culture. And cosmopolitan views first time acquired a principal opportunity to transcend the boundaries of abstract speculation and to be realized in the sphere of practical activity.

Now, in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, when the world became a holistic system according practically to all basic parameters of social life, some countries and peoples in fact have no choice – to take part or not to take part in globalization. They are determined to take part due to natural course of events, for them not only can not change the place of living or neighbors, but to avoid integrating into the world community. Theoretically it, of course, possible, but those who do not fit economic,

political and cultural processes of globalization, who confronts cosmopolitanism, putting his national sovereignty above all, is condemned to isolationism and backwardness. And this, apart from a series of negative consequences for such a people, creates also a threat to world stability, because in such countries the most suitable conditions are for inter-ethnic conflicts, organized crime and international terrorism.

So, being a natural process, globalization itself is neither good or bad, but it influences differently on different people. For less developed countries and deprived strata of population is really conceals more threats than positive solutions, while rich and developed countries win more from it. But the cause is not globalization, but sociopolitical and economic condition of modern humankind, its disunity and uneven development. Cosmopolitan ideas are not someone's engineering, but normal and needful condition for common living of different people in the global world.

That is why we should fight not globalization and cosmopolitanism, but the existing bad world order and unjust social relations.

What is said demonstrates some vector for resolving the problems set. Namely, if *cosmopolitanism* is a child of *culture* and *globalization* – a result of *civilizational development* of a society, our further analysis of cosmopolitanism and globalization should be directly connected with the analysis of these spheres of social life.

It is important to emphasize, that at the verge of culture and civilization the dualistic, contradictory nature of social development, confrontation between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, globalization and autarchy, reveals itself most acutely and openly.

Indeed, if we understand *culture* not only as creative activity of man and its results, but first of all as a complex of customs, traditions, beliefs, values, making the spiritual basis for human living activity, and if we understand *civilization* as a historically defined step in social development, which is characterized by a level of development of state, urbanization, technosphere, finally, civil society and law, when *culture* should have been named the soul and *civilization* – the body of a society.

But why we talk about it discussing, it seems, another topic – cosmopolitanism and globalization? The answer is, that under the influence of the objective global processes humankind moves in its devel-

opment from local manifestations of civilization to civilizational unity, engendering simultaneously not only a single global civilization,<sup>3</sup> but also what can be called global, universal, mass culture. And here newly understood ideas of cosmopolitanism become not just mind play or philosophical position, but a needful condition for human survival in the global and interdependent world. Another words, as far as globalization increases, cosmopolitanism also gains force, because it is directly connected with global world outlook and is an attribute of social life in the global world.

But this is only a part of the reality. The point is, that globalization, leading to some unification of social life, nevertheless, does not exterminate cultural diversity, which existed always, exists now and will exist in the future, because every people, as well as every separately taken person, is absolutely unrepeatable and in a way unique. One can not seat at several chairs at one moment, and one can not exist in several cultures, for even more than two thousand years later a well-known saying by Confucius did not become less actual: «People are close to one another in their nature, but they are fare from one another in their habits».<sup>4</sup> That is why cultural development of any people, deeply connected with its language, traditions, religion, mentality, etc. presupposes cultural autonomy and, hence, the defense of nation state, striving for self-determination and independence. As a well known Polish philosopher Tadeus Kotarbinsky accurately mentioned: «It is enough to be a cosmopolitan, to become a stranger in every point of the modern world».<sup>5</sup>

But in this case it is cultural context where one should look for the roots of nationalism, isolationism, chauvinism and everything, what, being brought to its extremes, is opposed to cosmopolitanism, global outlook, single humankind, i.e. to what, it its turn, civilizational development of both separated nations and the whole humankind leads. Let us mention, that globalization, now multiaspect, is a concrete form of such a development, which, independent on will and wishes of separated people with necessity forms the world civilization.

---

<sup>3</sup> Global civilization should not be necessarily associated with global state.

<sup>4</sup> Confucius. *Uroki mudrosti: Sochinenia*. – M., 2005. P. 109.

<sup>5</sup> See: <http://www.aforism.ru/html/k/kosm/00001.htm>

Summing up, one can say, that *civilization* is a basis for cosmopolitanism and the unity of the world community. It is the uniting element, the moving engine of the integration processes. At the same time, *culture* is a basis for individualism and difference. It separates and, in a way, disunites peoples, i.e. it is a basis for differentiation of the global humankind. And this state of things should not be evaluated in terms of «good» and «bad». It is reality that should be recognized and learned to live with. It is also important to understand that absolutization or exaggeration of the role of one of the social development factors – cultural or civilizational – engenders extremes and not needful social tensions. One can bring a lot of examples, including ones from the modern life, to confirm that where culture is exaggerated good soil for nationalism and chauvinism emerges. Where worship civilization and exaggerate the meaning of globalization – we deal with naked, abstract cosmopolitanism.

In this regard we should state that a complex symbiosis of the cultural and civilizational development engenders and, as far as globalization increases, enforces and aggravates the fundamental contradiction between the national and the international, between patriotism and cosmopolitanism. Now this contradiction has transcended the boundaries of pure consciousness and became a distinctive characteristic of social life in the age of globalization.

But the age of nation-states is not over and that is why I would compare modern humankind with a man, standing at two ice-floes, when one of them gravitates to one, and the other – to another bank. And in order not to be drowned he should constantly apply efforts to make these ice-floes not to distance from one another too much. And the world community is also determined to find the «golden mean», which would allow it most firmly balance between the global and the local, the international and the national, and, finally, between cultural and civilizational development of both separated peoples and the whole humankind.

But to analyze this new reality we need another categorical apparatus. The set of categories we use now, is badly equipped for the adequate description of the global world. We should change not only our vision of the world, but the means of its expression if we want to manage with global problems we face.

That is why, discussing globalization and cosmopolitanism in the context of modernity we can not avoid a customary notion of «civilization», because it not just inadequately reflects reality, but mixes things up being used while discussing contemporary world processes. In particular, the talks about multiplicity and diversity of civilizations is a myth, which we should as soon as possible to get rid of, for it is only what seems to exist, an aberration of our visions, when we are not able to see civilizational development in the cultural context, while tearing cultural context from civilizational development.

In fact, when in this or that society the first signs of civilization emerge, we can not divide its civilizational development from the cultural one. They, like two sides of one coin, are from this moment in unbreakable unity. And we should speak in this case not about culture or civilization separately, what at best would correspond some abstraction, but about *cultural and civilizational* development of this or that social organism. Another words: in the face of various social entities, separate states and now, in the conditions of globalization, already world community as a whole, we deal not with different civilizations or cultures as such, but with different *cultural and civilizational* systems.

On this evidence, cultural and civilizational components of such systems should be considered from the position of the complementarity principle.<sup>6</sup> That means what in one context we would call culture, will be nothing but civilization in the other context, and vice versa. Let us only mention, that if civilizational principles are common for all social systems; cultures are many. And separately taken cultures are not better or worse than the others. They are simply different. From here proceeds the multiplicity of cultural and civilizational systems, which can be classified by different foundation. For example, not only separate countries and nations can be cultural and civilizational systems, but also some regions, continents, or, for example, religious confessions. Europe, Latin America or Africa, along with

---

<sup>6</sup> The complementarity principle, formulated by N. Bore to explain corpuscular-wave nature of light and elementary particles, can be applied to social phenomena, of course, with some level of conventionality.



Christianity, Islam or Buddhism also can and should be considered as distinct cultural and civilizational systems.<sup>7</sup>

And all of them, being different, having their own tasks and reaching their own goals, defended, defend and will always defend their own interests. That is why conflict and confront not some sort of mythical civilizations or separately taken cultures, but absolutely concrete cultural and civilizational systems where achievements of civilization, norms or values, interwoven into different cultural contexts, seeming the same, produce unrepeatable and unique fusion of what we conventionally call soul and body of this or that concrete society.

That is why the East will never become the West and the West – the East. Ecumenist ideas will not replace multiplicity of religious beliefs, and cosmopolitanism will not become unconventional value and the only regulator of social relations for all people even when the world will be fully formed as a single system according to the basic socioeconomic parameters. Another words, we are condemned to live at the same time in the conditions of not only global, but locally constructed world with its diversity of cultures. Hence, although humankind develops in the direction of a global civilization, the future cosmopolis will necessarily remain culturally diverse and heterogeneous. And it is fully evident, that sensibility to cosmopolitan ideas, their spread will directly depend from the level of development of civil society at the global scale – the way, on which only the first steps are made.

World community has to make a correspondent system of governing world economy, what is practically impossible if we not follow the way of making global civil society and global democracy. Some results are already visible in this way. For example, we objectively become world citizens when, say, express concern about environmental problems of the world ocean or climate change of the planet, when we formulate our attitude to the situation in Iraq or in the Balkans. We also behave as citizens of the world when we are guided by universal norms of conduct outside our country. In fact, we already live in the global world and continue to discuss about cosmopolitanism, which became

---

<sup>7</sup> See: Chumakov A.N. Metafizika globalizatsii. Kulturno-tsivilizatsionnyi kontekst. – M., 2006.

equal to global world outlook and global world feeling, which we have in this or that way.

Time has come to clean the notion of «cosmopolitanism» from its fully negative connotations and to say that cosmopolitanism does not mean rejecting the national, as well as adherence to universal interests does not reject patriotism. The problem is in the correct putting the accents. Hence, a cosmopolitan is not the one who has no Fatherland of his own, but the one who correlates his duty to the Fatherland with the interests of the world community. It would be naïve to count that all people, even in the distant future, will take this position. But humankind will simply have no future without transformation of social consciousness in this direction, at least, good future.

As for us, the representatives of philosophy, if we really want to influence historical process, we should look at the ongoing events through the eyes not only observers, but participants. Of course, philosophy can not directly influence the decisions of national governments or the activity of international organizations. However, we, philosophers, as Richard Rorty justly says, are good for making bridges between peoples, for initiating cosmopolitan initiatives, for, if philosophers do not become internationalists, no one will.<sup>8</sup> Who, if not philosophers, he reasonably mentions, must formulated and defend «a clear image of a specific cosmopolitan human future: the image of the planetary democracy, a society where tortures, or closing a university or a newspaper in the other end of the world will provoke the same rage as if it has happened in the Motherland».<sup>9</sup>

In fact, about it Derrida speaks, who «does not want philosophy to be a judge, but rather a traveler and vagabond, having no place to dwell, hurrying here and where when it hears the call of the «other» for action».<sup>10</sup> And this is right. Philosophy is cosmopolitan already because it lives behind «the city walls», out of this or that polis. But in this case we should also agree with K. Marx, according to whom, the task of phi-

---

<sup>8</sup> Richard Rorty's Pragmatism and the Russian Context. Moscow, «Tradition», 1997, p. 110.

<sup>9</sup> See: Rorty R. «Filosofia i budushchee» – Voprosy Filosofii, 1994, № 6.

<sup>10</sup> Deconstruction in a Nutshell. A Conversation with Jacques Derrida. 1997. Ed., comm. by J.D. Caputo. N.Y.: Fordham University Press. P. 51.

losophers not only explain the world, but to change it.<sup>11</sup> And if it is so, time has come when we should seriously make the most important step in this direction: to start thinking over problems of globalization and the ideas of cosmopolitanism, to make them from bogey into, finally, the instrument of building just, sustainable and more secure global world.

---

<sup>11</sup> See: Marx.K. Tezisy o Feierbakhe [text 1888 goda]. – Marx K., Engels F. Sochinenia. Izdanie vtoroe. V piatidesiati tomakh. T. 42. – M.: Izdatelstvo politicheskoi literatury, 1974. P. 264–266.

---

## GLOBALIZATION STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

An interdisciplinary field of academic research conducted in Russia with the aim of revealing the essence of the processes of globalization, defining the reasons for its appearance and tendencies for development, as well as the study of global problems brought about by the said and the search for ways to ascertain the positive and overcome the negative consequences of these processes for both man and the biosphere. In a more general understanding the term 'globalization studies' constitutes the sum total of the scientific, philosophical, cultural and applied research into various aspects of globalization and global problems together with the subsequent results of such research and their realization in economic, social and political spheres both at the level of individual states and internationally.

The start of globalization studies in Russia goes back to the end of the 1960s beginning of the 1970s, when for the first time discussion started almost simultaneously in various countries about the global threats to mankind. However, its final form relates to the last ten years, when the attention of academics switched from global problems to trying to understand the phenomena of globalization, and the spectrum of the issues dealt with noticeably broadened. In this time the terms 'globalism,' 'globalization,' 'antiglobalism,' 'global village,' 'global threats,' etc. have become widespread and entered into daily usage.

Russian globalization studies despite their inception on the wave of critical analysis of the first publications of Western globalization studies, in particular the lectures of the Rome Club, has nonetheless relatively quickly developed its own style and approaches based on its own world views and methodological foundations. On the strength of reasons known at the initial stage of its development it was not free from ideological dependence, but being closely connected with science and the practice of overcoming global problems, it succeeded in becoming a serious area of academic research, exerting influence not only on

---

<sup>1</sup> Ideas in Russia. Idee w Rosji. Leksykon rosyjsko-polsko-angielski / pod redakcją Justyny Kurczak. Tom 6. Łódź, 2007.

the development of science as a whole but on various spheres of social life: economics, politics, culture and to a certain degree also on the ideology itself. In the last decade cultural-civilizational differences in the understanding of the tendencies and contradictions of the contemporary world has taken the fore. A sizeable number of different currents have arisen in Russia, which have been favourably received in scientific and specialist literature. The most important of which are:

1) *the philosophical-methodological current* which studies the philosophical bases, essence and genesis of global processes and analyses the most important socio-political and economic transformations necessary for the effective solution of the problems resulting from them. Here of particular note is the work of V. Vernadskii, I. Frolov, N. Moiseev, D. Gvishiani, V. Zagladin, G. Khozin and others 2) *the natural-scientific current*, where representatives of natural sciences deal with the solution of the concrete theoretical and applied problems of globalization studies from the position of biology, physics, chemistry, climatology etc. (A. Yanshin, E. Fedorov, V. Sokolov, M. Budyko). 3) *the techno-economic current*, where the specifics of the modern stage of economic development is analysed, which is linked, as a rule, with the globalization of economics, trade, the banking system, and the scientific-technical process (N. Inozemtsev, M. Maksimova, M. Lemeshev) 4) *the socio-natural current* encompasses a wide range of problems of which the greatest concern and worry is caused by ecology, the safeguarding of raw materials for mankind, energy, water and land resources. In this field noted influence is exerted by the works of authors such as V. Vinogradov, N. Reimers, I. Gerasimov, V. Anuchin, A. Ursul, N. Kasimov and others. 5) *the social current* within the framework of which are solved questions of demography, food, health care, education, law, counteracting poverty, international terrorism etc. (E. Girusov, G. Gudozhnik, V. Los, O. Kolbasov). 6) *the political current*, where international relations, of late called increasingly 'political globalization studies,' are examined in the light of the processes of globalization (A. Panarin, I. Vasilenko). 7) *the culturological current*, where the centre of attention are problems arising as a result of the influence of globalization processes on various spheres of culture, the mass media, value criteria, mass consciousness etc. (E. Markaryan,

V. Mezhuev, A. Katsura) 8) *the prognostic current*, characteristic of which is the generalization and extrapolation of contemporary processes, tendencies and states from the perspective of the future to predict the possible course of events through the preservation of appropriate conditions (I. Bestuzheva-Lada, E. Arab-Ogly).

As a result of the development of Russian globalization studies:

Firstly, globalization and the global problems brought about by it have been defined as an academic field, research into which involved the participation of sizeable numbers of eminent specialists from a wide range of academic disciplines and socio-political thought.

Secondly, the historical prerequisites for the creation of globalization and the main global problems together with the nature of the aforementioned were studied. A criterion of global problems was drawn up on the basis of which it became possible to differentiate these problems from many others: regional, local, individual, national etc.

Thirdly, it became obvious that globalization is an age-old naturally developing process of the creation of universal bio-social structures, links and relationships for the whole planet; global problems are the result of this process and globalization studies is the area of theory and practice, where attention is paid to globalization and global problems. It was shown that these processes and problems did not come about by chance, on the basis of somebody's mistake or bad idea. They were the result of the objective, naturally determined development of society and its changing relations with the environment around, in particular when the scientific-technical progress started in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries transformed itself by the mid-20th century into a scientific-technical revolution that has now already taken over a large part of the world's population.

Fourthly, it produced a system of problems that had a global status. It exposed their interdependence and hierarchy. Worked out and proposed was a systematic method allowing one to study problems at a level common to all men.

Fifthly, it correlated the studies of individual academics involved in specific aspects of global problems – philosophical, economic, legal, prognostic, and others. With the same it created the basis for globalization as an integrative interdisciplinary direction within science.

Finally, sixthly, researchers into global problems dispelled all doubts that inactivity or inadequate steps would simply worsen the situation and that the more the matter was put off the higher the price world society would be made to pay to return things to their normal state, excluding as a minimum the degradation of the environment around.

In recent years Russian globalization studies have noted new tendencies that show that the attention of academics, researchers and even politicians lumps together separate global problems in the processes of globalization, in the growth of mutually dependant varied spheres of social life and all possible international structures. A noted event was the publication in Russian and English of an international inter-disciplinary encyclopedia of 'Globalization Studies', which had been prepared by a large number of academics and specialists from 28 countries, and also the reprinting of this encyclopedia in a more accessible form through the participation of 600 scientists and specialists from 57 countries (see [www.globalistika.ru](http://www.globalistika.ru)).

---

## ARTICLES FROM GLOBAL STUDIES ENCYCLOPEDIA

Ed. by Ivan I. Mazour, Alexander N. Chumakov, William C. Gay. Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 2003. – 592 p.; Russian version – 1328 p.

**GLOBAL PROBLEMS, criteria** – quantitative parameters and features grounding evaluation of various problems with regard to their planetary spread, topicality, meaning, and the challenge they represent for all humankind. Setting global problems criteria better allows us to express those characteristics of these problems that are really global and to distinguish them from many others that are not.

Indeed, there is often a temptation to equalize «your own» and «the universal;» as a result, social or some other problems of a particular country are characterized as «global.» Unfortunately, science is not free from this terminological confusion. The reason is not just lack of scholarly attention to these issues or some objective difficulties accompanying finding a definition for such a complex subject matter. This has some impact, but very often the confusion occurs due to different world outlooks when one notion is being filled with different meanings. This is not only a result of epistemological refinements and the related obstacles; very often theoretical, political, and ideological differences play not a lesser role. For example, Marxists and non-Marxists, globalists and antiglobalists mean different things under notions like *global*, *global problems*, *globalization*, which give rise to various new contradictions. The president of the Club of Rome Alexander King expressed his concerns about this situation when he wrote in his introduction to a report *Beyond the Limits to Growth*, sponsored by this organization, that the first thing needed is to impress on certain public circles and decision-makers a deeper understanding of the nature of contemporary problems and their evolution (see: Pestel, E. *Za predelami rosta*. Moscow, 1988. P. 40–41).

Thus, for a constructive social and, all the more so, scholarly dialogue and mutual understanding, precise definition of terms and ironing out disagreements about their contents is not just an up-to-date task but an unavoidable one. Within the field of global studies it is solved



through, first of all, formulation and refinement of the criteria according to which this or that problem can be considered global. Initially these questions were raised at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s with regard to a wide-spread at that time practice of loose interpretation of the term «global» and were most thoroughly explored in the works of the philosophers and methodologists *I.T. Frolov*, *V.V. Zagladin*, *G.S. Khozin*, *I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada*, *H. Hoerz*, *H. Pauke*, *B. Hawrylyshyn*, etc. Further development of studies in the field of global problems required some refinement of the existing criteria and introduction of several new, additional criteria. This process is far from its end and even in the academic literature one can still find different opinions on which problems are global. These results from the fact that the criteria used nowadays do not always allow finding genuine essential characteristics of a problem and thus relegating it to global ones. The question remains open to what extent the list of global problems can be extended at each given moment. To avoid terminological confusion and misunderstanding as well as to work out a rigorously scientific language for this new emerging field of studies—global studies—we should continue discussing, finessing and improving global problems criteria on the basis of what has already been done and what avoids significant debate on principles shared by the entire academic community.

The main feature of global problems, all global problems scholars emphasize, is that they are a complex of the most acute social and natural contradictions pervading the entire world including all its regions and separate countries; and that, contrary to «regional,» «local» and «specific» problems, they are of universal significance. This distinction is very important not only from an epistemological point of view, but from the position of social practice because a failure to understand these differences clearly becomes, on the one hand, a serious obstacle in the way of finding out problems with really universal significance, while, on the other hand, it does not allow comprehending the way these problems manifest themselves in specific situations (at the level of separate areas, countries, and regions). In other words, it is important to distinguish between global problems having regional, local, and specific manifestations, and regional, local, and specific problems proper having distinct essence and a narrower sphere of influence. For

example, although the contents of the demographic problem vary in different states (some have overpopulation and too high a birth rate, the others have a decreasing population number; in the third group the situation is relatively stable), at the planetary level it remains one of the most acute problems of modernity because all Earth inhabitants in this or that way feel the negative consequences of the increasing anthropogenic pressure on the environment. Only in the last 100 years has the number of the planetary population grown 3.75 times—from 1.6 billion people in 1990 to 6 billion in 2000. For the period from 1950 to 2000 alone the population density has grown from 18 to 45.7 people per one square km, and while in 1990 it was 2.9 in Canada, 27.2 in the United States and 336 in Japan, in Bangladesh it was already 888 people per one square km. In the fields of ecology, resources, health, etc. one can bring similar examples of distinct regional importance combined with the absolute significance for all humankind. In other words, when one talks about regional, local, and specific problems, there will always be communities and states positioned as external observers, while when one talks about global problems there can be no such absent-minded external observers. Everyone is in one way or another involved in universal events and becomes a willing or an unwilling, a direct or an indirect participant, victim, or hostage of global problems and their consequences. When we consider problems on various levels specific manifestations of philosophical generalizations like «general,» «particular,» and «unique,» specific problems are understood as unique, local, and regional, as particular and global.

Connecting the definition of «the global» with the idea of «the globe,» some scholars mean the planet as a whole and think that spatial extension (in other words, the territory on which the problems in question are present) is the central global problems criterion—the so-called «geographical» criterion. They have in mind the whole sphere of human activity including the Earth's surface, subsoil, hydrosphere, and the part of the outer space being subject to human activity. A quantitative equivalent of the «geographical» criterion is the area of the entire Earth surface; therefore, it is also called «quantitative.» The largest Earth division unit is a region and the number and size in each given case depends on the purpose of the study or on the characteristics of the problems in question.

For example, in the Cold War period (up to 1991) the world was divided, according to ideological fault lines, among three big camps (regions): the socialist one, the capitalist one and «the third world.» When one is concerned about universal economic underdevelopment eradication, the number of regions is, as a rule, limited to two worlds (regions): economically developed and developing countries. After adding demographic, energy, resources or, say, ecological problems the number of regions grows significantly. In particular, if one takes population density per one square km as the division base, there can be distinguished several apparently overpopulated regions (South-East Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Near East) and several relatively stable regions (North America, Siberia and Far East, Australia, Northern Europe).

A problem may be considered global only when it is equally important for all regions of the planet and can be found in all of them. Otherwise we are talking about the problems of one region or of several regions, or even about less important problems. All global problems are at the same time regional, but not all regional problems are global; that is why there are always fewer global problems than regional ones. Sometimes global problems have no direct local or national manifestations or in some places they are less significant on these levels. For example, in the southern parts of the Indian or the Pacific ocean, which are relatively distanced from the main centers and sources of environmental pollution, the situation with air or water pollution can be satisfactory enough, i.e., anthropogenic influence in this case has no significant impact on natural processes, while generally speaking, at the global level, these problems are very important. In turn, not every local, not mentioning specific, problem is correlated with global problems because the former are always of greater number. This is also true with regard to correlation between local and specific problems. Each regional problem has direct local manifestations within a given region while at the level of specific problems their influence is sometimes, in fact, close to zero. At the same time, not every local, not mentioning specific, problem will be similarly important at the regional level.

The above-said means that one can make a sort of clear distinction between global and regional problems because all global problems are related to a holistic system that is unchanging in its size, i.e., the

planet as a whole. Hence, their exact number for a given system in a given historical moment can be estimated on the condition of precisely defined criteria. At the same time, such a clear distinction between regional and local, regional and specific problems can not be made because the borders of both distinct regions and areas are conditional and justified in each particular case by the concrete purposes and objectives of a study.

So, the quantitative («geographical») criterion allows us to define global problems from the position of their external (spatial) differences from the other problems but it leaves open the question of what is the essence of global problems and does not reveal the contents of this notion. This task can be solved by adding some extra, «qualitative» global problems criteria. Although there is still no conceptual unity in scholarly literature about such criteria, nevertheless, the following characteristics of universally significant problems cause, as a rule, no debate:

Firstly, the essence of these problems is that they concern not only private interests of separate individuals, but, what is more important, the interests and the destiny of all humankind.

Secondly, to overcome these problems coordinated efforts by at least the majority of Earth population are required. At the first glance, these two points seem to refer not to qualitative but to quantitative features. However, to avoid contradictions, we should especially emphasize that in the first point we mean not all humankind but the interests of all humankind. «All» is a necessary condition for this point but it complements and does not determine its content. The same is true for the second point where primarily not the majority of the Earth's population is meant but the fact that global problems will not just disappear; they can only be overcome as a result of purposeful and organized effort.

Thirdly, these problems are an objective factor of world development and cannot be ignored by anyone.

Fourthly, failure to solve global problems may in the future lead to serious and perhaps irremediable consequences for all humankind and its environment.

The above-listed criteria are commonly complemented by two other important characteristics, distinguishing global problems from the rest. The first one is that global problems are of high mobility. That

means some of them may become less important world-wide after being solved and change to a lesser level (regional); the others may rise to the global level as soon as they begin to satisfy both the quantitative and the above-listed qualitative global problems criteria. The second principal feature of global problems is that they are so complexly interdependent that a solution for one of them implies at least taking into consideration the impact of the others on it. Aurelio Peccei paid attention to this when he wrote that many problems humankind encounters have grappled each other like tentacles of a great octopus and enlaced the entire planet and that as the number of unresolved problems grows, they become more and more complicated and their «tentacles» strangle the planet with growing might (See Peccei, A. *Chelovecheskie kachestva*. Moscow, 1980. P. 7).

The above-listed criteria and characteristics of global problems are not universal and absolute; they, nevertheless, in general reflect the positions of the majority of scholars on this issue. They allow for better understanding that global problems were growing for several centuries but became fully visible only in the second half of the 20th century—that is why it is principally incorrect to talk about global problems before the era of great geographic discoveries. Nevertheless, there are alternative viewpoints about the solution for these problems, although not many of them. Within alternate approaches to global problems the criteria acquire different emphasis. For example, according to some Russian authors (A.M. Kovalev, A.P. Nazaretyan) the above-listed criteria do not fully elucidate the causes of global problems, their character, their distinction from the specific social problems of the humankind, which, according to these scholars, are also of universal significance. In connection with this it needs to be stressed that global problems criteria are not designed for finding the causes of these problems because this is a different task and it should be solved in a different way. While global problems criteria are, for sure, an objective factor, one should also consider subjective factors. The importance of these factors is proven by the fact that at the moment there is no unity among the scholars about the number of global problems. None of Russian or foreign specialists asserts that their number is limited to the universally recognized problems, such as, for example, environmental pollution, resources scarcity,

demographic crisis, etc. However, when someone tries to expand this list, significant disagreements become visible. To some extent, they can be, of course, explained by the underdevelopment of global problems criteria but conceptual, methodological, or national differences among the authors play at least not a lesser role.

The most widely spread misleading concept is a broad vision of global problems when nearly all modern challenges connected with human activities are included in the list, even the problems of our distant ancestors whose impact on the environment simply could not be of planetary scope because of the population's fewer number, its disintegrity and fragmentation and because human influence on the environment was yet primitive. Such extended use of the term «global problems» is typical for everyday speech. But this approach may often be found among journalists, politicians who want to attract additional attention to what they say, or even among some scholars when they begin to discuss universal problems without having paid appropriate attention to global problems criteria. One of the possible examples is overestimation of the Arabic cultural achievements by A.P. Nazaretyan who writes that «in the first half of the 2nd millennium industrial, military, and intellectual technologies of the Arabs had global significance» (Nazaretyan, A.P. *Tsivilizatsionnie krizisy v kontekste universalnoi istorii*. Moscow, 2001. P. 80). This expanded vision of global problems characterizes also the philosophers G.S. Gudozhnik and V. Eliseeva, who suggest that «the global nature of problems depends not on their all-Earth scale (global scale) but on the depth of a threat for a given social entity—a tribe, a clan, a nation, or a civilization» (Gudozhnik, G.S. and V. Eliseeva. *Globalnie problemi v istorii chelovechestva*. Moscow, 1989. P. 4). They think that «a social entity encounters global problems when, due to some reason, it happens to be under conditions of a 'limitrophe situation' – to be or not to be» (Ibid). This approach, of course, entails a very broad, «vague» global problems definition formulated like this: «Global problems are contradictions, difficulties, tasks getting in the way of social progress so that without having solved them a given social entity dies» (Ibid, p. 5). Following this vision of global problems one would have to admit that they existed perennially (even in the primordial times) because history provides countless examples of

deaths of not just separate «social entities» but of entire civilizations. This, however, does not correspond with the modern established vision of global problems and their history. Finally, it must be emphasized that this broad understanding of the term «global problems» results in its loss of any scientific, epistemological value. It becomes virtually impossible to use this term for scientific, especially multidisciplinary, analysis, or, at least, this task becomes extremely difficult because the meaning of the phenomenon in question is unclear.

Another extreme position in global studies is a narrow vision of the modern contradictions and overestimation of the direct negative consequences of human economic activity. In this case the entire spectrum of global problems is reduced, as a rule, to two or three of them positioned as the main and the most important for the humankind's present and future. Typically eradication of the threat of thermonuclear war and prevention of ecological catastrophe are named. This approach to the most important contradictions of modernity is characteristic, for example, of such scholars as A. Ehrlich, R. Heilbrunner, C Green as well as for the «antiglobalist movement» or various green parties in the West. For instance, the antiglobalist movement protesting against unjust world economic relations, supporting environmental protection and necessarily opposing the arms race and militarism in general, overestimates, as well as the greens, the above-mentioned problems. But, while stressing these specific problems, they often underestimate the role of many other global problems, their significance and the impact they have on the former. From the practical point of view, reducing the multiplicity of global problems to a handful of them is not constructive, or at least not effective.

Thus, a problem can be considered global only when it: a) satisfies the quantitative (geographic) criterion; and b) possesses such characteristics as mobility and interdependence with regard to the other problems. This approach to global problems criteria allows us to overcome numerous conflicting opinions often found in scholarly literature about which problems should be considered genuinely global.

Global problems criteria do not reveal what would be otherwise concealed. Life itself, reality, makes universal problems visible and they speak out about themselves in due time, being an unavoidable re-

sult of social development at a given stage of history. The above-mentioned criteria bring to light the priority, the primary significance of this or that problem for all humankind, providing, thus, an opportunity to react adequately and to work out methods of its theoretical and practical solution.

References: Zagladin, V.V., Frolov, I.T. *Globalnie problemi sovremenosti. Nauchnii i sotsialnii aspekti*. Moscow, 1981; Chumakov, A.N. *Filosofiya globalnikh problem*. Moscow, 1994; Horz, H. «Globale Probleme der Menschheitsentwicklung.» *Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Philosophie*. No. 11 (1982); Pauke, H. «Globale Probleme und der Menschheitsfortschritt.» *Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Philosophie*. No. 12 (1982); *Year Book of World Problems and Human Potential*. Compiled and published as a joint project by the Secretariats of the Union of International Associations and Mankind 2000. Brussels, 1976; Hawrylyshyn, B. *Road Maps to the Future. Towards the Effectiveness of the Societies. A Report to the Club of Rome, Oxford, 1980; Our Global Neighborhood. The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*. Oxford, 1995.

\* \* \*

**GLOBAL PROBLEMS, classification of** – arrangement of global problems into groups with the purpose of reconstructing the system that they form; this contributes to distinguishing essential connections, determining priorities, and defining the degree of acuteness of objectively existing global problems.

Classification acts as the major component of complex examination of current problems and facilitates examining these problems in their interaction and correlation. Besides, classification contributes to a deeper understanding of the systemic interrelation among problems of different orientations and assists in finding the right sequence of practical decisions. Another important factor is that a strictly and precisely formulated classification in a certain way sums up the results of preceding studies in the given field of knowledge and at the same time marks the beginning of a new stage in the development of such studies.

There are various principles of classification and approaches to arrangement of global problems into groups. Allocation of this or that problem to a certain group has to some extent a relative character and



depends on initial premises and on the basis of their arrangement. Therefore, any similar classification should be considered not as final variant of the problem's solution, but as one of the possible ways of reconstruction of the complex system, contributing to better comprehension of the nature of global problems and their interrelation with each other. Such a necessity occurs because of the limited possibilities of a person to cope with problems of a global scale. People are not capable of deciding all global problems at once and, thus, having weighed the power and resources, are constrained to do what is possible and most expedient in the given conditions. That is why it is important to choose the right orienting points and direction, taking into consideration that in a complex system of global problems some of these problems to a certain extent and for a certain amount of time will not «react» well to a lack of attention to them, and some of the problems, on the contrary, may immediately «answer» with a drastic outbreak in which they worsen as a result of such inattention. In order to define the degree of a problem's acuteness and how it correlates with others, it is necessary to classify them and to regulate them correspondingly. In scientific literature, classification is usually connected to the analysis of the constituents of any single whole and the reconstruction of the structure that they represent. A German scientist H. Horz wrote apropos of this: «Classification of global problems can help in distinguishing essential connections, establishing priorities, and defining the degree of acuteness of objectively existing global problems, contributing to deeper understanding of the system of their interrelations and choosing the right sequence in making practical decisions.» (Horz H. «Globale Probleme der Menschheitsentwicklung». *Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Philosophie*. 1982. No. 11. P. 1309.)

The first attempts at carrying out a systematization of global problems were made in the beginning of the 1970s, and they are connected to widely known studies of the *Club of Rome*, and also to works of V. Ferkiss, V. Bazjuk, J. Skolnikov, G. Brown, S. Chejz, and others. At the same time (in 1973) Swiss scientists A. Gabjuand E. Fontela also became interested in this issue and conducted a content analysis of the literature on global problems; they corrected the received data by conducting a survey among experts and made a list of 28 global problems

that formed 14 different groups. *Year-Book of Global Problems and Human Potential*, published in the West in 1976, listed an even greater number of problems (more than two and a half thousand) that were common to all humankind. In 1978 the prognostic center of the Congress of the U.S.A. named 286 problems common to all humankind and selected 32 out of them as the most important. Such a wide view on global problems was in many respects a result of poorly developed criteria of globality and general observations and superficial conclusions. I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada noted: «Attempts to constitute lists of social problems that the observer faces one by one are not constructive either in approach to them, or in their analysis and prognosis, unless there is a key to systematization and arrangement of problems according to a certain system» (Bestuzhev-Lada, I.V. *Poiskovoe sotzialnoe prognozirovanie: perspektivnie problemi obshchestva*. P. 56). That task was achieved a little later.

In the scientific and special literature of modern Russia one point of view (first generally formulated by I.T. Frolov and V.V. Zagladin) has received a wide circulation. According to it, all global problems, depending on the degree of their acuteness and the priority of solving them, as well as on the real life cause-effect relations between them are divided into three major groups.

The first group consists of problems that are characterized as the most general and urgent. They result from relations among different states and also between «basic social communities of humankind» (socioeconomic systems, unions and their member-countries); thus, they are called «intersocial.» There are two problems in this group that are particularly important for the whole world: society without war and ensuring a just world; establishment of a new world economic order.

The second group comprises problems connected to the system «individual–society.» Among those problems there are demographic problems, issues of health protection, education, international terrorism, etc.

Finally, the third group consists of problems that result from the interaction of society and nature. Problems of this character started to appear at the beginning of human history, but the gradual build-up of

industrial production all over the world had reached by the middle of the 20th century the point where extensive development of many industries became impossible because of the limited size of our planet and exhaustible mineral resources. As a result of these apparently quantitative changes, there appeared problems with a new quality that had not been global before. Among them: issues concerning energy, fuel, fresh water, raw materials, etc. In the same list there are various ecological problems, as well as those connected with the world's oceans and the exploration of outer space.

The division of all global problems into three major groups is important in the methodological sense as it gives the possibility of dividing all problems into «purely» social ones (first and second groups) and problems of interrelations between society and nature (third group). Thus, there is a prerequisite for detachment of purely ecological problems and for examination of their dependence on social and political factors. Because of the poor development of issues of the interaction between society and nature widely used terms (such as «ecology,» «global ecology,» «social ecology,» «human ecology,» «ecological problems,» etc.) are not precisely and clearly defined. Thus, a terminological tangle and a substitution of concepts often take place, which essentially complicates finding solutions for both theoretical and practical problems of environmental control and the rational use of nature. For example, such concepts as «ecological problems» and «problems of interaction between society and nature» are often used as synonyms, which is actually incorrect.

While working out the present classification, the following sources were used: Zagladin, V.V., Frolov, I.T. *Globalnie problemi sovremen-nosti*. Moscow, 1982; Inozemtsev, N.N., ed. *Globalnie problemi sovremennosti*. Moscow, 1981; Maksimova, M.M. *Globalnie problemi i mir mezhdunarodami*. Moscow, 1983; Bestuzhev-Lada, I.V. *Poiskovoe sotzialnoe prognozirovanie: perspektivnie problemi obshchestva*. Moscow, 1984; Utkin, A.I. *Globalizatsiya – protsess osmysleniya*. Moscow, 2001, etc.

The major global problems of the present

Group of global problems		Concrete problems		
«Intersocial» problems		– prevention of war and preservation of peace – overcoming of backwardness and ensuring of economic growth	–Ensuring and protecting major (inalienable) human rights – Problem of scientific and technological progress – Problem of international terrorism	Food problem
Problems of «individual – society» system		– problem of population – problem of education – problem of health protection –problem of person's adaptation in modern conditions –development of different cultures and their interrelations – ensuring of social stability and antisocial phenomena control		
Problems of society and nature interrelations	Problems of society and environment interrelations (ecological problems)	– environmental pollution –a) air protection –b) water conservation –c) soils conservation – fauna preservation – flora preservation – gene pool preservation		
	Problems of nature's development by society	– natural resources – energy problem		
	New global objects of nature	– exploration of outer space – exploration of world's oceans		

This classification allows for the selection of a special subgroup of problems resulting from relations between society and the environment in the third group of global problems («society-nature») (see **Table**). This subgroup unites ecological problems connected first of all with anthropogenic changes of the biosphere and environmental pollution (atmosphere, hydrosphere, lithosphere, etc.), with conservation of the gene pool, etc. At the same time a lot of problems ensuing from the interaction of society and nature when persons utilize natural wealth (energy, raw materials, outer space, the world's oceans, etc.), are independent and are not ecological problems. To underline the specificity of «new global objects of nature» and to pay attention to the originality of the solution to the problems arising in these spheres, this group subdivides into another, which includes exploration of the outer space and the world's oceans.

Classification of global problems, like any other classification, is inevitably conventional. For example, in the given scheme some of the specified problems cannot be univocally attributed to just one of the studied groups because of numerous and different reasons that are at the base of their origin and acuteness. In particular, international food problems cannot be reduced to only the production of food supplies (which is just a technical and economic aspect of the problem), but also include a process of distribution and consumption that has sociopolitical aspects involving both international and national levels. Analysis carried out by FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations) shows that basically there is enough food in the world for everyone, but it is irregularly distributed. Thus, the urgency of the food problem on a global scale depends on concrete conditions and will take the form of: a) a problem of the interaction between society and nature, if talking about production of food supplies; or b) an «intersocial» problem, if talking about interstate distribution of food by means of trade, assistance, etc.; or c) a problem of the system «individual–society,» if connected to distribution, re-distribution, and consumption of food by separate states. Noted features of the food problem allow arranging it along a «vertical column», i.e., it is an integral part of all three major groups (see Table). The same can be said about some other problems connected to scientific and technical progress or ensuring and protecting

the inalienable rights of persons, which can also be attributed not just to a «individual-society» system (where they are revealed), but also to a group of «intersocial problems,» because they emerge as not only constituents but also the most important part of international relations.

Another difficult issue in classifying global problems is that these problems are mobile and dynamic, so that the greatest difficulty is to create a hierarchy of these problems, to determine a priority scale that is dependent on the urgency of finding solutions. Each country, different regions, and the world itself have their own number of problems that require an urgent solution; that is explained by the socioeconomic reasons and natural conditions (geographical location, supplies of various resources, etc.) Therefore, the setting of a priority scale in each separate case is defined by concrete conditions, practical needs, or the primary purposes and objectives of studies. For example, national, local, or private levels may require the urgent solution of ecological problems, which can be made under certain conditions. At the same time positive results can be achieved without taking into account the dependence of ecological problems on problems of the first and the third groups. However, overcoming and, first of all, finding a theoretical solution of these contradictions necessarily requires an account of the complex hierarchy not only within one group but within the whole system of groups. None of the sciences can carry out such a task separately. This solution can only be the result of an interdisciplinary approach. See also *Global Problems of Modernity; Global Problems of the Modern World; Globalization*.

References: Zagladin, V.V., Frolov, IT. *Globalnie problemi sovremenosti*. Moscow, 1982; *Globalnie ekologicheskie problemi na poroge 21 veka*. Moscow, 1998; Chumakov, A.N. *Filosofiya globalnikh problem*. Moscow, 1994; Albrow, M. *The Global Age*. Cambridge, 1996; Honey, M. and T. Barry. *Global Focus. U.S. Foreign Policy at the 'turn of the Millennium*. New York, 2000.

\* \* \*

**GLOBAL CONSCIOUSNESS** – world comprehension and world outlook, in accordance with which interests and values common to all humankind are put forward while evaluating the principal, most

significant events; ability to think in categories of planetary scale, to realize personal participation in global matters and processes. Overcoming global problems is an extremely complex and long-term process. It lacks definite answers and ready-made solutions concerning the ways of achieving the desired results. At the same time many researchers bind together overcoming global crises and establishing and strengthening of a new ethics in mass consciousness, along with development of culture and its humanization. There are weighty reasons for that, because people's life position, their way of thinking, in many respects predetermines the mode of their actions, actual acts, and finally the result they try to achieve. At the same time it is obvious that changing the world outlook that has existed for centuries, eliminating obsolete thinking stereotypes, and asserting new humanistic principles in people's consciousness will not guarantee the solution of the problems of humankind. It is a necessary step, but at the same time the first step on the way to their solution, and it is connected with establishment of a new outlook, which will correspond to constantly changing situations and adequately picture modern realities. Fundamental to such an updated outlook should be a new humanism that will reflect new contents and new features of social relations, unknown to past epochs, as they are stipulated by a sharp rise of the internationalization of social life, characteristic only for the last century. That is why the new humanism should be focused on development of global consciousness and include at the minimum three basic principles: a feeling of the global, intolerance to violence, and a love for justice, resulting from recognition of every person's basic rights.

Historical experience shows that different nations can come closer more easily as their interests coincide, and the more these interests are realized, the more visible is the integration that results. Such a basis helps to confidently overcome various difficulties, successfully develop trade, and strengthen economic, political, and cultural connections, impossible without mutual understanding and coordinated actions. The major difficulties that have to be overcome on the way are usually connected to conservatism in world outlook, customary way of thinking, and traditions. They tend to change, but this takes a long time, much work, and, as a rule, it happens because of pressure of external or

internal circumstances. Among the external reasons there are, for example, a worsening of the ecological crisis, consequences of the «population explosion,» risk of war, and other global problems, which not only essentially change the living conditions of people, but also affect their consciousness. Internal reasons are connected to interest, the subjective, personal basis of a person, well illustrated by the expression—"if geometrical axioms infringed on people's interests, they would be refuted.» This circumstance should necessarily be taken into account when explaining why ecological problems are still so difficult even with the existence of the necessary objective preconditions and appropriate and substantial theoretical foundations for their solution.

As well as separate individuals, every nation and every country has a specific interest in this or that state of international affairs, direction of interstate trade flows and distribution of capital. They invariably stand up for their benefits in issues of usage of natural resources, environment conservation, etc., and that directly affects their policy in general and on particular matters and makes it unlike the policy of other countries. Quite often internal interests prevail over more general reasons, and then such a policy is carried out to the detriment of other states. For example, the state of ecology, as a rule, affects the interests of nations whose territories are adjacent. However, in conditions of intensified internationalization of public life and increasing integration of economic connections, more and more people in different parts of the Earth start to understand objective interests of the world community as a whole, the basis of which is one common interest—to survive even though confronted with global problems, such as the threat of nuclear war, the ecological crisis, overpopulation, and shortage of resources. The objective necessity of coordinating actions, perceived as imminent conditions for preservation of life on Earth, becomes not only the grounds for the formation of global consciousness, but also the major stimulus for broadening it.

\* \* \*

**GLOBAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY** are a section of global studies that seeks to solve, from the point of view of philosophy, the worldview and the methodological, culturological, and other aspects of



globalization processes and the consequences they generate. The existence of this area is a result of the fact that modern science cannot do without certain worldviews and principles that reflect universal values when it comes to solving difficult complex problems. Philosophy, forming this outlook, influences the process of making economic, political, and other decisions. Without such a wide view of the research object, spreading beyond concrete disciplines and reflecting every modern achievement in other areas of knowledge, neither fundamental discoveries, nor the development of science are possible. For example, the wide view of the world (compared to the view that dominated for a long time in classical physics) once allowed A. Einstein to develop the general theory of relativity, which included classical (Newtonian) physics. Any scientific discipline may find itself in a situation similar to Newtonian physics if it tries to solve any problem of a global character from its own position. Modern global problems form a very complex system dealing with people, society, and nature in their numerous interrelations, and consequently frameworks of concrete sciences are too narrow to see such objects of research as a whole, as a uniform system, in the context of modern global tendencies and the contradictions generated by them. Philosophy contains potential opportunities for development of planetary consciousness, humanization of international relations, and solutions for worldviews and theoretic-cognitive and methodological problems in the field of global studies.

Within the framework of global studies in philosophy a number of basic problems is being solved:

- Forming the outlook, a certain view of the world and a person's place in it, global studies in philosophy set corresponding estimation tasks, which in many respects determine the direction of human activity; thus their worldview and estimating functions are implemented;
- The methodological function of philosophy and generalizing theories that it generates, turn out to be extremely necessary to modern science as they promote integration of scientific knowledge;
- Philosophy helps to explain social phenomena and processes in their historical context; it formulates the most general laws

of the development of society and nature and consequently in the course of studying of global processes it aims at understanding them as a natural phenomenon integrally connected to social progress. The phenomenon of globalization and its consequences are thus considered not as an accident or demonstration of blind fate dooming humankind to destruction in advance, but as a result of an objective process of the conflicting development of the history of humankind;

- From the point of view of philosophy it is possible to see the general tendency and dynamics of the development of world processes, and also the correlation and interaction of the problems generated by them;
- Philosophy also carries out a culturological function as it enables us to develop a culture of theoretical thinking. Another aspect of this function is that studying the history of philosophy of various nations allows us to get acquainted with their customs, traditions, and culture, and none of the problems that this or that nation faces can be solved without this knowledge;
- The result of the whole vision of the natural-historical process and a complex approach to its interpretation is the opportunity for a more precise orientation in promptly increasing the flow of scientific information on global problems;
- Philosophy deals with issues of human life, death, and immortality, and that becomes of special value and urgency when confronting the threats posed by global problems.

Finally, the important methodological function of philosophy is the development of such categories as global studies, global problems, nature, society, civilization, social progress, scientific and technical revolution, globalization, globalism, etc., which are directly connected to the actual modern problems of humankind and are very important for comprehending the objective tendencies of the world development.

# APPENDIX

---

Alexander N. Chumakov

## GLOBALIZATION OUTLINE OF THE HOLISTIC WORLD

Moscow, Prospect, 2005 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2009): 432 pp.

### CONTENTS

Preface

Introduction

#### METHODOLOGICAL COMMENTARIES

1. Why specify what seems self-evident
2. When awakening comes

#### **Part I. Global transformations in the modern world**

1. Individual in the realm of problems
2. Global problems as reality
3. The emergence of global studies
4. The first global revolution
5. Paradigm shift
6. The phenomenon of globalization
7. From global problems to globalization
8. Resurrection of global studies

#### **Part II. Stages of progress: dynamics of scientific and technological development**

1. Science and technology as the engines of progress
2. Technological progress

3. Scientific progress
4. Scientific and technological progress
5. Scientific and technological revolution
6. Informational revolution
7. Social dimension of scientific and technological progress

### **Part III. Globalization as an objective historical process**

1. The holistic world
2. The main turning points of history
3. Prehistoric society
4. History begins
5. The first symptoms of globalization
6. Globalization begins
7. Fundamental globalization
8. Space era begins
9. Multiaspect globalization

### **Part IV. Conceptual approaches to history**

1. History as reconstruction of the past directed to the future
2. Formations approach
3. Cultural and historical types
4. Cultures approach
5. Civilizations approach
6. Noosphere
7. Sustainable development
8. Futurology

### **Part V. Understanding globalization: basic stages**

1. From reality to its understanding
2. Understanding universal linkages (*first stage*)
3. Understanding the holism of the world (*second stage*)
4. Discovering global problems (*third stage*)
5. Recognizing globalization (*forth stage*)
6. Post-globalization (*fifth, hypothetical stage*)

Instead of the Conclusion  
Appendixes  
Index  
Summary  
Contents

## SUMMARY

The volume is dedicated to one of the most topical issues today – to the issue of globalization. Academic discussions around this topic are numerous and the number of globalization-related studies and publications steadily grows. Although practical experience and theoretical material is vast, nevertheless, they can hardly be considered satisfactory. For the last decades the significance of globalization and global problems engendered by it has grown while adequate coordinated response of the world community still lacks.

This volume analyzes the phenomenon of globalization in tight connection with such fundamental social phenomena as «*scientific and technological progress*», «*culture*» and «*civilization*». The book claims that *civilizational interconnections emerged and developed as a result of the emergence and refinement of culture that arose with the upraise of the first human beings at some stage of history – more precisely, in the period of the Neolithic revolution. These interconnections gave birth to separated civilizational centers. From the very beginning civilizational development contributed into unification of social life to lead in the middle of the second millennium (in the era of Renaissance and the great geographic discoveries) to the beginning of practical globalization. In the last century it grew into multiaspect globalization that determined the formation of the world community and the emergence of global problems of humankind in the last half of the XX century.*

In the Introduction it is stressed that tight connections between mutually dependent and complimentary concepts of culture, civilization and globalization (and, most important, between the phenomena behind them) have not been understood and thoroughly analyzed so far. Numerous publications contain many diverse facts about globalization, attempting to figure out trends and repeating patterns but they fail to go

farther than simple description of what is going on in the world. There is neither theory of globalization, nor clear and concise analysis of its multiple and interconnected aspects. The volume raises these questions and attempts to answer them through comprehensive study of the objective foundations of globalization as well as of those natural and historical conditions under which this multiaspect and large-scale phenomena emerged and was developing.

The book is prefaced by methodological commentaries where the author stresses the need to define more precisely the basic concepts related to globalization. He emphasizes several principles explaining why our understanding of globalization falls behind with regard to the real world developments and why our interest to globalization emerges and fades away periodically.

Part One, Global Transformations in The Modern World, demonstrates that human beings are determined to face problems. These problems become more complex and acute while humankind is becoming global. It is stressed that the Earth is the best of all possible worlds for humans to live in. It is the real paradise often turned into hell by human beings themselves. This part of the book shows how global studies emerged and were developing as a transdisciplinary sphere of scientific knowledge located at the crossroads of philosophical, natural, technological and social sciences. Global studies are also seen as a set of practical activities (governmental decisions, political actions, social movements, etc.) directed towards resolving universal contradictions.

Part Two, Stages of Progress: Dynamics of Scientific and Technological Development, analyzes the emergence and development of science and technology and explains their role in the process of globalization. Basing on rich historical material, the volume describes various stages of scientific and technological progress and reveals the essence of scientific and informational revolutions and their influence on the formation of holistic world.

Part Three, Globalization as an Objective Historical Process, analysis the world as a holistic world. History is understood as an interconnected time-bound process divided into subsequent stages. Interchange of these stages signifies, according to the author, the four turning points of history. The first stage is prehistoric period. The second,

connected with the Neolithic revolution, means that history begins. The third stage defined by Karl Jaspers as «pivotal time» is characterized by the first signs of globalization. The fourth stage is identified with the era of the great geographic discoveries when practical globalization begins. Already by the beginning of the XX century it has become fundamental; with the beginning of space explorations and informational revolution it becomes multiaspect. Globalization is seen as a process of universalization, of the development of structures, ties and relations common for the whole planet in various spheres of social life. Globalization is also seen as a fact of reality, a phenomenon manifesting itself through the existence of the limited global space, single world economy, universal ecological interconnectedness, global communications, etc. This phenomenon, thus, can not be ignored by anyone. The volume shows how globalization embraces the whole Earth and its three basic spheres: geological, biological and social untied by a common name triosphere.

Part Four, Conceptual Approaches to History, analyzes various approaches to social development. Such concepts as socio-economic formations, culture, civilization, noosphere, sustainable development and futurology are critically studied in order to evaluate their applicability to describing the process of globalization.

Part Five, Understanding Globalization: Basic Stages concludes the volume and demonstrates that understanding globalization is a complex task having five stages. First stage meant understanding universal connections and lasted from the end of the XVIII century to the beginning of the XX century. Second stage meant understanding of the holism of the world and lasted from the 1920s to the 1960s. Third stage in the 1970s – 1980s meant discovering global problems of modernity. At the moment we witness recognizing globalization and this fourth stage will last about 10 years more. In the future one could suggest the beginning of the fifth stage provisionally called postglobalization.

The Conclusion sums up the volume stressing that our understanding of globalization is hampered by the fact that this phenomenon is not common for our normal perception. It has no historical analogies and its scale and complexity overgrows ordinary human vision of the world. Globalization is the largest and the most significant planetary

phenomenon, which can only be understood at some special and temporal distance. Time is needed for collecting and analyzing information, special distance is needed for details and particulars not to hide the main elements and outlines of the whole. To evaluate globalization correctly and non-partially we should recreate the holistic world outlook and to look at this complex phenomenon from various sides. This would allow to work out a general theory of globalization. Now the time have come to do it. Spatial distance needed is provided by space explorations, above all. This allows to consider globalization both as a natural and historical process and as the sphere of relations and confrontations between various forces and interests.



**Alexander N. Chumakov**

**Metaphysics of globalization:  
Cultural-cum-civilizational Context**

Moscow: «CANON +», 2006. – 516 pp.

**CONTENTS**

Author's Preface

Introduction

Methodological preamble

1. On specifying terms
2. On methods and principles of research

**Chapter I. Historical process categorized as «culture», «civilization» and «globalization»**

1. Social development as a subject matter of a theoretical study
2. The holism of historical process: philosophical aspect
3. Systemic approach to understanding social processes
4. Global evolutionism
5. Unity and interdependence of «culture», «civilization» and «globalization»
6. Synthetic vision of history

**Chapter II. Culture as a phenomenon and method of describing social reality**

1. Culture as a general characteristics of society
2. Etymology of the term «culture»
3. The idea of culture: in search of meaning
4. The universal and unique features of culture
5. The basic functions of culture
6. Statics and dynamics of the cultural complex

7. Bearers and fundamental components of culture
8. The nature of cultural diversity
9. Spiritual and material aspects of culture
10. Mass and elite cultures as products of globalization
11. Dialog and conflict of cultures in the global world
12. Globalization of culture
13. The phenomenon of universal culture
14. Value and ethical components of the global world
15. Historical process in the context of culture
16. Culture as a method of reflecting and understanding social reality

### **Chapter III. Civilization as a phenomenon and method of describing social ties**

1. Civilization as a general characteristics of society
2. Etymology of the term
3. Meaning and evolution of the term «civilization»
4. Civilizations systematized
5. Civilization as a form or external frame of culture
6. Civilizational unity of countries and peoples of the world
7. Historical types of civilizational development
8. Local and regional civilizations
9. From local and regional civilizations to the global one
10. The emergence of the global civilization
11. The global civilization as reality
12. Historical process in the context of civilizational development

### **Chapter IV. Cultural-cum-civilizational systems**

1. Culture and civilization in their unity and diversity
2. Genesis of cultural-cum-civilizational ties
3. Cultural-cum-civilizational systems
4. Ecumenes as regional manifestation of the unity of culture and civilization

5. Cultural-cum-civilizational conglomerates
6. Historical types of cultural-cum-civilizational systems
7. Universal unity of the world community
8. Cultural-cum-civilizational dimension of the modern world

## **Chapter V. Globalization of cultural-cum-civilizational systems**

1. Globalization as the third dimension of the world sociosystem
2. Dynamics of globalization
3. Fundamental principles of natural sciences applied to society
4. The formation of a new reality.
5. Cultural-cum-civilizational systems in the context of globalization
6. Metasystem «culture – civilization – globalization».
7. On the way to a global society (instead of the Conclusion)

Sources

Index

Summary

Contents

## **SUMMARY**

The monograph is an important part of the general globalization theory that continues a fundamental study initiated by the author in his book «Globalization: the contour of the holistic world»<sup>1</sup>.

While in the first book globalization is represented as a self-sufficient and objective historical process, progressing in accordance with its own patterns and the logic of local, regional and global social changes, now it appears to be one of the most important characteristics of the world sociosystem allowing to understand this system in its *dynamics* taking into consideration transformation of its inner contents (*culture*) and changes of its forms (*civilization*).

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander N. Chumakov. Globalization: outline of the holistic world – Moscow: Prospect, 2005. – 432 p.

*Culture, civilization and globalization* analyzed as tightly connected and fundamental characteristics of various social systems and world community as a whole are in the center of the study.

The book, written in exciting and understandable manner clearly demonstrates how thanks to objective reasons global problems of modernity have penetrated economic, political and spiritual life of various nations and how their cultural-cum-civilizational development has become part of the spiraling multiaspect globalization.

Step by step the reader may see the logic and certain consequence of historic events when civilizational ties that engender separated focuses of *civilization* emerge and enhance as a result of progressive development and perfection of *culture*. Finally, civilizational development had led to *globalization* that, in its turn, gave birth to the *global problems of modernity* in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Using systemic approach to understanding social processes and leaning upon the newest scientific and philosophical achievements in this sphere, the author concludes that a linear and plane world in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been finally replaced with a multi-dimensional world.

The world understood this way is represented as a complex fractal, consisting of separated cultural-cum-civilizational systems where relations between culture and civilization are defined by such principles as subsidiarity and uncertainty. From this viewpoint culture and civilization are thought to be an inseparable unity when something related to culture can be at the same time analyzed as related to civilization, and vice versa. At the same time, attempts to define culture more precisely make the definition of civilization less clear; clearer definition of civilization makes the definition of civilization less precise.

The approach to understanding cultural-cum-civilizational systems suggested in the book allows to study separated societies and humanity as a whole not only in one or two dimensions, as within contemporary cultural or civilizational approach, but «multi-dimensionally» – in three planes at the same time: from the viewpoint of culture, civilization and globalization.

The author demonstrates that the tightest connection of mutually defining terms «culture», «civilization» and «globalization» (and, what is more important, of those phenomena that exist behind them) is still

not enough recognized and researched. In this volume the issues in question are focused on while interdependence and mutual support of culture, civilization and globalization are being formulated as a research problem to be resolved.

The author stresses that not only at the level of everyday thinking, but among professionals more and more people regret that globalization has destructive impact on culture, ruins its traditional forms, «levels», «depersonalizes» or even «wipes out» its originality and specific features.

At the same time, «civilization» understood mostly as «Western», «technogenic» civilization is often proclaimed to be the one to blame for globalization and it-engendered problems. It is blamed for excessive dynamism and aggression, soulless mechanism and expansionist aspirations, environmental degradation and, last but not least, unification of values and destruction of «human nature». In the other words, civilization is thought to have destructive and demonic nature and to be the engine of destructive forces of globalization. Culture, in its turn, is seen as something passive, a phenomenon, threatened by globalization and forcefully changed by it through destruction of cultural basics.

Culture, civilization and globalization are usually analyzed as separated, self-sufficient phenomena, being mostly in a situation of serious contradiction and confrontation, which need to be removed through building obstacles in the way of «soulless technogenic civilization» and fighting globalization mercilessly.

The volume emphasizes that such, according to the author's opinion, mistaken positions ground many popular and non-constructive neo-Russoist claims, such as «to protect nature», «to preserve culture», «to change the type of civilizational development», «to restrain globalization», «to resolve global problems finally», etc. This philosophical platform becomes the basis for isolationism and non-cosmopolitanism, for straight-out struggle to protect «national interests», for mass protest movements, such as «antiglobalists», «alterglobalists» and so on.

The author suggests that one of the reasons for this is the fact that absolute majority of people consider modern world to be linear and plain. But by the end of the last century it has finally become non-linear

and multi-dimensional. Nevertheless, we try to understand, to explain, to describe this new, changed world using customary but old-fashioned terms and ideas.

The author specially stresses that the volume is not a special study in cultural or civilizational history. It does not aim at building a new system of periodization or a scheme of historical process in the context of globalization, as it may look like. Its central purpose is to combine in the framework of a single approach towards history and modernity three components or, in the other words, three dimensions: *culture, civilization and globalization*. These terms have emerged long ago and are actively used by social sciences but separately; they still are not taken as a whole in one context, inseparably, holistically, according to subsidiarity principle. The time for such approach has come because cultural-cum-civilizational approaches have nearly lost their heuristic value and are now in a vicious circle of finding new ways of being applied to understanding social processes.

The thought that people will sooner or later have to change their vision of the world if they want to cope with global problems they encounter is the leitmotif of the book. Our idea of the world should change in accordance with the changes of the world itself. For example, as a result of the «Copernican turn» our ideas regarding the position of our planet in outer space have changed. Now global studies face a necessity to have a new look at the apparently unshakable prepositions and to rethink some established concepts typical for both everyday and research language but being already backward and non-adequate to the rapidly changing modern world.

The book tackles many philosophical, humanitarian, historic problems and will be useful for researchers and specialists, providing valuable and topical information for teachers and students. It will also attract attention of the general reader interested in world problems of modernity and the future of globalization.

## BOOK REVIEW<sup>1</sup>

A.N. Chumakov. *Metafizika globalizatsii. Kul'turno-tsivizionnyy kontekst* [Metaphysics of Globalization. Cultural-Civilizational Context]. Moscow; «Kanon,» 2006. 516 pp.

A doctor of philosophical sciences and professor of Moscow State Academy of Law, vice-president of Russian philosophical society and editor-in-chief of its *Bulletin*, Aleksandr Nikolaevich Chumakov is the author of more than two hundred scholarly publications. He is the editor-in-chief of the international *Encyclopedia of Global Studies* as well as an interdisciplinary encyclopedic dictionary *Globaiistika*.

In *Metaphysics of Globalization*, Chumakov completes the second volume in a tetralogy of works devoted to this subject. The first monograph in the series was titled *Globalizatsiia. Kontury tselostnogo mira* [Globalization: Contours of the Integral World] and was published in Moscow in 2005. The first volume provided a general description of the main phases of the historical process of globalization. Chumakov argues here that globalization represents an objective historical phenomenon that unfolds progressively since the time of great geographic discoveries and has gathered momentum between the end of the nineteenth and the middle of the twentieth centuries. The 1960s saw the rise of the so called global problems facing humanity, while the 1990s brought about systemic attempts at understanding the phenomenon of globalization along with its dangers, prospects and hopes.

Chumakov's second monograph lays the theoretical foundation of his own approach to this phenomenon. The upcoming third and fourth volumes will discuss today's world in its political, social, economic and cultural dimensions from the global perspective as well as the place and role for Russia in the rising global society.

*Metaphysics of Globalization* is a significant work not only because of its theoretical ambitions, but also as one of the landmarks in the post-Soviet developments in Russian thought. The collapse of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Symposion: A Journal of Russian Thought, 13 (2008), 75–77.

Soviet Union drastically changed the philosophical landscape in Russia. The state-imposed Marxism-Leninism came to an abrupt end and Russia has embarked upon a rediscovery of its pre-revolutionary and emigre intellectual heritage as well as a search for a new philosophical identity. Several trends have crystallized as a result of these efforts in the following ten to fifteen years.

First, materialist philosophy, although significantly discredited, has survived in the post-Soviet cultural space – not as a dominant intellectual movement, but as one of the philosophical currents, often marginalized and suppressed by the new pro-Western approaches. Second, postmodernism – the most fashionable brand of thought in the West in the last two decades of the twentieth century – has set down roots in Russia. The most vivid and characteristic representative of the Russian version of postmodernism is, per-taps, Mikhail Epstein, a Russian-American scholar who has written numerous books on the subject.<sup>2</sup>

Third, the revival of Orthodox Christianity has helped to fill the spiritual void Russians suffered during the years of Soviet oppression as well as the collapse of communist dreams in the late Soviet period. In the 1970s and the 1980s the Russian Orthodox Church experienced a powerful resurgence, and in the decade immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union it became the leading religious and ideological force in post-Soviet Russia. Russian Orthodox consciousness did not become unified, however. It gave rise to various competing ideological camps, including a pro-western, pro-democratic Orthodox thought among whose representatives today is, for instance, Fr. Veniamin (Novik).<sup>3</sup>

Professor Chumakov's book *Metaphysic of Globalization* manifests the fourth philosophical trend that has crystallized in post-Soviet Russia. It substantially differs from the other options. Globalism represents a secular stream of thought that aims to formulate a worldview

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Mikhail Epstein, *After the Future: The Paradoxes of Postmodernism and Contemporary Russian Culture* (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, his book *Pravoslaviye, khristianstvo, demokratiya* [Orthodoxy, Christianity, Democracy] (St.Petersburg: «Aleteia», 1999). For a detailed discussion of 'liberal' Orthodoxy in modern Russia, see also my article «Liberal Orthodoxy: From Vladimir Solov'ev to Fr. Alexander Men», *Religion in Eastern Europe*, 23, no. 4 (2003), 43–50.



transcending the division between Russia and the West by providing a new philosophical basis for their integration and ultimate unity. It also breaks away from class-oriented Marxism while retaining some ideological ties with the globalism that characterized classical Marxism.

In his version of globalist philosophy, Chumakov replaces the basic Marxist concept of the «socio-economic formation» with the alternative notion of «cultural-civilizational system.» Chumakov traces the genesis of this term to early twentieth-century western thought, which opposed historical determinism and used the concepts of «culture» and «civilization» as two foundational ideas in the field of humanities (p. 247). In Chumakov's analysis, «in relation to civilization, culture occupies a primary position {prioritetnoe polozhenie} while «civilization [represents] a formal expression {forma kul'tury}, and an external frame of culture» (pp. 320–21). Chumakov argues for the essential unity of culture and civilization where «culture represents a particular code of social organism in which all the main distinctive features of its civilizational development are fixed and transmitted from generation to generation by way of cultural heritage» (p. 434).

Chumakov also distinguishes between «two main types of cultural civilizational systems, oikumene and conglomerates.» (p. 413) He describes eighteen *oikumene*, which he defines as supra-regional communities based on the territorial unity, including the North American, West European, East European, Russian, Indian, Chinese, and others. He also discusses seven «conglomerates» or «systems» based on the commonality of religion (Buddhist, Christian or Muslim), ideology (capitalist or socialist), or language (English or Spanish).

The key to Chumakov's analysis of the unity of culture and civilization lies, however, in his recognition of its global origin and character. «One has to dispel the myth of the multiplicity of civilizations» he writes, «since it is 'blocking' the understanding of history as a unifying, integrative process which indeed it is if one thinks on the level of all humankind, (p. 328). In the concluding chapter, he presents the results of his comparative study of culture and civilization in their relation to globalism – the «three main concepts which characterize the world community as an integral system» (p. 464). His summarizing charts reflect the vast and comprehensive scholarly work accomplished by the

author, but also the preliminary character of that labor waiting to be further applied to contemporary global politics, economics and culture.

The next two volumes will show the practical implications of Chumakov's project, but his monograph is already revealing an important trend in the evolution of Russian thought in the post-Soviet times – an effort to find new ways to understand the role of Russia in the forming global community that are not secular Marxist, nor traditional national-Orthodox, nor explicitly liberal and pro-Western.

*Yuri Mikhailov*