

**GLOBAL CRISIS
FATE AND FORTUNES OF THE WEST**

Andrey A. Pelipenko

**ГЛОБАЛЬНЫЙ КРИЗИС
И ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЗАПАДА**

Андрей Пелипенко

**ЕЛЬЦИН
ЦЕНТР**

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The current state of experts' community is inspiring anxiety. On the one hand, we face ever-growing evidence of global systemic crunch, with not merely finance and economy, but also a set of cultural and civilization values under exposure. On the other hand, experts' community apparently fails to give reasoning behind the mode and scale of the breakdown and, therefore, keeps from elaborating efficient and conquering strategies. I reckon all that is due to:

– **Lack of relevant theory basics, as well as due to scope of survey being limited mostly by short-term political, economic (ecological, demographic and other) environments within technocratic approaches of a broader sense.** The reason behind is decline of concern with theoretical knowledge in general, which, in its turn, is entailed by “the death of metaphysics” and strengthening of realpolitik reasoning;

– **Psychological inertia.** Intellectual milieu, fed mainly by a Western mentality, is psychologically not ready to go beyond the limits of and simulate reality out of its basics. That is backed by inherent ambition of Western civilization, as any other, for infinite extension of own existence, while escaping any fundamental self-modifications. Keeping its civilizational leadership, the West is not ready for conscious system transformation, as required by historical persistency, and shows universalization of its cultural and civilizational guidelines and values instead;

– **Discourse issue.** Current expert discourse is a reverberation of Western post-World War II ideology embracing such values as liberalism, democracy, a kind of human fundamentalism, the rights of an abstract human, individualism, zero tolerance to violence, etc. These values are shaping the framework which analytical thinking is “scared” and “reluctant” to go beyond, thus, starting to distort the image of reality and disregarding its *wrongful* features. Showing its inadequacy, such an approach turns out to be a serious handicap against elaboration of a global anti-crisis agenda.

Staying within the aforementioned framework, we shall always fail to build up new cutting-edge challenge-facing models of balance between individualistic and social principles, bearing in mind that the current ones happen to be exhausted.

It is high time left behind was the self-righteous political correctness dictatorship, enforcing a veto against properly speaking and, thus, a highly perverted and ideologically committed image of reality. In recession times, being blind within an inch of insanity is deathful.

One cannot any longer but notice the gap between eclecticism of pragmatic and relativistic approaches, inherent to postmodern mentality, and metaphysical primitivism of “universal human values”. By neglecting this disruption we foster a wide range of essentially unsolvable problems; such is the gap between enunciated multiculturalist values and political thinking based on 19th-century evolutionism. When issues of this kind stay far from being resolved and, even more, merely cannot be raised due to ex- and internal bounds, the solution comes in the form of sheer hypocrisy, double and triple standards and double-thinking on the verge of cognitive dissonance.

Is it possible to understand Western challenges, keeping an eye on it from Russia? The dialogue between Russian and Western researchers is, in majority of cases, a discussion of Russian state of affairs and country’s relationship with the West. Herewith, Russia’s image in the eyes of the West is an ethnic and cultural item, rather than agent. Still, Russia is not only an object but a subject, meaning that if Western analytics can discuss Russian issues, Russian researchers can equally consider Western ones as well. Even more so these issues are of both global and domestic importance and a glance from outside is, in many ways, more realistic than that from outward. The singularity of this situation is that, for the first time in our history, we evidence systemic crisis of anthropocentric rather than social centric civilization. All that renders it difficult to establish “diagnosis” from inward of Western mentality, therefore, a glance from Russia can prove quite useful.

Triggered by the aforementioned, the target of a **new analytical discourse** elaboration comes into light, the one providing for pertinent and consistent enunciation of global issues and outlining ways for their reasonable solutions. The build-up of such a discourse will invariably involve the violation of established “rules of the game” feeding the current cultural system, which takes control of minds and keeps the mode of thinking away from dangerous mainstream. By this conscious violation of rules I do not seek for uproar, neither provoke. The target is to overcome intellectual inertia and starry-eyed idealism, while introducing the alarming mood and true understanding of the upcoming crisis scope and nature into experts’ community. If open society proclaims the approach of free discussion on any matter, even though highly critical, this is the time to put this theory into practice. Otherwise, the West shall be simply deprived of its moral status as a pattern for non-western societies.

ISSUE OUTLINE

There is one criterion question I often put forth when talking to some politically correct gentlemen, 'Do you believe that the values of liberal humanism you defend so fiercely are the ultimate point of mankind cultural evolution, or they, are perishable, like other values in history, and sooner or later shall make way for the new ones?' Those of my interlocutors having heart to stay away from equivoques admit they would rather select the first, but had better opt for the second, driven by common sense. Nevertheless, even such an admission full of 'buts' inspires hope that alarming spirit is in the air of Western society today and shall anyway have its sobering effect; those perceiving the necessity of being saved are the ones savable.

The semi-poetical, semi-philosophical metaphor of Faustian spirit leaving or having already left Europe has worrisome and tragic meaning that white race¹ is quitting the historical stage. Apparently, 'white moor' has done his historical duty; 500-year supremacy of white civilization is coming to an end. This thought is in wide circulation and is being spoken out already, though the majority of the last Faustian-spirit bearers prefer to hope for either tactical successes or "eternal values", or sometimes for promising Western ability to adapt for challenges of any kind. We live in the era of condensed historical time; new alarming trends become more evident, making it even more difficult to wave tough issues away while looking further ahead. How the world will look like after another reappraisal of "eternal" values? Which part of great Western civilization heritage will be in demand with "new barbarians", and how the chemistry will work between departing people of Word and people of Digit, taking them over²? What will be the bare ground upon destruction of tumultuously changing yet customary world of today? Which part of its resource the anthropology system³ (AS) will sacrifice, while passing into a new evolutionary quality?

In search of answers, the idea of a post-human emerges quite often, as well as of civilization era coming to an end in general, of fundamental rebirth of both social and biological human nature, and of denial of social and historical genesis essential basics developed within last 5,000 years. The idea transforms into a discussable issue, of whether evolutionary cycle on Earth shall be brought to a close together with human history, or extended in a new, post-human form? Yet, coming back to a human dimension with a pass given to usual exaggerations resulted from a

¹ I hope employing of the word *race* is not a crime per se.

² Science of numbers is not the case; the consciousness is oriented at a numerical rather than verbal code.

³ The notion of AS is wider than culture, as embraces the part of nature which is immediately involved into human activities.

chronocentric view, the major issue may come in the form, 'What are the depth and scale of the recession the humankind is about to enter?', meaning the crisis that has already been defined as systematic and global. Answer to this *a priori* abstract question shall entail the choice of specific life strategies. For instance, the depth of systemic destructions, both mental (internal) and culture-historical (external), governs the mode of how the white race shall leave the history stage; either under typical scenario of system's general entropy escalation, meaning slow 'heat death', senescence and degrading of racial universe, or, given the current situation is unprecedented, under mysterious intersystem process laws allowing for various unconventional evolutionary turns. Science-fictionists easily take up discussions on exogenous approaches, such as mass cloning, engineering expression of 'the-ring-of-time'⁴ idea, etc. Still, could we conceive non-system solutions, while hardly being able to go beyond the boundaries of scientific evidence? Or, perchance, the hour is nigh to say, "So much the worth for the science?"

Speaking about the crisis scale, another dramatic side can be distinguished. Traditionally, in crisis times cultural systems could easily sacrifice colossal material, such as artefacts, texts, knowledge-bearing ethnoses, to say nothing of separate people, and could easily get solely by traditional, say pre-IT, simple means of experience transfer. Today, when digital data sources of almost infinite memory show apparent sign of expanding further, and technologies supporting their export are global, the old system can afford scrapping a great deal more. Who, for instance, is seriously interested in keeping nations under extinction alive, if everything and even more than we have to know about them is saved on a digital source, and their DNA samples, "just in case", are kept in retorts? New informational consciousness does not need any alive, feel-free and sensitive contact with reality, for the consciousness itself is the result of a higher-level interaction between a person and artificial environment created by him. Here is one of the signs that changes are not only profound but *systematic*. It could not have been otherwise, for all human history resembles the road leading us from divine nature, and huge steps are marked with systemic changes in both consciousness and psychophysiology, whichever ideological arguments could be put forward against by cognitive evolution opponents⁵.

When young, amateurs of metaphysics conceive death as somewhat remote and unreal. As the time of golden fall approaches, satiated by life and fatigued by its incorrigibility, disappointed in metaphysics, consciousness is resigned to death as indisputable truth. At the same time, it struggles to be reconciled to the fact of 'dehumanized' generation replacing it. Non-existence, meaning the failure to reproduce itself in *another*, is a true scaring matter, rather than

⁴ The point is hypothetical technical ability to redirect the time vector and endlessly be back to the past, where one can live through a potentially infinite number of parallel lives.

⁵ *Gerhard Vollmer*. Evolutionary Theory of Knowledge. Inherent Structures of Knowledge in Biology, Psychology, Linguistics, Philosophy and Theory of Science. Moscow, 1998. Page 196.

death. This is repeatable for generations in both human micro- and historical macro-cosms. Each vanishing tradition tends to blame the successors for 'wrong' otherness and, ultimately, for betrayal of human nature, the pattern of which it apparently places against itself. Hence some tragical and touching historical view aberrations emerge, where *another* is but a reflection, rudimentary and spoiled copy of that view.

Various cultural systems exist under different historical horometers. At least from Renaissance, the West has been living in the course of avalanche-like accelerating historical time, so frosty years came almost unpredictably. It would seem not so long ago the rampageous fever of communistic and national-socialistic totalitarian projects set the Middle-Age and Manichean mass energy in turmoil and entailed exuberant expansion of a self-asserting will, with its inherent explosive eschatological optimism. The last splash it was, obviously. Probably, a will to violence and a will to live are interconnected more than one could admit.

There are two dimensions a person exists in, micro and macro, i.e. human world and the universe of major cultural and historical processes. The former is 'Human, all too human' by Nietzsche, or a 'life-world', in modern social philosophical terms (N. Luman, J. Habermas). The second is the world of socio-cultural structures, institutions and relationships, the sense and life rules of which reveal within extended historical periods. This 'external' (towards a human) world is always to a wide extent estranged, unfriendly and mystical.

An ordinary person, as a rule, dislikes conflicts and transformations; with ignorance of how the outer universe is really organized outside their social and household world, they believe the laws and rules governing their 'minor being' may and have to be mapped onto macro level. History has a great deal of evidence of this approach being inconsistent and absurdist. Yet, endless attempts to measure historical via human, imposing highly conventional and evanescent moral standards to history, and, generally, applying ethical figures of merit to it is a misbelief, peculiar not only to everyday awareness. However much occurrences there were proving that interpersonal relationship patterns can hardly be extrapolated to cultural and historical processes of scale, the relevant image of reality keeps being misinterpreted under moralizing approach to historical being; taken in Lévy-Bruhl's sense, myth still reigns over experience. Extrapolations of that kind always have their after-effect, with the price sometimes being too high, going beyond simple ritual mourning over death of the God and laments, 'Where his eyes were!' The point here is that laws governing the big systemic world are inherently different from those of a small one, and their border running between *human* and *cultural* worlds reveals the dialecticism of a *dual-subjective reality*; having unlike attractors, subjectivity of a human and that of culture mutually determine each other and controvert in their historical genesis. When macro-level laws, first and foremost those of life and death of cultural systems, turn out to sort ill with human (too

much human) dimension, a 'thinking reed', by Blaise Pascal, is left nothing to do but repine or, driven by insult, declare the laws non-existent and search for comfort in various fatalisms.

What is science left with, facing a well-formed ontological crisis, with reality scarcely be seen through sophisticated wrapping of signs (J. Baudrillard,) let alone methodology crisis, which leads to persistent neurotic scare among current crop of scientific community before built-up of large-scale explanatory theories? May the answer be to self-absorb or to go into minor details not to witness the terrors of an overall picture, much like one of the last Romans who preferred enjoying the fountain in his garden rather than thinking about his own empire's death. May it rather be to continue academic disciplinary games, running away from the thought that everything will fall off the edge of the earth, be left behind and neglected. *Petits bonheurs*⁶ discovered by the Enlightenment philosophers served the postmodernists a good turn. Yet, playing a game of childhood, one cannot beguile the age. Neither can we hide from accursed questions, who we are and where we are going. Maybe that is a false dawn, but let us think we have a chance, the farther we go in search of answers for those sacramental issues, the higher probability is that our solutions will be in demand by after-comers, giving us a chance to escape nothingness.

Attempts to resolve the outlined issues reveal that strictly disciplinary approaches are exhausted. Still, their restricted manner is not the matter. Sooner or later, consciousness forgets that merely subordinate and secondary the connection (made by itself) is between knowledge content and notional, terminological and methodological tools; the discourse cocoons, closes on itself and turns into an autotelic game. All that, as a rule, passes unwitnessed for players themselves. Unsurprisingly, any field of cognition, like any other culture supporting system in general, tends to become differentiated from and 'peel off' syncretic unity, and, by doing so, produces and reproduces parameters of initial integrity in itself, then reaches a certain maturity and, inevitably, reverses the cognition subject matter and tools. That is what philosophy came to, as it finally lost the link to reality and reposed; left is satiated and self-disillusioned mental power, with its narcissistic self-concentration, making comments on commented annotations and catching the gleam of multiply mirrored reflexions. Effective role of philosophy as merely cultural privacy subject to the rules of cultural unity self-organization, rather than to an 'absolute observer' standing beyond cultural experience, is evident to anyone but philosophers themselves; the last-mentioned have long time ago given up as a bad job their *direct commitments* to explain the world as a unity and develop methodology for individual sciences. That is why their down-hearted and sausy forecasts on philosophy death in 21st century are, most probably, justified.

⁶ *Small mercies (French).*

Philosophy, as a self-thinking thought (by Hegel) is a head pretending it can live without a body. Not only the wish to live is pretentious, but also an arrogant slighting of that body at the height of its intellectual grandeur. However, the head is not the only one to think, but a body; verbal and textual codes are, albeit leading, not the sole languages of culture. Architecture, dress and clothing, food, images, technology and any other fields of human experience are codes or languages of culture which, like verbal language, extend further than vocabulary and, consequently, cannot be converted and sit well within the Procrustean bed of philosophical notions.

Short and, if necessary, eclectic arguments in this book can be definitely treated as philosophical in broader sense of this word. In a stricter sense, they refer to discourse of *systemic theory of culture*.

Since metaphysical absolutes died and abstract ideational speculations of any kind decreased abruptly in price, the knowledge became more practical and pragmatic, and philosophy, erstwhile an ambitious and sovereign queen of sciences, turned into moderate and sycophantic academic discipline. Strengthening pragmatism of knowledge does not mean freedom from theoretical approach; that is why today's cultural anthropology is the main challenger for becoming theoretical basics of new pragmatical (in good sense) knowledge with its lack of systemic design. Though, to state a challenge is successfully met would be an overestimation.

Theoretical cultural studies 'rejoin the head and the body'. Here, the body reasoning does not know any hint of disbalance with objective reality. Body is an integral cultural universe, with philosophy being a part of it and following the laws of unity. Those laws keep functioning, whichever wilds of multi-level reflection the head immerses itself in. Theoretical cultural studies perceive and interpret various languages of culture and therefore reveal notional layers hiding behind their 'vocabulary' considered by specific sciences, and explore their interconnection within cultural unity. Hence, subject matter of theoretical cultural anthropology is grammar, syntax and etymology of cultural codes.

In contrast to philosophy, cultural studies have come to terms with living in the world of relative values and notions. They do not strive, neither call for coming back to *things as they are*, keeping from eternally deadlocking discussions and speculations on the opportunities of such a breakthrough. Discourse of cultural studies settles for *concepts of things*, neither insulted nor annoyed by fatal knowledge imperfection. Herewith, cultural studies are deprived of metaphysical inhibitions; gnoseological and epistemological modes of revealing cultural concepts of things, however inexhaustible, fail to drive this science confused.

Today, another approach based on allowance for mental distance between the

contemporary culture and the one being explored replaces the traditional, initially introduced by G. Vico, J. G. von Herder and others and presuming there is a set of versatile parameters shared by all cultures. The new approach is used mainly by phenomenologists and allows restoring authentic context of the studied culture, every time from anew, rather than studying diverse content of the same so-called versatile parameters. Such an offset of cognitive guidelines is absolutely consistent and yielding. The only thing one has to bear in mind is that linguistic and mental determinations of contemporary culture cannot be done away with completely, when dipping into the context of considered culture; therefore, compromising with the second mentioned approach is inevitable. That is possibly for the better.

The traditional scientific and philosophical discourse is found within clearly defined figural and methodological borders. Such an approach, since the Enlightenment times, was realized by the European reasoning as solely possible; all domains of reality were classified and indexed to make it maximum easy for an objectivistic individual's intellect to implement its essential predilection, which is almost a maniac endeavor to get to the bottom of it, to the least units of analysis, whatever it takes. At those times of Early Modern period, epistemological deadend was still a distant prospect. Today, the critical target is opposite, to break the walls of disciplinary aisles adjusting vivid and 'wrongful' reality to methodologically 'right' epistemes, and to free the thought running slap into a blind wall, before it finally suffocates. That is what cultural anthropology is trying to do.

A cultural anthropologist and a philosopher bring up an issue in different ways. The former questions, *how any given visions of a human, world, thing, history etc. could emerge, evolve and reveal*, rather than *what is a world, human, thing, history etc.* That is, how the ideas of I. Kant, Aristotle or E. Husserl could emerge, expand, be interpreted and function in one culture-historical context or another, rather than wherein and to what extent they were right. The metaphysical aspect, marked with its different-caliber absolutes and mini-absolutes, vanishes together with abstract philosophical questionings and non-figurative "philosophical" human rejected decisively by this culture theory. The latter states that the human himself and the mankind history not only should be joined together somehow, but must not be envisaged separately. That is why historicism approach is understood differently here. Not a person in the course of history, but a person-in-history concept should be considered, where mental genesis, evolution of human species as separate history subjects and lifecycles of living systems form a single process. Therefore, cultural archaeology research context is a combination of deeply interrelated areas, such as human mentality, structuring rules in cultural systems and their evolutionary representations in history.

Any local cultural system (hereinafter, LCS) functions in such a way that its underlying

and primary basics are uncovered at the last moment, in sunset epochs, when the core value is being corroded by profaning; when, in search of transcendent revelations, human intelligence finally takes the varnish off the transcendence itself. Then, those discoveries entail pover and dismail, rather than euphoria before omnipotence of mind.

Indirect evidence of a close transition from immense accumulation of the past together with the present to an already near future is an escalated interest of the contemporaneity to a remote past, to the issue of anthropological genesis and biological origins in human and in culture. The transition is unpredictable, which means, so highly important is something lying beyond it, that previous generations have been banned from embracing it by culture. What shall unmasking of manipulating culture bring? Will it be a sense of victory or, as usual, the chill of existential alienation, worldwide anguish and languor; maybe, both by the very end?

Another way to formulate a problem is to ask to which extent could modern consciousness disengage itself from itself and take a glance from outside, i.e. from that ambience of relative alienation, at what is commonly considered natural; how could it see anecdotal and evanescent in something commonly-known as pan-human and versatile? Truly, two or three decades ago the European and 'circum-European' part of mankind was considered to be the mankind itself. Nobody was confused. Being reluctant to admit that own basics, ideals, languages and values are conventional and historically narrow-minded, culture delivers those as solely possible, or at least, solely right. For a human, their collapse is equal to shipwreck of the living world. Here comes to mind the Biblical, the more knowledge the more grief. Cross-cultural way of reasoning is not so easy to adopt as it seems; no cultural system is known to easily and painlessly release its 'human material' into neutral area, where full and unprejudiced assessment can be made, for its structure can be seen from afar there. Today the final movement of not the local culture but of the global macro-system is in sight, and no sideways exist to turn off the sorrowful way of knowing. In such circumstances, the inevitable question to be answered is where that common denominator is to unite through everything marked to perish, such as ideas, values, guidelines, institutions, forms and principles of life.

The answer to which major assumptions in this book are related is Logos that should not be interpreted in strictly theological sense from neither Christian nor ecumenical perspective. Logos is an immense culture-establishing accumulation of rationale and phenomena being the *core essence of human history* and, therefore, of worldwide cultural and civilizational processes (however much postmodernists and salesmen of local civilization theory were against this term.) Moreover, should one, partially and contingently, admit that *automorphic* change of some cultural and civilizational patterns by others is *immanently regular*, rather than treat that process

as evolution passing the primitive “challenge and response”⁷ scheme, the Logos meaning will grow even more. Hereunder, two definitions of *logos* are used, either lower- or upper-case. A small-letter logos is taken in the most broad sense, for this context; Logos with capital letter is the result of its ‘distillation’ up to supreme Absolute and the very semi-hidden self-nomination of culture itself, the status of which Logos gained in theistical tradition, first and foremost, in Christianity.

What do I mean by core essence (and center) of the history? Apparently, there is no need to prove once again that historical time is not a bead-like vector directed into sinister infinity “stringed” in a steady and linear mode with quantitative increments of various culture-civilizational parameters. The notorious evolutionary spiral is not worth recalling either. Just to mention, historical process still has its internal design; it can be traced at least along the known (to us) section, if embracing the whole field of our history is not possible (for our ignorance of the future.) Hereby, let me make a sheer axiomatic statement; should one take the renowned space of historical being as a unity, then Logos, as historically conditioned dominant for a group of local cultural systems, turns out to be space’s composition center, while the processes of emerging and establishing of logocentric cultural and civilizational principles become a central organizing stage of the whole historical genesis. That is why, to understand the essence of logocentrism and reveal its underlying basics with the use of cultural anthropology hermeneutics means one step from knowledge towards understanding, from description to comprehension; in other words, to reap away one cover of secrecy more from the mystery of human being-in-culture. No happiness will it bring, as usual, but possibly a bit better-equipped we shall be, facing our fatal future.

While addressing to the Logos/logos notion itself, two extremes should be avoided. The first is too broad an interpretation of logos as a cross-functional origin, immanent to a human in general, embracing language, thinking and culture as a whole. Another case was when Logos (majuscule) once became a semi-conscious pseudonym of the culture itself, which nevertheless happened under specific historical circumstances, which are likely to change in the course of time. Should we reject the historicism approach and, to please metaphysics, broaden the understanding of logos up to complete infinitude to search for it everywhere, up to archaic times, such a vague notion loses its gnoseological and heuristic sense completely. The second extreme does not suit either; historically narrowed, its understanding in antique epoch was deducted from

⁷ Arnold J. Toynbee, the author of “challenge and response” adaptation model, in late years understood its inferiority and successfully disowned it. “While growing, ever less challenges come from external environment and ever more from the inside of effective system or personality. The growth means, personality or civilization in progress strives to create their own environment, brings their own troublemaker and elaborates one’s own field of activity”. A. Toynbee. *A Study of History*. – Moscow, Progress, 1991, Page 250.

a myth and related to theistic worldview of Mediterranean peoples, the Europeans in particular⁸.

The understanding of logos/Logos, being of an exceptional significance for the subject matter of this book, is related to an overall concept-behind-phenomenon effect; in the absence of a relevant and tailored concept, we are forced to use the nearest, at least somehow applicable. As a rule, sooner or later formation of specific cultural forms looks as if narrower and semantically specific conceptual blocks 'were peeled' from a more syncretic base being that very nearest and purpose-used concept. That is what exactly happened to logos concept. Perfect would it be to find another, more exact notion for what is understood as logos within our context, but it is not found yet.

Another notion of *logocentrism* is of the same high, if not higher, importance than Logos. The former is something more than a mere cultural paradigm, and even great deal more than a target of post-modernistic philosophical criticism. That is rather a modality of cultural being, where verbal code is a system-building and dominant over other code systems of culture and over the whole diversity of dominant-subordinate relationships within various local traditions. Latent determination for logos and logocentrism starts from language genesis itself; they first reveal their hardly visible indirect attributes in the Upper Paleolithic period and reach self-relevant and dominant maturity in the Axial Age.

So, *logocentrism* stands for global cultural paradigm established as early as I. millennium BC and has been governing modes of mentality and civilizational practices of evolving part of mankind ever since. Evolution of logocentrism is related to fundamental processes, such as culture's decisive separation from natural basics and becoming self-centric, as well as institutionalizing of a Word/Logos as an ontological source of reality in the form of monistic doctrines, obscuring dualistic perception establishing. Clarifications thereon will be given further.

Logocentrism, therefore, presages the birth of *secondary macro-cultural synthesis*, succeeding ancient paleo-syncretism. That was the single possible response to crisis, erosion and destructive segregating of the latter in antiquity decline epoch (late second half of 2nd millennium BC.) Developing immanently, logocentrism, by means of soteriological studies, transformed dualistic perception into a monistic and thus gave birth to historically dominating culture-civilizational system, with evidence of its decline having become unmistakably clear as late as last century.

Logocentric paradigm turns the sacred word not only into a substitute (relevant representative) of reality, but also to its *ontological source*. Word acts as an optimal and versatile

⁸ Cultural anthropology does not question the omnitude or philosophical and heuristic-like understanding of logos as unity of opposites (Heraclitus), with logos *beyond them*. Instead, cultural studies question why such an understanding could emerge particularly on a European (Greek) soil at that particular time.

formula to encode and productively reproduce relations between continuity and discontinuity; due to that, linguistic reality expresses cultural reality at maximum. Here, the hardest problem of configuring and subordinating of cultural code systems arise; for instance, the balance issue of various cultural morphogenesis languages and their representatives in logos.

Due to the aforementioned, logocentrism within this particular context is a notion far too broader and more significant than a post-modernistic target of criticism already mentioned before. A contemporary human is the product of logocentric cultural system. Search for truth and unwillingness to admit that it is inaccessible are not eternally inherent to human spirit. This is all about logocentrism. Logocentrism is juxtaposing all our values with an ultramundane Absoute (even if it outgrew its traditional religious paraphernalia), considering that as a beyond-universe benchmark which embraces any possible hierarchies. Any kind of regulations and standardization systems, from moral stances to social statuses, though grounded in more ancient roots, are also verified from logocentric point of view. Once theoretical explanations become self-sufficient and ontologically comprehensive and 'tailor' the effective reality, it is logocentrism as well. All in all, any discourse within bibliological written culture is logocentrism rather than something inherently and globally human. A severe paradox of historical dynamics is that destruction of logocentric paradigm not merely allows for but also forces separation from that dynamics, to the higher extent possible.

Mentality shall be one more pivotal notion used. It is understood as a *genome of cultural system* within sustainably reproductive cognitive structures and *its psychic quintessence*. Herewith, a set of social and behavior programs and values is not the only thing mentality encompasses. Equally, it embraces both meaning-making products and *methods*. Such an interpretation of mentality brings nearer the answer to how methods and operational technologies of meaning-making schemes are transformed (by means of evolution?) in mentality within the course of history. Four analytical levels can be distinguished in relation thereto,

1. Cognitive techniques of meaning-making,
2. Mentality structures,
3. Socio-cultural,
4. Existing cultural phenomena triggered by those practices.

These four levels form a hierarchy of ontological 'floors' within any cultural system evolving in historical time and space.

Speaking about specific approach to the issue, one cannot but questioning the sacramental, "Which heritage do we abandon?" Set forth below are key factors I would like to qualify as prejudices or, following Francis Bacon, phantoms or demons deeply ingrained in

cultural sciences.

First factor is sustainable aberrations related to the notion of *evolutionism*. As far as it is concerned, inevitably, like a rabbit out of a hat, the image of classical 19th-century evolutionism comes to mind, with its linear outline of historical development, where all nations undergo the same stages. Such a rigmarole dogma serves as an excuse for equally obvious and latent eurocentrism; it has irretrievably discredited the notion of a progress and has become tightly connected to the notion of socio-cultural evolution. Neo-evolutionist arguments for the absence of any general outline and presence of common destination in the form of diverse branches of development, are for some reason perceived with difficulty. Moreover, the denial of common evolutionary scheme is made equivalent to denial of general historical process existence or of any common determining factors. My view is similar to and associated with contemporary neo-evolutionism. Important note is that acknowledgement of mainstream evolution vector by no means does imply building a hierarchy of local cultural and civilizational systems under some absolute parameters. In other words, some cultural systems are involved into mainstream evolutionism and shall anyway take up and pass the baton; the others, sooner or later, shall hit the wall. Yet, whilst the latter keep living, they handle their immanent challenges likewise successfully, and, from the point of view of a person within those systems, are not at all inferior. That is how the things look like for a cultural anthropologist striving for the viewpoint as much detached as possible. For now, let me keep distance from the so-called classical evolutionism, where marxist formation approach can peacefully exist next to liberal progressive one, as well as from any kind of creationism/providentialism, localism, relativism and radical indeterminism.

The second phantom is the curse of “abstract anthropology”, which is an inherently wrong mythological image of invariable human nature (in its metaphysical sense) infinitely reproducing itself, in spite of any alterations to historical and cultural context. The same abstract ‘philosophic’ human, with their abstract will, freedom and ever-growing needs, is initiating those changes again. Hardly could I say that historical alterations to mentality are totally renounced. They are admitted, but are not taken into consideration during specific analysis, drive to the fringes of consideration, turn to something secondary and superficial, touching upon just formally (distorting) the versatile essence of a human. Consistently, the ‘metaphysical’ essence is each time created from unconscious strive to universalize cultural and anthropological habitude of researchers themselves, or, at most, their anthropological ideas and historical horizon. In other words, the human of Aristotle is, loosely speaking, Aristotle himself; the person of Kant is Kant, etc. From here, mental structures, techniques and modes of reasoning are endlessly extrapolated over various situations of historic and pre-historic past. As a result, the image of civilizational history is created, which can hardly be even called corrupted. This is just

a certain imaginable “philosophic” history, which has nothing to do with the real one⁹, whichever self-consistent heuristic value it has. Here, some omni-purpose endeavors and absolute trans-historic targets are attributed to an abstract person, never-ending discussions on ahistorical freedom are held, and so on.

After the 2nd World War the abstract humanistic and metaphysical anthropology received additional support. For obvious reasons, speaking about unbridgeable cultural and anthropological differences between representatives of various societies, as well as about historically determined types of their mentalities, became disreputable. Respected authors without a moment’s doubt proclaimed an obvious nonsense, that now and always people think much the same. Those who dared to contradict, even in the most humble way, were labeled as racists, national socialists, colonialists, etc. In other words, only the content of thinking, i.e. its “vocabulary”, is admitted to be changeable, and neither its mental nor psychophysiological structures. Thus, cognitive revolution of a human throughout history is virtually denied. The flavor of this ideological provision has found its way into the matters that seem remote from ideology. For instance, even in the criticism of K. Lévi-Strauss towards the concept of L. Lévy-Bruhl’s primitive thinking an emphasis can be seen on denial of fundamental cognitive differences between a contemporary and a primitive person. That is an evident though possibly unconscious ideological forced argument. In other words, I uphold the position that cognitive evolution and structural change of mental configurations in history should be admitted. Such an alteration is supported by massive scientific data and is, as they say, a “medical fact”. If someones desires to make racial etc. Conclusions out of that, leave that upon their own responsibility.

Despite the fact that recently the balance-wheel of an attitude towards the problem has slowly and fearfully yet started to move right-about, the traditional philosophical anthropology apparently fails to get off the anchor of abstract humanistic metaphysics. So much the worse for it, for the failure of this doctrine, ideologized to the core, is obvious not only to a cultural anthropologist with correct reasoning, but also to a consistently thinking historian, who is often appalled at metaphysical schemes of cultural philosophers, flagrantly falsifying real historical context.

However, the mind of an historian is also, as a rule, to some extent “poisoned” by mythology of an abstract person and the spirit of eurocentric extrapolations, be they obvious or hidden. In no way would I like to entertain another interdisciplinary squabble. The goal is to state a pivotal, though very simple, thesis that no *principle of historicism can be implemented*

⁹ The answer to a tricky question, “Can we generally know what the real history is like?” is a separate discussion. For now, let me state that final uncertainty on that issue does not cancel the right to reject unsound reasoning.

into sciences and culture, if no profound and scrupulous restoration of mental structures is made, and if no culture-historical human types are stratified by pivotal, inherent mental habitude differences. To get rid of "philosophical human" phantom, only one thing is enough, which is easy to articulate yet almost impossible to accomplish. That is to stop transposing one's own psychological automatic actions and settings onto a human of other epochs and cultures. Too dangerous and destructive an activity is to vision *another* in a false mirror of one's own selfness, and worse yet, to imagine him as a "rudimentary" self, with all subsequent delusions. The current recessionary mentality, spontaneously getting rid of logocentric "phantoms" and psychological stereotypes contained therein, gets dramatically augmented fluctuational opportunities, intrinsic to any recession, or, to say it simpler, is pushed to a freedom space, situationally widened, where old logocentric cognitive standards are dying fast, and new are yet to burgeon. This renders experiencing mentality "unkept" and out of strict discourse control, say "discourse of power" by post-modernists. In such cases, considerable courage is needed to once again peer at the depths of estrangement. This is the duty experiencing mentality has to pay; from that point of view, striving to recognize oneself in another, or, figuratively speaking, to see one's own reflection in the pupils of a totally different culture representative is an inexcusable and dangerous intellectual puerilism.

Remarkably, modernization projections are scarcely based on rational arguments; those views do not endure any serious rationalistic critics. Here, a merely mythical paradigm is in place, prescribing to necessarily see one's own reflection in *another*. Otherwise, *another* turns out to be intrinsically and unconsciously alienated, unknowable and fearful. Consciousness flatly denies letting *another* in self, for *another* with their irregularity argues *my own* identity. One cannot but recall a pre-historic disfavor of a twin, "the same like me, but wrong"?

That is not to say that the issue of moving away from modernization and attaining a higher level of historicism has never been brought up before. Yet, the progress on that way comes in the form of sheer separate breaches in the strongholds of methodological or, more likely, psychological inertia. As mentioned before, the phantom of an abstract "philosophical human" is founded not only on anti-evolutional dogma by cultural anthropology¹⁰, but also on a pseudo-humanistic ideology, enforcing taboos on any kind of reasoning about organic differences in human nature. The "apostates" are expelled from "presentable" (which actually means ideologically sycophantic) science. Although the dogma of abstract anthropological parity has long before lost any scientific support and the idea of cultural anthropological stratification is in the air, the majority of authors prefer "not to get engaged". They will have to, however, for the

¹⁰ For instance, "Human brain functions are similar for the whole mankind" (Boas F. *The mind of primitive man*. Rev. New York: Macmillan, 1952. P. 135). Remarkably, such a Boas's belief goes well with cultural relativism that could be the object of postmodernists' envy.

time has come.

The third prejudice impeding a more relevant take on culture is “the phantom of economic reductionism”, or utilitarianism in a broader sense. At bottom, this is the same extrapolation of mental and value settings of a neo-European “economy human” over the whole historical space; social psychology of an average bearer of consciousness, emerged in the epoch when rationalistic neo-European intellect was entering the presumptuous maturity stage (with its peak falling to 19th century), is stated to be a common reference, measurement standard and statutory formula for development and is imposed to all periods and nations. A lot of authors, even though admitting – orally and “just in some cases” – the priority of non-economic factors influencing culture, do not provide any methodological output from such an acknowledgement and in specific analytical studies continue relying upon the fact that cost-effectiveness and rush for comfort first and foremost has been governing the human through all the history.

Under constraint of facts and rational thought, other researchers admit rather reluctantly that, for instance, if no wrenches are used, archaic person’s commitment to extra-pragmatic imperatives, to the prejudice of physiological needs, and the necessity/imperative to survive apparently do not match. Nevertheless, writhing out such and similar confessions, few of them have heart to put off pan-pragmatic prejudices and seriously change the optics. A conviction that some versatile aspiration to endlessly ameliorate material conditions has filtered its way to sub-consciousness and deposited, as an a-priori fundamental truth, is the living base, history engine and the driving force of human motives. Herewith, formally admitting the existence of “reverse influence” of non-pragmatic factors on the notorious “basis” (as a rule, nothing more than that!), utilitarian economists are never ready to reconsider their basis and superstructure model in essence. There is more to it than just “phantoms of Marx”, by J. Derrida. Current technocratic economism is often a far cry from marxism, in whichever broad sense it is understood. It is no mere chance that for policy makers in power the economic growth has become a sort of a fetish.

Sustainability of pan-economic delusions can be attributable to the fact that corresponding mindset developed in the period of cultural historical “imprinting” of a neo-European human and his “economical” civilization. As a form of its cultural identity, sub-consciousness has become deeply ingrained with such a mindset. This is an explanation, but not an excuse. Supposing one can never emancipate oneself from mythological fundamentals of scientific reasoning; yet, as far as reflexion is concerned, one can at least distance oneself significantly from an object of interest, i.e. substantially augment the level of existential alienation for the sake of a greater relevance in research target comprehension. It is another matter that such a goal paradoxically requires a greater level of implantation, exposure to the object and, as a matter of fact, cancelling subject-object dualism. That is done without imposing

one's own ontology to an object, which is the approach that rationalistic "law-making mind" (Z. Bauman's term) used to take and keeps taking, disregarding anything. That is a point of a separate discussion, though.

It is common knowledge that history of culture is not primarily the history of household economic, engineering and manufacturing practices. Such activities related within the culture itself to the programs of social relationship structure-making, setting-up and stabilization, take a relatively minor place within internal hierarchy of a cultural system. Household economic practices, even though related to basic life-support programs, have though never been a system-making factor for cultural systems, nor a major engine of cultural historic dynamincs. The mentioned definition can be applied solely to a conteporary post-indusrtrial period, and if so, with a lot of exceptions. Not by coincidence the complexity of household economic and engineering sphere is always the first victim of destruction and disintegration in turning and recession periods. This is the very part the culture sacrifices the most easily and painlessly, for the sake of its systemic transformations. It is my invincible belief that neither household economic, nor engineering, nor social political factors on their own can be backbone for cultural communities. *People's mental habitude types and internal topography of the system itself, its ststructural pattern* is the core.

The following delusion follows from the previous ones and is based on a modernized development of psychological logic; an average psychological type of a neo-European personality is extrapolated in both synchronous and diachronous directions. Mindset and values of a human from the liberal West are assigned to people from previous periods, as well as to contemporary non-western society members. Readiness to accept *another* person as a whole with his mentality and values in word, and to the sole extent that he is culturally relevant to a western person in deed, has turned into vulgar hypocrisy of the notorious political correctness and an obvious failure of the multiculturalism project as a whole, not only just of "multicultural policy". Most recent researches into the subject of discovering new identities by a modern human generally make no difference. Western values, though not so loud already, keep being declared or, at the most, be implied as panhuman.

Hence, a fictitious "exaltation-of-needs" law and all-imposed strive for transgression (Y. Kozeletsky's term), i.e. for "breaking the borders", "falling outside the limits", arises. That entails inescapable technocracy twinned with a touching myth which states the desire of any human for freedom in its liberal sense, etc.

Indeed, not everything is so simple and tough. Yet no dramatic turning point has been so far incurred by the significant and fruitful attempts to restore authentic cultural context of the previous epochs, made in 20th century by various authors and schools.

One can state that the aforementioned has long time ago became out of date, for post-modernistic critics (and a lot more) has gotten rid of all positivist and utilitarian-like theories, making those things of the past. Nevertheless, once having been already thrown out of the window, they keep using the door and emerge within totally extraneous paradigmatics (post-modernistic, for instance). All that makes me understand that the issue of "heritage denial" is still rather topical, at least partially.

All the aforementioned ideas are of significant interest, for the consideration proposed to a reader is hardly a sheer political journalism in the form of academic philosophy, nor is it a pure science. The question of whether the West can be saved, and if yes, how, does require a scientific impersonal and integrated approach. An analysis is required deeper than that applied in studies of short-term economic and political conjunctures. Another separate book is needed to develop the methodology for such an analysis. Due to all that, let me now be limited to some fragmentary experience within several local subjects of interest.

IN SEARCH OF A WAY OUT

Quite surprisingly, Western civilization with all its intrinsic values was found to be a finite event, though apparently immense, rather than an everlasting stop of history train. To all effects and purposes, Western mentality turned out to be completely unequal to leave the historical stage. The whole suspense is that there can be different ways of leaving. One can shove at a moment's notice, or inchmeal; fade away gently, or bang the door on depart to "let the earth tremble" (Goebbels); depart more or less painlessly, or leave bloody conflicts behind. Arguably, the essential self-addressed question of an outgoing person is how to extend oneself in *another one*, thus escaping the non-existence obscurity. Put it another way, how and under which form could one prolongate their participation in common evolutionary process? For the contemporary West, a response shall depend on the conditions of further cultural civilization synthesis, mentioned before. It is precisely this perspective the current state of affairs is worth considering from.

Foremost, let us question, what do we mean by 'way out', as far as crisis is concerned? Is that a reversion to a desirable state in the past? It's never the case. Is that another renovation for the best, and if yes, where the strategic target lies? Is that maybe a simple elimination of negative trends? Even so, within this perspective utterly confined, clear should be the understanding of the trend nature and destination. And – the most important – courage and mental determination for self-modification should be in place. No that, no ability to handle even the most apparent aspects of crisis. Seemingly, the answer to sore points is less liable to be found in economics, politics, ecology or technology, of however high importance that could be today. First and utmost, the response is rooted in the field of cultural anthropology.

The issue of balance between the individual and the social, in either socio-centric or anthropocentric form for each society, was mentioned in the first part of the book. As before, current crisis is the first historical precedent of how anthropocentric, rather than socio-centric, LCS is getting down and leaving the history. Western LCS, *under current historical conditions, obviously fails to find gratifying forms of social and individual harmonization*. This means, study of contemporary Western scenario has to be focused on the issue of humanism as "the assemblage point" of Western mentality.

The existing definition of humanistic crisis is no longer internal problem of European spirit torn between pompous sanctifying of a human and his inversive abjection, i.e. bringing him down to a sick animal (Nietzsche) or to a mistake in the evolutionary process (Koestler)¹¹. The target of salvational life renovation requires to decisively go beyond the limits of humanistic doctrine, customary to Western mentality. In its turn, that goal puts the following issues on agenda,

- To move away from the concept of an abstract “philosophical” human established within neo-European metaphysics;
- Study the genesis of Western humanistic values framework as a local historical phenomena, rather than mainstream vector of mankind evolution;
- Analyze the parameters of today’s humanistic mentality crisis;
- Build up the possible models of crisis challenging.

All issues deserve scrupulous studying; for this book, in peril of repeating the aforementioned, let me confine myself to the most general notes.

As noted before, the idea of anthropological unity of mankind is one of the holy cows the up-to-date humanistic ideology stands upon. Is it based on social democratic perception of liberalistic ideas and democracy, notwithstanding the antiquity-ascendant universalistic and metaphysical traditions of neo-European philosophy being the foundation thereof. In a post-2nd World War tradition, this idea got its new solid ideological supportive arguments (see Chapter 1.) Herewith, let me state my first riotous idea, that post-war logical and justified denunciation of Nazism has nevertheless been *pushed too far*. As known, any extreme, even though “correct”, is mischievous. It is not just the point that together with Nazism any kind of nationalism, including bourgeois, was damned. The latter was, by the way, a valuable form of social self-identification for a neo-European person. A severe taboo was enforced over any kind of stratification of “sole and undivided” abstract philosophical person; a westerner by default was considered to be his paragon. Alienation from Nazism terror, coupled with colonial system breakup, originated a psychological, if not psychopathic, of the opposite-content induction which overtook post-war mentality like a pestilence. Against the background of repression and stranglehold of scientific approaches entailing “improper” conclusions¹², multiple researchers including the leading scientists have converted into a renowned ideology of cultural anthropological parity. Others were on the dodge, trying to prove clearly absurdist thesis on the absence of quality differences

¹¹ The rotation of humanistic and misanthropic patterns in European culture is a separate topic.

¹² One example can be closing up of several schools of psychology and cultural anthropology, studying the mental diversity of culture-anthropological types within the society. Researches of that kind were outlined in 1960s in the USA.

in mentality of people of diverse epochs and nations. They were stating that solely the content of mentality is changeable, whilst its structures and forms are unified through all countries and ages. As if cognitive structures were a kind of a “glass” to “pour” any liquid in. Others preferred to “cool it” so as not to avoid being labeled Nazi, racists, Brown-shirts, colonialists, chauvinists, etc.

Doctrine of mankind’s anthropological parity has groundings more profound than just historically predetermined ambition to surmount birth-status and feudal strata, or even western-Christianity anthropological maximalism¹³. The point is that any breakthrough to a new evolutionary quality unfailingly presumes a sort of “adjustment”, i.e. leveling and simplification of heterogeneous complexity of “mother milieu”. Here is the case of a doctrinal alignment of culture-anthropological differences and socio-cultural practices based on that doctrine, which turned out to be a necessary prerequisite for neo-European person and his civilization.

Let us agree on conditions, in no way am I going to defense Nazism in any form or to render discussion into the field of racial and genetic differences, however interesting the facts were revealed by contemporary studies, not folded due to political correctness. The case is the stratification under totally different basis, i.e. by *mental habitude* type. The latter stands for a specific set of cognitive schemes and meaning-making techniques that have been consistently inherited by historical ethnical and cultural communities. The previous chapters cover the types of *mental habitude*.

No doubt, the model of cultural anthropological types described therein shall be interpreted vulgarly, in kind of direct popular social mapping; nonetheless, I will try to make a few major provisions.

Let me first remind that each mental habitude described is a dominant, rather than a matter per se within a person. As mentioned before, mentality of a contemporary human is usually shared by a dominant and subdominants of two other types. They can be in any kind of mutual dependency relations, up to nearly-parity. For instance, a balance-like ratio of logocentric and personality types of mentality is commonly found with major policy-makers. Yet, significantly, the lifetime development of subdominants basically cannot change the dominant’s *inherent* position. Indeed, the borders between culture-anthropological types are similar to species limits in biology; they can never generate any sustainably reproductive palliative forms, if mixed. Hence, it follows that

¹³ One should bear in mind that neo-European discussions on mankind referred primarily to the European humanity. Prior to mid-19th century, the doctrine of anthropological parity did not cover representatives of other races and nationalities.

– The aforementioned types exist within various historical chrono-worlds and advocate *incompatibly different* values,

– No “consensus” is possible between these types *in principle*. Even more, any inconsistencies, including conflicts between those types, is the foremost evidence of historical dynamics,

– All the three types are present in any society; the majority comprises post-individuals, then come logocentrics, and no more than 5 to 7 % of personalities. Herewith, the societies themselves, in view of their historical background, can be either-oriented. Personality-oriented societies are first of all societies of the West and its cultural and civilization provinces,

– In societies which are not driven by personal dominant neither full-scale modernization, nor reception of humanistic values (in western interpretation) is possible,

– Any form of social harmony between those types is always palliative, relative and unsteady.

Ability to adapt to the “game rules”, imposed by dominant type, should not mislead. In Western personality-oriented civilization, like in other societies, the majority of the population is not personalities. The phenomenon of a quasi-personality is a latent base for various culture-civilizational collisions of the present-day West and, as said before, is one of systemic crisis components.

Understanding of humanistic anthropology decline reasonably starts from an observation, evident yet highly unpleasant for Western mentality; that is, attributes of a Renaissance and early neo-European personality, traditionally referred to quite enthusiastically and solemnly, were driven wild and took shape in an apathetic, vulgar and self-interested individualistic middlebrow, which has nothing to do with personality except for apparent feeling of selfhood¹⁴. The system of notorious “universal” human values, being in reality a system of liberal humanism values, fails completely to take up challenges of the crisis epoch, for the latter demanding a drastic reconsidering of abstract humanistic “meta-narrations”, i.e. that war is a crime, the public is always right and their declarative will is sacred, even if the former is an accumulation of demos and mob (‘okhlos’ in Greek); that all people seek for freedom; that death penalty is inadmissible, etc. Following these meta-narrations or, to be more exact, mythologems worsens a range of serious and underlying contradictions which are essentially unresolvable within previous anthropological vision. Among these antilogies is society’s impotence against excessive selfhood of a separate subject who is not a personality in practice; making use of personality’s historical

¹⁴ One cannot say there has been lack of such an issue in Western thinking. In majority of cases, this topic was in Spengler’s manner reduced to sad nostalgia for knighthood and pre-bourgeois spiritualism of Middle Ages.

achievements, such as rights, freedoms, and so on. Manipulative tools the culture has to implicitly control that rowdy selfhood miss the mark increasingly frequently and all too often turn against the culture itself. For example, abstract humanistic doctrine of human rights entailed a belief that living at others' expense is justified, which then turned into worship of dependency, lumpen-proles and social parasitism. Moreover, with left-liberal views coming to absurdist extremes, an ideologeme was established that the rich are a priori to blame before the poor. Hardly a greater nonsense can be pictured. Meanwhile, that has nothing to do with liberalism, however broad sense it had. That is either insanity of cultural mentality, or conscious indoctrinations for the convenience of international bureaucracy.

In recent decades, sustainable well-being and no need for continuous struggle for survival has not only corrupted the western person (in particular, the Romance-speaking part of Europe,) but created a new problem. Taking great pains over artificial guilt for its colonial past, the West has brought up a "neo-barbarian" mentality of pre-personal and even anti-personal culture representatives, strongly believing that the West is an owing party. Being disabled by own liberal humanistic doctrinarianism, the West gives ground to impudent barbarians who are solicitous of Western civilization blessings and do anything but freeload. Moreover, they have a sincere dislike for it and holding it in contempt. With all that, an idea that personal criteria, attitude and social cultural behavior patterns are not applicable to non-personalities keeps being rejected by "politically correct" discourse.

I cannot fail to say a few words about the notorious political correctness in particular. Initially innocent intellectual fashion, political correctness grew into a serious handicap before pertinent understanding of reality. Let us put aside ethical criticism of hypocrisy standardizing, ban over making bones about something, imposing self-righteous euphemisms, bullying of common sense and logic, disregarding any inconvenient points of view, talking down, disguising of Matter for the sake of more than disputable Due, etc. The underlying reason is supposed to be the aforementioned fact that all cultural systems in history develop modes of self-defense against devastating historical dynamics. By accessible and reasonable means, culture blocks, taboos and sort of abolish, i.e. excludes any non-systemic, "wrong" and inconvenient matter from reality. In those cases, an ancient psychological tool works; should anything be taken away from semantic field, it is effectively *sort of* removed from reality itself. From that point of view, the so-called intellectuals are little more than prehistoric hunters, who believed that magic manipulations with an image were totally identical to physical effect on the depicted item. Like Ecclesiastical Inquisition, which used to defend decomposing Middle-Age mentality, the dead-smooth political correctness inquisition advocates the left-liberal ideology developed in the last quarter of 20th century, which keeps showing its irregularity ever more obviously. Here, as well as in variety of

other cases, the self-defending system is indifferent to global development processes; expanding own existence is the one that matters. To this extent, political correctness police is needed to lengthen the life of mother system, in its up-to-date left-liberal (in broader sense) modification. Fatal delusion is the fact that Western world, still keeping its forefront position within global civilization, is primarily busy prolonging its status quo and thinking that could be a rescue from any shocks the rest of the world can face. This is where the root of a crucial inconsistency of modern times can be found; globally applicable problem-solving recipes are exclusively taken from cookbook of left (again, in its broader sense) liberalism or relevant views (social democratic, etc.) In some cases, policy-makers dare to take ideology-free actions and disregard the prescription to select ideologically relevant decisions under the effective “rules of the game”, rather than most reasonable and efficient. Such a counter-natural situation forces them to lie, prevaricate, look for awkward excuses, resort to double-hearted gimmicks, dual standards, etc. However, the policy of common sense (do not confuse with unscrupulous pragmatism) in modern world, however paradoxical, fails to have any ground, neither worldview, scientific, ideological, nor, therefore, discursive, even though the lack of such a discourse is progressively palpable. In relation thereto, the second riotous idea shall be, ‘Off political correctness!’ Down with pharisaic left-liberal ideology of the bureaucratic international! Down with abstract humanistic demagoguery degrading culture-civilizational identity of the West! As I understand, neither people blinded and induced by the ideas of multiculturalism (like those from 1920-1930s of the previous century, driven by National Socialism), nor those making use of political correctness ideology for their own purposes, shall miss my words. Yet, the Truth (non-existing, according to post-modernists), has the right to be outspoken.

The aforementioned issue has in-built relation to another contradiction, utterly unresolvable within liberal humanistic discourse. That is the one between proclaimed multiculturalism fundamentals and a de-facto persistent image of the Western civilization as a leading one, determining the mankind’s development fairway. It’s not just the failure of “multiculturalism policy”, finally and indistinctly admitted by leading European politicians, nor is it the reluctance of other cultures’ representatives to assimilate – deceived hopes of left “intellectuals” who came up with all that “multiculturalism”. There is more to it than that; cultural diversity, being the fifth essence of nation’s historical experience and mentality, is not an exotic supplement to the notorious “human values”, supposedly familiar and clear to anyone. Another culture is, first and foremost, *another system of values*. Whether “right” or “wrong”, it is in any case *a different one*. Take an example of a cannibal; how should one treat him from the point of view of liberal humanism and multiculturalism? Should his indigenously cannibal traditions be admitted and esteemed, for those, as any other traditions, “have the right to exist”?

Indeed, a cannibal is a human; consequently, human rights are applicable. Or, should he be assassinated, because a cannibal, as historical experience witnesses, is unrectifiable and cannot be dishabituated to murder and eat humans? Within current liberal humanistic discourse there is no answer, for the former fails to admit an evident thing, that sustainable harmonization of cultural relationship (firstly, between *own* and *other* culture) on a parity basis *is impossible as a matter of principle*. Heterogeneity leveling, flattening of antagonisms, as well as differences of capacities all lead to entropy growth, not only in physical systems. The same happens to any system, including socio-cultural. That is why the doctrines of culture-anthropological parity, human values, “clearing off” mental divisions, avoiding, at all hazards, forced conflict resolution is not the simple old-age lack of determination, which is peculiar to Western civilization slipped into sentimentalism. This is its self-destruction code which can also be activated off its limits.

The matter of the heart is humanistic philosophy, constantly mingling two completely different schemes of things, i.e. the living world of a human and systemic world of culture shown through social institutes, traditions, standards and other above-personal regulations. As mentioned in Chapter 1, humanistic consciousness consistently transposes the “human, too human” (Nietzsche) over culture-historical level in attempt to impose own ethical discourse to the history. Laws and relations within the above-personal world of socio-cultural institutions and relations appear as a simple *quantitative* persistence of human world. Due to that, this world is supposed to be under the competence of humanistic morale. Any discrepancies appear to be annoying circumstances, which need to be eliminated; basically, they do not violate the homogeneous individualistic and social world. In spite of vast range of contemporary social philosophical studies on world dichotomy, the last conclusions are to be made. The difference between reference systems of a singular individual and society is qualitative rather than quantitative. There are completely diverse laws governing each, and no direct mutual extrapolations are possible. Unfortunately, that is where endeavor worthy of a better cause is applied by humanistic consciousness. One example can be the controversy surrounding death penalty issue (see Chapter 3). Adversaries resort to a trivial “aporia” on choice between execution of one innocent or release of a dozen criminals and pose a rhetorical (as it seems to them) question, “What is better?”; they fail to understand that without a clarification, “Better for whom?” such a rhetorical question turns into sheer demagoguery. For the accused, still and all only those decisions are acceptable that let him/her stay alive. For the environment, the issue of life and death of a separate subject *in principle* cannot be too significant. What is metaphysics of inestimable and “inconvertible” human life for anthropocentrism adherents shall be operational units of manipulating (subject to statistical laws) for the society. Here comes my third riotous idea, that for society, however sad it was, not to release ten villains is a priority; death of one

guiltless is not such a significant loss. Let me remind you once again, that to reconcile/harmonize standpoints of society and of a separate person, represented by a group defending his interests, *is impossible* as much like putting kilos and kilometers to one measuring unit. One should finally make clear notice of which viewpoint is overriding for us, and why. The task here is hardly to select some once-and-for-all relevant view; enough of ethical metaphysics! The target is to elaborate the most flexible criteria for selection of an optimal attitude for each particular case. Thus, not the search for a versatile scale of values is targeted, but *methodology of selection* of situational decision model for each specific case. This is where the idea of different mental habitude types and human characters can easily come in useful.

Humanistic moral system prescribes impatience to hunger and destitution, to help poor countries and strive for building bridges between the poor and the rich. By all means, poverty is considered bad, and wealth good. Strangely, the fact that such a metaphysical approach is only suitable for a separate individual or a small group is left out of account. On the level of major historical communities and processes, it is not all that simple. Leveling-off living standards decreases the difference of various socio-cultural groups' potential and leads again to entropy and decline of socio-historical dynamics. A few generations living in comfort and prosperity guarantee society's quick depravity and decline. That is why there is no question of negative trends elimination, if abstract metaphysical understanding of "good" and "bad" is not abandoned. My next riotous idea shall be as follows, if no hunger should exist from the point of view of the starved, it is nevertheless needed from the perspective of macro social processes. This is not cynicism, but merely an understanding of the fact, no acute contradictions, no progress. This is the law one cannot wriggle out of.

Another "meta-narration" coming out of disability to see *another person as truly different* is the negation of shared responsibility principles. The reason is that liberal humanism refuses to see anything but a *personality* in any subject. Personality qualities and, accordingly, personal status with all inherent rules, rights and freedoms is a priori charged with everybody, without limitation. We should bear in mind, no personality, no personal responsibility. By sneaking personal moral choice and acting as an unconscious agent of collective will, a subject, for no matter which reason, effectively misses out on the right to be considered as subject of personal liability. Generally, this will be my fourth rebellious idea that the bearers of pre-moral consciousness can act solely as collective responsibility subject. This is not fascism, neither Nazism nor any other dreadful "-ism". This is nothing but a common sense.

Summary statement following from the described before is as follows: historically all-embracing contradiction between social and individual cannot be any longer eventuated on the base of liberal humanism with its metaphysical fundamental of "cross-functional" morale. The

latter *has never* existed in history. It hardly ever could, for any self-regulated socio-cultural nature keeps its internal heterogeneity away from lethal aligning. As for philosophical religious doctrines of a versatile moral system, their implicit intended purpose is to influence omnicultural context implicitly, while performing other tasks, rather than be embodied straightforwardly. That is a matter of a separate discussion.

In the tideway of a monistic paradigm, traditional for logocentric culture, humanistic consciousness a-priori associates monistic doctrines with the truth, thinking that there is but a *sole* truly and reasonable approach in the course of any contradictions, which can be overcome on the basis of *one* common principle¹⁵. Recently, to follow Plotinus's maxim that "unity is a boon, and multiplicity evil" has come too expensive. Intellectual context of modern world requires denial of monistic stereotypes; search for the sole Truth should be substituted for developing of relative criteria for *positioning*, in the situation of an irremovable multiplicity of "coordinate systems". For instance, we had better discuss the underlying triggers of a choice made towards either social or individual attitude in *each* separate case, than argue about which of the denoted approaches is versatile and standard-setting in general and, ultimately, how they could be consistently combined. Isn't it a target for a post-postmodernist intellect? At least, it is more serious and interesting than worship one's painful disbelief to self-evident things. To say it simpler, the present-day discourse raises an issue of how, to the best advantage, select among two or more options, while not seeking for omnitude, rather than how to find *a sole Truth*. Herewith, the criterion of the best is related not to the proximity of abstract and overall form, but to pragmatism, in the most precise sense of this word. Yet, postmodernism which used to threaten doing away with meta-narrations, has deceased already, and logocentric monism keeps living.

When western leaders address their culturati for new ideas, concepts, theories, those interrogations have bitter taste of hypocrisy. A counter-question comes to mind, whether you are ready to perceive or at least *hear* those new ideas? However, no interlocutor seems to be available to address such a question, for Western intellectual milieu is not the best at producing new ideas. Even a simple alarming cry, with no far-reaching conclusions made, triggers an "accident in best-regulated families". Suffice it to recall response to Thilo Sarrazin's book.

Western problems are not a cause of malevolence. In Russia, it is even worse. Here, even bourgeois-democratic revolution goals are not met yet. That means the Western realities undergoing their most probably final crisis stage have not even been born in Russia. Russian Westernism keeps mind off such a trouble, but does it really alter anything? Russian system,

¹⁵ Post-modernists reject that in word; yet, judging by their impatience to everything not in line with post-modernistic code, they are subject to the same doctrine.

fundamentally sociocentric and anti-anthropocentric, where personality has always been marginal, keeps blocking, by the skin of teeth, the genesis of selfhood and historical consciousness, has no future and is totally powerless in the face of current challenges. An up-to-day individualism is barbarian rather than bourgeois by its nature; it does not correlate neither to work ethics, nor to social responsibility. The problem of Russian ethos is a never-ending tug-of-war between barbarian individualism and service paradigm, regulatory for all logocentric communities. The former is blowing away before our eyes, and a kind of a comparable bourgeois individualism is evolving in European-oriented strata of megalopolises. Possibly, this process desperately going behind shall still serve its purpose, in case second historical release of Modernity project will take place on the basis of Eastern-European civilization.¹⁶ Let us hope, the nearest future shall give answer to this question as well. Anyway, the centaurus – a mix of “communistic anthropology” and stubs of enlightenment-romantic humanism – is buried. Nothing stable can emerge instead, until the quasi-imperial agony is terminated. For now, humanistic discourse in Russia remains an abstract theory; yet Russia is not under discussion now.

Is a resemblance of post-humanism possible on the wreck of disintegrating humanistic tradition? Theoretically, yes. Death of metaphysics and consciousness relativization (not deliberately in the form of an “academic” postmodernism) is underpinning a key and for now a seditious thesis, that people are different. That is why new humanism rejects the doctrines of universal morale, by its substitution to the principle of moral relativism. That means, we had better *talk to each using their language*, than invariably charge everybody with a sole language. A barbarian will be addressed to in barbarian, a narrow-minded slave as a slave, etc. Such an approach requires profound self-consciousness on a cultural anthropology basis; as evident from historical experience, in an emergency humanity can fix tougher problems. Most importantly, the necessity for that should be deeply understood. Such a mentality transformation would allow for partial conservation of traditional humanistic values, but in a more local and purpose, thus operational, format. Otherwise, they will simply be rejected in their totality by contemporary Western mentality, with all Sartre-like nausea, aching void and disbelief in whatsoever but one-off concerns. For a non-western-mentality bearer, alternatively, these values have never been apprehended and adopted to full extent. Should the aforementioned paradigm shift take place, it will mark an overturn in philosophical, cultural and psychological anthropology and the funeral of an abstract “philosophical human”. That, in its turn, means that mythologem of cultural and anthropological parity shall no more be able to constrain new strata and hierarchy formation trends. Now, indignant reader’s imagination certainly pictures some neo-Olympians, aristoi of

¹⁶ Generally, the perspective of “self-completion” (Habermas) of Modernity project on Western-European culture-civilizational basis seems to be a matter of separate discussion.

the nearest future, i.e. demigods sustaining life with bio- and nanotechnologies and manipulating consciousness “of these little ones” by the same measures. I will for sure be credited with this anti-utopist image, whichever reservations I made. Let me keep from being defensive. Moreover, I am sure the future belongs to meritocracy governed by post-humanist philosophy based on differentiated approach to bearers of various mental habitudes. Herewith, no version of mondialism is the case, for meritocracy is taken as power of the salt of the earth, rather than of those born at random in reach countries.

Another possible way out is synthesis of a coming-apart liberal humanistic tradition and Oriental ethical views. Within the framework of Euro-Atlantic and Far-East civilizations, synthesis renders it feasible to overcome western-mentality individualistic extremes by means of “injection” of some modernized Confucian ethics.

Admittedly, post-humanistic outline can be pictured from a totally different perspective. It is a case of a stepwise change of mental features peculiar to major part of the mankind. This can be conditioned upon evolutionary motion from transitory (personality) type of mentality to a new global systemic quality, previously referred to as New Naturalness. Depiction of such a cultural anthropological type, nascent before our eyes, requires a separate and detailed discussion. I will just mention that its distinctive characteristic, as compared to all other types, is that mentality is not just a simple, relatively integral “device” within social system network, falling away from the latter due to its proliferous selfness, but an *independent system*. The development of sociality as it is goes to the background and fading away. (In this sense, F. Fukuyama’s forecast is to some extent justified.) *Internal mental and cultural evolution of a human* is advancing to the forefront as a relatively autonomous system. In relation thereto, the traditional historical disposition of person vs social system to some extent loses its evolutionary significance and becomes automatically self-reproducing. Internal coherence of person’s mental sub-systems, each bearing their own specific cultural semantic habitude (see above), is found on the edge of front-end development.

This is not a regular utopia regarding “spiritual revival” everyone has got sick of. The matter of discussion is an abrupt breakthrough to a new quality, rather than renaissance of whatever used to exist in the past. The truth is that shapes of such a new quality cannot usually be visible within the previous attributes, for an evolutionary saltation always gives birth to something totally unexpected.

Anyway, new humanistic mentality shall have to resolve a number of problems one cannot wriggle out of. First and foremost, they are as follows:

- Defining a new concept of a human subject,
- Developing of fundamentally new forms of harmonizing the social and the individual,

- Relativization and contextualization of what has so far been regarded as versatile cultural anthropological constants,
- Elaborating criteria of stratification of cultural historical subjects by their mental habitude,
- Clearing the new anthropological doctrine from any racial etc. connotations,
- Creating a new, sufficiently flexible and viable relativistic ethics on its basis.

All these deeply connected goals are incredibly complex and require considerable intellectual courage. Yet, no simple ways can be found to come out of recession.

Even partial solutions to problems shall make it possible for the West to mitigate the signs of systemic crisis. Additionally and more importantly, a potential shall open up to covert maximum volume of our cultural and historical experience into an upcoming synthesis, and preserve such an experience from drastic denial. To enter the future, one should change; it is easier said than done.

**GLOBAL CRISIS
FATE AND FORTUNES OF THE WEST**
Andrey A. Pelipenko

**ГЛОБАЛЬНЫЙ КРИЗИС
И ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЗАПАДА**
Андрей Пелипенко

**ЕЛЬЦИН
ЦЕНТР**