INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF
PHILOSOPHY AND COSMOLOGY

PHILOSOPHY & COSMOLOGY

Volume 30



Kyiv, 2023

Philosophy and Cosmology, Volume 30
Academic Journal
ISSN 2518-1866 (Online), ISSN 2307-3705 (Print)
The State Registration Certificate of the print media KB No. 20780-10580P, June 25, 2014.
http://ispcjournal.org/
E-mail: bazaluk@ispcjournal.org

It was printed in the manner of scientific-theoretical digest "Philosophy & Cosmology" since 2004.
It was printed as the Academic Yearbook of Philosophy and Science "Философия и космология/ Philosophy & Cosmology" since 2011.
It was printed as the Academic Journal "Philosophy & Cosmology" since Volume 12, 2014.

Printed according to the resolution of the Scientific Board of the International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology (Minutes of meeting No 4 from January 25, 2023)

Editor-in-Chief

Oleg Bazaluk, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

Editorial Board

Gennadii Aliaiev, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Deputy Editor-in-Chief, Ukraine)
Anna Brodsky, Ph.D., Professor (USA)
Javier Collado-Ruano, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (Brazil)
Kevin Crotty, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (USA)
Leonid Djakhaia, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Georgia)
Panos Eliopoulos, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor (Greece)
Georgi Gladyshev, Doctor of Chemical Sciences, Professor (USA)
Oleksandr Horban, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Vitalii Nitsenko, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Viktor Okorokov, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Sergii Rudenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Roman Sapeńko, Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor (Poland)
Denys Svyrydenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)

The journal is abstracted and indexed in the following international databases:
Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL); Citefactor; Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ); Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR); Directory of Research Journals Indexing (DRJI); EBSCO; ERIH PLUS; Index Copernicus; Open Academic Journals Index (OAJI); Polish Scholarly Bibliography; Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR); ResearchBib; The Philosopher's Index; Science Index; Web of Science; WorldCat; Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology http://www.bazaluk.com/

© International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology, 2023

Cosmological Methodological Prism of the Conceptual Demarcation of Culture and Civilization

Zoreslav Samchuk

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Research Fellow, Kuras Institute
of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: warrier1@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7247-186X

Lesya Panchenko

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Professor,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: E-mail: rada@npu.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8436-1206

Samchuk, Zoreslav and Lesya Panchenko (2023) Cosmological Methodological Prism of the Conceptual Demarcation of Culture and Civilization. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 53-63. https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/5

One of the most expressive definitions of philosophy equates it with the field of knowledge about meaningful demarcation of the semantic boundaries of objects, phenomena and trends. In this context, the conceptual distinction between culture and civilization is quite logical, natural, and even irreplaceable. Nevertheless, such a research and interpretive approach acquired fundamental features only at the beginning of the 20th century and mainly within the limits of the German worldview, semantic and axiological hierarchy. The remaining socio-cultural forms of worldview stylistics continued to prefer the symbiotic and synonymous interpretation of social reality's cultural and civilizational components. The meaningful distinction between culture and civilization has a characteristic feature – a surge of further efforts in this direction is always a consequence of crisis trends in the global world order. In particular, this was the case at the beginning of the 20th century, when the exhaustion of the previous resources of civilizational development and the deepening of contradictions between the main centers of power caused by this factor led to a resolution in the form of the First World War. The second wave of careful attention to the meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization occurred in the 1930s when the tendency of the inability or unwillingness to resolve existing global contradictions led to the situation slipping into the maelstrom of the Second World War.

© Samchuk, Zoreslav, 2023
© Panchenko, Lesya, 2023

Currently, there is an unequivocal awareness of the inappropriateness of the illusions associated with the global world order formed on the ruins of the Berlin Wall according to the patterns of neoliberalism. The world at the beginning of the third decade of the 21st century feels confused about its inability to respond to the challenges of modernity convincingly and promptly. This state of affairs once again objectively and logically actualizes the interest in a meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization since it is precise with these tools that the answers to the crisis status quo and the prospects for overcoming it are connected. An important task for concretizing this research goal is the cosmological prism of the conceptual demarcation of culture and civilization.

Keywords: cosmological prism, culture and civilization, meaningful separation, criterion features, conceptual approaches, crisis phenomena.

Received: 1 November 2022 / Accepted: 12 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction

The existence at the level of both modern humanitarianism in general and philosophical thought in particular of two paradigmatic approaches – on the one hand, meaningful separation and, on the other hand, homogenization of culture and civilization – requires certain reflections and clarifications. Each paradigmatic approach a priori has the right to exist, and only two types of regulatory norms and restrictions can exist a posteriori in relation to it: firstly, such an approach must be internally consistent; secondly, its conceptual respectability depends on argumentative persuasiveness.

Until quite recently, the paradigmatic approaches to meaningful separation and homogenization of the cultural-civilization array maintained approximate parity according to the sign of internal consistency, and according to the criterion of argumentative persuasiveness, the homogenization tendency had the advantage, which was a consequence of the idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon. In this context, the cultural component performed the function of organic addition or illustrative accompaniment of civilizational hegemony.

The natural consequence of such a trend was the perceptible prevalence of publications in which the concept of "civilization" had an irreplaceable dominant status. The fundamental book of Adam Hart-Davis "History: From the Dawn of Civilization to the Present Day" is indicative, in which the genesis of human history is carefully conceptualized and clearly illustrated as a progressive evolution from barbarism to civilization (Hart-Davis, 2015). For the author of this work, the history of mankind is primarily the history of human achievements in the form of innovative inventions, ideological conceptualism, as well as outstanding figures, and defining historical events.

In the book "Civilization: The West and the Rest", Niel Ferguson tried to find an answer to the question of the reasons thanks to which the civilization of the West managed to overtake its eastern rivals (Ferguson, 2012). The author conceptualized the position according to which, starting from the 15th century, the West made a breakthrough in six crucial areas in which the rest of the world could not compete with it – socio-economic lifting, the rule of law, science, work ethics, consumer culture, and medicine.

Opportunely, we note that both Adam Hart-Davis and Niel Ferguson give the status of civilization to many features that are imperatives of culture, but since there is no mention of culture in these works at all, this feature created the prerequisites for the "appropriation" of possessions and options by civilization cultures.

Another wave of homogenization of the cultural and civilizational array under the auspices of the civilizational factor took place after the end of the Cold War and the significant expansion of the European Union. Such tectonic shifts led to inflated expectations and idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon at the level of mass consciousness and political elites, at whose service was a vast information array about the substantive heterogeneity and internal contradictions of various components of the supposedly unified Europe.

The key problem is that behind the facade of formal unification, there remain significant and even glaring differences on the mental, socio-cultural, socio-economic, and other levels. It turned out that there were fundamental civilizational gaps between individual countries and entire regions of Europe, which led to mistrust, xenophobia, and generally disappointing stagnation of what one and a half to two decades ago was denoted by the pathetic phrase "European project." The idealization of the European civilizational phenomenon is inherent not only in tendentious political memoranda and proclamations but respectable humanitarian conceptualism also did not avoid the temptation to meet the requirements of contemporary trends. In addition, in the presence of a certain level of "social expectations", the need for thorough and convincing argumentation disappears, giving way to postulativeness.

This feature can be traced at the level of the resonant book "Faustian Man in a Multicultural Age" by Ricardo Duchesne, in which the author tried to "discover the origins of the uniqueness of the European civilizational phenomenon" (Duchesne, 2017: 6). Duchesne explored the formation of the European civilizational type through the prism of the vicissitudes of the Faustian spirit, the basis of which is innovation and creativity. The author emphasizes the heroic and individualistic tradition of the West and its Indo-European roots. However, regarding each criterion marker of the European civilizational phenomenon (starting with its "uniqueness" and ending with "Faustian spirit", "innovation and creativity", and "heroic and individualistic tradition"), many questions arise that require argumentatively convincing answers, as well as factual support, which in this case is absent. An attempt to avoid burdensome argumentation by giving hypothetical judgments an axiomatic status has too little in common with science, its theoretical component.

The lack of polemical, reflective, and argumentative components has been forming an interpretative-narrative trend for a long time, which is increasingly taking on the characteristics of having no alternative. For example, the same Ricardo Duchesne five years earlier published the ambitious book "The Uniqueness of Western Civilization", which, according to the author, was supposed to "challenge widespread attempts to provincialize the history of Western civilization" (Duchesne, 2012: 475). Duchesne tried to conceptualize the position according to which "the roots of intellectual and artistic creativity of the West should be sought in the unique aristocratic culture of Indo-European language speakers" (Duchesne, 2012: 477), and "the uniqueness of Western civilization is the embodiment of the desire for high achievements and the desire to leave its mark in of history" (Duchesne, 2012: 478).

The author probably believed that the publication of pleasant and desirable maxims for the mass European consciousness was quite enough for the publication's success. Therefore, he decided not to burden himself with an argumentative clarification of what exactly consists of the "uniqueness" and "aristocracy" of the "culture of speakers of Indo-European languages" and what their undeniable advantages are over the culture of speakers of other languages. Also, how the Europeans' "striving for high achievements and the desire to leave their mark in history" fundamentally differs from the similar aspiration of representatives of other cultural and civilizational formations that remained outside the brackets of the author's attention.

Dissatisfaction with civilization 2.0.

The crisis of the idea of a united Europe first led to conclusions about the essentially illusory nature of the European civilizational phenomenon and later to the conceptual strengthening of the paradigmatic approach, which gives priority attention to the meaningful differentiation of the cultural and civilizational array, to the expression of the meaningful differences of various components of modern civilizational reality. However, such a trend is not something unique or extraordinary: almost a century ago, the resonant book "Civilization and Its Discontents" was published by Sigmund Freud (Freud, 2019).

Freud saw the main problem in the incompatibility of the expectations of the individual and society: the range of material options that the individual expects in one's contact with civilization, in the absolute majority of cases, does not coincide with the list of regulatory norms by which society "civilizes" the life of the individual. Freud's conclusions were disappointing: he did not know effective means for a posteriori overcoming the aforementioned a priori contradictions. Our modernity leaves this gestalt open – at least, it is not yet possible to come across optimistic reports on this matter.

By the way, Sigmund Freud was by no means the first iconic figure to diagnose the genetic dysfunctionality of civilization both in relation to man and society and culture: for example, Immanuel Kant likened civilization to "at best a technical type of culture." According to him, a person of culture is guided not by regulations external to him (such as social norms and prescriptions) but by one's ethical foundation, and conscience. This means that a person of culture not only can, but sometimes must behave contrary to social regulations. On the other hand, for a civilized person, ignoring external regulations is categorically unacceptable, but ignoring one's own conscience is quite acceptable, so such an individual appears as a textbook embodiment of cynicism.

Oswald Spengler's thesis that the transition from culture to civilization always symptoms and signals degeneration, and depletion of vital and creative resources, remains an unbreakable argumentative monolith despite numerous attempts to deny and refute it. In most cases, civilization appears as a triumph of routine, mediocrity, and everyday life. It is an empty shell devoid of soul and content, which, nevertheless, insists on its significance and even its irreplaceability on its status as an imperative element of the social system.

Civilization is the final stage of the existence of culture, a natural stage of internal burnout, exhaustion of the welcome, creative, heuristic, intellectual and spiritual capacity of culture. This is always a certain level of population concentration, complemented by centralized management of most of the life processes of society, which creates a visual effect of orderliness, controllability, and predictability. It is such functional options that civilization considers its key advantages. In fact, in many cases, they are disadvantages because the fact of order in itself is not a panacea. For example, orderliness, which functions on purely formal, dogmatic principles, is a priori doomed to a downward, entropic development trend, to movement in the direction of chaos.

The above-mentioned functional-instrumental specificity of civilization acquired distinct features only in the 19th century, when "the meaningful emphasis of the concept of "civilization" began to shift in the direction of indicating a high level of social development (for obvious reasons, at that time it was primarily about the countries of Western Europe). Such a drift in meaning led to the mention of civilization often accompanied by a series of synonyms primarily and mainly of material culture. In other words, civilization was associated with providing a high standard of living and creating everyday coziness, comfort, and convenience. From this point of view, the attributes of civilization are housing, the

sphere of service, transport and communication, household appliances, etc. (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 38). The only intractable problem is that technological civilization may well be accompanied by worldview, axiological, ethical and other barbarism – that is, a direction of a development opposed to the priorities of culture.

It is significant that in the Western philosophical tradition, there has been a structuring division into rational and reasonable forms of human activity and behavior for about two centuries. This time limit coincides with the meaningful expression of civilization, not by chance. As Erich Fromm wrote, "the power of rationalization as a kind of forgery of the mind is one of the most mysterious phenomena of humanity. If it were not so closely intertwined with our existence, the tendency to rationalize would be likened to paranoia: a paranoid can be an extremely intelligent person and effectively use his mind in all spheres of existence – except for that isolated segment that is included in his paranoid system. A person who uses the mechanism of rationalization acts in the same way" (Fromm, 1998: 51).

In addition, civilization's emphasis on the cultivation of rationalization mechanisms paradoxically paves the way for numerous cognitive distortions and the inability to build a correct hierarchy of semantic priorities. As for irrationality as a worldview tool and means of knowledge, civilization generally imposes a taboo on it, considering it a priori destructive and dangerous. As Dan Ariely points out in the book "The Upside of Irrationality: The Unexpected Benefits of Defying Logic", irrationality exerts a surprising influence on our lives: a collection of small and seemingly insignificant motives of everyday life is often the determining determinant for making fateful decisions as an individual, as well as at the global level (Ariely, 2011).

Don Juan, through whom Carlos Castaneda broadcasted his worldview hierarchy, has wise advice: if you want life not to leave a bitter taste, perceive it as a dream – act decisively, boldly, and do not look for excuses. It is a memorandum of the perniciousness of rationalism – at least in its refined, hypertrophied, and total versions. Rationalism should not be overestimated: even those who equate it with humus should understand that humus is only a thin layer of soil, the practical resources of which are pretty limited. Given the visibility of its existence, it is impossible not to reckon with it, but at the same time, one should not hyperbolize its capabilities.

If the shortcomings of civilization concerned only its functional specificity, then they could be ignored or distanced from them. However, the postulative and absolutely non-reflective presentation of dubious symbols of faith and speculative theses in the format of indisputable truth inherent in civilization is spread in the form of a regulatory norm to almost all spheres of society's life. This has a particularly dramatic effect on those spheres of society that, according to their functional vocation, should generate a critical analysis of reality.

The mission of educational institutions in affirming the ideals of the culture of rationality is interesting: Humboldt believed that the university is a work for the formation of individuality through the unity of science and education, Weblen argued that a university is a place of striving for truth, Ortega-y-Gasset adhered to the need for the existence of a faculty of culture in every university, Jaspers saw the university as a place of spiritual communication, etc. However, in the process of accelerating the pace of scientific, technical, and social progress and increasing the social and professional mobility of the population, the new European ideal of the university as a "temple of liberal sciences" came into conflict with the needs and expectations of the social environment: "At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, under the influence of structural changes in the economy and employment, as well as the trends of massification, professionalization, and "polytechnicization" of education, the classical

model of the university and university education underwent severe changes. This reduced the social functions of universities mainly to the training of specialists of a certain profile for the economic and social spheres to the order and under the control of the state, as a result of which university education was equated with professional education. The concept of "university" was reduced only to the status of a higher educational institution" (Samchuk, 2015: 28-29).

The postulative nature of the essential foundations of civilization leads to the fact that all versions of dystopias are associated with it, with its genetic defects – negative utopias, utopias with a "minus" sign. As Umberto Eco noted, three-quarters of what George Orwell described in the novel "1984" is not even a dystopia but the history and everyday life of our civilization.

The credo of Aldous Huxley's worldwide technocratic state is the triad "Unity – Unanimity – Stability", which is coherent with the stereotypes of every civilization. The same applies to Aldous Huxley's phenomenon of "enforced happiness," which is not just a desirable possibility or possibility, but the sacred duty of every law-abiding member of a dystopian society. And, of course, civilization resonates with dystopia under the regulation, which has the metaphorical name "Big Brother." Undoubtedly, he only formalizes himself as a brother, but in reality, he is an authoritarian-totalitarian tyrant. This is where the legendary phrase "Big Brother is watching you" comes from.

Another characteristic feature of every civilization is excessive attention to its protection from external threats. So, the exquisite irony, curiosity, and at the same time, a paradox is that, in fact, "civilization needs protection not only from external expansionism, threats, dangers, and challenges but also – as paradoxical as it may sound – from itself: in the sense of its shortcomings, chronic problems, trends of degradation and degeneration, which a priori to one degree or another is inherent in every civilizational phenomenon" (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 95).

Solemn aimlessness or technological utilitarianism: the quintessence of essential differentiation of culture and civilization

Suppose utopianism (inherent in every cultural effort, project, and idea) can be considered a shortcoming of culture in one way or another. In that case, functioning on dystopian principles should be recognized as a shortcoming of civilization. However, this feature does not end the significant differential. Still, it only begins: for example, if culture functions, expressing in the style of Blaise Pascal, with that sublime aimlessness with which wildflowers surprise the world with their inexhaustible altruism, then civilization applies a purely utilitarian approach to its life activities. It certainly has a purpose, but this purpose refers to narrowly applied aspects designed to ensure life activity for the near future, for the here and now.

In other words, if culture is not always able to decide on effective tactical means based on distant priorities, then civilization – on the contrary – in its life activities proceeds only from tactical considerations, considering the aspect of strategy either incompatible with life pragmatics or as something that is automatically implemented in case of pedantic observance of a specific set of postulates. This thesis can be presented in a slightly different interpretive format. If organicity is a distinct common feature of creations of nature and culture, then the critical feature of civilization is instrumental efficiency and convenience in a concrete historical applied context.

In essence, culture and civilization are related in the same way as a flower, and the results of flowering relate fruit: a flower is the embodiment of creativity, perspectives, and possibilities, on the other hand, a fruit appears as a concrete embodiment of such perspectives and possibilities and means the triumph of methods, mechanisms, and algorithms instead of creative multifacetedness. It is for this reason that the humanitarian sphere operates with the concepts of culture, not civilization because these historical phenomena were characterized by life-affirming creativity like flowering (that is, culture), which for various reasons did not lead to the appearance of fruits as a result of such flowering in the form of large cities, excellent transportation communications, systems of administration and taxation (that is, civilization).

Finally, the imperatives, essential, and criterion demarcations of culture and civilization are not exhausted by the above aspects: in particular, if culture is creation, then civilization is reproduction, replication based on technical (technological) devices, skills, abilities, stereotypes, and various innovations and production machines. If civilization reflects natural, spontaneous selection, then culture is the embodiment of a higher type of selection – purposeful cultivation according to certain priority features and criteria: "If the criterion reference point of culture is quality, creativity, art, heuristics, and creativity, then civilization is correlatively compatible with quantity, technology, procedure, "scientometrics." Suppose culture reflects the spiritual origins, refined quality, and genealogical rootedness in the social reality of a certain concrete-historical format. In that case, civilization is characterized by diametrically opposite features – material criticality, mostly quantitative signs, and units of measurement, as well as the desire not to burden oneself with close and deep connections with one or another paradigm of social functioning" (Rafalskiy & Samchuk, 2018: 629).

Another differentiating criterion concerns the marker of historical memory: if a long historical memory characterizes a culture, then civilization is characterized by either a short-term memory of the critical stages of social processuality or no memory at all, the displacement of memory as an option, excessive and burdensome to preserve the zone of physical comfort. Therefore, phantom pain (in the conditions of which something hurts that is no longer there) can be an attributive sign of culture but by no means civilization.

As for the fundamental differences between culture and civilization, they are mostly related to the dichotomy of spirit and matter: if the phenomena, phenomena, and trends of spiritual culture reflect the culture in the diversity of its essential features, then artifacts and achievements of material culture testify to the level and instrumental capabilities of civilization. True, at the base of every material culture, there are particular spiritual prerequisites, worldview foundations, and priorities: no matter how unspiritual a civilization may seem on the surface, it is, one way or another, born of specific spiritual intentions. It is the spiritual component that makes any act of creation possible – and the creation of civilization is no exception to the general rule.

The spiritual intention of civilization appears as the main and, in many cases, the only link between culture and civilization. In this case, the term "connection" is not used by chance: if this process were reversed, then the concept of "relationship" should be applied, but since the reverse influence of civilization on culture is mostly either absent or has destructive signs, it is correct to state one-sided influence – the connection of culture with civilization.

However, even this one-way connection with time inexorably fades, and the practice of the functioning of a civilization can acquire essential features that are the actual antipodes of the cultural intentions that led to the birth of the civilization. For this reason, it is sometimes difficult to detect the correlation of civilization with culture in general and a specific culture

in particular, which is not only possible a priori, but also necessary. This phenomenon creates the effect of the cultural decline of civilization, which can be refuted only as a result of a careful study of the logic of cultural and civilizational continuity.

Suppose there are essential differences between cultures and civilizations. In that case, it is quite correct to raise the issue and sharpen the aspect of particular anthropo-social types (categories) of people according to the criterion of cultural or civilizational correspondence – people of culture and people of civilization. On the example of the history of the intellect and worldview and stylistic features of life, Socrates can be considered an expressive representative of the category of people of culture, on the other hand, his student Plato and Plato's student Aristotle are to a more significant extent representative of the category of *people of civilization*.

Cosmological scaling for meaningful demarcation of culture and civilization

The importance of cosmological scaling for a meaningful separation of culture and civilization is because the cosmological factor is recognized as a respectable argument in favor of the advantages of each of the parties in this conceptual confrontation. In particular, civilization's claims to its alleged superiority over culture are linked to the imperative of orderliness, which associatively resonates with an order as the key identity of the Cosmos, and hence of cosmology. However, such kinship is purely formal and superficial. In the substantive sense, cosmology is based on principles and criteria that are identical to the ontology and functionality of culture, not civilization.

The key advantage of culture is its organicity. Organicity clearly and unequivocally likens and identifies culture with cosmology and these two spheres as fundamentally, essentially, and substantially related. On the other hand, civilization is generally unable to identify itself with a certain status quo of organicity since it long ago and unconditionally got rid of the roots that make it kindred to any specific historical or socio-cultural format of organicity. Accordingly, a priori civilization cannot understand the principles and value priorities on which cosmology is based, not to mention that these principles and priorities are the basis of its own functioning.

Another vital research aspect concerns the criterion dichotomy embodied in the conceptual metaphor of letter and spirit: if the level of the spiritual culture is much more related to the very idea of cosmology and its fundamental principles, then at the level of the letter, there are clear associative parallels between civilization and cosmology – in particular, as on civilization, as well as cosmology, the second law of thermodynamics and its statement about entropy as an alternative perspective of every inertial system fully applies.

After all, even in this aspect, culture can challenge civilization because it is possible that it, as a living and, therefore, non-inertial system, has much more content than civilization, the coherent logic of the functioning of the Cosmos. Such fundamental principles of living systems characterize it as unique orderliness, impeccable stereometric balance, and aesthetic perfection of human-sized and culture-creating ideal models. Unfortunately, the level of instrumental support of modern science does not allow us to verify such an assumption at an impeccable level. However, the given statement is based on a much more reliable argumentative foundation, the formal kinship of civilization and cosmology based on orderliness as a regulatory norm.

Let's trace several other factors that throw over the bridge of essential kinship between culture and cosmology. At the same time, they are unattainable for civilization or a priori

ignored by it. For example, if civilization is correctly identified with craft, then culture is, first and foremost, creativity. Suppose civilization is formed by a set of tools thanks to which life cycles are reproduced. In that case, culture is, first of all, a school of thinking – a special kind of thinking: independent, critical, semantically expressive, argumentatively weighted, interpretatively convincing, complex, systemic, comparative, dialogical, etc. Such options of thinking are at the basis of the phenomenon of the evolution of humanity based on the principles of qualitative growth. Christopher Celenza convincingly presents this aspect in the book "The Intellectual World of the Italian Renaissance" (Celenza, 2020).

With the help of critical reflection tools, science outlines the horizon of knowledge. The resonant work of Charles Johnston (Johnston, 2020a) is devoted to the aspects of productive thinking and cognitive improvement. Based on the results of the analysis of the key challenges of our present, the author concludes that the challenges faced by modern society require more balanced and systematic ways of understanding the situation and responding to it. The prologue to such a consensus could be the transparent form of the conceptual foundations of the "new common sense."

In another book, "The Creative Imperative: Human Growth and Planetary Evolution", Charles Johnston tries to answer one of the most critical questions of our time, namely: how we should think to achieve a chosen goal (Johnston, 2020b). The author's answer is related to the theory and practice of creative systems. This conceptual framework combines a reasoned understanding of the goal, the efforts required to achieve it, and interaction at the level of interpersonal relationships.

Stephen Johnson's book "Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation" (Johnson, 2011) made an essential contribution to the innovation theory. The author tried to answer tough questions – such as what factors determine the emergence of innovative bursts in the history of mankind and what is a necessary and sufficient prerequisite for creativity? Perhaps there is no comprehensive answer to such questions at all. Still, Steven Johnson analyzed various innovations by time parameter and in various spheres of life. He convincingly systematized the standard features of innovative bursts of the most diverse profile.

The book "The Systems Thinker – Mental Models: Take Control Over Your Thought Patterns. Learn Advanced Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Skills" by Albert Rutherford pay attention to a typical case in the age of the information society, when an excess of information leads to the fact that we are dealing with too many options and conflicting advice about the appropriateness of a particular choice (Rutherford, 2020). Under such circumstances, as the author argues, it is essential to determine your priorities and find the most relevant information: if mental models serve as a source of transparency, orderliness, deep understanding, and meaningful context, then the use of systems thinking as a cognitive tool provides depth and balance to analytical efforts.

The resonant manifesto of the ethno-futurists connects the prospects of Europe's revival precisely with a return to cosmological principles and priorities of functioning (Kaalep & Meister, 2020). The authors convincingly insist: to achieve success in the future, it is necessary to realize today that we are integral components of the cosmological chain that stretches from our ancestors to our heirs. Only by effectively using the cosmological heritage will Europeans be able to obtain reliable landmarks on the way to the goal.

"Manifesto for a European Renaissance" by Alain de Benoist and Charles Champetier makes a compelling case for the transhistorical significance of differences between cultures and civilizations, as well as the right of peoples to defend themselves against cultural

homogenization. The "Manifesto" conceptualizes the ideal of a reborn Europe that "will find its strength in return to authentic values and traditions, in uncompromising opposition to multicultural imperialism and the global market" (Benoist & Champetier, 2021: 37).

Conclusions

Since there is a close correlation between civilization and world order realities on the associative and stereotypical levels, the crisis state of the current world order objectively and naturally actualizes the aspect of rethinking the meaningful and functional features of the phenomenon of civilization. Such an analysis involves, first of all, the identification of the immanent shortcomings of civilization and the ways of their leveling and compensation.

The fundamental problem of the civilizational format of the existence of man and society lies in the practical inability of self-critical reflection of civilization and hence its unwillingness to work on mistakes and learn the instructive lessons of the historical past. This leads to the fact that each specific historical format of civilization is precisely what it is, and it can be significantly different in principle – neither a priori nor a posteriori.

The cosmological prism is a vital criterion marker for the conceptual separation between culture and civilization. In this context, it should be noted that civilization is characterized by a purely formal affinity with the Cosmos as a universal world order and cosmology as a set of ontological principles and functional algorithms. Instead, cultural kinship is meaningful and principled at the level of essential quintessence and the very logic of being.

The only means of saving the world order in the way of leveling and compensating for the shortcomings of civilization is the cultural factor: only the functioning of the world order and civilization based on ontological principles, values, and priorities of culture and cosmology opens the way for qualitative renewal and vital reboot based on the principles of functional efficiency and perspective.

🕮 References

Ariely, D. (2011) *The Upside of Irrationality: The Unexpected Benefits of Defying Logic*. Harper Perennial.

Benoist, A. de, and Champetier, C. (2021) *Manifesto for a European Renaissance*. Arktos Media Ltd.

Celenza, C. (2020) *The Intellectual World of the Italian Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press.

Duchesne, R. (2017) *Faustian Man in a Multicultural Age*. Arktos Media Ltd.

Duchesne, R. (2012) *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*. Brill Academic Pub.

Ferguson, N. (2012) *Civilization: The West and the Rest*. Penguin Books.

Freud, S. (2019) *Civilization and Its Discontents: Adapted for the Contemporary Reader*. Independently published.

Fromm, E. (1998) *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. Kyiv: Nika-Center.

Hart-Davis, A. (2015) *History: From the Dawn of Civilization to the Present Day*. Dorling Kindersley.

Johnson, S. (2011) *Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation*. Riverhead Books.

Johnston, C. (2020a) *Rethinking How We Think: Integrative Meta-Perspective and the Cognitive "Growing Up" On Which Our Future Depends*. ICD Press.

Johnston, C. (2020b) *The Creative Imperative: Human Growth and Planetary Evolution*. ICD Press.

Kaalep, R., and Meister, A. (2020) *Rebirth of Europe: The Ethnofuturist Manifesto*. Arktos Media Ltd.

Rafalskiy, O., and Samchuk, Z. (2018) *Civilizational crossroads of modern society*. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine.

Rutherford, A. (2020) *The Systems Thinker – Mental Models: Take Control Over Your Thought Patterns. Learn Advanced Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Skills*. Independently published.

Samchuk, Z. (2015) *Cause-and-effect relationships of worldview maturity and quality education*. Available online: https://ihed.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Analiz_dosvidu_gumaniz_VO_ch1_2015_203p_IBO_avtors-kolektiv.pdf