

PHILOSOPHY AND GLOBALIZATION: FROM ANTHROPO-CENTRISM TO COSMO-CENTRISM

Alexey A. KOCHERGIN¹
Albert N. KOCHERGIN¹

ABSTRACT. *The article deals with the impact of globalization on the transformations in philosophy. The modern society demands such a philosophy that reflects the current existential needs and might articulate the pragmatic pathway of human survival and rescue of civilization in new conditions. In contrast with the postmodernist trends, here we defend the need to include the invaluable past experiences, recorded in traditional philosophical systems, values and life-affirming norms of the past.*

KEYWORDS: *philosophy; globalization; confrontation; unity; survival; civilization; value; history; world-outlook; dialogue; humanity.*

Contents

1. Philosophy as a dialogue of the civilization and time in the system of social transformation
2. Philosophy of survival as a reaction to the globalism of social transformation

The owl of Minerva spreads its wings only with the falling of the dusk.
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel

*Philosophy triumphs easily over past and future evils;
but present evils triumph over it.*
François de La Rochefoucauld

¹ Moscow Lomonosov State University, Moscow, RUSSIA.

1. Philosophy as a dialogue of the civilization and time in the system of social transformation

A dialogue allows working out both monologues.

Igor Karpov

It is impossible to understand a person at a glance, listening to him absently.

Sergey Fedin

If we proceed from the understanding of philosophy as “the era of self-consciousness,” “culture of the soul”, the identification of its present intention we should start with the identification of specific features of the modern era. The globalization is transforming nowadays the modern world into interconnected and interdependent system, which has no analogue in the history. First of all we ought to understand such a world before interfering in it. Therefore, the world outlook becomes the main function of philosophy in modern conditions. (Marx’s eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, applied to modern conditions should be formulated as: “Before you convert the world, you ought first of all to understand it”). Only the understanding of true meaning of the events may protect transformation projects from utopian illusions. The human activity has become truly of cosmic character. Therefore, there is a return to the ancient cosmo-centrism on a new basis. The modern era’s features determine human responsibility for the fate of civilization in a cosmic scale. As the world is organized by the integrity, people, transforming the world, should respect the principle of its organization [Aristotle, 2006].

The phenomenon of globalization generates specific contradictions of social development. These contradictions are caused, on the one hand, by the disparity between the great potential to improve material and cultural standard of living (thanks to new scientific and technological achievements), and on the other hand – by the prevailing of conventional, relatively conservative forms of self-civilization, in which the achievements in different spheres of social life are used unevenly and inefficiently. Previously the problem of self-governing was actual for governments of separate social formations or its local (regional) organizations, but now, for the first time in human history, it has become urgent for humanity as a whole. Humanity must develop appropriate means of self-management on a global scale, overcoming the most acute contradictions (which are tearing the modern world), and learning to subordinate private interests to planetary (and even common to the whole human species) ones. Only in this case the civilization gains the opportunity for its further existence and development. If humanity cannot do this (do not want, is not able, will not have time to do this), then its existence would be questionable (mankind has accumulated more than enough means of self-destruction). Hence it is clear that the phenomenon of globalization requires a transformation of civilization’s self-government system. This, in turn, requires a change in the traditional style of thinking, traditional ways of life support, the traditional value orientations that underlie the civilization, i.e., it is necessary to create a philosophy that meets the challenges of the modern world.

Globalization is a comprehensive, multi-faceted process of turning the world into an integrated system, which determines the future of civilization. This circumstance determines the complexity and contradictions of modern integration processes, as well as the ambiguity of evaluation of the globalization, of its role and impact. It is important to stress that the process of globalization as a new structural differentiation of the world is not only the interaction of civilizations, but especially impact some of them on others, which is carried out by means of economic, financial, military, and market mechanisms and technotronic means. Civilizational identity of any traditional classical society, which supports its (society) real unity and continuity of generations, is supported by cultural tradition. This cultural tradition stands nowadays in the way of such a kind of globalization. Postmodern concept insists essentially on the fact that the culture along with the history of the people, their experiences, the established structures of communication, values and meaning of life are to be removed as really “an archaic” and “vestiges of the past” and give way to a “world without walls”, where consumerism and money are the main measure of human values; and the spread of pluralism on morality makes in fact meaningless the concept of morality as it relates to the prohibition of certain types of acts. Focus on individual liberties, and not on the responsibility to the society, reinforces not only the individualism but also the selfishness that is inherent in all living things. This leads to increasing atomization of society, the collapse of public relations – a process which impedes globalization, understood as the equal integration of different countries, nations and cultures. The consequence of this is the emergence of even more unacceptable forms of globalization. It is quite obvious (and this fact is ignored by the part of society), that global problems cannot be solved from the position of individualism, private property and the owner's desire to maximize profits. The necessity to develop a program of “common affairs” (i.e. the survival of civilization) raises the question of the forms of property from the perspective of opportunities to solve global problems.

Therefore, the global nature of many of today's problems gives rise to the need for concepts that take into account the relationship and interdependence of reality. Concepts built on isolation and confrontation, do not allow to understand and describe the modern world to a degree sufficient for effective interaction with it. In conditions where humanity is close to the borders of its existence on a global scale, the traditional values, laid in the foundation of technogenic type of civilization (benefit and true), do not provide the latest survival.

Each era brought forth his philosophy. The modern philosophy, taking into account emerging threats that have arisen, must become, above all, the philosophy of survival. None of the traditional philosophical systems can not apply for this role, including the marxist one, which looked at the problem of transforming of the world in the context of the class struggle and the “class cannibalism”. The relatively slow development of the traditional world (in contrast to the modern one), the lack of global interconnectivity and interdependence impacted on the character of the philosophical systems of the past – they were closed and unchanged. The nature of philosophy undergoes inevitable changes in the interdependent and rapidly

developing world: philosophy relies to perform the function monitoring of accordance of the human activity, its final bases and the changing realities of life. Its mission is to seek values and to develop cultural grounds that provide the survival of civilization. The new philosophy is to make human as a genuine purpose, and all the forms of its activity – sensible and humane. To do this, philosophy must cover the entire culture and make possible to understand all its layers and shapes. This implies a shift from “barricade thinking” and “class cannibalism” to mutual tolerance. Human history is continuous, but the culture it engenders and promotes the generation of a new social reality, over time, transformed from one type to another. Human history is continuous, but the culture (which is generated by history and contributes to the generation of a new social reality) transforms over time from one type to another.

Does the current state of the philosophy meet adequately the challenges of reality? The answer is unequivocal: no it does not. Marx often repeated Hegel’s words: “The owl of Minerva flies at midnight”. This means that philosophy comes to the fore when the old forms of life collapse. Now we are dealing with a civilizational and even anthropological crisis. So, the modern world is at a critical point. But if we pay attention to the names of the publications in the field of philosophy, we will easily see that the vast majority of them is devoted to traditional intra-philosophic problems. The teaching of philosophy is also underway on traditional programs. There are mostly journalists, writers and poets, who write about the crisis phenomena in the society. Why do not the philosophers? Why are not we seeing the emergence of new philosophical systems, new major figures? We are after all talking about changing the value orientations of civilization, about its survival. The argumentation here is quite diverse. Basic kinds of its shape can be summarized as follows.

Previous experience, that is recorded in the values and orientations of traditional philosophical systems, does not allow solving modern problems, which are unparalleled in history. Therefore philosophy undergoes awareness of their insolvency, reduction in its authority. At present, the displacement of philosophy by science takes place and manifests itself in the penetration into philosophy (under the guise of philosophical knowledge) of purely scientific (and also pseudoscientific) positions. Many scientific disciplines (cybernetics, synergetics, general systems theory, information theory, etc.) acquire nowadays general methodological significance. This enabled Heidegger to conclude that philosophy is increasingly becoming an empirical science of all that internalized and proven by modern technology; also philosophy becomes a vanishing vestige of fantasy and myth. All this according to Heidegger marked the end of philosophy [Хайдеггер М., 1993].

Destruction of philosophy itself by dint of postmodernism with its principle of deconstruction, a focus on the process of disassembly, loss of historical memory does not allow to “grab” the integrity of the modern world (this integrity is perceived in the synthesis) and to reveal the essence of what is happening in the world today. Without all this, it is impossible to develop values appropriate to the world.

Extinction of philosophy’s “passionarity”, its creative impulses, which leads to its degeneration into the history of philosophy (in which traditional patterns are reproduced with some new interpretations) does not allow to make a breakthrough of

the existing horizon of values and to create a fundamentally new values, relevant challenges of the time.

The transformation of philosophy into a science on the grounds that the absence of consensus and common results in the philosophy allows philosophers only to express their opinion (but not to receive new knowledge) leads to the fact that philosophers should pay their attention only to the description and explanation of the phenomena, which means that they must stop being philosophers.

How to treat the arguments of the death of philosophy? The answer to this question involves the definition of the concept of philosophy. There is the difficulty here associated with the lack of a common understanding of philosophy. Also, there is an existential understanding of the philosophy in the theoretical sphere, and how many philosophers, so many definitions of philosophy [Кочергин А.Н., 1996]. So, to answer the question it is necessary, first of all, to ask the original understanding of the philosophy, on which it will be possible to build on the conclusions of its transformation. It is known that the three main approaches to the interpretation of the philosophy developed in antiquity. These approaches include: Sophian, epistemic and technemic ones [Майоров Г.Г., 2009]. Technemic interpretation gradually transformed into logic, rhetoric, argumentation theory, and sophianic and epistemic interpretations identified the main line of the “watershed” in the understanding of philosophy as a science and as not a science. Understanding of the philosophy as a science, in essence, removes the question of the relation between philosophy and science. Consideration of philosophy as “the era of self-consciousness” and “the culture of the soul” (such a review, it was stated earlier in this article) means that philosophy does not fall under the definition of science. This can be substantiated by comparative analysis of the scientific and philosophical thinking.

Scientific thinking is objective, i.e., embedded in a clear framework for the subject of science, but the philosophical thinking is an inter-objective one associated with the transition from one domain to another. Scientific thinking is strictly rationed by rules and regulations adopted in a particular science, and philosophical thinking is normalized less strictly – it submits to the rules of logic. Scientific thinking operates with concepts that fix a well-defined part of reality. Philosophical thinking operates with categories which are less defined. The philosophical thinking is related to goal-setting, the scientific one applies to the implementation of the selected goals and values. Scientific thinking answers the question, why a certain phenomenon occurs just so and not otherwise, and philosophical thinking answers the questions, *how* to study the phenomenon (the methodological function of philosophy) and *for what* (*purpose*) should be studied phenomenon (worldview function of philosophy). Discovery of the laws of reality is a prerogative of science, and philosophy helps science to get out of crisis situations. Scientific thinking aims at studying of the reality’s properties, and philosophical thinking is focused on evaluation of the reality from perspective of a chosen system of values, i.e., thinking of this kind is reflexive in principle, because it deals not with the reality but with the knowledge about it. By virtue of these particular qualities the philosophical discourse is a specialized one. That is why philosophy can act as integrator of culture, its self-reflection. Only within

it can be fixed with the very existence of different ways of the world's development, can be revealed in their essence (what true is, benefit is, beauty is, etc.). All of them act as the base of activity, life and culture. On this basis, we will continue to understand philosophy as an independent form of social consciousness, which engages in identification, explication, justification, and rearrangement of the mental structures that define the human relationship to the world. Philosophy appears here as a worldview, the core of which are the values that act as factors of a choice and set value relation of human to the world.

This position is not new, of course, and it is shared by many philosophers. Heidegger argued that philosophy is a matter of the mind, which responds to the call of the things of life, to the challenges of time ("Mind Holder"), and the means of its expression is language [Хайдеггер М., 1993]. V.S. Styopin believes that the sense of philosophical research is not only the manifestation of ideological structures that define the image of the world and the way people live, but also a reflection on them in order to develop new meanings of life and new values. They are just worldview universals in the form of philosophical categories that determine in its entirety the vision and ways of human understanding of the world, and translation of the experience, fixed in them, ensures the reproduction of a certain way of social life and certain personality traits. Philosophical reflection on the cultural foundations allows us to understand not only what the world is in its extreme deep foundations, but also to introduce new ideas about desirable lifestyles, new values, that cause "mutation" in the culture, during which the new "faces of culture" are formed [Степин В.С., 1994]. The role of philosophy is not to apply the methods of science, and in the value, the spiritual orientation of a person. In this sense, the slogan of "physics – beware of metaphysics" gives way to the slogan of "metaphysics beware of physics" (K. Jaspers). R. Rorty, based on the idea of philosophy as a free thinking ("Freedom is the soul of philosophy"), says about the uselessness of philosophy in a tyrannical society. Human needs philosophy until there is no further development. The development exists only in a free society, and in the course of development there is a need to replace obsolete vocabulary (which records previous experience) new one, due to the conflict of the past language with the future needs. The salvation of mankind is in awareness of its responsibility for the world's fortune. Therefore, philosophy should be the philosophy of creative and morally oriented freedom, its self-consciousness, which expresses the "tragic optimism"; it is none other than the adoption of more and more stringent conflicts raised by life, from the perspective of an optimistic moral-volitional beginning (personal dignity, moral self-discipline, proper behavior) (Порти П.). We can continue the list of authors who understand the philosophy as a rational reflection on the grounds of culture and reject the thesis of its death in modern society, but considering our goals, it is important to fix the very existence of the major philosophers who insist on the growing importance of philosophy in the modern era. The author's position is a statement that the significance of philosophy for the survival of humanity has never been as high as it is now, because we are talking about changing of the foundations of civilization on which it was formed and developed.

But what about the pluralism of philosophical trends? As rightly observed S.N. Bulgakov in his “Tragedy of Philosophy”, philosophical thought is freed from its inevitable paradoxes at the cost of heavy casualties, falling into the “one-sidedness of abstract principles of philosophical heresy”. But if the world is not only the mere existence of reasonable existence, the distraction from what is outside the field of view of the mind always takes place. Therefore, the desire of the mind to logical monism, i.e., interpretation of the world from the only one beginning, is impossible. How, then, one philosophical system should treat to another one? Should they denounce each other as the crooks that knowingly mislead people because of ideological reasons (as it did, for example, the official Marxist philosophy in the USSR)? Or should we interpret other philosophies as predecessors of our ones (such as Hegel did)? Or should we consider all the philosophical systems as mutually complementary to each other? Each of them claims to be an absolute. But “the verdict of history is harsh”: life goes on, and philosophical absolutism fails [Булгаков С.Н., 1993]. Antiquity gave birth to cosmocentrism as a type of philosophizing, the Middle Ages gave rise to Theocentrism, the Renaissance – to anthropocentrism, the modern times – to sociocentrism. In response to the questions of life were also such types of philosophizing, as an empirical, sensual, rationalistic, metaphysical, enlightenment, positivist, phenomenological, class-ideological pragmatist, existentialist, postmodernist, eco-centric (noosphere) ones. The modern age creates new cosmocentrism due to human responsibility for the future of civilization in the cosmic scale. Therefore, the dialogue between the civilization and time should be carried out from this position.

2. Philosophy of survival as a reaction to the globalism of social transformation

The only way to survive is to set constantly new goals.

Harvey Cushing

*Give a person a purpose for which to live, and he
will be able to survive in any situation.*

J.W. Goethe

There is a point of view that the change of philosophy is a reaction to the change of culture (Миронов В.В). Indeed, the civilization now faces a crisis of culture, which causes the need to change the philosophy. But, at the same time, the philosophy, proposing new values as being bases, contributes to the formation of a new culture. The difference between the current situation from the previous one is in the globalization of culture in the process of which not intercultural dialogue and interaction dominate, allowing different cultures to adapt to each other, but almost violent impact of one of them (which is more powerful in the economic, military and other respects) on the other one (weaker). Under these conditions, an equal dialogue is impossible. Classical philosophy found itself to be unable to respond to the reality's challenges and to change itself according to the reality. As a result, such a trend in philosophy was formed as postmodernism. This trend affirms the need to

turn to the language as to such a beginning that structures the object. I.e., postmodernism focuses on what is true in certain limited notional proportions and timeframes. However, any movement of ideas from one culture to another without prior semantic adaptation “contaminates” communication filters, and therefore makes impossible equal dialogue between cultures and their mutual understanding. All this brings to the fore a communication problem caused by lack of ability to negotiate in a productive dialogue on the adoption by all peoples and nations such values that ensure the survival of civilization. Survival philosophy must become the backbone center of productive synthesis of different cultures.

Philosophy cannot act any more as an ideology of violent transformation of society, humanity and its environment. It is necessary to cultivate in modern society a consensus as a way of thinking and behavior. It means that it is also necessary for the solution of global problems to move from “barricade thinking” and the revolutionary upheaval of society to social evolution. The new philosophy is to make human a true purpose (avoiding extremes of holistic and individualistic attitudes), and all the forms of its activity must be reasonable and humane. To do this, it must cover the entire culture on a global scale and to make possible the understanding of all its layers and forms. Education of outlook and worldview is not violent “breaking out” of the human soul, but the establishment of a competitive mechanism for the development of systems of attitudes and behaviors that allow us to make personal choices based on personal reflection, the essence of which can be expressed in the question “Do I live right?”. Therefore, the new philosophy should busy not only professionals, but also be a way of life, the main value of which is the preservation of life on a global scale. The mass consciousness must accept the fact that the main danger to human is human himself. Hence it is necessary to take control over human activity and to determine its limit points.

An overview of the world cultural heritage, contrary to the postmodernists’ assertions, indicates that different cultures contain elements that can be included by the philosophy of survival. A comparative analysis of paradigms of eastern (oriental) and western types of philosophizing allows us to highlight their particular qualities. The western type of philosophizing is characterized by binary (duality) of thinking (the opposition of one another), and focusing on the fragmentation of reality; by representation of the original imperfection of the world (which is necessary to convert); by installation on the activity and creativity; by recognition of the idea of progress. The oriental style of philosophizing comes from the recognition of non-duality of thinking (the identity of opposites, the relative difference) and focusing on the reality’s integrity; from original perfection of the world (which does not need alteration); from principle of non-action (negating the installation on the activity, creativity and asserting the need to follow the cosmic rhythms in affairs); from nonlinear type of coupling of natural elements (denying a causal relationship of elements and presupposing the existence of different elements as a condition of the others ones; the consequence of that is the denial of progressive nature of the development, of monocentrism and of division of the natural factors and phenomena into simple and complex ones). These paradigms of Western and Eastern types of

thinking really imprint on specific philosophical problems. For example, the specificity of the Western philosophical consciousness is seen in logic, the Eastern one puts at the forefront morality; the Western conception of freedom is secularized, the eastern one is sacred; the Western understanding of the relationship between material and spiritual is characterized by unlimited consumption of material goods (the more the better), the eastern philosophical thought advocates the subordination of material to spiritual; the Western attitude of an individual and the state is liberal, the Eastern one is hierarchical. In turn, the solution of these problems affects the approaches to specific issues.

Within the philosophy of survival peculiar synthesis of the relevant paradigms of thinking needs must be done. The one-dimensional thinking, the principle of “either-or” has outdated in today's interdependent world. Now we can talk about the beginning of a peculiar protest against the linear thinking. The European science has expressed this formulating the principle of complementarity, the emblem of which N. Bohr established “yin-yang”. Of course, the development of a new type of thinking, corresponding to modern realities, requires not blind borrowing of Eastern wisdom, and knowledge of the general laws of development of human thought; in this sense, the emergence of the global (universal) evolutionism is very significant. Many researchers note nowadays a growing trend of unity of parties disintegrated in the Western culture: human and nature, subject and object, the senses and the mind, intuition and logic, etc. The Russian philosophy, the main desire of which was primarily to understand the Absolute (according especially Soloviev), found itself to be closer to the intentions of union than the Western philosophy (which, in the words of Jung, mainly analyzes, weighs, selects, classifies, isolates). Thus, one can say that characteristics of the national consciousness define certain prerequisites for national type of philosophizing. For example, the plasticity of the Greek intellectual culture defined picture of the world created by Greek thought, no less than categories developed by philosophers. The Platonic view of ideas' reality inevitably inserted into the picture of cosmos not in such way, as medieval realists saw it later. Any conceptual system, built doctrinally, being transferred from one cultural environment to another, finds itself in a different perspective and, therefore, is interpreted differently. What is truly universal and global, originates in the national.

In order to attain universal significance, culture must pass the stage of self-reflection. Every major nation passed a period when the main spiritual characteristics were developed and realized; it was the time of national self-reflection. It was carried out not only in conceptual structures, but also in selected and created mythology, in art's images. In particular, the axial time Russian national consciousness coincides with the time of formation of the Moscow State and is usually characterized in the spiritual sense as “the golden age of Russian holiness”. During just this period such features were formed that became then characteristic of Russian national identity. It was the iconic canon “speculation in the colors” (in the words of E. Trubetskoy), which became visible embodiment of the national self-reflection. This principle is the high iconostasis, which was not known in the Byzantine Empire, was taken in the Moscow cathedrals in the early fifteenth century. So the national architectural style of

Orthodox church was formed. It was also set the monastic ideal, which was submitted by Sergius Radonezhsky, and became the core of the monastic development of the north-eastern territories. There were just mysticism, aestheticism and historicism, which became the features of Russian spiritual culture and determined its further development. Russia took over the Byzantine heritage and in particular its mysticism. In the late Byzantine time Gregory Palamas's hesychasm triumphed with its ideas of mental prayer, silence and possibility of direct perception of the divine energy. This proved to be deeply akin to the Russian consciousness. Russia, taking the idea of the inner mystical union with the divine extrasensory world, did not know scholasticism in the form in which it emerged in Western Europe and the Kiev Metropolia. The mystical mood of Russian intellectuals determined the dismemberment of the spiritual life, although less than in Europe. Historicism as a lively awareness of their role in the development of mankind manifested itself in the emergence of the specific Russian chronicles and gained religious and cosmic significance with the advent of the concept "Moscow is the Third Rome". It is just the depth of historical consciousness that makes us understand the fact that culture is primary in relation to the individual. Hence the idea of catholicity was deeply perceived by Russian philosophical thought. Aestheticism means recognizing of beauty's the unconditional value and sensitivity to it in any kind of activity. It manifests itself in the legendary act of the choice of a religion (where the decisive criterion for selection was the beauty), directly in the artistic life and in relation to such a category, as *word* ("weaving of words"), in morality ("Beauty will save the world"), in constant penetration of artistic images into philosophy and in philosophicity of poetry. V.S. Solovyov expressed mysticism, aestheticism and historicism especially full: it is a deep mystical insight of the world's unity as a universal unity embodied in the beautiful azure and gold image of Sophia, and also intense search for historical reasons of a future ideal theocracy [Донских О.А., Кочергин А.Н., 1996].

The survival philosophy should develop values to ensure convergence of East and West. The Russian philosophy of universal unity and the philosophy of dialogism play an important role in the synthesis of the cultures (that has just started); history "ordered" so that Russia, because of its geographical position, had to "grope" contact point of East and West before other countries.

The survival of civilization implies the absence of a nuclear war. But the peace is not only the absence of a war, but the condition for the existence and development of mankind. The peace is impossible without a consensus, and the consensus is impossible without understanding. The understanding can be found only in a dialogue, acting as a fundamental principle of human's attitude to other people, the world and God. The dialogue is conducted with the help of language. Hence the philosophy dialogism philosophy belongs to the forefront in the structure of the survival. The linguistic turn in philosophy marked the recognition of the fact that language is not only a means of thinking and the mediator between human and reality, but also an independent reality which create human and his relations with the world. Heidegger was one of the first from those who realized that language is more than an object of linguistic analysis, it is really the house of being [Хайдеггер М.,

1993]. Language not only reflects reality, but also creates it. Russian philosophy (V.S. Solovyev, I.V. Kireyevsky et al.) made a significant contribution to the development of the philosophy of dialogism, initiating the formation of a way to understand reality in all its diversity. M.M. Bakhtin argued that a foreign culture is revealed fully only in the view of another culture, i.e., one meaning reveals its depth more fully when it meets another one, alien one [Бахтин М.М., 1996]. An intercultural dialogue helps to overcome insularity and unilateralism of the meanings of different cultures. Speech should serve the establishment of right relationships in any partners' dialogue. The problem of intercultural dialogue comes to the fore in the context of globalization. However, it is important to bear in mind that the dialogue cannot be productive if each party precludes the ability to take something from the position of the opposing party. The search of common values as bases for civilization's survival implies tolerance and lack of dogmatism. Mankind has not yet learned the art of productive dialogue, based on the relevant principles. While it should be stated that mankind has entered the new century with an absolute predominance of violence against tolerance. The mentality of different cultures change will not be possible immediately. However, it should remember that extremism is not rooted in the cultures as such, but in political games. Therefore the search for the foundations of tolerant consciousness in different cultures should be done more intensely and purposefully. However, the dialogue of cultures will not be easy, it will require some time. It is known that only those components of a foreign culture are available for analysis which were found by researchers. A researcher also discovers only that he is really able to detect and understand thanks to his cultural orientation, professional competence, and certainly taking into account peculiarities of the historical epoch. Therefore, in order to analyze the foreign culture, a wider range of vision is required than just the norms and values of their own culture. Consequently, it is inadmissible for anyone, evaluating other cultures, to declare his own position as an absolute criterion of truth. Such difficulties actualize the question of whether effective communication of cultures is possible and whether different cultural worlds are at least partly impenetrable to each other. Is R. Kipling right or not? How to solve the problem of understanding, if the Western culture treats the person from the position of his conditioning (by mentality, social environment, family history, the subconscious, etc.), and the Indian one – from the perspective of liberation from any conditioning? In addition, each (especially religious) culture contains sacred values that cannot be questioned. However, dialogue requires mutual concessions. If it is absent, the consensus impossible. The philosophy of survival does not mean mechanical coupling of the Western and Eastern ideas. First, the synthesis process will involve the values that do not have a sacred character, ie, the ones that are easier to accept as they do not affect the underlying units. Gradually, the synthesis process will include the value of a deeper nature. An important role will belong to the adoption of standards that would ensure the survival of humanity. This is particularly important, but not the way (scientific, religious, etc.) of the “insertion” of new standards in the mass consciousness. Perhaps the most important element in

the synthesis of different cultures will be finding in them the sacred grounds of unity of mankind for the sake of its preservation.

The survival philosophy as propaedeutics for the future philosophy will consist of a variety of sources that contribute to the development of a common understanding of the world. Let us draw attention to the conception of some of these sources that may be included in the content of the survival philosophy.

A. Schweitzer's the principle of reverence for life focuses on the understanding of all life as the supreme value, on the individually responsible behavior of each person, on the prevalence of the spiritual sphere on material culture, on the recognition of causing harm to somebody's life only in cases of extreme necessity, on the rejection of war on ethical grounds, on the service to the people as the behavioral base, on the improvement of society, and on improving of the state of the world.

S.V. Meyen's principle of sympathy affirms the importance and the need to understand other than as a mute object, but as a subject, possessing of the right to have their own opinion in any dialogue, which implies a sympathetic attitude to his position, allows us to understand why he sees reality in a different light, and creates the conditions for fruitful dialogue which is impossible without an understanding of the parties' positions.

Philosophy of Russian cosmism contains the following ideas: of organically integrated world; of human as the organizer of the cosmos (inhabited part of it); of humanity's planetary problems; of a victory over the elemental forces, starvation and diseases; of nature protection, and the spiritualization of human life; of the understanding of the fact that human is as part of nature; of equality with other forms of life, of kinship of all people; of a common cause and common responsibility of all human beings for common survival; of reasonable asceticism; of the transition of society from "blindness to the consciousness"; of global evolutionism and self-organization, replacement anthropocentrism on anthropocosmism.

Ecosophy (being essentially the deep ecology) proclaims (as a principle of universal rights) the right to life of all its forms, regardless of their role in satisfaction of the vital needs of people. According to this principle people are *ab agendo* to reduce the diversity of representatives of the living world in order to satisfy their needs. Environmentalism focuses on the objective study of the state of the human environment in order to preserve the natural gene pool and to promote moral and legal norms.

The self-restraint philosophy focuses on the changing priorities in the development of civilization – on the transition from "affluenza" to a reasonable austerity, from the priority of material production and consumption to that of cultural production and consumption.

The philosophy of tolerance and dialogism focuses on the transition from the "narrow departmental", "barricade" of thinking to understanding of all the layers and forms of culture on the basis of a productive dialogue, which provides for the equality of the parties.

The philosophy of education and training includes teaching paradigm, aims at preparing of a person not only knowledgeable, but also understanding, creative

thinking, with developed reflection and self-reflection, whose interests and orientation of actions accord not only with the desire for self-determination and self-affirmation, but also with the public interest.

The philosophy of the noosphere and coevolution aims to harmonize the relationship between society and nature, to eliminate war from the life of society, to ensure the equality of all people and religions, to manage the evolution of society on a scientific basis and to carry out joint and not smiting each other development of society and nature.

The Ecumenism Philosophy aims at bringing together the various religious denominations of one church in order to eliminate inter-religious conflicts, bringing serious discord in the relationship of peoples inhabiting the planet.

The philosophy of culture orients it (in the globalizing world) not to the unification of cultures according to the script of forces that govern the process of globalization, but to the preservation of diversity in unity and to the search and adoption of diverse forms of humanity.

The philosophy of secular humanism aims at understanding and affirmation of humanism as a human right to happiness, combined with the social responsibility for their actions, which implies a number of principles aimed at the application of rationality and science to all spheres of human life (including the education system).

The list of such examples can be continued – humanity has accumulated in different strata of culture such rules, which allowed overcoming critical situations of local and regional scales. It would be a serious mistake to neglect this experience. The known forms of culture synthesized within a single system can be the basis of formation of the philosophy of survival that defines the strategy of preservation of human civilization and expresses its cosmic responsibility. The aim is to make accessible to everybody the cultural “alloy” that has been suffered by humanity in the sake of preservation of life (and which is currently available to few). Only in this case we can talk about mass instrumental use of this “alloy”. People are not telepathists, so the only means of communication is still the WORD, and every affair can be carried out only on its basis. The WORD “works in the field of” education, upbringing, dissemination of knowledge, the formation of noosphere thinking and related behavior patterns. The difficulty, however, lies in the fact that, as evidenced by historical experience, understanding of what is happening is often falls behind the events themselves. So, to understand the experience of the Patriotic war of 1812 L.N. Tolstoy “took the historic lag” of real events from it in half a century. To understand the experience of war between North and South William Faulkner took about the same time. The more distance from the actual events, the fuller and deeper understanding of them, as their consequences, which are not always apparent at the time of the event, are clarified over some time. But the time does not wait. Only that country will be a leader in the twenty-first century that more quickly than others will be able to solve the problem of creating of the survival philosophy, i.e., will be able to suggest ways to solve of global problems. The presence of the spiritual prerequisites for that in Russian culture allows us to hope that such a country could be Russia.

A.F. Losev emphasized such a feature of Russian philosophy as an interest in spiritual issues, the fate of humanity, understanding spirit as the reality of human speech (the article of “Russian Philosophy” (1919)). This intention of Russian philosophy manifested itself in dialogism philosophy. – M.M. Bakhtin's dialogical method comes precisely from the Russian philosophical tradition of understanding of the spirit as the reality of human speech – it organizes and defines everything that a person does [Бахтин М.М., 1996]. In other words, the dialogical method is that of understanding of reality. The essence of dialogism philosophy is very clear: peace is impossible without the consent of all the participants of the dialogue (polylogue), consent is not possible without mutual understanding of all the positions, and the understanding is set in the dialogue through language. Survival Philosophy has as its main objective just searching for such type of relationship among people (as well as between human beings and nature), that would be acceptable to all the people. Consequently, one of the most important tasks of the modern system of education and training is to equip the participants with special forms of participation in a productive dialogue. Nothing else, than the state will should manifest itself in the management of social transformations. Thus, the phenomenon of globalization is having a tremendous impact on social transformation of modern society, and therefore requires a change in government civilization system, which, in turn, requires a change in the traditional style of thinking, traditional ways of resolving of the contradictions between society and nature, between social systems, change in the traditional value orientations, i.e. it requires the creation of philosophy, able to offer all the types of base human activity that meets the challenges of the modern interdependent, globalized world. Concepts built on isolation and confrontation, impede understanding of the modern world and its adequate description. In the modern world that is rapidly changing, the nature of philosophy is also changing, and philosophy should promptly carry out a kind of control over accordance of the bases of human activity and the changing realities of life. Therefore, philosophy itself must evolve in line with changes in the world. Its mission is to develop values and existence bases which ensure the survival of civilization. It must be the survival philosophy as the basis of co-evolutionary harmonious development of society and nature. One must not forget that the biosphere is the “maternity home” and “home of human existence”.

Philosophy cannot take the form of the ideology of violent transformation of society, human and nature any more. It is necessary in the modern world to cultivate consensus as a way of thinking and behavior. Global problems can be solved only from the position of the global philosophical reflection. Philosophy itself should develop a mechanism to prevent deformation of its functions. Therefore, the new philosophy should be not only professionals' affair, but also a way of life, and its main objective is the preservation of life on the planet on a global scale and the creation of conditions for co-evolutionary development; i.e. the new philosophy's purpose is to be the backbone center of different cultures' synthesis. Only such a philosophy can become a philosophy of survival.

References

1. Аристотель Соч.: В 4-х т. Т. 1. – М.: ЭКСМО, 2006.
Aristotel. Soch.: V 4-t.. – М. ЕКСМО, 2006.
2. Бахтин М.М. К философским основам гуманитарных наук // Бахтин М.М. Собр. соч. – М.: Русские словари. 1996. – Т. 5.
Bahtin M.M. K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk (By the philosophical foundations of the humanities) // Bahtin M.M. Sobr. Soch. – М.: Russkie slovari (Russian dictionary). 1996. – Vol. 5.
3. Булгаков С.Н. Трагедия философии (философия и догмат) // Булгаков С.Н. Соч.: В 2-х т. Т. I. – М.: Наука, 1993.
Bulgakov S.N. Tragediya filosofii (filosofiya i dogmat) (The tragedy of philosophy (philosophy and dogma)) // Bulgakov S.N. Soch.: V 4-t. Vol. I. – М.: Nauka, 1993.
4. Донских О.А., Кочергин А.Н. Культурологический подход к истории русской философии // Вестник МГУ. Серия философия. – 1996. – № 3.
Donskikh O.A., Kochergin A.N. Kul'torologicheskiy podhod k istorii russkoy filosofii (The approach of cultural studies to the history of Russian philosophy) // Vestnik MGU. Seriya filosofiya. – 1996. – № 3.
5. Кочергин А.Н. Саморефлексия философии. – Ижевск: УГУ, 1996.
Kochergin A.N. Samorefleksiya filosofii (Self-reflection of philosophy). –Izhevsk: UGU, 1996.
6. Майоров Г.Г. Философия как искание Абсолюта: Опыты теоретические и исторические. – М.: Либерком, 2009.
Mayorov G.G. Filosofiya kak iskanie Absolyuta: Opyty teoreticheskie i istoricheskie (Philosophy as a quest for the Absolute: theoretical and historical experience). – М.: Liberkom, 2009.
7. Миронов В.В. Трансформация философии в эпоху глобализации. [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: www.rus-crisis.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id+641:641&
Mironov V.V. Transformaciya filosofii v epohu globalizacii (Transformation of philosophy in the age of globalization).
8. Рорти Р. Философия и будущее. [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: gtmarket.ru/laboratory/publicdoc/2007/2673
Rorty R. Filosofiya i budushee (Philosophy and the Future).
9. Степин В.С. Философия и образы будущего // Вопросы философии. – 1994, № 6.
Styopin V.S. Filosofiya i obrazy budushego (Philosophy and images of the future) // Voprosy filosofii. – 1994, № 6.
10. Хайдеггер М. Что такое – философия? // Вопросы философии. – 1993. – № 8. – С. 113–123.
Heidegger M. Chto takoe – filosofiya? (What it is – a philosophy?) // Voprosy filosofii. – 1993. – № 8. – P. 113–123.