

NOOSPHERE ASPECTS OF ECOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

O. Y. Kolosova

*Krasnodar university of Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russian Federation
Stavropol, Russia
kolosova.07@mail.ru*

V. N. Goncharov

*North-Caucasus federal university. Stavropol, Russia
vgn1968@rambler.ru*

Tendencies of global development are increasingly determined by the “Challenges of History” under the global problems requiring from humanity coordinated and extraordinary measures to ensure their right to further existence. Stochasticity, nonlinearity of historical processes is manifested in the world polycentric development, diversification of its mechanisms, need to overcome its most serious and inefficient forms - destructive crises and confrontations. Superattractor which main feature is noosphere and aesthetosphere synthesis should be the final result of multi aspect and contradictory processes of the modern world dynamics which lie at the heart of globalization. From the perspective of synergetics, one-sided cult of order is typical for noosphere thinking and synthesis of order and freedom (“chaos”) is considered to be harmonious for aesthetosphere thinking.

Key words: society, socio-historical evolution, synergetics, globalization, the noosphere, superattractor.

Modern era is an era of civilization shift, global civilization crisis. There are various estimates of the crisis itself – optimistic, as natural phenomenon of change of cultures, as “end of history”, and pessimistic, as destruction of civilization. But, in spite of differences in the crises assessment, there is a position uniting them. It is an opinion that those numerous crises which the mankind met are manifestations of the general crisis adumbrating exhaustion of the whole phase of anthropogenesis – the Neolithic phase of humanity development which has led to replacement of integrally complete relation “person – world” by its degenerate form “subject-object”. Therefore, it is impossible to overcome it with any technological means, as it is a crisis of technological relation to the world.

Modern humanity is in a greater degree involved into the processes conducting to the change of its vital activity and living arrangement bases. The direction of world development is more and more defined by “*Challenges of History*” within global problems, demanding from mankind the coordinated and extraordinary measures to ensure the right for its further existence. “It represents one of the brightest manifestations of modern public progress, the evidence of further expansion and complication of social communications” [3]. Stochasticity, nonlinearity of historical processes is manifested in the world polycentric development, diversification of its mechanisms, need to overcome its most serious and inefficient forms – destructive crises and confrontations. Mastering a new type of development which cornerstone is principles of partnership, compromise, cooperation and consensus is a problem solved throughout the long evolutionary period, but already today humanity has to choose an orientation to a similar result if it wishes to get more or less optimum strategy of its future construction.

For the first time in human history global issues marked limit, turning point, liminality that exclude hope of incidental circumstances favorable concatenation, the objectivity of social regularities, reducing the role of people to vanishingly small fluctuations, lack of control, commitment to the previous, established ways of economic activity and methods of power resolution of interstate controversies, worldview attitudes, authorizing the development vector of technogenic civilization based on the values of anthropocentrism, secularized humanism, unlimited activism and individualistic hedonism. The human being is not the main value any more, he became a productive force.

It is necessary to find other paradigms of life overestimating new value of subjectivity and a place of the human in the biosphere and space, a ratio of spiritual and material, intellectual and emotional, sensual and willing, educational and instructional processes, individual and public, cul-

tural and civilization, traditional and innovative, monological and dialogical forms of communication with the nature, cutting off historically depleted stereotypes, despite their persistence.

The crises of the current situation lies in fact that network of external and internal ecological threats brings society and biosphere out of the zone of an attractor which promoted steady functioning of planetary system and development of *homo sapiens*.

Nowadays one of the key questions exciting the world community is: what are humanity prospects? What structural state – in the direction of order or freedom (a disorder or chaos) the development vector is directed to? What dominates in the person's activity: regulations or liberalizations? In fact, these questions concern very deep bases of human existence expressed in philosophy in the form of so-called eschatological and existential problems.

The eschatological problem considers probability of the end of social history on Earth. Is there a limit of cultural development of humanity or are these processes infinite? The matter of purport of individual life and individual death is a basis of an existential problem. Solution of existential and eschatological problems is interdependent.

Works of I. Prigozhin and his followers marked the next stage of the scientific revolution connected with formation of the next metatheory of development in general and sociohistorical evolution in particular. Synergetic approach assumes that:

- time direction and evolution direction of social life are not specified from the outside, they “are constantly performing at the level of “common” human relations”;
- according to the historical process it is possible to speak about a peculiar reversibility of social time in contradistinction to basic irreversibility of mechanical time as existence form [6, p. 15];
- “human society is a very difficult system which is capable to undergo a number of bifurcations (explosive changes) giving new, unpredictable directions of evolution” (that is confirmed by variety of different cultures which developed over a rather short period in human history) [7, p. 6].

In 2000 in an interview to “Expert” I. Prigozhin claims that with increase of the globe population the probability of the nonlinear microfluctuations connected with an individual freedom of choice [5] increases as well. But, on the other hand, association into global network structures occurs by means of information technologies that can give opposite effect when collective interests prevail over a personal liberty of choice. Considering modern society from the viewpoint of the nonequilibrium processes theory, it is possible to note that globalization, informational and technological revolution lead not only to bigger interrelation of people with each other, but also to increasing of the certain individual role in the historical process when at the point of bifurcation of society development creative person influence on historical events is much higher, than influence of masses.

It is about two opposite tendencies in the modern society development: on the one hand – increasing of the system organization level (globalization, pursuit for totalitarianism), and on the other hand – growth of freedom (individualization, tendency to anarchism). I. Prigozhin speaks about necessity of compromise between these contradictions. However, the compromise gives the chance only of temporary relief of contradiction and delay of its solving for the uncertain period. Only synthesis of order and chaos can become a solution when distinction between them vanishes.

In the rational solution of an eschatological problem such fundamental concepts as superselection and superattractor which are peculiar only to social synergetics have fundamental value. According to V.P. Bransky, social superselection is a selection mechanism of choice criteria of decision-making in social systems management, superattractor is a global attractor which the set of local attractors tend to [1]. In the states far from balance (namely it is represented by the crisis phenomena of society), bifurcation mechanisms start functioning – presence of short-term points of bifurcation of transition to this or that rather long mode of system – to attractor. It is impossible to predict which potential attractor will be chosen by a system.

Superattractor should be the final result of not only multi aspect, but also dynamics contradictory processes of the modern world which are cornerstone of globalization. Emergent effects scales from nonlinear sociocultural dynamics constantly increase, social systems gradually lose their stability, deviate from balance. Understanding of global threats and globalization processes

causing them, creation of “a global cheloveynik (human colony)” [4] and corresponding global consciousness, culture and life of an increasing number of planet inhabitants considers to be an important sign of these changes.

Resolution of the conflicts is establishment of civilization balance between scientific-ly-technological and morally-esthetical potentials of humanity culture. The movement towards global information telecommunication space will signify, most likely, a technical and technological component of society emersion not only of rational (*homo sapiens*), but also creative person (*homo sapiens ingenius*).

The concept of noosphere is closely connected with understanding of globalization processes. According to one of the most famous supporters of noosphere approach A.D. Ursule: “Formation of noosphere will be continuation of a social and technological row of development (primitive society – agrarian – industrial – post-industrial). The first stage of noosphere creation will be information society (info-noosphere) as global information civilization where due to the processes of informatization, united hybrid collective (noosphere) intelligence which is capable to operate planetary social environmental development, will be created” [8].

According to V.I. Vernadsky, association of humanity into a whole unity is conditioned by formation of noosphere in which science, technology and ethical mind of a person are connected together [2]. Noosphere and technical use of scientific knowledge aren't identical for a person; mind is not scientific or technocratic. It is an ethical Mind realized both in science and in technology. In the concept of noosphere truth, kindness and beauty are inseparable. Sources of V. I. Vernadsky optimism are both in his philosophical and historical point of view and in scientific orientation of his position.

Though the idea of the controlled development is traced during the early period in the noosphere theory of Vernadsky, however, he speaks rather careful about probability and possible prospects of such development. He said that mind of a person is responsible for further development of society and biosphere. Thus, he doesn't express any categorical judgments about concrete mechanisms which are necessary for an implementation of this responsibility in contradistinction, for example, to Soviet Marxism supporters. Humanity should only learn and be capable to coordinate its own needs with biosphere potential. Practically, it is a theory of rather directed, but not coordinated development. V. I. Vernadsky has never specified how to realize this coordinated, more specifically, directed development, what efforts should be taken and what organizational decisions should be made. It significantly distinguishes Vernadsky's concept from Teyar de Chardin's theory, and from doctrines of the Soviet Marxism acting from the position of extreme views.

It is possible to assume that creation of noosphere has already begun and this concept itself has certain bases, but so far, speaking about noosphere, we will define it as the predictive humanity future. For us it is important to realize that noosphere can't be characterized as an objective state. Mainly, this time is defined by our consciousness. Noosphere assumes the development of a new paradigm in the directions of perception and activity, and the variations of its image following from it, as it is a new type of society and nature interaction. In other words, noosphere implementation is conditioned by human development. Content of noosphere includes necessity of obsolete attitudes revision; it can't be only consequence of free intellectual initiative.

Along with development of science and technicalization of modern society one can observe an opposite process – general aestheticization (submission of all spheres of existence to aesthetic requirements). V.P. Bransky notes that in consequence of this process “all available to humanity part of space turns into an absolute work of art (space art ensemble). In humanity cultural development it is naturally to call this limit as aesthetosphere (social structure meeting the requirements of universal feeling)” [1, p.112]. It should be noted that culture in general and artistic culture as its subsystem and aesthetosphere of culture refer to complicated and hyper complex systems.

Speaking about prospects of cultural development of the XXI century it is possible to note ideas of J. Feiblmann who suggests in future emergence of so-called post-scientific or rational type

of culture which will take place of scientific one [9, p. 125-150]. The author notes that errors of his predecessor will be corrected within post-scientific type; and everything that has been earlier considered as impossible will be accomplished. Science, philosophy and art will be the main occupations of this culture type. It is obvious that humanism, science and morality have to act as the whole unity both when it is referred to world development and when humanity chooses an advance trajectory into information era. Understanding of bifurcation state in which culture of modern society exists, leads to the conclusion that a dialogue of mankind with nature and a dialogue of cultures at all levels of culture existence – legal, political, confessional, ethic, aesthetic, art appears to be an alternative of humanity death due to further development.

From the all abovementioned one can conclude that peculiarity of superattractor lies in synthesis of noosphere and aesthetosphere. The aesthetosphere thinking is based on deep synthesis of philosophy of science and philosophy of art in contradistinction to noosphere thinking which relies only on science philosophy. If from the synergetics point of view unilateral cult of order is typical for noosphere thinking, then for aesthetosphere – harmonious synthesis of order and freedom (“chaos”). The aesthetosphere concept includes noosphere concept, but it can't be reduced to this particular concept. After all aesthetosphere is not only a sphere of domination in all public and private affairs of “collective mind”, but also “collective (valid) feeling” (charismatic empathy) [1]. Creation and realization of absolute ideal are necessary for suchlike synthesis, as difference between utilitarian (economic and political) and spiritual (ethical, aesthetic and worldview) ideals, in other words, between interests and beauty disappears in absolute ideal.

References

1. Bransky V.P., Pozharsky S.D. Prigozhin's Paradox and superattractor // Globalization: synergetic approach / under the editorship of V.K. Yegorov. M., 2002.
2. Vernadsky V.I. Scientific thought as geological strength // Reflection of the naturalist. M., 1977.
3. Goncharov V.N. Political information in public system // Humanitarian and social and economic sciences. 2011. № 3.
4. Zinovyev A.A. Global supersociety and Russia. Minsk. 2000.
5. Prigozhin I.R. The creating person // Expert 18.12.2000. № 48.
6. Prigozhin I.R. Rediscovery of time // Philosophy Questions. 1989.
7. Prigozhin I.R. Philosophy of instability // Philosophy Questions. 1991. № 6.
8. Ursule A.D. Noosfera // Global studies: encyclopedia. M., 2003.
9. Feibelman J. The Theory of Human Culture. N. Y., 2004.

June, 18, 2015