

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v8i1.2054

Citation: Shestakov, Y. (2019). Interrelation of the Culture and Historical Consciousness in Terms of Developing a Modern Value Paradigm. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 8(1), 1-12. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v8i1.2054>

Interrelation of the Culture and Historical Consciousness in Terms of Developing a Modern Value Paradigm

Yuri A. Shestakov¹

Abstract

This paper reveals what foundations of the value paradigm of modern society are the most appropriate to contemporary cultural and historical realities on the basis of the study of interrelation between cultural phenomena and historical consciousness. The study employs a significant range of methodological and theoretical approaches of philosophy, cultural and social studies. The article argues that three different approaches to interrelation of culture and historical consciousness are correlated with three approaches to the establishment of the value paradigm of modern society. The author considers that the most suitable axiological basis for the establishment of the value paradigm in modern social and cultural situation is the principle of individual autonomy that will help to strike a balance of values of personalistic egoism, national and corporate altruism, and also humanistic universalism. The historical consciousness developed within this value paradigm makes it possible to overcome both an objectivist interpretation of historical path typical for classical science and a subjectivist one common to post-modern historical philosophy.

Keywords: Cultural philosophy, Historical consciousness, Anomie, Heteronomy, Tradition.

¹ Don State Technical University, Shakhty branch, Rostov Region, Russia. E-mail: yshtyrov@hse.ru

1. Introduction

Modern philosophy is addressing more persistently the phenomenon of values as a main force determining human-world interaction. The study of this force is the most urgent within the cultural philosophy, since the culture is a sacralization of being, its endowment with certain value capacity. To carry out an essential analysis of this force, cultural philosophy should address the history, since it is hardly possible to find more interrelated areas of being than culture and history. History is a way of cultural development, and culture constitutes the content of the historical process. Culture includes an aspect related to achievement of ideal-value purposes, the relocation of values from the world of the due to the world of the matter², and history serves as a mediating tool that implements this relocation. It is not surprising that modern cultural and philosophical thought is appealing increasingly to the issue of history-culture relation, as it is in the area of social values takes place interrelation of cultural and historico-social basics. Historical thought now also pays close attention to cultural issues. In historical and philosophico-historical studies steps forward the search not for objective laws of history, but for an idea of historical process and its value context. In this regard, the issues of its alternative and multifactorial nature are raised.

The issue of culture-history interrelation has at least two aspects. The first one is to find out cultural impact on history. The second one is related to revealing historical influence on culture. However, in terms of anthropological path that marked the development of the last-century philosophy, intentions of philosophical thought to determine foundations and areas of human subjectivity, to understand surrounding cultural and historical space based on the very human, steps forward not the issue of culture-history relationship, but the one of culture and historical consciousness. It is historical consciousness that reflects the historical process in a perfect form, i.e. bound-up in the interests and values of human and society. It performs an axiological function that evaluates and interprets the historical process in historically temporal cultural forms. Therefore, the main issue that should be solved by author is to find out the most appropriate foundations of the modern value paradigm to contemporary cultural and historical realities on the analysis of the main patterns of culture and historical consciousness interrelation.

2. Methods and Materials

The research methodology is aimed at revealing basic approaches to culture and historical consciousness interrelation and social value system types, establishing cause and effect relations between them and discovering the best possible axiological matrix to develop the modern value paradigm.

We can achieve a desired goal using a significant range of methodological and theoretical approaches of philosophy, cultural and social studies. Therefore, we employ an integrated interdisciplinary method that includes a number of approaches, namely: cultural, axiological, philosophical, and sociological.

An extensive theoretical and methodological framework of global and national philosophical, cultural, and sociological self-reflection of the culture-history interrelation is of particular importance for this study. In modern philosophy of culture, cultural and social studies a high attention is paid to the analysis of the axiological constituent of modern public being. In modern Russia this issue is of great concern in terms of

² Chavchavadze N.Z. External and internal forces of cultural development // Culture and social development. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1979. P. 23.

ensuring social and national security³. The study of the methodology of this issue is also contributed by the author of this paper⁴.

In terms of the stated topic, this collected theoretical and methodological heritage has an undeniable value, demonstrating attempts to classify culture-history interrelation, as well as the systems of values constituting the axiological matrix of social structure. The author also contributed to the study of this issue⁵.

The study also relies on the fundamental epistemological principle of the historical and the logical unity. In addition, in the study we applied formal-logic methods of abstraction, formalization, system-structural analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, as well as the categories and laws of dialectic logic.

The historical method made it possible to consider the object under study retrospectively to state essential characteristics of culture and historical consciousness interrelation, as well as axiological positions of individuals and social groups.

The principle of specificity is reflected in the line of the study to unite the diverse facts and processes needed to be summarized. Comparative method is necessary to understand the specific features of different interpretations of culture and historical consciousness interrelation, as well as the versatile types of value systems typical for various types of societies.

3. Results

Within the philosophy of culture there had been developed three main views on the place, role of the historical process and the historical consciousness reflecting it in the culture, and culture and historical consciousness interrelation.

The first (it may be notionally referred to as “philosophico-historical”) interprets culture as a gradual human perfection in the course of the historical process. This approach was founded by philosophers-representatives of the Enlightenment. They suggested a philosophico-historical construct and substantiated the historical consciousness, and through them interpreted history as a gradual improvement of culture as the human creative capacity on the basis of mental development. The history was studied by almost all great philosophers of Western Europe thought of the 18th century as a pure space where the cultural process accomplished the so-called progress. The historical consciousness developed by the philosophico-historical proceedings of the enlighteners and their followers comprehends human history as a premise and condition for the establishment and improvement of culture, i.e. an exhibition of the mind, discovery of creativity potentially inherent in the latter. Within this type of historical consciousness, humanity is united by absolute universal values. It aims people and certain communities at necessary acquisition, foremost, of the universal human historico-cultural experience. This paradigm of historical consciousness axiomatically states the universal nature of history and culture.

³ See, for example: Kuznetsov V.N. Sociology of Security. M., 2002; Kuznetsov V. N. Ideology: Sociological Aspect. M., 2005; Kuznetsov V.N. Security through development. M., 2000; Ivanov V.N. Federalism and State Security // SOCIS. 2005. – No. 11; Kortunov S.V. Establishment of security policy. M., 2003; Yanovskii R.G. Social dynamics of humanitarian changes: a sociology of a chance for Russia to have a decent and safe life for population. M., 2001; Serebryannikov V.V., Khlopev A.T. Social Security of Russia. M., 1996; Viktorov A. Sh. Mental security of the Russian civilization. M., 2005; Cheban V.V. Culture of national security of Russia: history and modern times (socio-philosophical analysis). M., 1996; Starostin A.M., Ponedelkov A.V., Denisenko I.F. Culture elites: new positioning in the political process // State and municipal government. Scientific notes of SKAGS (South-Russian Institute of Management of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration). 2000. No. 4.

⁴ Shestakov Yu.A. Methodological foundations of historical consciousness as a factor in the establishment of a culture of national security // Economic and Humanitarian Studies of the Regions. 2016. No. 6. PP. 172-178.

⁵ Shestakov Yu.A. Determinants of the historical consciousness of the individual in terms of the establishment of a culture of national security // Humanitarian and socio-economic sciences. 2017. No. 1 (92). PP.51-56.

Culture here acts as a catalyst of the historical process, accelerating its historical dynamics. A kind of construct of historical consciousness should be also related to the category of progress as a movement from the worst to the best, from less perfect to more perfect, because this category is of attributive and axiological nature and implies “fruitful spiritual shifts”⁶ in the course of the historical process.

The last century has significantly changed and diversified the understanding of the factors that determine the human historical and cultural evolution within this type of historical consciousness. Mind in its subjective and objective interpretation as a force setting the development of history and culture was replaced by the unconscious in terms of psychoanalysis, philosophy of life, and structuralism. However, the main thing in the perception and evaluation of the historical phenomenon established by the philosophico-historical paradigm of the historical consciousness as a cultural phenomenon is an inflexible rule. The historical process is valuable and significant, first of all, as a field and space to implement and improve the culture. However, this space is of passive, neutral-value nature. Modern universal philosophers fully agree with this interpretation of culture-history interrelation and predict a gradual loss of understanding of cultural identity as a kind of absolute value, because it is dissolved in the sea of information of rational and technological sense.

However, the philosophers analyzing modern cultural space have reasonable doubts of the fact that present approach is suitable to modern social and cultural realities. In cultural and philosophical national thought, for example, the idea of universal human values as just too down-to-earth axiological phenomena is prevailing, since they “contribute only to the external unity of people in the struggle for survival”⁷.

In addition, an unconditionally positive interpretation of universal values as an ideal worldview is opposed to the idea of their ambivalent nature. They can’t help but exist as they are, “since the same thing is common to humanity”⁸. Besides, a “cultural relativism” fraught with anomie and threatening the abolition of the enormous potential of the humanistic cultural heritage accumulated by mankind is often hidden under the banner of Eurocentrism claiming to be universal. Finally, it is obvious that the Eurocentric ideal of infinite technical growth threatens the very foundations of material and spiritual existence of mankind.

On the other hand, people don’t comprehend universalism any more as an obstacle to cultural diversity and, moreover, to anthropocentric understanding of culture. “Universalism is a modern worldview-methodological concept of understanding and achieving the united human community to maintain cultural diversity in its humanistic orientation”⁹. Thus, J. Mariten, a preeminent religious philosopher of the 20th century, argued that the Catholic religion as a central phenomenon of cultural and historical progress is “transcendent to any civilization and culture”¹⁰. From his point of view, it is a genuine global culture. In his opinion, Catholicism plays in the history the role of revivifying determinant of local cultures. Its metahistorical objective is an implementation of honest human life resting on the harmony of reason and morals and leading to opportunity to contemplate world-scale “higher truths” of Christianity.

Thus, from the point of view of many modern followers of cultural-philosophical thought, universalism “consists in assignment of panhuman, universal significance to the most important elements of cultural

⁶ Ibid. P.270.

⁷ Vasilev A.M., Vasileva A.N. Anthropological content of constructive-critical study of Western civilization. Science Time. 2014. No.1 (1). P. 22.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Shchekotova R.R. On tradition relevancy in time as a spiritual value in the aspect of the universalism methodology // Studia Culturae. 2013. No. 15. P. 224.

¹⁰ Gurevich P.S. Philosophy of Culture: textbook for higher education institutions – M.: NOTA BENE Publishing House, 2001. P. 115.

experience”¹¹. That is, universalism doesn’t exclude, but, on the contrary, presupposes the maintenance of cultural identity that is the basis of the so-called universal human values.

The second (nominally referred to as “sociological”) concept of the culture and historical consciousness interrelation understands culture as “a factor of establishment and existence of some society”¹². In this situation, the history is valuable bank of “symbolic capital”, values, ideas that the society is ready to advocate and protect, being constituted as a result. And really, universal human values always exist in a definite-cultural form of values of various social groups. Modern cultural-philosophical thought classifies cultures, comparing them to the historical development of mankind. Usually, the fundamental axiological principle that defines them serves as a criterion for classification. According to this criterion, we distinguish cosmocentric, theocentric, anthropocentric, sociocentric and logocentric cultures. However, it is recognized that this fundamental feature can have different exhibitions and consequences for society¹³, and also doesn’t constitute a linear alternative of historical development and cultural progress.

Many modern researchers believe that the human historical development is a process of rising “self-knowledge and self-affirmation” of the “national principles”¹⁴. The idea of cultural equality, where each culture has a kind of “natural right” to sovereignty and dignity, increases the number of followers. In the 20th century this point of view was substantiated by solidly historical and philosophico-historical speculations of the so-called “Annales School”.

Exactly the analysis of the unique in the historical process comes into the foreground in the proceedings of historians and methodologists of historical science who reckon themselves among this school or its various modern modifications. They conclude that macroconcepts, concepts and categories established in terms of the history, as well as philosophy of modern history, are Eurocentric, i.e. they represent the prevalence of modern era over historical process¹⁵; and, as a result, they don’t allow to adopt the wealth experience gathered by mankind. Instead, it is supposed to proceed to the study of microprocesses. An appropriate methodological and categorical unit that would be induced by a definite historical situation, but wouldn’t be purely repressive to the object of scientific analysis is under search. Further, with the help of this analysis it is proposed to select mental structures determined by definite culture that orientate a person in the historical process.

Many modern Russian philosophers of history also follow a similar interpretation of the historical process and historical consciousness. Thus, due to the development of a sociological approach to culture-history interrelation A.S. Panarin, a preeminent Russian philosopher, political scientist and publicist, introduces a concept of “habitus” as a way of coordination of human practices with collective memory testaments¹⁶. This approach means upholding the principle of local culture, prevalence of value group over “universal human values,” which is hardly typical for disciples of the first approach. In these discussions, history seems to be a multiple-path, open to various cultural creativity¹⁷. On the basis of this approach, he unfolds a criticism of the Faustian, Promethean European culture as a creator of the ideal of a free, creative and self-revealing personality, since the latter subordinates the nature that is the highest sacred value of other non-Western types of culture.

¹¹ Ibid. P. 225.

¹² Ibid. P.23.

¹³ Ibid. P.226-227.

¹⁴ Gurevich P.S. The work cited. P.228.

¹⁵ Ibid. P.134.

¹⁶ Philosophy of social and human sciences. Textbook for higher education institutions / Under general editorship of Prof. Lebedev S. A. - 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. M.: Academic Project, 2008. - P. 55.

¹⁷ Gurevich P.S. The work cited. P.274.

This interpretation of the relation of historical consciousness to culture enriches the human development dynamics and allows to implement cultural capacity.

One of the most distinguished modern Russian experts in the field of historic axiology I.V. Frolov agrees with Panarin's point of view. According to his opinion, "an understanding of leading life values of one or another society makes it possible to establish its own motion path in history, to acknowledge its true specific nature¹⁸". In this regard, the academician offers his basic methodological principle of scientific historical research. It consists in analyzing "the specific nature of both society and the individual in their inseparable unity"¹⁹ based on the identification of social values shared by most members of society in particular historical periods.

Within sociological approach there are two types – rejecting the main path of human development (the concept by O. Spengler and, considerably, by A. Toynbee) and approving this path, but insisting on the maintenance of various oases and local culture settlements, where they should be developed authentically. However, any way, this interpretation of the fundamental principles of historical consciousness enriches the human development dynamics and allows to implement the whole cultural capacity. Disciples of this approach focus on the peculiar features of values in one or another society.

Social and human science disciples tilting toward corporatism also admit a similar interpretation of culture and historical consciousness interrelation. As a phenomenon of modern philosophical, cultural and sociological thought, it dates back to A. de Tocqueville's point of view. He saw the guarantee of freedom in terms of growing democratic tendencies in the maintenance of corporatism and stratification. In the 20th century his views were defended by E. Durkheim and W. Ecko, the most established members of structuralism and post-structuralism. They saw the solution of numerous issues of modern society (when the state fails the function of the universal social regulator) in the decentralization of authority and consolidation of corporate institutions on the basis of corporate values. From their point of view, corporations of modern society should be transformed (and gradually transform) into consolidated "collective personalities" who recognize their rights and duties as moral values. This progressive process, in their opinion, didn't mean undermining national unity and, at the same time, allowed to maintain social value capacity, as well as competitive diversity and creativity. They believe that the appearance of corporatism as a cultural unit was an absolutely natural phenomenon related to complex performance of numerous socio-economic systems at the stage of transition from an industrial society to a post-industrial one. Performance of these systems can't be coordinated from a unified center due to an increasing complexity in new conditions.

Within this paradigm, a category of "corporate culture" takes a central stage. It determines the coherent value orientation of one or another social group. Research methodology actually considers corporate culture (in terms of genetic, internalist and symbolic approaches) as either one based on the tradition of the system's capability to prevent its disintegration (the threat arises due to the dynamic and unpredictable nature of the corporate system's existence), or as an obstacle to these changes (within, for example, the conduct approach), or, finally, as a peculiar and, by this, "self-valuable" system (in terms of the comparative approach)²⁰.

Anyway, the corporation is considered as a carrier of peculiar, unique cultural values which accumulation is closely related to its historical development.

Many modern philosophers pay attention to the narcotic and visionary nature of the modern global, universalist culture threatening loss of freedom by an individual. However, cultural analysis shows that the

¹⁸ Ibid. P.138.

¹⁹ Ibid. P.135.

²⁰ Lebedeva N.Yu., Shironina E.M. Methodological issues of studying organizational culture // Fundamental research. 2012. No. 9-3. PP. 729-733.

individual consciousness is scarcely ever flexible to the influence of the main carriers of its values – the mass media. Researchers began to credit this circumstance to the individual's engagement into various groups which he belongs to. This interpretation also reinforces "neo-corporatist" positions.

The third approach (nominally referred to as "philosophico-anthropological") produces culture from the "nature" of a person²¹. Historical consciousness tilting toward this approach interprets history as an arena for the implementation of the creative powers and abilities of particular individuals. P.S. Gurevich sees the cause for the appearance of this approach in that there is a long-established "polemically sharpened intention to free a person from all the chains, to reveal the inexhaustible potential of the personalistic tradition..."²² in philosophico-historical, cultural, political, and other human thought. However, this approach provided by the priority of the personal principle over institutional and organizational one became especially popular exactly in the modern conditions. In the words of A.Ya. Gurevich, the most distinguished expert in the field of methodology of historical science, "quantification aimed at the study of group and mass phenomena, at the present stage has been replaced by an individualization"²³. The followers of this interpretation subjectify the history in their proceedings: from a function of the historical process a person turns himself into a modus (image) of historical being. That's why the methods and forms of the historical study supposed by historians-universalists and the Annales School are unacceptable by many historic philosophers and methodologists of historical science. Because under this approach, a person appears to be a contemplative being, not an active one. The value of history as a space for mental development puts into the foreground exactly the creative, but not the adaptive function of culture.

Within this paradigm the culture is understood primarily as a socially significant creative activity aimed at the human production. The concept's personalism is focused on the understanding of human freedom in the form of historical experience-based possibility and necessity of withstanding the values of both humanity, and any social group. This opposition is explicated as a basic condition for the constitution of a person, who is, foremost, a creative and innovative being. Within this approach the culture loses often the nature of sacred senses set, but history (against logic) get the status of the good in so far as it withstands the culture. Culture becomes a "hostile to the history, acting as its protector"²⁴.

Eurocentrism crisis of the 19th century, in particular, contributed to this understanding. Eurocentrism was based on the point that the East countries are backward societies in the cultural aspect, because they are at the stages of development already passed by Western culture. Eurocentrism opponents (F. Schlegel, A. Schopenhauer, F. Nietzsche) postulated the autonomy of cultural processes in different types of communities, considered the authenticity of Eastern cultures to be valuable.

Western cultural values, such as labor, mind, and intention to differentiate and regulate infinite being has been disputed on the grounds that they don't contribute to "spiritual revival", the development of physical and mental human abilities, harmonization of human-nature relations. The philosophy of life that emerged against this sociocultural background placed a human in a world of chaos. Within it, the culture is conceived as a regulator, even some kind of history dictator imposing certain standards, and the very history is interpreted as an uncontrollable, spontaneous, chaotic process. Positivism representing the opposite trend of the development of modern global philosophy and believing that human belongs to the nature, but not to the spirit, divine, sacralizing beginning, also rejected cultural role and value as a historical process catalyst.

Consequently, historical consciousness established in terms of cultural-philosophical tradition that interpret differently culture-history interrelation regards the historical process as a combination of

²¹ Ibid. P.120.

²² Ibid. P.38.

²³ Ibid. P.428.

²⁴ Ibid. P.269.

unlimited potential opportunities of human “chained” by temporal cultural space. However, it is necessary to note that philosopher tilting toward this path, at the same time, acknowledges that history doesn’t have the opportunity to achieve its potential beyond hostile cultural framework. In other words, continuous search for moving beyond cultural frames is seen as a ground and idea of the historical process. Accordingly, basic value of history reflected in this type of historical consciousness, is appeared in the substantiation of the possibility and necessity of this search.

The prevalence of a similar point of view in the paradigm of post-modernist philosophy of the modern Western world is no coincidence. For onward and upward cultural evolution, the phenomenon of history within it should be of progressive nature as a movement from the worst to the best. However, for culture to be developed in crisis similar to the current global cultural one and to be changed dramatically, the phenomenon of history should be obviously deprived of progressive nature. Thus, the crisis of modern culture provokes a crisis of the progressive paradigm of historical science and the so-called “metanarrative” as a concept justifying universalism and accumulative-progressive nature of the world-wide historical process. The latter within the postmodernist paradigm of the historical consciousness establishment is reckoned beyond the categories of objectivity and coherence. This type of historical consciousness develops the idea of its unpredictable chaotic nature. It appears before us as a series of coincidences.

The metanarrative as the cornerstone of the cultural constitution is viewed as a “self-organizing forecast”, whose victim is the historical process; the course of the latter is determined by the universalist value-bearing idea. In terms of this type of historical consciousness, the chains of historical laws are being broken.

This approach, as well as the previous ones is critically evaluated by many post-classical philosophers. On the one hand, this may sound strange that its danger is discovered in a provocative nature for personal disorganization. It is taken into account that a person becomes a personality through a free orientation in the system of values developed by mankind and various social structures. Therefore, he needs to commensurate his goals with the universal human ones, as well as of a particular social group. Hereupon, we put forward the thesis that personality shouldn’t try to impose his self-serving interests on society.

Thus, N.A. Berdyaev arguing with the disciple of personalism M. Stirner had written that “there is no personality, if no any above it”²⁵, since all the good in a person is voluntary and free submission to the highest principle. Any value that develops a personality is an individual choice of a person, his measure of moral exactingness²⁶.

J. Ellul supposed that in modern times the end of authority sacralization contributes to the displacement of the value gravity center on the person. Hence, the historical consciousness of modern man, in his opinion, should interpret history as a number of alternatives that can be implemented if an individual believes in his self-distinctiveness. Nevertheless, the French philosopher was an opponent of unlimited individualism and egoism. He believed that historico-cultural process consists precisely in enabling the individual to perform alternative cultural activity creating a personal beginning, and the value system existing in society. In his opinion, the technical civilization based on utilitarian egoism has eliminated traditional values and diluted the culture, having created its universal pattern.

The value system had collapsed. Ellul proposed to revive the ideals lost due to the mass culture dominating²⁷. The French philosopher is supported by German researchers of modern culture, arguing that mass culture based on standardization of production and consumption, including cultural one, leads to the

²⁵ Ibid. P.157.

²⁶ Ibid. P.158.

²⁷ Ibid. PP.318-319.

loss of “moral bonds, kinship, traditional institutions, beliefs...to alienation of the individual”²⁸ and, as a result, to the danger of hostile takeover by totalitarian party and regime.

A similar position is common to a number of modern psychologists. Thus, according to an established American psychologist and researcher I. Janice, psychopaths and sociopaths have the strongest anti-conformal position.

The issue of culture and historical consciousness ratio is closely related to the issue of axiological arrangement and structuring of social existence. The most common principle to classify organizational foundations of society envisages its foundation either on the principle of anomie, or tradition, or heteronomy. It can be reasonably assumed that the condition of social anomie is associated with personalism, which values are defended by philosophico-anthropological approach to the elaboration of historical consciousness. Prevailing tradition is recognized as an unbreakable value by corporatism and nationalism supported by a sociological approach that correlates culture and historical consciousness. Heteronomy seems to be more typical for universalism and historical consciousness based on philosophico-historical view of essence of the interrelation of culture and ideal reflection of the historical process.

Cultural objective is to maintain the integrity of the social system, preventing its disintegration through the establishment of balance between the values of personalistic egoism, national and corporate altruism and humanistic universalism.

This balance may be attained by adoption of individual autonomy suggested by some researchers of value issues. The implementation of the highest value of modern being is possible, from their point of view, as an opportunity to choose within alternatives provided by society.

Such a solution allows to find ways out of the antinomy of choice: whether a personality should follow his own self-interested motives, corporate-national, or universal values. Supporters of this point say that “generally, an individual autonomy is a coherent and healthy personality who can choose normal value attitudes of both collectivism and individualism, both altruism and rational egoism”²⁹. Individual autonomy, in their opinion, provides an opportunity of a harmonious attitude of the individual to society, to his cultural medium and to his being, that is, the most suitable co-existence of universalistic, national-corporate and personalistic values. Autonomy is based on the individual’s assimilation of the diversity of social institutions and prevailing social rules. Therefore, the objective of historical science, social and cultural studies, philosophy of culture and history is “to establish the relationship of general sociological, cultural-historical and semiotic (character-symbolic) premises for the relative autonomy of all subsystems of moral life of the society”³⁰, as well as their unity in order to revive the creative abilities in a person, thereby to implement his nature.

On the basis thereof, the historical process reflected in the historical consciousness of an autonomous individual should be interpreted as a combination of direct determination (prevailing dependence over independence), “inverse determination” (vice versa) and self-determination (their dialectical interaction)³¹. Thereby, an objectivist interpretation of the historical path typical for classical science and subjectivist one common to post-modern philosophy of history is dialectically overcome.

Thus, different approaches to culture-history interrelation and produced types of historical consciousness (philosophico-historical, sociological, and philosophico-anthropological) are correlated with three approaches to the development of the modern value paradigm. The first one is a universalist based on the value phenomenon of heteronomy. The second one is a national-corporate, acknowledging traditionalism

²⁸ Ibid. P.315.

²⁹ Vasilev A. M., Vasileva A. N. The work cited. P.19.

³⁰ Ibid. P.20.

³¹ Ibid.

as an axiological determinant. The third type is a personalistic, anomie-grounded. It appears that in modern socio-cultural circumstances the most suitable axiological basis for the establishment of the modern value paradigm is the principle of individual autonomy that will help to strike a balance between the values of personalistic egoism and national-corporate altruism, as well as humanistic universalism, and established historical consciousness within that allow to overcome both an objectivist interpretation of historical path typical for classical science, and a subjectivist one common to the philosophy of the post-modern history.

4. Discussion

The issue of the basic principles that the valuable unity of the society should be built on is of keen interest among modern national and international cultural philosophers, cultural and social studies scholars.

The urgency of the issue is underpinned by the current cultural situation that due to the accelerating rate of socio-cultural dynamics and dilution of value orientations as a result of the approval of multiculturalism principle naturally raises doubts about the individual's ability to adapt to the dramatically changing circumstances of his socio-cultural existence.

A modern man is interested in what position should he take in these conditions. Therefore, he turns his eyes to the future, trying to understand whether is it possible a fundamentally new value paradigm, what cultural ideals it will be based on (if positive answer to the first question) and, finally, what way it will combine local and universal cultural values. It is obvious that the answers to these questions are inconceivable without appeal to the phenomenon of history and perception-based historical consciousness.

Modern researchers understand anomie as a "total change in individual or group values and rules leading to disagreement of behavioral structures and the vacuumization of social space"³². Anomie prevalence is a period of destructive processes in politics, disintegration of social institutions, devaluation of moral rules. The anomie may evidence beginning disintegration of culture as a way to arrange and develop human activity³³. Anomie "represents a condition featured by a lack of purpose, self-identity or ethical values in an individual or in society as a whole"³⁴. Anomie means the loss of social development goals, sense of existence, self-determination and integrity of orientations, predictability of social phenomena, as well as a priority of material values over cultural ones. At the individual level, anomie researchers state an increasing rate of solitude, individual's desolation and social vacuum as a consequence of the loss of the scale of values.

On the other hand, it seems to be sufficiently proved that a new socio-cultural choice is impossible without anomie. Outstanding American social scientist R. Merton considers a social anomie as a real incentive for changes that are scarcely ever negative. The basis of any innovation and creativity is always, to a certain extent, a violation of a social rule. "Any moral of progress and improvement is therefore inseparable from some extent of anomie"³⁵, because progress (especially in the form of developing the personal principle) and blind obedience to the rule are incompatible.

Improvement is associated with continuous dispute accompanied by uncertainty. In accordance with the synergetic approach, uncertainty and unpredictability are stronger as the system is closer to the bifurcation point, where the destruction of the system becomes irreversible. The latter ceases to exist, either collapsing or restructuring dramatically.

³² Pokrovskii N.E., Ivanchenko G.V. *Universum of solitude: sociological and psychological essays*. M.: Logos, 2008. P.92.

³³ Meshcheryakova N.N. Anomie as an exhibition of socio-entropic growth // *Sociology of authority*. 2011. No. 4. P. 85.

³⁴ Pokrovskii N. E., Ivanchenko G. V. *The work cited*. P. 189.

³⁵ Meshcheryakova N. N., *The work cited*. P. 88.

Modern times also evoke the issue of the tradition-time interrelation, in fact, like culture-history one. It is paid attention to the fact that in modern conditions “tradition always acts as something external, past and old, and time is more than ever experienced as my individual, personal time, private property and present value³⁶. In this regard, we propose a dynamic understanding of tradition. The tradition is meant to be a certain temporal continuum that ensures the unity of culture, despite an inevitable devaluation of values. The interpretation of tradition arises not as a “dead form, archaism, or a social institution”, but as a “lively active substance”³⁷.

The world-wide philosophic thought is also ambivalent to heteronomy based on the universalism of culture and history. It is recognized that mass culture is contrary to the fundamental needs of the individual that are replaced by social inactivity or pseudosocial “idols”. However, the conformism of modern human is not rendered as an immanent property of his consciousness. It is stated that a person in the new conditions of a globalizing world is able to continue the search for an appropriate sociality, revising social standards.

The general conclusion of discussed issue on choosing value-grounded social principles consists in the necessity of harmonious synthesis. Therefore, some measures required.

The improvement of this measure involves analysis of the types of culture and historical consciousness interrelation to substantiate accurately the principle of individual autonomy, as well as historical consciousness comprehending the historical process as a combination of direct determination (prevailing dependence over independence), self-determination (their dialectical interaction) and “inverse determination” (prevailing independence over dependence)³⁸.

5. Conclusions

On the basis of three paradigmatic attitudes on the culture and historical consciousness interrelation (philosophico-historical, sociological and philosophico-anthropological) we can conclude that none of them individually doesn't seem a sufficiently relevant basis for the development of an axiological matrix of modern society. This circumstance is proved by the fact that, basically, each of these approaches is unilateral and, at the same time, quite controversial at the present time, including the value maxims typical for other two. Philosophico-historical universalism based on the concept of an integrated, accumulative and progressive advance of culture in terms of the historical process now doesn't except, but, on the contrary, envisages the maintenance of cultural identity (the so-called universal human values are established on the latter).

Sociological nationalism and corporatism, whose disciples pay attention to identity of the values of one or another society, considers this approach as a force of eliminating the negative aspects of universalist culture. At the same time, they don't deny its positive aspects.

Philosophico-anthropological individualism that substantiates release of a person as a historical being from the chains of cultural restrictions, assumes that a person becomes a personality through a free orientation in the system of values that are already established by mankind as a whole and its cultural-civilizational structures. Therefore, a person should correlate personal interests with the axiological parameters of humanity and society. Consequently, the choice of value orientation by a person and society that is the most appropriate to modern cultural realities and their scientific and philosophical reflection is not anomie, tradition or heteronomy, correlated with the above features of the relationship between culture and historical consciousness, but the principle of personal autonomy suggesting a co-existing type of historical consciousness (culture and history have complex relations of mutual determinism). Personal autonomy

³⁶ Shchekotova R. R. P. 225.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

implies a harmonious attitude of the individual to society, to his cultural medium and being, contributing to the implementation of the most suitable combination of universalist, corporate-national and personalist values.

References

Chavchavadze, N. Z. (1979). External and internal forces of cultural development. Culture and social development (pp.5-32). Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Durkheim, E. (1994). Suicide: a sociological etude. Translation from French with abbr.; edited by V.A. Bazarov. Moscow: Thought.

Ellul, J. (1995). The technological bluff. / It's a human. Anthology (pp.265-294). Moscow: High School.

Gurevich, P. S. (2001). Philosophy of Culture: textbook for higher education institutions. Moscow: NOTA BENE Publishing House.

Lebedeva, N. Yu. & Shironina, E. M. (2012). Methodological issues of studying organizational culture. Fundamental research, 9(3), 729-733.

Meshcheryakova, N. N. (2011). Anomie as an exhibition of socio-entropic growth. Sociology of authority, 4, 83-91.

Lebedev, S. A. (eds.) (2008). Philosophy of social and human sciences. Textbook for higher education institutions (2nd ed.). Moscow: Academic Project.

Pokrovskii, N. E. & Ivanchenko, G. V. (2008). Universum of solitude: sociological and psychological essays. Moscow: Logos.

Rudenko, A. M. (2012). Socio-vital concept of the life-purpose intentionality of human existence: thesis ... by Doctor of Philosophy: 09.00.13. Rostov-on-Don.

Shchekotova, R. R. (2013). On tradition relevancy in time as a spiritual value in the aspect of the universalism methodology. Studia Culturae, 15, 224-230.

Shestakov, Yu. A. (2016). History as a force of national security in the context of O. Spengler's history of philosophy. Economic and Humanitarian Studies of the Regions, 2, 150-155.

Vasilev, A. M. & Vasileva, A. N. (2014). Anthropological content of constructive-critical study of Western civilization. Science Time, 1(1), 14-23.