

УДК 141.7:316.32

DOI <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2021-8-85-03>

©NIKITENKO, VITALINA

Engineering educational and scientific Institute of Zaporizhzhia National University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)

E-mail: vitalina2006@ukr.net

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9588-7836>

Інженерний навчально-науковий інститут Запорізького національного університету, 226 пр. Соборний, 69006 Запоріжжя, Україна

Engineering educational and scientific Institute of Zaporizhzhia National University, 226 Soborny Avenue, 69006 Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPT OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GEOVALUES, GEOCULTURE AND GEOPOLITICS AS FACTORS OF GLOBAL WORLD FORMATION

Abstract.

The article analyzes the philosophical concept, which is based on the interaction of one another, caused by the escalation of contradictions between globalization and glocalization processes. information, communication and organizational unity of the global community. **The purpose** of the article is to conceptualize the philosophical concept of the relationship between geovalues, geoculture and geopolitics as factors in shaping the global world. **Objectives** of the study: 1) to analyze the historical approach to the formation and development of geovalues and geoculture; 2) identify the conditions for the formation of geoculture and its components in the context of cultural globalization; 3) to find out the influence of geovalues and geoculture on the formation and development of geopolitics in the context of integration and disintegration processes. **The methodological basis** of the study is the general philosophical principles of objectivity and historicism, universal connection and development, historical and logical, dialectical, axiological and hermeneutic methods and a systematic approach based on the universal laws of nature and society. Geoculture is a product of geopolitical processes, the core of which is geovalues. Considering geoculture as a philosophical and political concept, it should be noted that it is a worldview in cultural and geographical images, and defining its process, in another way, can be called an activity that produces cultural images and determines the appropriate behavior of the state in the international arena and domestic politics. . The image of world development is a system of coordinated "chains", or clusters, purposeful, specific geographical megaimages, which include stable ideas about the dynamics of geospatial development of certain human communities. In this case, the purpose of the study allows us to use them, the concepts of "geovalues" and "geoculture", as synonyms, for example, in the analysis of scientific approaches to the study of geovalues or in the evaluation and selection of methodological tools.

Keywords: geovalues, geoculture, geopolitics, cultural globalization, social organism

Problem statement in general and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks.

The relevance of the study is due to the following circumstances: first, the philosophical thought of the XXI century continues to deepen the importance of reflection on profound and unique changes in socio-political life associated with large-scale processes of transformation of human relations, values and social structures. globalization and glocalization processes that bring to the fore the problem of the relationship of geopolitics and geoculture as factors in shaping the global world. Secondly, the study of the relationship between geopolitics and geoculture is represented by the dynamism of a contradictory world in the context of globalization, as growing tensions associated with changing values, the need to find and quickly find common solutions, and therefore comes to the fore a culture that has high mission – to form new values

of the individual and to solve the global problems of mankind, facing the modern world community. Third, the problem of human understanding of the basic principles of the global world and, first of all, the transformation of values that reformat the algorithm of its existence and renovation, lead, on the one hand, to the ontological, informational, communication and organizational unity of the global community. on the other hand, neither social philosophy nor modern management theory can adequately answer the questions and determine the reasons why integration processes in all spheres of social reproduction increasingly lead to regressive and crisis consequences and results in public life, and disintegration – vice versa. Fourth, the modern era as a transitional, bifurcation stage in the development of world civilization opens up unique opportunities for the realization of the intellectual and creative potential of the Intelligent Man as a global subject

of historical creativity. For the first time in world history, the necessary conditions have been created for the self-disclosure of the global humanistic nature of global human society, however, modern man must become both an object and a subject of his own history, which he creates. This indicates an obvious gap in the study of the relationship between geopolitics and geoculture for the sake of social reproduction. The way out of this situation is to find an explanation of what is happening to us in the semantic depths of our existence, addressing the deep foundations of philosophical thinking.

Analysis of recent research and publications, which initiated the solution of this problem and on which the author relies.

The founders of the classical geocultural school, if we consider that geoculture has stood out or is closely related to geopolitical science, should be considered F. Ratzel, R. Chellen, A. Mechen, H. Mackinder, N. Spikeman, in whose works the central place was given geographical location of the element of international policy. The founder of the civilization approach in geocultural research is rightly considered to be M. Ya. Danilevsky, author of the world-famous work "Russia and Europe". The problems of civilizations were also studied by K. Leontiev, O. Spengler, P. Savitsky, L. Gumilev, and A. Toynbee. Ideas of formation of geocultural and geopolitical paradigm of world development are considered in the works of modern Western politicians and scientists: I. Wallerstein, Z. Brzezinski, F. Fukuyama, S. Huntington. Z. Brzezinski [1] predicts the geopolitical situation on the Eurasian continent; F. Fukuyama affirms the beginning of geocultural planetary existence under the sign of democracy; S. Huntington argues that modern world geoculture has entered a new phase, when the source of conflict is not ideology or economic causes, but the sphere of culture, the confrontation of different civilizations. Geocultural considerations are found in the works of domestic scientists of the late nineteenth – early twentieth century. M. Hrushevsky was one of the first to formulate and analyze the spatial and geographical orientations of Ukrainian geoculture, its main geopolitical vectors, predicted the "Black Sea orientation", considered the western geocultural direction, determined the special value of "natural orientation". The geopolitical concept of equilibrium between East and West, proposed by M. Hrushevsky, has been considered by domestic scholars at different times. I. Lysnyak-Rudnytsky made a significant contribution to the further development of this concept, believing

that complementary western and eastern geocultural influences took place at all stages of Ukrainian history. S. Rudnytsky puts forward concepts based on the synthesis of geographical, historical, political and legal sciences. At the end of the twentieth century, the first works on the problems of Ukrainian geoculture and geopolitics appeared, including the works of V. Voronkova, V. Bekh, F. Rudych, V. Kremen, V. Tkachenko, M. Mykhalchenko. The leading idea of these works is that the authors see the overcoming of the original East-West confrontation through a cultural and political synthesis of the civilizational heritage of each nation. The Ukrainian geocultural paradigm as a component of modern philosophical and political science is just beginning to be developed in this context, where the central role is played by the relationship between geopolitics and geoculture as factors in shaping the global world.

Highlighting previously unsolved parts of the general problem to which this article is devoted.

Geocultural values and geocultural are the subject field of this study, the development of which allows us to clarify in the course of cognitive analysis all the necessary philosophical characteristics of this phenomenon, namely: a) to establish their semantic nature, essence, content and form; b) its generation by man; c) to form their own worldview prism on the holistic worldview of values, because in our field of view there is a planet and the peoples who inhabit it – are their producers, carriers and protect them from axiological and political external influences; d) to determine the ideology of finding answers to the above tasks in the paradigm of the selected scientific research; e) to consider the social and cultural organism of the planet as a dispositive, which at the same time unites peoples with universal values, and regional and ethno-national values, on the contrary, divides and opposes them among themselves; g) analyze and form a categorical apparatus, or a common semantic field (knowledge of needs, values, interests and norms, law, policy / management), g) formalize the existing flow of social information, which carries the necessary axiological meanings for analytical work; h) select tools and form the methodology of our further search work, etc. Analysis of scientific approaches to the subject of the study found that the concepts of "geovaluation" and "geoculture" in this study and show their relationship with geopolitics, which we consider as a philosophical concept that sees in foreign policy a decisive role of cultural and geographical factors.

Purpose and formation of the goals of the article (task statement).

The methodological basis of the study is the general philosophical principles of objectivity and historicism, universal connection and development, historical and logical, dialectical, axiological and hermeneutic methods and a systematic approach based on the universal laws of nature and society. Given that the social, economic and cultural organism of the planet is an object of functional origin, a positive role as a tool of cognitive analysis should play modern methodological foundations of research on the organization of systems based on the principle of integrity, systemicity and organization. functionality as the main property of the organization. The article focuses on the search for the foundations of philosophical understanding of new trends in integration-disintegration. One of the scientific principles and methodological approaches is the principle of holism, which focuses research on a multifaceted analysis of social and cultural phenomena. An important methodological approach to the study is also the analysis of the integration and disintegration of universal values of material and spiritual origin into regional and national. In this regard, it seems effective to use a modeling method in which the "base model" is projected at a specific, in this case, the planetary, regional and national levels. Since methodological pluralism prevails in modern humanities, traditional philosophical methods (dialectical, phenomenological, hermeneutic, axiological, cultural, synergetic) in these conditions work most fruitfully on the basis of the principle of composition (complementarity).

Presentation of the main material of the research with substantiation of the obtained scientific results.

Historical approach to the formation and development of geovalues and geoculture.

Every civilization, every civilizational community has its own geoculture and its own, unique technique of geocultural design. Based on this understanding of geoculture, ie considering it as a form of geopolitics based on the distinction between culturally "own" and culturally "foreign" and more subtly – on the selection of those who are part of the core of civilization, those excluded from it and those who are in between. It is fair to say that geopolitical thought is based on the complex manipulation of geocultural criteria. Before approaching the analysis of geocultural forms and current trends, let's try to approach the quantitative analysis of geoculture.

F. Brodel emphasizes that civilization is not identical to the world order and therefore there are several civilizations in the world. F. Brodel proceeded from the fact that any community that was once a separate geoeconomy, later even integrated into a more capacious geoeconomic space, retains the potential of a special civilization and a separate self-consciousness. Let us return to I. Wallerstein, who contradicts F. Brodel, noting that there are as many civilizations in the world as there are world economies, that is, one, and so geoculture is also one, planetary, while the past of the people does not affect its current position. in the world system. In most cases, geoculture is generated by a certain civilization. In some cases, geoculture may go beyond a single branch of civilization. In this case, a certain geoculture can be offered to humanity as an ideal cultural model. In this context, we will consider the geoculture of developmentalism, Westernization, postmodernism, globalization, and so on. The current state of scientific knowledge allows us to talk about the versatility and alternativeness of any new trends in modern life. It is with this approach that the current state of geoculture in the interpretation of globalization should be considered. It is an indisputable fact that the West has a leading position in globalization processes, but its right to monopolize the positive achievements of globalization and to blame the rest of the world for the negative ones is less indisputable. In the context of modern geocultural development of the country can be classified according to the ratio of their internal and external factors of development. This is the main geopolitical paradox of Westernization, namely: Europe's strategy towards other countries was pluralistic, consistent with the internal diversity of Europe itself. The modern geopolitical experience of the consolidated West shows that the creative-pluralistic character is gradually lost, becoming monovariant. The complication of the latest Westernization process in the post-Soviet countries is due to the fact that after the Bolshevik purges, the national origins of cultures began to disappear due to their weakness, and to the fact that the West itself became less open and less moralistic. There is a certain contradiction, which was marked by anti-Western tendencies of the beginning of the XXI century. This scenario is related to the behavior of Western civilization, which is manifested in NATO's militaristic activities with the subsequent consolidation of the West as a system that opposes the West and, according to the logic of this confrontation, becomes increasingly aggressive. It should be emphasized that this behavior in

the form of its extreme expression can lead to World War III. Westernization is part of a more general geocultural process, which in the scientific literature is called modernization. In this topic, the cultural identity of each country loses relevance and recedes into the background, and the technocratic comes to the fore. Conditions for the formation of geoculture and its components in the context of cultural globalization

Note the fact that the formation of universal culture and the spread of cultural globalization contributes to the number and intensity of international relations – political, economic, communication, and, finally, cultural. A cultural phenomenon that occurs in one region or sphere of life is spreading rapidly around the world and is reflected in the nature of the development of different areas of public life in different countries. The tendencies of cultural globalization are realized at the moment when any social group shows a desire to accept the elements of universal culture that are appropriate to its level of development and opportunities. Let us consider the main concepts of modernization, among which, given the geocultural theme, a special place is occupied by developmentalism, which serves as a justification for the transformation of underdeveloped countries into capitalist ones with a fairly high level of development. Developmentalism has been proposed as one of the areas of political analysis that examines the study of political dynamics and processes of transition to new forms of social order, mainly in developing countries. This theory of modernism has a special role in the development of research on political regimes. To achieve the goal of our study, it is extremely important that in the world theoretical heritage there are two types of philosophical and historical concepts of culture – global-world and local-historical [2, p.199]. Of course, it is better to start figuring out the meaning of terms from philosophical sources, because they concentrate the achievements of science in this area. Therefore, it makes sense to refer to the "Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary", which states: "in a broad sense, culture is a set of manifestations of the life achievements and creativity of peoples. Culture, which is considered in terms of content, is divided into different areas of the sphere: morals and customs, language and writing, the nature of clothing, settlements, work, education, economics. The nature of the army, the socio-political system, the judiciary, science, technology, art, religion, all forms of manifestation of the objective spirit of a certain people. Such phenomena allow us to speak about

the extent to which the bearers of culture have remained true to the essence of their culture. The difference between culture and civilization is that culture is a manifestation and result of self-expression of the will of a people or individual ("cultural person"), while civilization is a set of technological achievements and associated comfort "[3, p. 229]. Culture is defined as "care, improvement, ennoblement of physical, mental and spiritual strength, inclinations and abilities of man, and hence the degree of their development; respectively distinguish between body culture, soul culture and spiritual culture; a set of ways and methods of organization, implementation and progress of human life, ways of human existence; a set of material and spiritual possessions, expressing the historically achieved level of development of society and man, embodied in the results of productive activities; localized in space and time socio-historical formation, which is specified either by historical types, or by ethnic, continental or regional characteristics of society "[2, p. 386]. The philosophical dictionary "Man and the World" by N. Khamitov and S. Krylova defines culture in a slightly different way [4]. (1999): "Culture – the process and result of human development of the world. Strictly speaking, culture is a special human being generated by the processes of cognition and creativity. Culture is the interpenetration of the processes of cognition and creativity and the results of these processes in the form of work-objects: theories, artifacts of art, etc. In the world of culture, the individual is introduced by the will to knowledge and the will to creativity, which raises the being of the individual above the will to power"[4, p. 113]. From the standpoint of sociology, the category of "culture" is used in close cooperation with the category of "society". Their relationship is natural, because for each culture, society is a key prerequisite, and vice versa, for each society is inherent in culture as a product and as a condition for continued existence. That is why the problem of culture requires a natural connection with the problems of society. Sociological scientific thought offers the following definition and hermeneutization of the phenomenon of "culture", namely – culture – is: 1) everything created by mankind in the past, present and what will be done in the future in the spiritual, social and material spheres (anthropological understanding); 2) a specific, not genetically inherited set of ways, forms, orientations of human activity, their interaction with the environment, which are generated to maintain the structures and processes

of social life (general sociological understanding); 3) inherent in a particular group or community system of collectively accepted values, patterns and norms of behavior, activities and communication (narrow sociological understanding). Sociology deals with culture as a social phenomenon, ie studies culture as accessible to observation, empirical means of research social system. From a political point of view, the term "culture" is, according to VP Gorbatenko, a set of material and spiritual values created by mankind throughout its history and various forms of activity aimed at their production, assimilation and application. The concept of "culture" captures the qualitative difference between human life and biological forms of life, as well as the essential originality of historically specific forms of life at different stages of historical development, within certain eras, socio-economic formations, ethnic and national communities (ancient culture, bourgeois culture, Russian culture, Ukrainian culture, etc.). The concept of "culture" also characterizes the features of consciousness, behavior, activities of people in specific areas of society (culture of work, culture of communication, art culture, culture of life, political culture, etc.) [5, p. 179]. Thus, culture is the accumulated experience of humanity in all spheres of life, which characterizes the degree of its (humanity) development. Then it makes sense to clarify the share of "geo" in the main concept of our study. "Geo" when translated from Greek (ge – Earth) means the first component of complex words associated with the Earth, such as geography, geology, geophysics [60]. Therefore, in this study, the share of "geo" in combination with the terms "culture", "values" and "political culture" means a phenomenon that covers or intends to cover the planetary space and function / develop in it through natural mechanisms of anthropogenesis, ethnogenesis, nation-genesis, sociogenesis, noogenesis, or, conversely, artificial mechanisms of force (military, economic, religious) coercion, political, diplomatic, international influence, moral authority of leaders, and finally, overt and covert manipulation, and others. Note that geocultural values are spiritual and semantic units that reflect the needs of ordinary citizens or their social formations, such as ethnic, national, regional, state, supranational, supranational and interstate entities in meeting their personal and collective vital and social needs. that materialize in geoculture and constantly function in the form of the interests of the people for the protection of which the subject of cultural and historical process is ready to spend and spends its own energy, material

and spiritual strength, ie – their own life resources. Therefore, the subject field of our study is divided into three major segments: universal values, regional values and ethno-national values / systems, and therefore its study should use only a systematic approach using such a methodological tool of integration into integrity as a dispositive [6] (for M. Foucault). In the methodological part, we will present this concept in more detail, because it plays a leading role in "consolidating" into a consistent picture universal or global values, special or regional / local values and individual or ethno-national values. Together they constitute the geocultural values or values of the geoculture on which the social world rests and unfolds. It should be noted that geoculture, as a relatively independent phenomenon, is more complex than geovalues, because in addition to values, it also contains an act of behavior or external manifestation of internal activity, the product of which is values and worldview mixed with values. This means that geovalues are by nature always a culturological product. At the same time, geoculture can be studied by other components, such as norms and geobehavior of the subject, the driving force of which may be other factors, such as external coercion, political pressure. Norms of culture are generally accepted rules of interaction within a group or society. According to which some forms of interaction are recommended as desired, supported or disapproved. In this case, the purpose of the study allows us to use them, the concepts of "geovalues" and "geoculture", as synonyms, for example, in the analysis of scientific approaches to the study of geovalues or in the evaluation and selection of methodological tools. The norms of geoculture and the geobehavior of the subject in philosophical research are rarely the subject of research. This is more the subject of attention of political scientists. In the theoretical part of this study, they should be more clearly separated as separate semantic units. Next, it makes sense to consider existing scientific approaches to the study of geoculture. Because they, as semantic units, have their otherness in the structure of personality, due to the presence, needs, worldview, consciousness, self-consciousness, superconsciousness, its worldview culture and structure of society: social, political, military, culturological, axiological, ethical, ecological, finally, international spheres and therefore take other forms of their own existence, the study of which are engaged in, in addition to philosophy, and other sciences. The influence of geovalues and geoculture on the formation and development of geopolitics in

the context of integration and disintegration processes

Geopolitics is a scientific discipline, or, more precisely, a worldview, which is based on the principle of geographical coordinates when considering any issues of economics, politics and culture" – said S. Datsyuk and V. Granovsky [7, p. 4]. Professor of Lviv University O. Shablii states: "... in the Ukrainian General Encyclopedia (UGE) it is interpreted as" consideration of the importance of geographical conditions for all social life. " In L. Guplevych's research a special place is occupied by the theory of the state, its territory, the influence of its size, configuration, position, ie a significant number of geographical factors were emphasized. The well-known reference book "Small Soviet Encyclopedia" states that "geopolitics – a scientific discipline that treats the forms of political life in terms of their relevance to geographical conditions" [8, p. 442]. In general, according to most reference sources, they interpret geopolitics as a political concept that uses geographical characteristics such as territory, location, population, and climate to justify political expansion. They also add that geopolitical theory is associated with racism, social Darwinism, Malthusianism and, finally, was the official ideology of fascism, which clearly explains the difficult fate of science, especially in post-Soviet countries. "Geopolitics as a science grew out of political geography in the late nineteenth century, but attempts to understand the relationship between the political organization of society in the face of the state and the surrounding space have taken place in the works of philosophers, historians and political scientists since ancient times" – said M Aschenkampf, a famous Russian researcher of history and geopolitics, statesman [9, p. 3]. S. Baburin focuses on the political and legal aspects of the geopolitical problems facing the world and modern Russia. For him, geopolitics is "the conditionality of state policy by geographical factors, such as territory, geographical location, climate, minerals, etc." [10, p. 27]. S. Baburin emphasizes that modern geopolitics includes: a) domination over the territory; b) domination over land resources; c) domination over the creative forces of nations; d) domination and control over the demographic situation; e) domination over the ecological situation. At the initial stage of development, geopolitics was enriched with ideas about the space of the state as the most important political and geographical factor and the superiority of maritime powers over land, theories of the Great Powers and Gartland, the con-

cept of civilization as a world and more. The most authoritative were the German, British and American schools of geopolitics. In the postwar years, representatives of the German and Japanese schools, and later of the American, French, and British schools, had the advantage of forming the theoretical and methodological foundations of geopolitics. Within the framework of predominantly European domestic geopolitics, a historical trend is developing (P.-M. Holtz, E. Kuto-Begari, J. Chalian, G.A. Jacobson, etc.), the tasks of which are the historical reconstruction of the discipline, its chronology and systematization, and reprinting. texts by prominent authors, etc. Meticulous attention to the historiography of the ideas of classical geopolitics is combined with the search for new approaches and efforts to build a theoretical basis for geopolitics that would meet the challenges of today. These include: a) the emergence of new, more aggressive geopolitical players alongside states, represented by regional and integration groups, transnational companies, terrorist organizations, etc. ; b) the globalization of the world economy and, as a consequence, the gradual shift of emphasis from politics to the economy; c) widening the gap between rich and poor (states and segments of the population), exacerbation of environmental problems, the spread of terrorism, etc. ; d) on the one hand, the unification of the cultural and ideological sphere, its cosmopolitanization, on the other – the explosion of patriotism, national liberation movements; e) search by geopolitical actors of mutually beneficial ways of development of a geopolitical situation in the postbipolar world, etc.

Thus, the question arises: is the division into parts of the world natural or unnatural? According to M. Danilevsky, this division is artificial, because the southern peninsulas of Europe, such as Spain, Italy, Turkey (the part south of the Balkans) – are undoubtedly more similar to Asia Minor, the Caucasus and the northern coast of Africa. than with the rest of Europe. Similarly, Arabia has much more in common with Africa than with Asia; Cape of Good Hope is more similar to the continent of New Holland than to Central or North Africa; the polar countries of Asia, Europe and America have more similar features than each of them – with the continent lying south of it [11, p. 333]. The distribution was artificial, taking into account only the boundary delineations of water and land. This distinction is not always fair, because often the water space separates those parts of the land that, by all physical factors, form a whole natural organism, and vice versa – parts, quite different in

their physical characteristics, are often "stitched" by the continental surface. A striking example, according to M. Danilevsky, is the Crimean peninsula, which is surrounded by water on all sides, including the narrow Perekop Isthmus. The Crimean peninsula does not represent a homogeneous physical whole [11, 334]. M. Danilevsky answers the question about Russia's belonging to Europe ambiguously, taking into account "whoever wants to." He characterizes the meaning of the word "Europe", believing that it is not geographical, but cultural and historical and has nothing to do with geography. The nature of polar opposites is West and East, Europe and Asia. In the presence of polarities there should be their points: Europe, the West make a pole of progress, infinite perfection, continuous movement forward; Asia and the East are opposite geographical complexes, which are areas of stagnation, regression and other negative processes of human development. These are historical and geographical axioms that no one doubts. Influential representatives of modern geopolitics can be considered S. Cohen, A. Toynbee, S. Huntington, 3b. Brzezinski. Strategic interests of the United States, according to 3b. Brzezinski, should focus on "the creation and development in Eurasia of two more closely related geostrategic triangles: the first of which includes the United States, the EU and Russia, and the second – the United States, Japan and China. In order for the connection between them to be strong and effective, a constructive connection with Russia is necessary" [9, p. 14–15]. S. Huntington attaches special importance to cultural differences between civilizations and at the heart of the growing conflicts sees the desire of the United States to promote a universal Western culture [9, p. 17]. A. Toynbee vividly described his own theory of the civilizational approach to the historical process, offering a detailed classification. The author of the theory singles out "Orthodox-Russian" as a special kind. No less interesting in the studies of A. Toynbee is the theory of "Call and Response", which considers the formation of the theory of the genesis of civilization [12]. S. Cohen proposed to distinguish between geostrategic regions, which are characterized by a common, to some extent, economy, communication system and ideology, and smaller geopolitical areas, which differ in geographical proximity, common features of life, history and culture [13]. It should be clarified that the chronological approach, like the essential one, cannot be considered as a dogma, because the same concepts of geopolitics developed in different periods in different countries. At the same

time, the development of science is closely correlated with the idea of the determining factors that influence the power of the state and the formation of the geopolitical structure of the world. At first, preference was given to physical and geographical data, because the state itself was identified.

Thus, the above scientific approaches to the subject of this study indicate that the treasury of world scientific thought has accumulated significant material on geoculture and geovalues behind geopolitics. The bridge between geoculture and geopolitics bridges the phenomenon of "interests of the people", which were studied by V.V. Dubinin [14, p. 5–6]. First, geoculture as a phenomenon originated long ago, but its existence was not total, because it was carried by individual, even prominent personalities, such as philosophers or military leaders such as, for example, Alexander the Great, Napoleon and others. And only at the beginning of the XXI century the process of their formation gained critical power and began to manifest itself along with the formation of the ontological, organizational and informational unity of the world community. Secondly, the subject of research requires the use of all the above approaches, because only integrated knowledge about it can with a high degree of probability explain the process of generating geovalues, the functioning of geoculture and their product – geopolitics, as well as contribute to scientific forecasting of the world community integrative-disintegrative processes inherent in the modern transformation of the structure of the planetary community. Third, the analysis of scientific approaches to geoculture has shown that it has semantic, value, psychological, social, political characteristics that show the value-semantic matrix of planetary life in the space-time dimension; it becomes more visible and more influential on the life of planetary humanity. Geovalues are just one of the elements of this natural movement of intelligent living matter. Fourth, the intensification of the phenomenon is observed on the time scale due to a significant increase in the spatial continuum over time, and with the growth of current globalization trends should be expected aggressive manifestation of its organizational properties in the form of integration and disintegration processes and negative psychological consequences among localized cultural entities. historical process, not ready to morally accept the formation of a world civil society, cling to their own ethno-national values, such as Sharia, do not understand the main tendencies of self-development of the planetary community are the mastery

of intellectual energy, the formation of cosmopolitan consciousness and its adequate worldview, the creation of an intellectual civilization and, finally, the departure of humanity beyond planetary existence.

The study conclusions and prospects for further exploration in this direction.

Geoculture is a product of geopolitical processes, the core of which is geovalues. Considering geoculture as a philosophical and political concept, it should be noted that it is a worldview in cultural and geographical images, and defining its process, in another way, can be called an activity that produces cultural images and determines the appropriate behavior of the state in the international arena and domestic politics. Geoculture, which systematically covers the modern social world and constitutes its axiological matrix, has three levels of planetary values or three types of values: a) universal, b) regional and c) ethno-national, or in the language of philosophy: universal, special and individual. Universal values integrate the planetary community into an organic axiological whole, and regional and ethno-national ones disintegrate and localize communities, so they objectively oppose and confront universal values. Therefore, this axiological contradiction is quite naturally chosen as the subject of this study. Fourth, the study of the subject field requires a fairly original methodological tools, as the emphasis is not on axiological dimensions, but on the spatio-temporal aspects of the planetary scale. Among them, the leading are the determinants of universal, regional and ethno-national origin, which can be reduced to a single system only through such an original methodological tool as a dispositive – a planetary social organism.

Analyzing geoculture, special attention should be paid to the processes of intercultural and intercivilizational adaptation. The image of geoculture is formed in the broadest possible context, which means the largest conceptual volume of geopolitical,

geoeconomic and geosocial issues. Geocultural potential is measured by the power of geocultural images that coexist, cooperate, intertwine in different spaces. Therefore, the geocultural image is a system of the brightest and largest signs, symbols, characteristics of geospace, which depict the peculiarities of the development and functioning of certain cultures or civilizations in the global context. The geographical diversity of individual regions, countries and continents makes it almost impossible to imagine a single main image of world development. The image of world development is a system of coordinated "chains", or clusters, purposeful, specific geographical megaimages, which include stable ideas about the dynamics of geospatial development of certain human communities.

The complexity of figurative geoglobalism, ie large-scale or even general geographical representation of a large area is that it is impossible to correctly formulate a single geographical image of world development. It is also considered almost impossible to create a world system interconnected by geographical images of world development. Today, the image-geographical map of world development is the result of the interaction of the largest and strongest megatrends that enclose its borders. Megatrend should be understood as the main vector of development of any geographical image, which is constantly transformed, corresponding to certain circumstances of its dynamics; at the same time, the image itself must territorially "cover" in real space a certain part of the world, a continent or a large geoeconomic, geopolitical, geocultural region of the world. Thus, the purposeful civilizational "cones of removal" of Euro-American civilization can be considered Latin America and part of Southeast Asia, the Middle East. If we consider the figurative and geographical aspects in the context of globalization, we can emphasize that there is a geocultural, geoeconomic, geopolitical conquest from Eurasia and South America.

Список використаних джерел

1. Бжезинский З. Великая шахматная доска. Господство Америки и его геостратегические императивы. Бжезинский. Москва : Междунар. Отн., 2005. 256 с.
2. Філософський словник соціальних термінів / В. П. Андрущенко [та ін.]; заг. ред. В. П. Андрущенко. 3. вид., доп. Київ ; Харків : Видавництво "Р.И.Ф.", 2005. 672 с.
3. Философский энциклопедический словарь / [ред.-сост. Е.Ф. Губский и др.]. Москва : ИНФА, 1997. 576 с.
4. Хамітов Н. В. Філософський словник. Людина і світ / Н. В. Хамітов, С. А. Крилова. Київ : КНТ: Центр навчальної літератури, 2007. 264 с.
5. Політологічний енциклопедичний словник / упорядник В. П. Горбатенко; За ред. Ю. С. Шемшученка, В. Д.Бабкіна, В. П.Горбатенка. 2-е вид., доп. і перероб. Київ : Генеза, 2004. 736 с.
6. Фуко М. Наглядати й карати: Народження в'язниць / М. Фуко ; [пер. з фр. П. Таращук]. Київ : Основи, 1998. 392 с.

7. Грановский В. Современные фабрики мысли: аналит. докл., 1999 г. / Владимир Грановский, Сергей Дацюк, Тантели Ратувухери Хариманга; Агентство Гуманитар. Технологий. Київ, 1999. 86 с.
8. Малая советская энциклопедия / гл. ред. Н. Л. Мещеряков. Москва : Государственный ин-т «Советская энциклопедия».
9. Геополитика: антология / сост. Н. Н. Ашенкамф, С. В. Погорельская. М.: Академический Проект; Москва : Культура, 2006. 1003 с. (Серия "Summa").
10. Бабурин С. Н. Территория государства: правовые и геополитические проблемы / С. Н. Бабурин. Москва : Изд-во Московского ун-та, 1997. 480 с.
11. Классика геополитики. XIX век: сб. / сост. К. Королев. Москва : ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2003. 719 с. (Philosophy)
12. Тойнби А. Дж. Постигание истории: избранное / А. Д. Тойнби; пер. с англ. Е. Д. Жарков; ред. пер. УкВ. И. Уколова, Д. Э. Харитонович. Москва : Айрис-Пресс, 2006. 638 с. (Библиотека истории и культуры).
13. Geography and Politics in a Divided World / S.B. Cohen. L., 1964
14. Дубінін В.В. Інтереси народу як предмет соціально-філософського аналізу// Автореф. на здоб. доктора філос. наук за спец. 090003- соціальна філософія та філософія історії, Київ : НПУ ім. М.П.Драгоманова, 2011. 34 с.
15. Нікітенко В. О. Креативний клас як чинник удосконалення людського капіталу у контексті розвитку смарт-освіти. Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University, 2021. 7 (84). С 22-30.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2020-7-84-03>
16. Puchenko, Oleg, Voronkova, Valentyna & Vodop'yanov, Pavel Health care as a global problem of humanity and its relationship with other global problems. Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University, 2021. 7 (84), P. 39-47.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2020-7-84-05>

REFERENCES:

1. Bzhezynskyy, Z. (2005). Velykaya shakhmatnaya doska. Hospodstvo Ameriky y eho heostratycheskye ymperatyvy / Z. Bzhezynskyy. M.: Mezhdunar. 256s.
2. Filososf's'kyy slovnyk sotsial'nykh terminiv (2005) / V. P. Andrushchenko [ta in.]; zah. red. V. P. Andrushchenko. 3. vyd., dop. K. ; KH. : Vydavnytstvo "R.Y.F.". 672 s.
3. Fylososf'skyy éntsiklopedychesky slovar' (1997) / [red.-sost. E.F. Hubs'kyy y dr.]. M. : YNFA, 1997. 576 s.
4. Khamitov, N. V.(2007). Filososf's'kyy slovnyk. Lyudyna i svit / N. V. Khamitov, S. A. Krylova. – K. : KNT: Tsentr navchal'noyi literatury, 2007. 264 s.
5. Politolohichnyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk (2004) / uporyadnyk V. P. Horbatenko; Za red. YU. S. Shemshuchenka, V. D. Babkina, V. P. Horbatenka. 2-e vyd., dop. i pererob. K. : Heneza. 736 s.
6. Fuko, M. (1998). Nahlyadaty y karaty: Narodzhennya v"yaznyts' / M. Fuko ; [per. z fr. P. Tarashchuk]. K. : Osnovy. 392 s.
7. Hranovskyy, V.(1999). Sovremennye fabryky mysly: analyt. dokl., 1999 h. / Vladymyr Hranovskyy, Serhey Datsyuk, Tantely Ratuuvukhery Kharymanha; Ahent-stvo Humanytar. Tekhnolohyy. K. 86 s.
8. Malaya sovet-skaya éntsiklopedyya / hl. red. N. L. Meshcheryakov. M. : Hosudarstvennyy yn-t «Sovet-skaya éntsiklopedyya».
9. Heopolytyka: antolohyya (2006) / sost. N. N. Ashenkampf, S. V. Pohorel'skaya. M.: Akademycheskyy Proekt; M. : Kul'tura. 1003 s. (Seryya "Summa").
10. Baburn, S. N. (1997). Terrytoryya hosudarstva: pravovye y heopolytycheskye problemy / S. N. Baburn. M. : Yzd-vo Moskovskoho un-ta. 480 s.
11. Klassyka heopolytyky. XIX vek: sb. (2003) / sost. K. Korolev. M.: ООО «Yzdatel'stvo AST». 719 s. (Philosophy)
12. Toynby, A. (2006). Dzh. Postyzhene ystorry: yzbrannoe / A. D. Toynby; per. s anhl. E. D. Zharkov; red. per. UkV. Y. Ukolova, D. É. Kharytonovych. M. : Ayrys-Press. 638 s. (Byblyoteka ystorry y kul'tury).
13. Geography and Politics in a Divided World(1964) / S.B. Cohen. L..
14. Dubinin, V.V. (2011). Interesy narodu yak predmet sotsial'no-filosofs'koho analizu// Avtoref. na zdob. doktora filoz. nauk za spets. 090003- sotsial'na filozofiya ta filozofiya istoriyi, K. : NPU im. M.P.Drahomanova. 34 s.
15. Nikitenko, V. O. (2021). Kreatyvnyy klas yak chynnyk udoskonalennya lyuds'koho kapitalu u konteksti rozvytku smart-osvity. Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University. 7(84), 22-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2020-7-84-03>
16. Puchenko, Oleg, Voronkova, Valentyna & Vodop'yanov, Pavel (2021). Health care as a global problem of humanity and its relationship with other global problems. Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University. 7 (84), P. 39-47. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2020-7-84-05>

НИКІТЕНКО, ВІТАЛІНА ОЛЕКСАНДРІВНА – доктор філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри менеджменту організацій та управління проектами, Інженерний навчально-науковий інститут Запорізького національного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)

E-mail: vitalina2006@ukr.net

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9588-7836>

ФІЛОСОФСЬКА КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ВЗАЄМОЗВ'ЯЗКУ ГЕОЦІННОСТЕЙ, ГЕОКУЛЬТУРИ І ГЕОПОЛІТИКИ ЯК ЧИННИКІВ ФОРМУВАННЯ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО СВІТУ

Анотація.

В статті проаналізовано філософську концепцію, в основі якої взаємовплив однієї на другу, викликаних загостренням суперечливостей між глобалізаційним і глокалізаційними процесами. Нині загострилася проблема розуміння людиною базових засад розвитку глобального світу і трансформації цінностей, що переформатовують алгоритм буття людини і реновації, що ведуть до становлення онтологічної, інформаційної, комунікаційної і організаційної єдності глобальної спільноти. Мета статті – концептуалізація філософської концепції взаємозв'язку геоцінностей, геокультури і геополітики як чинників формування глобального світу. **Завдання дослідження:** 1) проаналізувати історичний підхід до становлення і розвитку геоцінностей і геокультури; 2) виявити умови формування геокультури та її складових компонентів в умовах культурної глобалізації; 3) з'ясувати вплив геоцінностей та геокультури на становлення і розвиток геополітики у контексті інтеграційно-дезінтеграційних процесів. Методологічною основою дослідження є загальнофілософські принципи об'єктивності й історизму, всезагального зв'язку та розвитку, історичного і логічного, діалектичний, аксіологічний та герменевтичний методи і системний підхід, що ґрунтується на універсальних законах розвитку природи і суспільства. Геокультура є продуктом геополітичних процесів, стрижнем якої є геоцінності. Розглядаючи геокультуру як філософсько-політичну концепцію, слід зазначити, що це є світосприйняття в культурно-географічних образах, а визначаючи її процесом, по-іншому, можна назвати діяльністю, що виробляє культурні образи і детермінує відповідну поведінку держави на міжнародній арені і у внутрішній політиці. Образ світового розвитку – це система скоординованих «ланцюжків», або кластерів, цілеспрямованих, специфічних географічних мегаобразів, які включають в себе стійкі уявлення про динаміку розвитку геопростору тих чи інших людських спільнот. У даному випадку мета дослідження дозволяє нам вживати їх, поняття «геоцінності» і «геокультура», у якості синонімів, наприклад, при аналізі наукових підходів до вивчення геоцінностей або при оцінці і виборі методологічного інструментарію.

Ключові слова: геоцінності, геокультура, геополітика, культурна глобалізація, соціальний організм

НИКІТЕНКО, В. А. – доктор філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри менеджменту організацій та управління проектами, Інженерний учебно-научний інститут Запорізького національного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)

E-mail: vitalina2006@ukr.net

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9588-7836>

ФИЛОСОФСКАЯ КОНЦЕПЦИЯ ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ ГЕОЦЕННОСТЕЙ, ГЕОКУЛЬТУРЫ И ГЕОПОЛИТИКИ КАК ФАКТОРОВ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО МИРА

Аннотация.

В статье проанализирована философская концепция, в основе которой взаимовлияние одной на другую, вызванных обострением противоречий между глобализационным и глокализационными процессами. Сейчас обострилась проблема понимания человеком базисных основ развития глобального мира и трансформации ценностей, которые переформируют алгоритм бытия человека и реновации, ведущие к становлению онтологическому, информационному, коммуникационному и организационному единству глобального сообщества. Цель статьи – концептуализация философской концепции взаимосвязи геоценностей, геокультуры и геополитики как факторов формирования глобального мира. Задачи исследования: 1) проанализировать исторический подход к становлению и развитию геоценностей и геокультуры; 2) выявить условия формирования геокультуры и ее составляющих компонентов в условиях культурной глобаллизации; 3) выяснить влияние геоценностей и геокультуры на становление и развитие геополитики в контексте интеграционно-дезінтеграционных процессов. Методологической основой исследования являются общеполитические принципы объективности и историзма, всеобщего связи и развития, исторического и логического, диалектический, аксиологический и герменевтический методы и системный подход, основанный на универсальных законах развития природы и общества. Результат исследования. Доказано,

что геокультура является продуктом геополитических процессов, стержнем которой является геоценности. Рассматривая геокультуру как философско-политическую концепцию, следует отметить, что это мировосприятие развивается в культурно-географических образах, по-другому, ее можно назвать деятельностью, которая производит культурные образы и детерминирует соответствующее поведение государства на международной арене и во внутренней политике. Образ глобального развития – это система скоординированных «цепочек», или кластеров, целенаправленных, специфических географических мегаобразов, которые включают в себя устойчивые представления о динамике развития геопространства тех или иных человеческих сообществ. В данном случае цель исследования позволяет нам принимать их, а понятие «геоценности» и «геокультура» использовать в качестве синонимов, например, при анализе научных подходов к изучению геоценностей или при оценке и выборе методологического инструментария.

Ключевые слова: геоценности, геокультура, геополитика, культурная глобализация, социальный организм

© The Author(s) 2021

This is an open access article under
the Creative Commons CC BY license

Received date 5.06.2021

Accepted date 29.06.2021

Published date 01.07.2021

How to cite: Nikitenko, Vitalina. Philosophical concept of the relationship between geovalues, geoculture and geopolitics as factors of global world formation. Humanities studies: collection of scientific papers / Ed. V. Voronkova. Zaporizhzhia : Publishing house “Helvetica”, 2021. 8 (85). P. 29–39.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2021-8-85-03>