

Communicative resources of socio-economic development and pedagogical activity in the context of globalization challenges

Vasyl Levkulych^{1*}, Lesya Chervona², Mykola Iehupov³, and Oleksandr Mozolev⁴

¹Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine

²Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, 9, Bastionna Street, Kyiv, 01014, Ukraine

³National University of Ukraine on Physical Education and Sport, Fizkultury, Street, 1, Kyiv, 02000, Ukraine

⁴Khmelnyskyi Humanitarian-Pedagogical Academy, 139 Proskurivskoho Pidpillia Street, Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi Oblast, 29013, Ukraine

Abstract. From the point of view of the theory of social systems, culture is rather a wide field of possibilities that are revealed in human communication. This is our main initial methodological position, which in the future we recommend for use in socio-economic and humanitarian studies not so much in the regime of a rigid method that formats research, but as a cross-cutting value and ideological setting. Communication, as a message, can always give a different meaning to a report, but this is immediately apparent in social relationships. What does not work in such cases is the principle of communication, namely the difference between information and a message, which gives the message itself the character of an event that requires a reaction. It is at the level of intimate social relations, where the fundamental dependence of the realization of social freedom in the external social instance is manifested – even if it is a loved person. While multifunctional itself, morality can limit the scope of a functional specification. In this case, social interpenetration cannot be distinguished without taking into account interhuman relations. In addition, morality imposes its own limitations on the sphere of intimate relationships. After all, it is also impossible to deepen between people if it is associated with public morality. The model of a unified and standardized world (single and uniform) is being replaced by new concepts of globalization, containing the idea of preserving cultural diversity in people's lives.

1 Introduction

Based on the synthesis of many special knowledge and disciplines, combining historical, sociological, economic, historical, and philosophical materials, the German philosopher and sociologist Jurgen Habermas attempted a historical reconstruction of the models of social relations during the emergence of the space of open and free public communication. He

* Corresponding author: professor@feo.ua

showed under what conditions, when and how the rational-critical debates of citizens on social problems, as well as the arguments born in these debates, began to form an authoritative basis for making political decisions; how the society (public) and its inherent “public opinion” have become a factor of politics and socio-economic life in European culture [3].

First of all, the communicative prerequisites for human freedom include the following:

- the public as a social customer and a voluntary consumer of open communication products and services represented by civil society;
- autonomous social and communication institutions, free from state interference and ideologizing;
- liberal-democratic state regulation that protects the rights and freedoms of individuals, groups, and the community as a whole;
- business entities that financially support open media.

All these prerequisites are associated with specific social institutions of culture, which are primarily exemplified by the liberal press and democratic governance. First of all, the successful functioning of such institutions should be based on the spread in a society of the type of a liberal-democratic worldview. In turn, the last, together with the former ones, embody that democratic normativity, which was substantiated by I. Kant [4] and the founders of American democracy, as Max Weber wrote [2]. And they are one of the possible organizational and institutional incarnations of democracy as a social system, not just a certain political regime and the corresponding political system.

2 Research results

Let us try to characterize this hierarchy of interdependencies from the point of view of Niklas Luhmann's theory of social systems, which we have chosen as the theoretical and methodological basis of the research. In this case, all these interdependencies should be traced as those that affect the direct relationships between people. «Relationships of interpenetration and connections exist not only between a person and a social system but also between people» [5], Luhmann notes, developing his thesis about the complexity (internal complexity) of building social systems as a result of their interpenetration.

The complexity of one person matters to another, and vice versa. Luhmann speaks of interpenetration between people and this fact must be taken into account before talking about any levels of socialization higher than interpersonal interaction. The meaning of the concept of “interpenetration” in the case of use does not change: “The attitude of man to man is thus given to the same understanding as to the attitude of man to the social order. In this case, it is in the identical concept of different phenomena depending on what types of systems it belongs to” [5].

It goes without saying that the relationship of man to man remains for Luhmann not just an intimate event, but above all a social phenomenon. Only as such it is of interest to sociology, but there is every reason for this in reality. This means not only that the conditions and forms of such interpenetration of people are social and depend on further social conditions. In addition, social conditions and forms are included in the fact that people give each other not only their sociability but thereby also the experience of incommunicability: “the Alter becomes important to the Ego in those relationships that the Ego cannot communicate to the Alter” [5].

It is not a lack of words or a lack of time or other personal resources for communication. Niklas Luhmann's work is not just about ridding another person of unbearable (and also, as a rule, unnecessary) communications. Communication, as a message, can always give information a different meaning, but this is immediately apparent in an intimate relationship. What does not work in such cases is the principle of communication, namely the difference

between information and message, which gives the message itself the character of an event that requires a reaction. In conditions of intimacy, this need for the reaction is further enhanced in this capacity. People sometimes know each other so well that they cannot take a step without eliciting an answer. Thus, in our opinion, already at the level of intimate social relationships, the fundamental dependence of the implementation of our social freedom in the external social instance is manifested – even if it is a loved person.

According to the German philosopher, it was in the age of the Enlightenment, when all the concepts of the social sciences were considered akin to the concept of interaction, that they concentrated on this problem. Never again have they offered such a rich set of "twists" from the deliberately playful use of forms, the creation of paradoxes, irony, and cynicism up to a focus on sexuality. At the same time, it was always said about a failure in communication, and the question was in what forms it can be deliberately allowed and, again, deliberately avoided: "This problem has been known since the discovery of intimate relationships, but it does not seem to lend itself to any effective formulation. Sociology is perhaps the last of those who are called to advise on silent love" [5].

So, in Niklas Luhmann's theory of social systems, the concept of "interpenetration" is important both in the construction of communication system/person, and person/person. At the same time, relations between people remain a social phenomenon and a subject of research not only for sociology, as Luhmann himself believed, but also for social philosophy – at least in the part where it explores the human dimension of culture on a systemic and communicative basis. As far as it can be judged from Luhmann's papers, he himself gives priority to these issues not so much to social theory as to social practice, namely, the practice of education.

Thus, he asks the following key question: "Is there a binary schematization that should simultaneously serve both types of interpenetration and act functionally so diffusely as to reduce complexity for both social and inter-human interpenetration?" [5]. Under the reduction of complexity, Luhmann here means achievements in social practices as the embodiment of the logic of social systems into concrete human behavior of optimal solutions for practical implementation among a significant number of those offered by different social systems.

The answer to this question for Luhmann is to appeal to the authority of morality with its special normative function.

Luhmann believes that before developing the concept of morality, comprehended on a new basis (it, of course, cannot be deduced from a function, but must be correlated with it), it is necessary to briefly record the assumptions arising from this functional constellation for all that is used properties of morality. While multifunctional itself, morality can limit the scope of a functional specification. In this case, social interpenetration cannot be distinguished without taking into account interhuman relations. Where this happens – Luhmann mentions the sphere of formally organized labor, where its own morality arises – there, in our opinion, a person becomes the last instance deciding on the functioning of a particular social system in a particular situation. In addition, morality imposes its own limitations on the sphere of intimate relationships. Indeed, in the same way, it is impossible to deepen intimacy between people if it is associated with public morality: "... if society promotes greater intimacy, then the place of generally binding morality is blocked by peculiar codes of love passion, references to nature, and aesthetic statements. These are the tendencies that have spread widely in Europe since the 18th century, and that undermined the world of former social forms, they leave the impression that morality, which had a socially integrative function, no longer fulfills it in full" [5].

However, this understanding of the moral constraint on interpersonal interaction is overlooked not because it authorizes right or wrong behavior, but because it occurs as a communication. The consequences for the theory of upbringing in this sense can only be

outlined: “Upbringing, and this is its difference from socialization, is an intentional and related to intention activity. It can achieve its goal (distract from the possibility of indirect, imperceptible manipulation) only through communication” [5].

In this case, upbringing as communication is also socialized, but not so unambiguously, because it does not impart any other purposefulness, except for the one that already exists in upbringing itself. The one who needs education, through communication for such purposes, also gains freedom or distance or is generally in search of other opportunities – but no more than in some other activities. Another thing is that in studies this happens deliberately. A person deliberately creates differences, based on the difference from his previous self, from himself with less knowledge [10; 11].

“First of all, any specific pedagogical activity is loaded with differences. For example, it determines the direction of success and thereby justifies the possibility of failure. Learning and the ability to memorize also presuppose forgetting, here the limits of one's capabilities are cognized as the impossible. In addition, along with all the specifics, the likelihood increases that the caregiver and the pet are based on different schemes of differences, different assignments, different advantages within the schemes of differences” [5].

Taking all this into account, it is hardly possible to consider education as just an effective action. It is even better, according to N. Luhmann, to consider that based on pedagogically intentional and reasonable actions, a special multifunctional system is distinguished that produces its effects of socialization. In this case, the pedagogical activity and the corresponding communication must be again introduced into the given system as a contribution to the self-observation of the system and as a constant correction of the reality created by it.

“If necessary differentiations are understood as correlates of socio-structural enhancements of complexity, then penetration with (unintended) socializing effects becomes understandable. Against this background, “moral education” becomes a problem. Against this background – that is, based on experience showing that society cannot be controlled by morality, and socialization cannot be controlled by education” [2]. This also reveals the limits of the influence of culture on society. Culture, like morality, does not have a specific plan for each individual.

From the point of view of the theory of social systems, culture is rather a wide field of possibilities that are revealed in human communication. This is our main initial methodological position, which in the future we recommend for application in social and humanitarian research not so much in the regime of a rigid method that formats the research, but as a cross-cutting value and ideological guide.

Best of all, such an attitude can be represented by the situation of globalism, which for quite a long time has meaningfully determined both social communication and the creation of culture by a person in modern society.

Moreover, if the topic of a person in various theoretical perspectives that specific social or humanitarian sciences provide him with is explicit and substantive in such studies, then the topic of communication can be traced here with a dotted line – namely, as a strategic direction, which in some cases earlier, and some later, but inevitably manifests itself in modern socio-philosophical studies of culture, especially if the dynamics of the development of the sphere of culture as a dominant is properly taken into account, while the consideration of culture as a symbolic system, that is, ahistorical education, will be for such studies not so much secondary as backgrounds.

The most important issue on the agenda for modern humanity is the image of the future (world, economic development, the relationship of different regions of the globe) and, accordingly, the role of different types of cultures and the place of man (personality) there. As a positive point in the discussion of this problem, it is necessary to highlight a very important trend: the model of a unified-standardized world (single and monotonous) is

replaced by concepts that include the idea of preserving cultural diversity in people's lives. What will happen to peoples, cultures, religions in a globalized world, how will the interaction of meta cultures-civilizations develop? What are the features of the development of modern information and industrial culture in interaction with the traditional way of life? According to A. Belik, no matter how they exist for the authors of most studies, on the pages of popular books, one can find only scholastic wordplay [1]. In general sociological works, the most important issue of the regulation of the flows of information, ideas, and people in the world as a whole is poorly expressed, and more attention is paid to the distribution of finances, goods, and geopolitical issues. The problem of “design-production” of the future is connected with the same question. Comprehending the future is certainly not a new topic in philosophy and science, but a real “explosion” of interest in predicting future options for human development occurred after the formation of the Club of Rome.

In the research projects known as “Papers to the Club of Rome” (a non-governmental organization headed by “the best manager in the world” A. Peccei), several ideas were put forward that suggested the transformation of the principles of economic activity in the industrial world. For the first time, the idea of the need for continuous economic growth was questioned. In the first report to the Club of Rome “The Frontiers of Growth” by L. Meadows and his colleagues [8], the concept of zero growth was proposed, which was then corrected in the report of M. Mesarovich and E. Pestel “Humanity at the Crossroads”, where the concept of organic growth is already used [9]. In addition, it was supposed to take into account the peculiarity of the functioning of ten different regions of the world during industrial development and, which is especially important, the quality of life of subsequent generations by preserving the main global environmental parameters.

A. Peccei, just like his colleagues, defended the position that a person can be self-actualized as a person, and individuality only when he, to some extent, has mastered the element of industrialism. The essence of this situation, which was developed in the 80s of the 20th century (it remains so to this day), in the best way is expressed by one of the ideologists of the Club of Rome E. Jantsch: “Currently, we are beginning to understand human society and the environment as a single system, the uncontrolled growth of which is the reason for its instability. The absolute level of this uncontrolled growth achieved today determines the high inertia of the dynamic system, thereby reducing its flexibility and ability to change and adapt. It became obvious that in this system there are no internal cybernetic mechanisms and no “automatic” self-regulation of macro processes is carried out. This cybernetic element of the evolution of our planet is man himself, who is able to actively influence the formation of his future. However, it will be able to actually accomplish this task only if it has control over the entire complex systemic dynamics of human society in the context of its environment, which can signal the entry of mankind into a new phase of psychological evolution” [6].

Instead of subjective cost indicators of industrialism, Peccei suggested using “human qualities” as goals for economic development (which, today, unfortunately, looks like a utopia), among which the preservation of cultural heritage and natural cleanliness of the environment plays the most important role. In general, Peccei believed, “the problem of the boundaries of human growth and human development is, in essence, a mainly cultural problem” [6].

Peccei – one of the happy practitioners of organizing production (the FIAT concern of the era of its heyday) – is very close in understanding the future with the biologist, founder of human ethology K. Lorenz, who believed that changes in the modern world are necessary and possible only based on an “in-depth ethnocultural and sociopsychologist” analysis of both archaic and modern cultures”. Peccei’s views are also consonant with the ideas of the humanistic psychology of Maslow and Fromm, as well as concepts that exist in the cultural anthropology of the United States [1].

What is the future of globalized humanity – monotonous universalism or cultural diversity? An attempt to more adequately reflect the processes existing in the world was the work of S. Huntington “The Clash of Civilizations and the Transformation of the World Order” (1996). The author offered another holistic vision of the “world order” and “image of the world as a whole”. It is especially important for us what role Huntington assigns to the diversity of cultures in global interaction and, accordingly, to diversity in behavior, values, beliefs, that is, the problems studied by cultural anthropology [7].

Huntington's book contains many interesting reflections, facts, and their interpretations, scenarios for future developments. Not all of his views and assessments of specific historical events can be accepted, but his research has a huge advantage over most works on globalization, as it postulates the cultural diversity of the world in the long run and considers it natural to strive for cultural identity and otherness, originality, a difference from others.

Huntington assigns an important role to the preservation and reproduction of a specific way of life, awareness of oneself as a member of a cultural community, and analyzes the attendant differences in ethnopsychology. It is no coincidence that in the final part of his work “Community of Civilization” he pays special attention to the preservation of cultural identity. The main conclusion of S. Huntington's research: in the process of future development, it is necessary to find a certain relationship and forms of interaction between industrialism and traditional society. The main task of Western culture is the ability and ability to understand and integrate the values of non-Western cultures, which is completely impossible with the absolutization of universalism and uniformity of the way of life in the world as a whole.

3 Conclusions

The development of inter-civilizational dialogue is the most important aspect of the modern era. Diverse development, change, any functioning of sufficiently complex sociocultural systems presuppose differentiation and integration. If we take a “completely homogeneous” community of people and isolate different groups in it, then over time each group will have its own differences in behavior, language, etc. In reality, the processes of differentiation and integration are carried out simultaneously at different levels of ethnocultural human communities (professional, economic, social, ethnic). In the process of globalization of integration, integration is possible based on separation, differentiation.

Despite a certain unity and similarity in the manifestations of industrial culture around the world, the culture of the United States is still different from the European one, the Italian from the German, the French from the Spanish. And in the United States, the lifestyle in California is not all similar to the lifestyle of the east coast, and the culture of the midwest of the United States is far from a copy of the culture of the south (for example, Texas). Thus, the industrial form of being is also culturally diverse and contains the potential for the rooting of multiculturalism.

References

1. A. A. Belik, *Cultural (social) anthropology* (Moscow: RGGU, 2009)
2. M. Veber, *Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism* trans Yu N Davydov, 61 (Moscow: Progress, 1990)
3. Y. Gabermas, *Structural transformations in the field of openness*, trans A Onyshko (Lviv: Litopys, 2000)

4. I. Kant, *The answer to the question: what is the Enlightenment?* Works in six volumes ed Asmus vol **6**, 25 (Moscow: Mysl', 1966)
5. H. Luman, *Social systems. General theory outline*, trans N A Golovin, Gaziev (Saint-Petersburgh: Nauka, 2007)
6. A. Peccei, *Human qualities* trans D V Gvishiani, O. V. Zaharov (Moscow: Progress, 1980)
7. S. Huntington, *Clash of civilizations*, trans K Korolyov, T Velimeev, Yu Novikov (Moscow: Izdatelstvo AST, 2003)
8. D. Meadows, et al. *The Limits to Growth* (New-York: Potomac Ass. Books, 1972)
9. M. Mesarovic, E. Pestel, *Mankind at the Turning Point. The Second Report to the Club of Rome* (New-York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc. Reader's Digest Press, 1974)
10. V. V. Zinchenko, *Perspectives of Science and Education* **44(2)**, 10 (2020). DOI: 10.32744/pse.2020.2.1
11. V. V. Zinchenko, *Sustainable development goals as an integrative basis of the global public strategy for the effectiveness of ecology, education and science at all levels*, IOP Science: Earth and Environmental Science **635**, 012012 (2021) DOI:10.1088/1755-1315/635/1/012001