




THE PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSES OF SYNERGETIC GLOBALIZATION THEORIES

Kadzhik OGANYAN ¹  | Karina OGANYAN ^{1,*}  | Vladimir PYZH ¹ 
Victoria ERMILOVA ¹ | Mihail CHUDAEV ¹

¹ National State University of Physical Culture, Sports and Health, named after P. F. Lesgaft, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation

* *Correspondence*

Karina OGANYAN, Ispitateley st. 8, 62, Saint Petersburg 197 227, Russian Federation

E-mail: karina_oganyan@mail.ru

Abstract: The article deals with the laws of social synergetic in the context of the relationship between social order and chaos. A special place is occupied by the analysis of Prigogine's paradoxes in the context of considering the synergetic philosophy of history. To solve the problem, the features, signs, and characteristics of the super attractor as one of the main mechanisms for the disclosure of social synergetic are identified and argued. The super attractor, as a product of the realization of the absolute ideal, and the people who make it up, have the ability to transform the world around them and themselves.

Keywords: super attractor, synergetic philosophy of history, globalization, ideal, order, chaos, social synergy, paradox, self-organization, society.

Introduction

As is known, in the Soviet period of Russian history (1922-1991), the meaning of life for the majority of the Russian population was ultimately determined (voluntarily or involuntarily) by communist ideology - serving the communist ideal. Any opposition to this ideal - direct or indirect, explicit or implicit - was considered in fact a state crime ("treason to the party, and, consequently, to the Motherland"). This idea played the role of a kind of "secular god", with a very vindictive character: he did not tolerate ideals, the requirements of which for a person and citizen could diverge from his requirements. In other words, it was a totalitarian ideal - such a value orientation that not only dominates the public consciousness, is not only shared consciously or semi-consciously by the majority of the popula-

tion (total coverage of the majority of citizens), but also imposes a ban on the existence of other value orientations (Oganyan et al., 2014).

Since, under a one-party system, the party ideology of the ruling party inevitably becomes a state one, in such a situation it is quite logical that any deviation from such an ideology not only can but should be considered a crime against the state.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the third (and last in the 20th century) Russian Revolution (1989-1993) ended not only with the collapse of the communist ideal, but also with the adoption of the Constitution, which proclaimed ideological pluralism and, consequently, the rejection of a single state ideology. But this event of fundamental importance immediately put Russian society in the face of the following very acute and very difficult questions (Oganyan & Bransky,

2013b):

1. Is it possible for a long-term existence of a stable and successfully developing society without a dominant ideology that corresponds to the interests of the majority and is therefore supported by this majority?
2. Should ideological pluralism in a democratic society gradually become heterogeneous in terms of the sustained popularity of different social ideals? In other words, is it possible to violate the equality of different ideals as generally significant value orientations in the development of society?
3. Does the development of a democratic society involve the gradual formation of a dominant (dominant in the public consciousness) social ideal, as a leading value orientation in the activities of the majority?
4. Does such an ideal threaten to return from a democratic society to a totalitarian one?
5. What is the relationship between the concepts of dominant and totalitarian ideal?
6. Is ideological pluralism compatible with ideological chaos? Are the laws of social synergetic applicable here, i.e. a general theory of the relationship between social order and social chaos?

Methodological Framework

The particular relevance of the correct answer to these questions is due to the fact that the ideological pluralism proclaimed in the modern Russian Constitution takes place at that epochal time when humanity as a whole (and Russia in particular) is involved in a fundamentally new process called globalization (Roudometof & Robertson, 1995)¹.

¹ In the space of modern discussions about the problems and prospects of globalization, several significant concepts can be distinguished that actively influence the content and direction of ideological and scientific debates regarding the dominant trends and prospects for world development in the 21st century. These include: the theory of “open society” by K. Popper; the concept of the “end of history” by F. Fukuyama; I. Wallerstein’s “world-system” concept; the theory of “clash of civilizations” by S. Huntington; geopolitical concept of Z. Brzezinski; the theory of “glocalization” by R. Robertson and W. Beck; A. Panarin’s concept of globalism; the theory of “post-economic society” by V. Inozemtsev; “multifactor concept of globalization” by A.

This process, which began in the 70s of the twentieth century, involves the growth of the interconnection and interdependence of economic, political and socio-cultural structures on a planetary scale. The growth of the interaction and interdependence of different social structures, in turn, implies an increase in the interaction and interdependence of different value orientations (ideological attitudes) that determine the activities of the respective structures. Globalization is thus associated with the interweaving of different cultural traditions and different ideological influences. It is not difficult to understand that these kinds of influences are difficult to assess if there is no reliable global benchmark for such an assessment.

As a result of such globalization, a society that is in a state of internal ideological chaos instead of looking for ways out of this chaos can easily aggravate this chaos at the expense of external ideological chaos.

As a result, it may become a victim of ideological attitudes alien to the majority of its population and may partially or even completely lose its mono- or multinational and mono- or multicultural “identity” (originality, originality, specificity). Even more than that: in the absence of its own global value orientation, such a society can become a kind of sociocultural “colony” of a foreign power or an alliance of such powers that have a clearly defined ideological orientation (Bransky & Oganyan, 2014).

It follows from the foregoing that the formation of a new value orientation (a new Russian dominant ideal) essentially depends not only on the correct description of globalization as an objective phenomenon but also on a correct understanding of the objective essence of this phenomenon, i.e. from the presence of an effective (in the scientific sense) theory of globalization.

In connection with the interest in the theory of globalization (attempts to reveal the essence of this radically new phenomenon, which is not reduced to such processes similar to globalization as integration, modernization, globalization, etc.), the discussion that has unfolded in the Western press about the connection theories of globalization with the philosophy of history.

Utkin; “synergetic theory of globalization” by V. Bransky and K. Oganyan and many others.

As you know, this discussion was started by the American political scientist F. Fukuyama in his sensational book *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992). In this book, its author tries to prove that with the collapse of the communist ideal (and the collapse of the USSR), it is being replaced by a Western liberal ideal with American characteristics. The latter assumes the priority of human rights over his duties and utilitarian values over spiritual ones. According to Fukuyama, after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, this ideal becomes widespread and becomes dominant on a planetary scale. His victory on such a scale is tantamount to the “end of history”, for a society is emerging in which all the utilitarian needs of the ordinary person are satisfied. In such a purely consumer society, the limit of social development is reached and one can, so to speak, “rest on one’s laurels”. It is for this reason that Fukuyama calls the typical representative of such a “spiritless” society the “last” person. Thus, globalization in the interpretation of Fukuyama is Americanization (the spread and implementation on a planetary scale of the American ideal of social order).

In contrast to such a (finalist) philosophy of history, another American political scientist, S. Huntington, wrote his no less sensational book *The Clash of Civilizations* (Huntington, 2021).

He tries to justify the opposite approach to the prospects of globalization (infinite philosophy of history). In his opinion, history will never end, because the resolution of some social conflicts (for example, between countries or states) gives rise to new conflicts (for example, between civilizations and cultures).

To overcome these new contradictions, a new struggle is required (both in the economic and political spheres). And such a struggle presupposes an ideological struggle, which is based on a clash between different value systems. Such a clash is due to different value orientations (“ideals”), i.e. different (often alternative) criteria of values.

Huntington’s concept of the essence of globalization is the direct opposite of Fukuyama’s concept: globalization, according to Huntington, cannot be reduced to the Americanization (Westernization) of humanity, because it is the result of the interaction of both Western and non-Western cultures (civilizations). Therefore, the Western system of values and the value orientation under-

lying it cannot claim universal significance.

In the process of globalization, different participants in this process may have significantly different ideas about the essence of globalization (and about its prospects), and very sharp and dangerous conflicts can arise and develop on this basis (Oganyan, 2009).

It is easy to see that from a philosophical point of view, the described discussion about the nature of globalization has the following meaning. Some participants in the discussion (following Fukuyama) insist that globalization expresses the desire of mankind for unity, and this is the main thing in globalization.

Others (following Huntington) see it as a desire for unlimited variety. This discussion in the 90s of the XX century had a serious heuristic value: the analysis of its results helped in the formation at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries a new approach to the essence of globalization from the standpoint of a general theory of the relationship between social order and social chaos (the concept of synergetic historicism) (Oganyan & Bransky, 2014). It turned out that the desire of mankind for both unity and diversity allows a deeper understanding, both in the law of self-organization (differentiation and integration) of social institutions and in a similar law that universally significant (social) ideals obey (Oganyan et al., 2013). The research of the law of self-organization (differentiation and integration) of social ideals has shown that it is this law that provides the key to understanding the patterns of the relationship between ideological chaos and ideological order. Therefore, a scientifically substantiated answer to the questions posed above without taking into account the law of self-organization of social ideals is hardly possible at present.

Synergetic Philosophy of History

The founder of synergetics, Prigozhin, formulated in a very clear form the central problem of human development at the turn of the 21st century: where is humankind heading? To what structural state is in the direction of greater order or greater freedom (disorder, chaos)? More and more regulation of all human activity or more and more liberalization of it? The paradox is that both opposite tendencies take place at the same

time! (Prigozhin & Stengers, 1996; Haken, 2003).

The solution to the problem can only be such a synthesis of order and chaos, in which the very difference between them disappears. The last phrase in the above quotation contains a hint of such a synthesis, but only a hint, no more. Obviously, in discussing this contradiction, Prigogine comes close to the concept of a super attractor. But he does not formulate it, apparently for the reason that his physical synergetic does not require this concept. But it does not require it because it is limited only by selection and does not affect the mechanism of super selection. This mechanism is specific, apparently, for social synergetic.

However, after the emergence of the general scientific theory of self-organization (Prigozhin & Stengers, 1996, Haken, 2003; Knyazeva & Kurdyumov, 2006), one serious difficulty has been discovered, which the concept of universal evolutionism inevitably faces. The difficulty lies in the paradoxical combination of two mutually exclusive tendencies in social development:

1. The growth of the universal interdependence of all members of society from each other and the strengthening of the regulation of their activities (the tendency to form an ideally programmed human community);
2. The growing influence on the state of the global system of human individuality, which is a source of unpredictable random perturbations in the entire global system (the tendency to violate the interdependence and regularity of individual actions).

We called the collision of these trends the Prigozhin paradox (Prigozhin & Stengers, 1996). As shown by synergetic research, the solution of this paradox is possible within the framework of the synergetic historicism concept. The concept of universal evolutionism is unable to solve this paradox. The reason for this is that the concept of universal evolutionism is limited to the concept of selection as the fundamental “driving force” of development, whereas the concept of synergetic historicism generalizes the usual concept of selection to the concept of super-selection. This immediately leads to the concept of a super-attractor (Bransky et al., 2018), which gives a relatively simple and at the same time very elegant solution to the Prigozhin paradox.

To find such a solution, it is necessary, in

their opinion, to answer three questions (Oganyan, 2007):

1. how social self-organization proceeds in the general case;
2. why it proceeds in this way and not otherwise (that is, what are its driving forces);
3. where it ultimately leads.

Without a clear answer to all these questions, there can be no question of any theory of globalization. Meanwhile, many of those involved in the theory of globalization shy away from discussing some of them: either the second or the third question, and often both of them.

The solution to Prigogine’s paradox is very clearly and visually presented in the form of the so-called synergetic model of global self-organization. This model not only does not call into question the existence of objective laws of social self-organization but also reveals the specific content of these laws. Self-organization turns out to be a complex process of alternating chaos and order, associated with a multitude of bifurcations and local attractors.

According to the concept of synergetic historicism, this process is due to a deep process of social selection determined by the internal interaction of the elements of a self-organizing system.

Moreover, this interaction has a dual (contradictory) character, being the unity of such opposite factors as competition and cooperation.

The most important result of the synergistic analysis of the laws of social self-organization, in my opinion, is, however, the following: the alternation of order and chaos, in turn, turns out to be unstable, due to which, in the course of the cycle of integration and differentiation of social structures, their hierarchization and dehierarchization, a certain dominant tendency - the movement of the system as a whole to a global attractor (super attractor). In this state, a complete synthesis of chaos and order is carried out, which practically manifests itself in complete harmony between the freedom and responsibility of the individuals that make up the society. This, according to the authors, occurs because in the course of self-organization, there is feedback between the results of selection and selection factors.

In other words, the ordinary selection is eventually followed by super selection (selection among the selection factors themselves).

Thus, from the point of view of the modern

methodology of scientific research, the synergetic concept of self-organization provides a theoretical explanation of globalization (movement towards a super attractor), and the real process of globalization helps to empirically confirm this concept. In my opinion, the discovery by Bransky and Pozharsky of a deep connection between globalization and self-organization (in its historical interpretation) deserves special attention, which remains out of sight for many authors writing about globalization. The solution of Prigogine's paradox proposed by them is undoubtedly a fundamentally new result obtained in the field of social science based on rational analysis (without any digressions into the field of emotional philosophical journalism) and, of course, deserving of the most serious discussion. However, a prerequisite for discussion must be a correct understanding of this result, which, unfortunately, requires more developed abstract thinking.

One of the most important consequences of this solution to Prigogine's paradox is the distinction between two essentially different types of globalization (instead of general arguments about "globalization in general"): socially responsible globalization (so to speak, globalization with a "human face") and socially irresponsible ("with an animal grin"). The first involves the improvement of the human personality, and the second - its degradation (both one and the other on a global, that is, on a planetary scale).

Thus, the synergetic theory of globalization, built based on the methodology of synergetic historicism, like any full-fledged theory, has not only an explanatory but also a predictive (prognostic) function. The most significant forecast here, I think, is the conclusion about the implementation of globalization in the future according to the method of successive approximations (alternating globalization with deglobalization and the need to distinguish between relative and absolute globalization).

However, here, in turn, two options are found: synergetic historicism without the idea of a super-attractor and him with a super-attractor. It shows well the fundamental importance of such synergetic concepts as bifurcation and attractor in the analysis of social self-organization. It is the concept of bifurcation that leads to the substantiation of the nonlinearity of social development and the formulation of the problem of choosing

different historical scenarios. At the same time, the responsibility for the choice lies with the attractor. It is argued that the reason for the choice is a certain "call of the attractor". Some authors (Kurdyumov, Knyazeva, etc.) also use such an expression – "the future times the past". All such expressions hint at the fact that the laws of self-organization supposedly allow the possibility of the future influencing the past, whereas according to the general scientific principle of "acting" causality, this is impossible. It is obvious that such an explanation of synergetic choice is equivalent to the introduction of Aristotelian "target" ("final") causes, independent of "acting" causes and demonstrating the limitations of explanation with the help of "acting" causes. Such an impression really arises with a purely phenomenological approach to self-organization.

Synergetic historicism without a super-contractor suffers from serious inconsistency: it is limited only to describing self-organization as a phenomenon, however, does not reveal the essence of this phenomenon.

Thus, consistent synergetic historicism must necessarily end with the idea of a super-contractor (eschatology of self-organization). Nevertheless, there are authors who, while accepting the concept of synergetic historicism, at the same time reject the idea of a super-contractor. How can we explain that the idea of a super-contractor is often perceived with great difficulty?

Usually, one of the following arguments is put forward against the existence of a super-contractor:

1. this idea is dreaming (thirst for an optimistic solution to the problem of the "meaning of history");
2. It shackles our freedom (excludes alternative ways of development and in general a variety of ways of development);
3. It has no solid foundations, being either a postulate, a hypothesis, or a prophecy, but nothing more.

All these considerations are untenable for the following reason:

1. Historical optimism is not an argument for the existence of a super-contractor, but a consequence of the existence of a super-contractor. Therefore, it cannot be used as an argument within the framework of synergetic historicism.
2. The super attractor cannot fetter our freedom,

because it is the result of the interaction of an infinite number of free actions (acts of choice at bifurcation points) of free people. In other words, a super attractor arises, because of the interaction of many individual “freedoms” and without these “freedoms” cannot be formed at all. One can say even more: the super-tractor is a product of “militant freedom”, because it presupposes the subsequent neutralization of some objective laws with the help of other objective laws.

If the actions of one free person (or a group of such persons) begin to counteract the movement towards the super-contractor, then eventually the actions of another free person or group of persons begin to counteract this primary opposition, that is, they contribute to the progress towards the super-contractor. This type of interaction is a consequence of its nonlinearity – the tendency of the elements of the system not only to interact with each other, but also to self-action. Since the super attractor is the result of many bifurcations leading to local attractors, it not only does not exclude a variety of development paths, but also assumes a much greater variety than that with which local attractors are associated.

We now summarize the characteristic features of the super attractor (Oganyan et al., 2018).

1. Complete synthesis of order and chaos, i.e., such an order that is stable relative to absolute chaos. This means, on the one hand, the complete unity of action of the elements of the system - global cooperation, instead of the combination of local cooperation with local competition, which we have encountered so far in history. Thus, it would seem that absolute order is established in the system, and chaos disappears altogether. But on the other hand, global cooperation itself acquires a chaotic character in the sense that it changes its direction in an unpredictable way to compensate for the chaotic influences of the external environment.
2. A super attractor cannot be classified as either a simple or strange attractor, because it overcomes the very opposition between these types of attractors. Therefore, it is appropriate to call it a super strange attractor.
3. Since the super attractor is the material embodiment of the absolute (universal) ideal, and this ideal is an absolute unity in the absolute diversity of desires, then the super attractor is the embodiment of such unity. That is why the path to it lies through the consistent development of the entire variety of desires.
4. The super attractor must be the end result of what is usually called the process of globalization. The latter, however, is contradictory, because it presupposes the interaction (“struggle”) of the general technization of human society and its general aestheticization. As a result of universal technization, the entire part of the cosmos accessible to mankind turns into an absolute technical product (space technical ensemble). This is exactly what is commonly called the noosphere (a social structure that meets the requirements of the universal human mind). But the matter is not limited to this process. Parallel to it, another process takes place, in some respects opposite to the first one - universal aestheticization (subordination of all aspects of life to aesthetic requirements). It is natural to call this limit in the cultural development of mankind the esthetosphere (a social structure that meets the requirements of universal human feeling). Hence it is clear that the specificity of the super attractor lies in the synthesis of the noosphere and the esthetosphere. The condition for such a synthesis is the formation and implementation of the absolute ideal, because in the absolute ideal, the difference between utilitarian (economic and political) and spiritual (ethical, aesthetic, and ideological) ideals disappears, in other words, between “usefulness” and “expressiveness” (usefulness and beauty).
5. In contrast to biochemical and biological evolution, in which the limit of complexity is reached in a finite time, a super attractor over a finite period is in principle unattainable by mathematics. Ultimately, the movement towards the super attractor must be endless, because the overcoming of old social contradictions gives rise to new contradictions that give a new impetus to development. Both mutually exclusive tendencies in the evolution of mankind towards achieving maximum stability and new variability can only be combined if the emerging contradictions are minimized, i.e. tendencies to their gradual “softening” and “attenuation”.

Synergetic Historicism and Prospects for Its Development

The development of the synergetic philosophy of history begins in the 90s of the XX century and reaches a certain degree of maturity at the beginning of the XXI century.

A significant contribution to a better understanding of what a synergetic philosophy of history is was made by the works of (Nazaretyan, 2000; Vasilkova, 2002; Oganyan, 2007; Oganyan & Bransky, 2010; Knyazevoy & Kurdyumova, 2006). A comparative analysis of various works, one way or another affecting the problems of fundamental social synergetic, shows obvious progress in the field of methodology: step by step, researchers in the field of fundamental social synergetic are moving from a journalistic style, when the author confines himself to describing his impressions of the literature he has read, to a conceptual style, when he generalizes well-known literature and puts forward some new idea (or several such ideas) and, finally, to a conceptual style, in which a complex of new ideas, put forward by different authors, it is linked into a single (integral) concept that has a certain explanatory and predictive function.

The noted methodological progress in scientific research led to the fact that at the beginning of the XXI century, the contours of the concept of synergetic historicism were clearly outlined.

A major role in the formation of this concept has played the activity of the St. Petersburg theoretical seminar "Social Philosophy and Synergetic approach" (1999-2013). The generalization of the activities of this seminar made it possible to raise research in the field of social synergetic to a substantially new level. There was a need to create a specialized scientific center for the study of the problems of synergetic historicism. Such a center was established in 2003 in St. Petersburg. This Center has hosted various symposiums specifically devoted to the analysis of the concept of synergetic historicism, the place occupied by this concept in research in the field of synergetic in general and the prospects for its development. Meaningful and sharp discussions took place. The main interests of the symposium participants were centered around two problems:

1. the relation of synergetic historicism to the scientific worldview (consistency or inconsistency of this concept with the principles of

the scientific worldview);

2. prospects for the development of synergetic historicism, i.e. a range of specific problems in solving which the concept of synergetic historicism can provide significant assistance.

The most controversial was the range of problems related to the relationship of synergetic historicism to the scientific worldview.

The first problem that arose when comparing synergetic historicism with the scientific worldview was whether synergetic historicism was compatible with the concept of fundamental objective reality as a self-consistent system of attributes (phenomenon and essence, quality and quantity, stability and variability, space and time, causality and interaction, etc.) or whether a kind of "redefinition of being is required".

Self-organization can be interpreted as "developing harmony", but the highlight of the program is how to understand the nature of this harmony. It can be interpreted as transforming harmony associated with the transformation of the world and man, or it can also be interpreted as conformist, conditioned by adaptation to the transcendent essence of the objective world ("merging with the mystical essence", "world soul", etc.). The discussion showed that the first interpretation does not lead to a contradiction with the scientific worldview, and the second leads to (because it violates, at least, the principles of determinism and rationality). Transforms "developing harmony" means such a joint transformation of the world and man (humanity), in which all private human ideals "merge" into a single universal ideal, and this global ("absolute") ideal is realized (embodied in reality) in a superattractor - a state of ending world and man, in which any there was a discrepancy ("disharmony") between the universal ideal and objective reality.

The second problem is connected with an attempt to bring synergetic historicism closer to holism due to the importance that synergetic attaches to the integrity of the system, manifested, in particular, in the phenomenon of cooperative ("coherent") long-range interaction between the elements of the system. Therefore, self-organization, indeed, cannot be understood with the help of classical ("mechanistic") reductionism, but this does not mean the irrationality of the whole and the impossibility of knowing it with the help of rational analysis. Synthesis is impos-

sible without analysis, because there is nothing to synthesize, and without synthesis, any rational cognition (cognition with the help of scientific concepts) is impossible.

From the fact that a person is not a purely rational being, but combines rational and irrational (emotional) behavior, it does not follow at all that this dual nature of a person can be attributed to an objective reality that exists before man and humanity.

The third problem is related to the apparent similarity of the concept of “attractor” used in synergetic with the “target” (“final”) cause of Aristotle. In other words, we are talking about a teleological interpretation of a new type of determinism and causality, which appeared in synergetic. This similarity is especially reinforced when it comes to the super attractor. However, an in-depth rational analysis of the nature of the super attractor shows the incorrectness of the teleological interpretation of the nature of the super attractor (and the attractor in general).

In fact, the real interest is the study of the specifics of selection as an active factor in the process of self-organization, which determines not only bifurcations and attractors, but also the alternation of the processes of hierarchization and de-hierarchization of dissipative structures due to the interaction of such selection factors as thesaurus, detector, and selector. Moreover, various kinds of extreme principles (playing the role of stability principles) can act as selectors.

The fourth problem that caused a sharp discussion was the question of the relationship of pluralism in the development of science and philosophy with monism. It was a question of whether a comparative analysis of different interpretations of social synergetic should be carried out, or whether it is necessary to limit ourselves only to putting forward new interpretations without trying to reduce them to some unity. During the discussion, it was shown that the concept of synergetic historicism is just such a concept that allows bringing together different interpretations and carrying out their logically consistent synthesis. The problem of the relationship between pluralism and monism was given a more concrete sound in connection with the problem of the relationship in the process of social self-organization of economic, political, and socio-cultural determinism. At the same time, the idea was expressed about the advantages of a

pluralistic approach compared to a monistic one. Meanwhile, it is the theory of self-organization that shows the inadmissibility of absolutization of both any forms of monism and pluralism.

The synergetic approach to the analysis of different spheres of social life (economic, political, and socio-cultural) requires taking into account their connection and interaction on the basis of a new concept of selective determinism, which brings all forms of determinism into an integral system and this significantly differs from the old eclectic theory of factors. Consequently, synergetic historicism also considers the problem of the relationship between pluralism and monism in full accordance with the scientific worldview. This is best seen in the example of the synergetic theory of globalization. The very fact of the globalization of humanity and the orientation of this globalization towards the super-contractor clearly testifies to the inadmissibility of the absolutization of both objective and subjective pluralism.

The fifth problem is related to the relationship of such fundamental concepts as noospherogenesis and supremeness. The first term refers to the movement of society into the noosphere (the state of complete rationalization on the scientific basis of any human activity, and, consequently, its complete programming in the spirit of the social ideals of Saint-Simon and O. Comte) (Oganyan, 2022).

Such an approach to the development of society presupposes a complete rationalization of the human personality, i.e. taking into account only rational actions dictated by the requirements of reason, and ignoring irrational (emotional) motives of behavior dictated by the demands of feelings and associated with certain social ideals. Therefore, the noospheric concept of globalization takes into account only the trend toward universal technization, but ignores the alternative trend toward total aestheticization (“emotionalization”). In other words, the noospheric approach is characterized by a one-sided interpretation of human nature, in which a person undergoes rationalization (in the words of Academician N. N. Moiseev, “Ascent to Reason”) and is isolated from ideologization (“Ascent to the Ideal”). Due to this, the noospheric concept of globalization ignores the dual (contradictory) nature of globalization (a combination of craving for totalitarianism and craving for anarchism) and cannot over-

come the Prigozhin paradox. The deideologization of globalization leads to ignoring the law of self-organization of social ideals, which gives the key to understanding the self-organization of culture. Meanwhile, the interpretation of globalization as supremacy, i.e. the movement towards the super-tractor shows that globalization is not only scientific and technological progress (rational improvement of society), but also artistic and technical progress (“emotional” improvement of the same society). Consequently, along with the movement into the noosphere (the formation of an absolute technical work), there is a movement into the asthenosphere (the formation of an absolute work of art). Thus, although both the noospheric approach to the development of society and synergetic historicism are equally guided by the scientific worldview, the former exaggerates the role of scientific and technological progress in this process, while the latter does it in a balanced way, showing the equally significant role of artistic and technological progress.

Therefore, the analysis of the relationship of synergetic historicism to the scientific worldview shows the following. The novelty of the concept of synergetic historicism consists not in the rejection of certain principles of the scientific worldview (objectivity, determinism, rationality, etc.), but in the further development and generalization of these principles.

The real novelty of synergetic historicism is fully manifested in overcoming the old contradiction between the finalist and infinite concepts of the philosophy of history: is there an “end” of social history, or may there not be such an “end”? As is clear from the above, synergetic historicism answers this question as follows. In this formulation, the question excludes the possibility of an unambiguous answer (“yes or no”): on the one hand, there must be a limit to the cultural development of mankind (“super-tractor”), but, on the other hand, the movement to this limit must be asymptotic, i.e. it cannot be reached in a finite historical period, however, you can approach it in principle as close as you like. Is it good or bad? It is even very good because such a situation means the inexhaustibility of the “meaning of history” and the preservation of the “meaning” by history throughout its entire course. Only with such a solution to the problem of the relationship between the finite and the infinite in history (“dialectic of the finite and the

infinite”) can we talk about the validity of the principle of historical optimism.

The most important practical significance of the concept of synergetic historicism lies in the fact that based on this concept it is possible to lay the foundations of the synergetic theory of globalization and find out how and why the so-called socially responsible globalization, or globalization with a human face, is possible (Bransky et al., 2009; Bransky & Pozharsky, 2004).

The Relation of Social Synergetic to Classical and Modernist “Philosophies of History”

In order to properly evaluate the scientific and practical significance of social synergetic and its novelty, avoiding both terminological euphoria and methodological phobia, it is necessary to compare the synergetic concept of history with well-known historiosophical concepts. The latter can be divided into classical (V-XIX century) and modernist (late XIX - XX century) (Oganyan & Bransky, 2010).

The first, in turn, can be divided into three groups: the concepts of divine manifestation (Augustine, etc.), the historical cycle (Vico, etc.), and global progress (Condorcet, Herder, Hegel, Comte, Marx, etc.). The second form two groups: concepts of local civilizations (Danilevsky, Spengler, Toynbee, Sorokin, etc.) and absolute chaos (philosophical de constructivism of the last third of the XX century). At the same time, attention should be paid to a kind of terminological incident associated with the qualification of concepts of absolute chaos. In the modern philosophical literature, they are usually called “post-modern”. Such terminology, however, can be misleading, because postmodernism always represents a kind of return to the classics, but based on modernism. This means that postmodernism is a kind of synthesis of modernism and the classics. The concepts of absolute chaos depart from classical traditions in historiosophical constructions even further. Therefore, they are not post, but supermodernism. Their novelty in comparison with the concepts of local civilizations lies not in taking into account the role of chaos in history (the idea of chaos is also present in the concepts of local civilizations), but in denying the role of order and, thereby, the creative role of

chaos.

Social synergetic shows that supermodernism is a preparatory stage for the formation of real (constructive) postmodernism. If we now compare synergetic historiosophy with those just listed, it will not be difficult to notice a clear tendency to creative synthesis, based, at the same time, on vigorous constructive criticism.

Indeed, social synergy, as we have seen, represents, first, the revival of the concept of global progress. However, this is no longer the “linear” (“infinite” or “finite”) progress that the founders of progressivism wrote about.

Now global progress is becoming nonlinear and asymptotic. Moreover, it grows on the ruins of the parabolic evolution of local civilizations and their very existence. Formation is impossible without such evolution.

The picture of global progress is also becoming more complicated in one more respect: progressive development now looks, contrary to what former progressives were used to, like an alternation (cycle) order and chaos. Chaos is organically woven into the picture of progress, but at the same time retains its creative character, generating new order.

Finally, what is most surprising, the picture of global progress, when viewed from a certain angle, looks like the phenomenon of an absolute man in the image of superman.

Thus, social synergetic turns out to be a real postmodern “philosophy of history”, highlighting with utmost clarity both the strengths and weaknesses of both classical and modernist historiosophical concepts.

Now it’s time to compare the analysis of globalization from the point of view of the methodologies of DE constructivism and synergetic historicism (Oganyan, 2007). The question arises: with all the differences between these methodologies, is there anything in common between them? It seems that such a commonality lies in the high value that both DE constructivism and synergetic historicism attach to the concept of chaos.

In the XX century. came the realization that the state of chaos is the same natural state of objective reality as the state of order. Therefore, the synergetic theory of self-organization is a further development and far-reaching generalization of the classical theory of development. Development as a transition from one type of order to

another is a special case of self-organization as a transition from order to chaos and from chaos to order (with repeated alternation of these processes). However, if we take a closer look at how DE constructivism and synergetic historicism approach chaos, it is not difficult to notice the following significant difference. Chaos can be interpreted as the final state of social reality, from which this reality does not find a way out (the absolutization of chaos). But chaos can also be interpreted as one of the intermediate states, in the depths of which the prerequisites for the formation of a new order are ripening (relativization of chaos; emphasizing the creative role of chaos). In this case, the final state of social reality is such a synthesis of chaos and order, in which the very difference between these states is erased (global attractor, or super attractor).

If we compare these initial assumptions regarding the role of chaos in the development of mankind, the following conclusions become obvious. The absolutization of chaos leads to the conclusion that a scientific analysis of such a phenomenon as globalization is impossible. Therefore, the construction of a theory of globalization is an unsolvable task and therefore meaningless. Consequently, the methodology of DE constructivism does not have a heuristic function in this case (in serious science in such cases they say: “there are no results”). On the contrary, within the framework of the methodology of synergetic historicism, it is possible not only to give a detailed description of globalization as a unique phenomenon at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries but also to explore its essence and very interesting and peculiar patterns associated with it. To what extent the patterns described in the article by Bransky and Pozharsky reflect the objective patterns of global self-organization remains to be seen in the course of a special discussion. Nevertheless, the scientific result is obvious.

What is the difference between both approaches to globalization in answering the question: “Will Clio survive in the conditions of globalization?” In other words, is humanity’s desire for global unity compatible with the preservation of its local diversity?

The DE constructivist approach gives a negative answer to it. The synergetic approach tends to be positive. At the same time, from the point of view of scientific methodology, a reasonable

answer to such a question is possible only if there is a theory of globalization. Meanwhile, as one could see, the DE constructivist approach excludes the possibility of creating such a theory. Therefore, strictly speaking, from a DE constructivist point of view, the question posed cannot be unambiguously answered (any answer will look unreasonable). On the contrary, the synergetic theory of globalization gives a well-founded unambiguous answer to this question.

Conclusion

1. If we take into account all the features of the super attractor listed above, it becomes clear that it is this concept that contains the solution of the contradiction described by Prigogine between the tendency to increase order and the tendency to increase freedom (and thus disorder, chaos). Those who are afraid of excessive scientific and technological progress do not take into account another parallel process, which is ethical and aesthetic progress, which involves the improvement of ethical and aesthetic standards and their approximation to the absolute (universal) ideal. This process used to be called “spiritual progress” or “improvement of morals”. But a better term, taking into account the connection of this process with the law of differentiation and integration of ideals, is “sociocultural engineering”. Since the super attractor is a product of the realization of an absolute ideal, the people who make it up, having gigantic possibilities in transforming the world around them and themselves, at the same time choose from these possibilities only those that correspond to ethical and aesthetic standards dictated by absolute morality and absolute beauty. Therefore, the conflict between freedom and order is resolved through the realization of an absolute (universal) ideal. The fact is that absolute freedom turns out to be not irresponsible arbitrariness (as philosophizing anarchists of all ages imagined), but a possibility of choice within the framework of absolute morality and absolute beauty, determined by an absolute ideal.
The contradiction disappears within the framework of the super attractor because the people who make up this society, having ab-
2. solute freedom (due to proximity to the absolute truth), at the same time are guided in all their actions not by a multitude of various individual ideals (which may contradict each other), but by a single universal ideal, formed as a result of the integration of an infinite variety of various individual ideals. The spiritual unity that is achieved in the super attractor differs fundamentally from totalitarian unity in that it is not a particular human unity forcibly elevated to an absolute, but a natural unity that exists in absolute diversity and spontaneously formed in the depths of this diversity.
2. The concept of synergetic historicism is the application of the synergetic method to the philosophy of history and the construction of a new (synergetic) philosophy of history. This philosophy forms a natural “bridge” between the philosophy of natural science and the philosophy of social science. Here, too, the problem of synthesis arises, but already much more general, namely, the synthesis of natural science and humanitarian knowledge.
3. The synergetic philosophy of history includes a general theory of social self-organization, which is a far-reaching generalization of the classical theory of social development. The heuristic role of synergetic historicism is to build the foundations of the synergetic theory of such an important phenomenon of our time as globalization.
4. Globalization is a special type of self-organization. Therefore, the general patterns of globalization can only be revealed with the help of a general theory of social self-organization, which is a new science - social synergetic (Oganyan & Bransky, 2016; Oganyan et al., 2018).
5. In the synergetic model of global progress, the creative role of social chaos in the formation of new forms of social order is shown, the general patterns of social selection as the driving force of social development and the main factors of this selection (thesaurus, detector and selector) are studied, the concepts of super selection and super attractor are introduced, revealing the meaning historical development in the long term.
6. Accepting the main provisions of the synergetic philosophy of history, one can evaluate the results of the third Russian revolution of the 20th century (the first took place in 1905, the

second in 1917-1921, the third in 1989-1993). With the collapse of the socialist system, according to the synergistic understanding of history, quite expected chaos ensued, but the disorder must end with the organization of a new order, without falling into the extreme of complete rejection of past reasonable forms of activity. And philosophers had to think over and develop models for the formation of a new - balanced - order. For example, in the past, official Marxism took the form of a dogmatic doctrine. But in our time, it has undergone complete denial, which has opened the way for irrational, mystical teachings and philosophical pluralism that rejects rationality, materialism, and the scientific rigor of philosophical research.

References

- Bransky, V. P., & Pozharsky, S. D. (2004). *Globalizatsiya i sinergeticheskiy istorizm* (Globalization and synergetic historicism, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Polytechnic.
- Bransky, V. P., Oganyan, K. M., & Pozharsky, S. D. (2009). *Sinergeticheskaya filosofiya istorii i filosofiya cheloveka (vvedeniye v sinergeticheskuyu teoriyu ideologicheskogo i potrebitel'skogo obshchestva)* (Synergetic philosophy of history and philosophy of man (introduction to the synergetic theory of ideological and consumer society, in Russian). In *Sinergeticheskaya filosofiya istorii* (Synergetic philosophy of history, in Russian) (pp. 177-233). Saint Petersburg-Ryazan: "Kopi-Print".
- Bransky, V., & Oganyan, K. (2014). Synergetic philosophy of human: A new research trend. *WISDOM*, 3(2), 108-125. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v3i2.101>
- Bransky, V., Oganyan, K. M., & Oganyan, K. K. (2018). A new line of research: Synergetic philosophy and sociology of personality. *WISDOM*, 10(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v10i1.203>
- Haken, G. (2003). *Tayny prirody. Sinergetika: ucheniye i vzaimodeystviye* (Secrets of nature. Synergetics: Teaching and interaction, in Russian). Moscow-Izhevsk: In-t komp'yuternykh issledovaniy.
- Huntington, S. (2021). *Stolknoveniye tsivilizatsiy* (Clash of civilizations, in Russian). Moscow: Izdatel'-stvo AST.
- Knyazevoy, E. I., & Kurdyumova, S. P. (2006). *Osnovy sinergetiki* (Fundamentals of synergetic, in Russian). Moscow: KomKniga.
- Nazaretyan, A. P. (2000). *Tsivilizatsionnyye krizisy v kontekste vsemirnoy istorii. Sinergetika, psikhologiya i futurologiya* (Civilizational crises in the context of universal history. Synergetics, psychology and futurology, in Russian). Moscow: PnrSE.
- Oganyan, K. M. (2007). *Metodologicheskiye problemy teorii globalizatsii (dekonstruktivizm i sinergeticheskiy istorizm)* (Methodological problems of the theory of globalization (Deconstructivism and synergetic historicism, in Russian)). *Social sciences and modernity*, 2, 150-155.
- Oganyan, K. M. (2009). *Sotsial'nyy ideal i vybor optimal'nogo puti globalizatsii* (The social ideal and the choice of the optimal path of globalization, in Russian). *Zhurnal Uspekhi sovremenogo yestestvoznaniya (Journal Successes of Modern Natural Science, in Russian)*, 7, 137-139. Moscow.: RAE. Retrieved from <https://natural-sciences.ru/ru/article/view?id=12730>
- Oganyan, K. M. (2022). *Filosofiya cheloveka* (Philosophy of man, in Russian). Moscow: Yurayt.
- Oganyan, K. M., & Bransky, V. P. (2010). *Sotsial'naya sinergetika* (Social synergetic, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Petropolis.
- Oganyan, K. M., & Bransky, V. P. (2013b). *Ideal neoliberal'nogo cheloveka v novyykh usloviyakh* (The ideal of a neoliberal person in the new conditions, in Russian). *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal fundamental'nyye issledovaniya (International Journal of Basic Research, in Russian)*, 10, 670-674.

- Oganyan, K. M., & Bransky, V. P. (2014). *Zakon relevantnosti i integratsii idealov povedencheskikh stereotipov* (The law of relevance and integration of the ideals of behavioral stereotypes, in Russian). *Vestnik KRSU*, 14(6), 70-79. Retrieved from <http://vestnik.krsu.edu.kg/archive/72/3002>
- Oganyan, K. M., & Bransky, V. P. (2016). *Sotsial'naya sinergetika* (Social synergy, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Petropolis.
- Oganyan, K. M., Bransky, V. P., & Oganyan, K. K. (2013). *Globalizatsiya i obshchchelovecheskaya tsennost'* (Globalization and human value, in Russian). In *Yevraziyskiye issledovaniya: aktual'nyye problemy i perspektivy razvitiya. 3 oktyabrya Yerevan (Eurasian Studies: Actual Problems and Development Prospects, in Russian)* (pp. 89-99). Erevan: Amaras.
- Oganyan, K. M., Bransky, V. P., & Oganyan, K. K. (2014). *Globalizatsiya i obshchchelovecheskaya tsennost'* (Globalization and universal value, in Russian). *Zhurnal Gumanitarniy Yuga Rossii (Journal Humanitarian of the Russian South, in Russian)*, 4, 78-88. Retrieved from http://www.isras.ru/-files/File/Gumanitary_Yuga_Rossii-/2013_4/Bransky.pdf
- Oganyan, K. M., Bransky, V. P., & Oganyan, K. K. (2018). *Teoreticheskoye i empiricheskoye obosnovaniye sotsiologicheskogo osmysleniya zhizni s pomoshch'yu ponyatiya "superatraktor"* (Theoretical and empirical substantiation of the sociological understanding of life using the concept of "superattractor", in Russian). *Sotsiologiya i pravo (Sociology and Law, in Russian)*, 1(39), 31-38.
- Prigozhy, I., & Stengers, I. (1996). *Poryadok iz khaosa* (Order out of chaos, in Russian). Moscow: "Progress".
- Roudometof, V., & Robertson, R. (1995). *Globalizatsiya, teoriya mirovykh sistem i sravnitel'noye issledovaniye tsivilizatsiy* (Globalization, world system theory, and the comparative study of civilizations, in Russian). In S. K. Sanderson (Ed.), *Sivilizatsiy i mirovykh sistem: izucheniye vseмирno-istoricheskikh izmeneniy (Civilization and world systems: the study of world-historical changes and, in Russian)*, (pp. 273-300). Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Vasilkova, V. V. (2002). *Poryadok i kaos v razvitii sotsial'nykh sistem. Sinergetika i teoriya sotsial'noy organizatsii* (Order and chaos in the development of social systems. Synergetic and theory of social organization, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Publishing House "Lan".