

УДК 316.32

## Globalization as an Object of Study (Historical Aspect)

Michel P. Jacenko\* and Ivan A. Pfanenshtil\*

Siberian Federal University,  
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia <sup>1</sup>

Received 14.08.2009, received in revised form 21.08.2009, accepted 28.08.2009

*Modern condition of historical gnoseology is the result of a complex process of differentiation, which has been going and is going now, differentiation of historical cognition and the birth of historical science. There can be singled out two directions in philosophy of history: one of them generates knowledge, addressed to historical reality, the other is the knowledge, revealing logical structure and methodological bases of historical cognition itself.*

*Historical gnoseology involves all the forms of cognition, all the axiological structures, which are present in common knowledge, in artistic, philosophical, political and scientific cognition. Problems appear, when we start constructing historical knowledge classifications, synthesizing empirical (or descriptive-historiographical) and theoretical levels (philosophy of history, theoretical history, sociology) of investigative activity, as far as here, the historian must possess qualities of philosopher to the full extent, be able to investigate, if not to solve a complicated knot of axiological and ontological problems.*

*History plays a principal role in reproduction of «the collective memory», in the possibility to connect the interests of personality formation and a whole row of basic historical categories (ethnos, world society, and civilization) in history making, what acquires a special meaning in the conditions of globalization.*

*Keywords: historical cognition; historical gnoseology; cognitive structure; dynamics of historical cognition; differentiation of historical cognition; historical bases of globalization.*

### Point

The approach, according to which development of humanity is characterized by principal integrity, is rather well-spread in science. This approach has been expressed in the evolutionistic paradigm. We may refer the formational theory to one of its variants with an element of conventionality. Classical conception of modernization is also based on the evolutionistic approach version, which is not sensitive enough to the variable changing of history. That is why the statement of E. Morena sounds rather topical:

«The matter is not in the fact that we are to refuse from cognation of parts in favour of cognation of integrities or to refuse from analysis in favour of synthesis; we need to combine both of them. This is the challenge to complexity, which we are inevitably to face in the period of our planetary era». Understanding of the depth of global problems provokes in the society a challenge to uncertainty, which is first of all revealed in the loss of future: «In XX century, people found out that they had lost their future, as far as they had proved, that their future was unpredictable...

\* Corresponding author E-mail address: ymp1957@rambler.ru

<sup>1</sup> © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

The future still stays open and unpredictable». Moreover, people have perceived that «history does not at all present by itself a linear evolution ... history is a complicated knot of order, disorder and organization» [1, p. 16-19].

### Example

«Historicity» of knowledge is measured by the time of events and can be understood as its other dynamics, being different from the linear one. Thus, «the picture of history» is defined by the existential condition of conscious (epoch mentality, spirit of time and so on. Cognitive intentions of conscious are also included in the fabric of history. Thereat, social reality conditions become historical to the extent to which the situation contains the act of appearing of something new. Being used in the historical cognition, notions are more often not so strict in their logical sense. The historian more often deals with concepts instead of notions. For example, the notion of «history» itself is transformed into a concept. We may also refer to such concepts as «community», «revolution», and «farmer» and so on. They differ from their notions by their flexibility, poly-semanticity, and poly-functionality and in this form they are not so strict in the logical scale.

Problems appear, when we start constructing historical knowledge classifications, synthesizing empirical (or descriptive-historiographical) and theoretical levels (philosophy of history, theoretical history, sociology) of investigative activity, as far as here, the historian must possess qualities of philosopher to the full extent, be able to investigate, if not to solve a complicated knot of axiological and ontological problems. And as far as «the combination of qualities of a historian and a philosopher in one person is quite a rear case» [2, p. 331], moreover, these qualities in classic rationality have been referred to different types of activity – factual knowledge and theoretical

knowledge – so, they are sooner turn out to be differentiated in different disciplines (proper historical disciplines and theoretical disciplines: methodology and philosophy of history), than in synthesized ones. That is why classical rationality cannot manage the dilemma of historical cognition, when it is impossible to admit without significant concessions the scientific character of descriptive historiographical works, where there are no «general compact thinking constructions (actually, theories and conceptions), able to serve for integral conceptualizations, understanding and explanation of piles of various data and facts, growing as a snow ball, there are no any «objective laws of society's historical development» [3, p. 138] and there is not any corresponding categorial-notional apparatus. Though, a vivid image of the past is revealed in the emotional experience; and human understanding of the past senses appears already in the present.

Nevertheless and unfortunately, the attention of historians is not so concentrated on revelation of new possibilities of historical cognition and creative activity conditions, which are forming the history, as on «negative consequences», erasing the border between history and literature, between objective truth (facts being proved by the references to a source) and subjective fiction (free interpretations of the facts, being not substantiated by any sources). Here, the matter is not only in the unwillingness of historians to refuse from the accustomed understanding of their «crafts», but also in their anxiety to lose their professional sovereignty, to lose the power of the historian-ideologist. Nevertheless, a new expanded interpretation of knowledge historicity vice a versa allows raising the status of historical cognition (and scientific cognition on the whole), though it presupposes modernization of the profession of a historian.

On the basis of the mentioned, we formulate theses, which are beyond the limits of classical

notions of historical knowledge and methods of its explication in other classifications: the theses about the uniqueness of historical knowledge, which is typical for various epochs upon «peculiar circumstances» and with «individual sense» (Hegel); about the non-linear dynamics of historical knowledge; about the dynamics of social reality, defined by the present time; about people, included in to the situation as agents, forming social reality; about history, self-creating through generation of senses in the present unique situations; about the possibility to act freely in a certain social situation, creating a condition-content of generation of other ideas; about organization of historical knowledge as an open system.

Precisely, this is the moment, when historical knowledge becomes the means of search of possible variants of social processes' further development, and the instrument of this search is thinking in its operation-procedural form. In this case, historical knowledge is organized in projects and forecasts in accordance with possible alternatives of situation development on the basis of chosen priorities.

It is especially important, because future global changes will be so deep and so large, that none of the countries and none of the peoples on the Earth are ready and able to admit them. Some branches of industry appear, others – disappear. The most modern technologies will become useless and will be changed by new ones, yet unknown; prospering territories of today will devastate tomorrow, other lands will suffer from over-population; today's moral virtues will become an object of mockery, and yesterday's sins – a condition of success. That is why today the whole world is speaking about the necessity «to open oneself anew», «to invent oneself again» or at least «to understand oneself in the new world» [4, p. 28].

For example, in her search of an integral point of view of the world, L.Starodubceva

considers three main means of the world cognition – theological, philosophical and scientific. At present time, as it seems to her, development and differentiation of these three spheres of knowledge have reached catastrophic proportions: «... using today the notions of «theology», «philosophy» and «science», we may not forget even for a moment that behind each of them there is a boundless spectrum of schools and trends, which are quite far from each other, but sometimes they fancifully intercrosses» [5, p. 193-194].

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to consider that integrity of humanity can be reduced to the leading constants of human existence and considered as a changeless condition, being out of history. In various epochs, humanity possessed its integrity, which differed by its quantity and quality in the content volume and revelation form. For a long time, spatial-territorial disintegration, displacement and dispersal of tribal-generic communities over the surface of the earth prevailed in the human history. This tendency was only partially controlled by direct communication of separated collectives. Transition from the appropriating economy to the producing one («Neolithic revolution» according to G. Child), from the nomadic to the domiciled way of life, vivification and growth of towns, expansion of constantly functioning communications, territories of towns and later of empires with the world supremacy messianic ideology on the basis of the idea of monotheism – all these brought to a turning point in the course of the world history, to the oncoming of «the axial time» (according to K. Jaspers). The process of divergence, detaching specialization of ethno-cultural and ethno-political communities, has been gradually changed by convergence, which makes the communities closer to each other by means of universalization of methods of their reproduction, what goes most actively in the

spiritual sphere as far as world religions are propagated. Objective domination of convergence over divergence has been fixed in the epoch of industrial civilization and capitalistic social stratum becoming. And if on the stage of stratum formation the tendency to national separation, to formation of national-regional economy, markets and states is temporarily increased, then on the ephelic stage of its development the following tendencies finally dominate: the tendency of the world economy formation (international labour specialization and cooperation), of the world market (international circulation of capital and goods) and of the states-empires of a new type, their coalitions, which share the territory of geosphere economically, politically, and ideologically among themselves.

Evolutionary paradigm is opposed by multi-linear theories, which followers underline the variableness of models and stages of development. The given approach has been vividly revealed in the theory of local civilizations, which pays special attention to the peculiarities of separate civilizations' or cultures' dynamics. In the basis of the second approach, there lies the idea of plurality of civilizational laws. Thereat, the tendencies of humanity development disappear, though the idea of historical integrity is factually eliminated.

In its today's bourgeois-liberal variant, the conception of post-industrialism does not present any real alternative to the ecologically destructive industrialism, to the instrumentally using-people attitude to the world. Though, the main danger is in the following: as globalization is now spreading in the horizon of subjective interests meeting, it leads to changing and, in its tendency, even to elimination of national cultures, which up till now have been the basis of civilizational variety of the mankind [6, p. 233-238].

Though, at present time, the content, goals and tasks of the world education are more and

more falling behind of the global tendencies of the informational society's becoming. And firstly, it is expressed in the fact that educational services have got their concrete monetary value in the result of commercialization, and that has defined a pragmatic, utilitarian approach towards education. This approach is expressed in its «being taken down to earth», in its «fixation» on solving of practical tasks. But a person, living in the modern world, is appealed to solve rather complicated and diversified problems, which demand not only professional training, but qualitative fundamental and humanitarian education as well. In this context, history acquires an exceptional position. The status of history is raised sharply in connection with the fact that today the problem of education humanitarian crisis is especially acute in the whole world. The given crisis can be overcome by means of changing of the economical consumptive paradigm for a new, humanistic one, including the sphere of education as well. In the basis of the new humanistic paradigm, there lies a powerful humanitarian component, which is able to alter the person, his world outlook, his system of values, moral and ethic attitudes, his intellect and education.

In the conditions of globalization, historians face at least two problems, which concern structures and elements of historical action, they are: 1) the necessity to reconsider the problem of subject of historical action, forming the modern processes of development in the conditions of national state's model crisis; 2) estimation of the sovereign state conception viability in the conditions of globalization and informational technologies development, and also establishment of elites' activity connection with «the spirit of people», *esprit genera* [7, p. 147-168].

Modern condition of historical gnoseology is the result of a complex process of differentiation, which has been going and is going now, differentiation of historical cognition and the

birth of historical science. Here, we can single out two directions in philosophy of history: one of them generates knowledge, addressed to historical reality, the other – knowledge, revealing the logical structure and methodological bases of historical cognition itself.

Historical gnoseology embraces all the forms of cognition, all the axiological structures, which are present in common knowledge, in artistic, philosophical, political and scientific cognition. As far as «...logics of history is the first to reveal the deepest essence of the logical on the whole, it cannot be limited only by the sphere of history, but it must involve the whole world, consequently, the whole nature... but common logic of natural sciences can be only the logic, gliding along the surface of thinking, which is reduced to a meditated impression and its separating reflection, the logic, which does not take into account mutual intermediation of a flexible reality in its parts and on the whole. This kind of logic can be an abstract reflexion, which prescind everything singular from the authentic vital integrity, isolates it in reflexion and then units it outwardly into the known integrity» [8, p. 214].

Historical gnoseology has its own specifics, which is first of all connected with the informational field multi-layeredness, which concludes in itself the notion of «history». O. Shpann noticed: «History is a sensible hierarchy of periods, being in the condition of mutual correlation. These periods unfold various structural elements of the humanity, i.e. cultures, which develop various spiritual tendencies and possess different speed of unfolding and that is why they are on different stages of the unfolding process» [9, p. 359]. To the mind of L. P. Karsavin: «In its narrow and precise sense of the word, history presupposes and studies development there, where it is revealed most of all. And it does not reveal itself immediately in the material-

spatial being, but with a big difficulty and with a help of certain metaphysical positions, which are presented unconsciously and instinctively by philosophically uneducated natural scientists, and systematically and reasonably by philosophy» [10, p. 81]. As we can see, quite different thinkers notice that the historical past impact on the person and the society has various aspects, especially in the conditions of globalization. All these aspects acquire high significance in the conditions of globalization.

One more typical tendency of the modernity is in the following: the correlation between the social and mental history also changes in the world historical science. Poly-disciplinarian approach is becoming more and more popular. They undertake the attempts to achieve a new historical synthesis, which presupposes to refuse from the idea of the global determinism. Professional historians pay special attention to new theoretical approaches: civilizational, culturological and anthropological. Finally, all these lead to refusing from the unitary universal doctrine of historical process. In their turn, the specialists in the sphere of science theory and methodology remark that there can be singled out three levels of scientific knowledge, which differently influence on the cultural self-definition of any nation: paradigmatic, methodological, and concrete-scientific.

The mechanism of society's choice of this or that historical way variant inevitably includes in itself the procedure of social-historical experience analysis, not only and not so proper one (acquired by the whole society or by its significant social strata in the course of various historical collisions), but also translated by other social systems (borrowed, acquired by other people in the same way. The second type of influence is connected with the analysis and digestion of other peoples', states' and cultures' experience. The question of «external» experience efficiency, its limitations and usage still stays open.

The presence of other people's appropriately interpreted historical experience makes much easier for the elite, being responsible for the decision making, to render this decision to the masses. In this case, the necessity of theoretical substantiation of the chosen way is significantly reduced; sometimes, it is quite enough to give just references to the society's sound sense and some positive examples.

From the point of view of the leading native scientists, history is a fundamental process of mankind development, which criteria are: perfection of people's life quality, their way of life, development of personality, progress, which means the movement of people «to the well-being, conveniences, comfort, to steady and reliable life necessities, to material wealth, to cultural and spiritual development, to perfection of personality and to improvement of the life quality on the whole in all its material and spiritual revelations» [11, p. 2]. The usage of basic parameters data allows considering the history of nations and countries as organic components of the mankind global development. Thereat, the mentioned parameters are used as integration degree indicators of separate historical flows in the panhuman civilizational process. On this background, the notion of «panhuman values» causes much polemics.

### Resume

Some scientists consider, «the principle of panhuman values priority is not simply a wish of good or a phrase-mongering statement, but it is an axiological imperative, ... and the mankind will cease its existence without it» [12, p. 96,97]. Though, most of the Russian modern philosophers

doubt such a presentation of the problem, as far as it goes against history, first of all. «And what concerns the theory of panhuman values, which exaggerates the meaning of individualistic society's ideals and life standards, it is internally indefensible in the given exaggeration. Firstly, the valuable is something, always concerning the relation to the subject from the number of many subjects; consequently, the valuable excludes the panhuman. Secondly, axiological, using relation to the world content is one of the possible relations to it, and that is why, being traditional for the West, such relation actually turns out to be inappropriate in other regions of the world, particularly there, where there is traditionally a more far-seeing attitude to the internal and external world of people. Thirdly, axiological relation to the content of the world is veiled by the position of the world unapprehensiveness; it is a cynical contemptuous attitude to the objective laws of nature and society (in particular, to the laws of objective dialectics), to the laws of micro- and macrocosmos. Fourthly, axiological relation to the world content and pragmatism and egoism imposing to the whole world have brought in practice to expansion of the planet tragedy under the name of global problems of the modernity. And it has become obvious, that it is impossible to solve the mentioned global problems from the position of the world content axiological relation» [13, p. 264].

Thus, history plays a principal role in reproduction of «the collective memory», in the possibility to connect the interests of personality formation with a whole row of basic historical categories (ethnos, world society, civilization) in historical making, what acquires a special meaning in the conditions of globalization.

### References

1. E. Morena. *Cognition Principles of the Complex in the Science of XXI Century.// The Challenge to Cognition: Modern World Science Development Strategies /Executive editor: N.K.Udumjan. Moscow, 2004.*

2. M.A. Kisel. Philosophy of History // The Modern Western Philosophy. Moscow, 1991.
3. N.S. Rozov. Theoretical History – Its Place in the Social Cognition, Principals and Problematics / N.S. Rozov // The World of Piece. Almanac. Edition 1: Historical Macro-Sociology of XX Century / under the editorship of N.S. Rozov. Novosibirsk, 2000.
4. A.I. Jur'ev. Political Psychology of Terrorism / A.I. Jur'ev // The Philosophical Sciences. – 2005. – №10.
5. L. Starodubceva. The Opinion of Linnaeus, or the World through the Lenses of Speculations / L. Starodubceva // The Second Navigation: Almanac. – Zaporizhzhia: The Wild Field, 2006. – №6.
6. Ch.S. Kirvel', V.I. Strel'chenko. Globalization of Education and Social Strategies of the Modernity / Ch.S. Kirvel', V.I. Strel'chenko // The Dialogue of Generations and Cultures in the Context of Globalization: Materials of the International Conference «The Conflict of Generations in the Context of Informational Globalization». St. Petersburg, The Polytechnic University Publishing House, 2007.
7. S. I. Dudnik. History and Historical Conscious / S. I. Dudnik // I (A. Slinin) and We. – St. Petersburg: The St. Petersburg Philosophical Society, 2002. – Edition X.
8. Je. Trjol'ch. Historicism and its Problems / Je. Trjol'ch – Moscow: The Attorney, 1992.
9. O. Shpann. Philosophy of History. St. Petersburg: The St. Petersburg University Publishing House, 2005.
10. L. P. Karsavin. Philosophy of History / L. P. Karsavin. – St. Petersburg, 1993.
11. The History of Humanity: 8 volumes. Volume VIII. Russia / Executive Editor: corresponding member of RAS A. N. Saharov. – Moscow: «MAGISTR-PRESS» Publishing House, 2003.
12. L. N. Stolovich. About Panhuman Values / L. N. Stolovich // The Questions Of Philosophy. – 2004. – № 7.
13. N.M. Churinov. Perfection and Freedom. / N.M. Churinov. Krasnoyarsk, 2001.