Philosophical and Anthropological Aspects of Globalization

Olga Bondar[(✉)]

Department of Social Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St., Moscow 117198, Russian Federation
bondar_oyu@rudn.university

Abstract. The current stage of globalization development is revealed in the context of its complexity and multidimensionality. The historical prerequisites, which have prepared the world for the global state, are investigated. Socio-cultural transformations initiated by the global processes are discussed, and their contradictions and costs are revealed. By the example of the phenomenon of "structurally superfluous man" the problem of the exclusion of the marginalized from the currents of modern (global) life is considered. The question of alternative models to globalization is raised.

Keywords: Alterglobalism · Antiglobalism · Globalization · Glocalization · Modernization · Fragmegration · Risk society · Axial Age · "Structurally superfluous man" · Transnationalization of place

1 Introduction

In recent decades, the world has been undergoing radical sociocultural changes. Inevitably, the modern person involved in them becomes not only an eyewitness to diverse and large-scale events but a real participant in them. Time has put him before many questions that require immediate answers: what is the society in which he lives? How to comprehend what is happening around him? Where is he heading? Finding answers is not an easy task, because we are talking about a dynamic modernity that eludes all definitions that limit its freedom by the limits of words. In the desire to grasp what is happening in the modern world, a person inescapably faces such a concept as "Globalization" [1][2].

It is difficult to find a more urgent topic. With its emergence in the last quarter of the twentieth century, Globalization has caused heated discussions in various spheres of public life. The subjects of polemics are everything - the very concept of *Globalization*, the time of its emergence, its relation to other processes of social life, its influence on the development of planetary life. A great deal has been said and written about globalization. However, the abundance of opinions, approaches, and assessments does not give us clarity in its understanding because it is impossible to define the complex processes that define it.

2   The Historical Preconditions for the Emergence of Globalization

It is impossible to comprehend the essence of Globalization without referring to its history, to the prerequisites that prepared its emergence. Two approaches can be distinguished in the study of this issue [3]. The adherents of the first approach view Globalization as a continuous process of intercultural interaction which has consistently been changing its historical forms: archaic (covering the pre-industrial era), prototypical (16th-18th centuries), modern (after the 18th century) and post-colonial (mid-20th century). In this context, Globalization is presented not as an essential feature of modern processes, but as a trivial fact of the movement of people and the results of their activities across the planet. The result is the assertion that Globalization is *just* a process of historical integration of various human communities.

In the framework of the second approach, Globalization is primarily understood as a phenomenon inherent in the modern world, qualitatively different in its processes from previous historical eras, namely, the *Axial Age* (from the 8th to the 2nd centuries BC), the first wave of planetary integration, in which the great cultures of antiquity - China, India, Greece, Persia, and Palestine - interact; the Modernization era (the Modern Age), the second wave, when the main dynamic force of world history becomes Western civilization, which readied the world system and the global economy to what is now known as Globalization. The last one was the third wave of planetary unity of humanity, a historically new level of its development.

Proponents of this approach conclude that the correct understanding of the modern era and the definition of its descriptive traits should follow the path of identifying the distinctive features, rather than search for continuity or similarity with the previous stages because every time lives its own life.

Considering the second approach to be more acceptable in solving this problem, we will ask: what distinguishes Globalization from its predecessor epoch, i.e. Modernization?

3   Modernization and Globalization: A Comparative and Referencing Perspective

Modernization (as well as Globalization) is a phenomenon unique to the Western world in the sense that its emergence was prepared by several circumstances associated mainly with the progressive development of Western European civilization. Having opened unique opportunities for Europe's breakthrough, Modernization determined the subsequent scenario of the development of non-European habitat. European civilization, having made a breakthrough into Modernity, thereby establishing a certain distance between itself and the rest of the world, which found its expression in the horizons of their specific existence, reflected in the oppositions of political, economic, and cultural order, respectively, First World–Third World, Developed Countries–Developing Countries, Center–Periphery.

The Modernization project, being an unprecedented phenomenon in the history of the non-European area, for European civilization itself was no more than a form of manifestation of the expansionist nature of its policy. Its historically earliest form was

the project of Colonization, which was stimulated by the Age of Discovery. In reality, Colonization was not only territorial but also spiritual, denying the non-Europeans the right to "be themselves." By classifying peoples into colonizers and colonized, European civilization determined the scenario of the latter's fate: either to capitulate to it, which means to disappear, to be wiped off the face of the earth, or to accept into its civilizational fold its innovative model and values, alien to them by nature. In pursuit of its goal to remake the non-Western part of the world in its *image and likeness*, the West has unified the world, bringing it to uniformity. The notion of *civilized* was identified with the concept of Western and European versus, respectively, barbaric and uncivilized non-European. The barbarian could become human only through exposure to the benefits of European civilization. Thus, the non-Western world had a painful experience with modernization. Most of its experience comprised introducing, implanting, and imposing external, alien to its value and cultural models.

The basis for the Modernization project was the process of homogenization, which took place through the absorption of one cultural-historical world by another. In contrast to Modernization, Globalization is characterized by the opposite process - heterogenization, accompanied by localization and fragmentation. The interdependence and complementarity of these processes are described by the concept of *glocalization* (Roland Robertson) when the local formation becomes an integral and necessary element – a condition for the existence of a global formation. Along, the concept of *fragmentation* (James Rosenau) has entered the academic vocabulary. It records the combination of the chasm, i.e., fragmentation, with integration processes, linking, and connecting the parts into a single whole.

Globalization signals a new way of world order, one that is carried out not by fire and sword, capture or claim, but by the will and desire of the subject to develop. Globalization brings with it not only freedom of choice but also the choice of freedom. If in Modernization a person was pulled, then in Globalization, on the contrary, no one is pulled. Everyone may decide whether to be a participant in Globalization, if to *be himself* becomes a principle of the life of a region, a people, a person.

The modernization for barbarism was historically inevitable. Globalization, on the contrary, allows avoiding it and remaining a barbarian for as long as you like. The Globalization dynamics would bypass it without disturbing its inert state, which would have been impossible in Modernization. Globalization is a unique case of the juxtaposition of worlds and tendencies: the barbarian may simply be of no interest to it, even in terms of its exploitation. The only interest it may have in him is tourism. Everyone asserts himself in the conditions of Globalization, defending his identity and originality. Another thing is *how*: either to unleash all its creative potential, exhaust all its possibilities, or fade in its distinctive features.

The process of emancipation of the parts, intrinsic to Globalization, offers each cultural and historical subject the opportunity to determine the degree of its participation in it - to be open, capable of interaction, or to close itself off and oppose the processes coming from outside. This is how the self-determination dilemmas arise:

- fragmentation/individualization ↔ unification;
- variety of possibilities for self-expression ↔ the necessity of following set models/types;

Table 1. Historical eras end types of interaction

Waves of intercultural interaction	Axial Age	Modernization	Globalization
Historical types of societies	Pre-industrial (Traditional)	Industrial (Modern)	Post-industrial (postmodern)
Historical types of interaction	Man - nature	Man - machine	Man - man
Historical types of labor	Extractive	Manufactoral	Informational
Resource (sector), moving society ahead	Agriculture	Industrial (material) production	Information

- self-determination in the absence of authorities ↔ the presence of stable authorities set by the socio-historical environment;
- standardized, commodity-market-like behavior ↔ relying on the historical experience-the experience of the people/community.

4   Socio-cultural Transformations in the Context of Global Processes

The American sociologist Daniel Bell, analyzing the state of the modern world, notes that each historical era develops a particular way of human life or "type of interaction" [4, P. 55]. In pre-industrial society (Axial Age), life, according to Bell, is an interaction with nature, when a man uses brute physical force. In the industrial age (the Age of Modernization), in a technological and rationalized society dominated by machines, life becomes an interaction with a transformed nature. Comparing to these two eras, life in post-industrial (globalized) society is service-based and is an interaction with people. The main role in the latter is played not by physical force, not by energy, but by information. Historical types of interaction to be considered: *man-nature*, *man-machine*, *man-man*.

Once humans ensured their existence by cultivating the land, they relied only on his physical power. Later, they had to meet the requirements of machine production. With the emergence of post-industrial society (*service society*), information turned into the object of labor for most people. The growth of information directly depends on the growth of employment in the service sector. Information workers, whose professional activity is connected with the use, storage, and processing of information, are becoming the dominant group in the sphere of employment. The most in-demand occupation in the modern world implies not only the possession of the skill and ability to handle technical means but also the constant replenishment of one's baggage of knowledge.

Historical types of interaction correspond to historical types of labor, namely: *extractive*, *manufactural,* and *informational*. Schematically, it looks like this (see "Table 1"):

The essential characteristic of the post-industrial world is the human-centricity of its axiosphere. There is an increasing emphasis on subjective well-being, the quality of life

of the individual. Since service is the basis of man-man interaction, the quality of this interaction is automatically brought to the forefront. A human-oriented society becomes a *caring* society [5].

In the globalizing world, knowledge and information are no longer the object of possession of the chosen ones. The high concentration of symbols around the person - books, pamphlets, radio, television, video, Internet - makes information available. This moment marked a radical transformation of human existence - society has become *networked* [6]. Networks connect people, institutions, and states. They compress time and space, open borders, and allow to establish contacts anywhere in the world. Borders are not an obstacle to digital information flows. Forms of spatial and temporal organization of social connections and relations have gained new contours.

The German sociologist Ulrich Beck, drawing attention to the radical transformations in the arrangement of the space-time continuum that Globalization has brought about and defines the world today as a "globe of compact time." In it, events of varying degrees of importance and significance, occurring at different points on the globe, can be on the same time axis. The modern world is decentralized, it has no fixed zones - the Center and the Periphery - and thus there is no rigidly fixed point - the Center - as the only determinant of historical development. Currently, any point on the Periphery may become the Center of world history, and the Center can be pushed aside to the Periphery. As for time, "the local time of many regions is compressed into a single rationed and proscriptive world time (…) the globe is no longer huge and wide (…), it has no distant countries, it has compacted and become small thanks to the united telecommunications network (…) markets" [7].

The space of private and public life enters a third dimension, changing the usual system of coordinates. From planar, it becomes spherical, enabling new paths to be laid and communications to be rapidly and easily established among different parts of the globe. The dynamism of the contemporary world has decisively affected the character of private life - from a sedentary and tied certain place of residence to a nomadic one [8, 9]. Life today is life on the move, in a car or on an airplane, by the phone, or on the global web. Nowadays, connections among people can go beyond the usual spheres (boundaries) of their localization: neighborhoods, blocks, settlements, cities, and megalopolises. Social networking online spaces can become one of the closest places for people to communicate across time and distance. Living in the same locality does not now mean living together, and living together does not mean living in the same place [10].

We have to talk about the *trans-nationalization of place*. This phenomenon not only asserts itself everywhere in new links among cultures, people, and places but also defines our everyday life, bringing to supermarkets hardly known products, to cities - signs and symbols of cultures other than our own, creating a new type of *cosmopolitan* person. In Globalization, the partitions between various segments of the world are not crumbling but are being transformed. They become permeable membranes with controlled exchange currents.

5   Multidimensionality of Globalization

Initially, the main actors of Globalization were the governments of the leading Western states, as well as international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund

(IMF), the World Bank (WB), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The purpose of their activities was the development of free entrepreneurship. Cross-border mergers and acquisitions have drawn the Transnational Corporations (TNCs) into the global institutions' orbit. The latter, having made the economies of national states dependent on themselves, became global players and figures determining the development of the economic system as a whole, in which the global economy found its institutional form.

Since economic activity surpasses everything, Globalization is often identified with the formation of the world economy. According to many researchers, including U. Beck, it is not right to reduce Globalization to the economic dimension. Such a complex, composite process cannot be monocausal: the economy serves as an engine, giving impetus to development but not exhausting it. The build-up of (social) connections taking place in the modern world indicates that Globalization is taking place in different dimensions, and aspects. It is a multidimensional process, framed by the logic of development. All spheres of human existence, bar none, are globalized. Along with economic, we have to talk about political, cultural, and environmental Globalization. Even private lives - biographies - are being globalized. There is the belief that these spheres are naturally inertial, compared to the economy. However, this is far from being the case. The closest example of this is the ecological cross-section of Globalization - problems related to the environment and health, like global warming and pandemics. They raise the need to be aware of the universal threat that comes from the interconnections that arise in the course of Globalization and that can cause disasters. The latter makes it possible to say that if in the age of Modernization (pre-globalized state) the unifying principle of humanity was the "single logic of development," in the global world it is the "dynamics of risk" (U. Beck), which recognizes neither security zones nor territorial boundaries. "In contrast to material poverty, however, the pauperization of the Third World through hazards is contagious for the wealthy" [11]. The concept of "risk society" [12–14] which reflects the peculiarity of the modern stage of historical development, appears in academic texts. It captures the fundamental instability, the difficult predictability of the development of the global world, and the riskiness of the nature of its existence. In Globalization the complexity of technological and social systems increases immeasurably and, consequently, enters the zone of uncontrollable risks. The last-mentioned are out of control of individuals and social groups alike, including states. In such a situation, the question of human ontological security is acutely raised. "To live in the era of 'late modernity' is to live in a world of chance and risk, constant companions of a system that seeks to establish dominance over nature and the reflexive creation of history" [15].

6   To Overcome the Exclusion of the Marginalized

It would be wrong to assume that the globalization processes going on around the world are devoid of criticism and have no complications. Their origins are found in the temporal multidimensionality of the modern world, which holds in its space the entire history of humankind from the Archaic to the Postmodern. In such a world, astronomical and social times are not synchronous. It turns out that society's modernity does not automatically guarantee the modernity of each person living in it. This situation prompts researchers to speak of a new social and historical stratification brought about by Globalization.

Alvin Toffler describes it as the life of globalizing humanity in different time niches: in the past (in its multivariance), modernity, and the future [9]. Immanuel Wallerstein fixes the division by the conceptual triad *core–semi-periphery–periphery* [16]. It seems possible to complement the description of the situation with Ronald Inglehart's concepts of *non-guaranteed survival*, *physical security*, *and existential security* [17]. The division of humanity into the higher, middle and lower types lays down the prerequisites for the exclusion of marginalized subjects (at macro and micro levels) from the currents of modern life. In its extreme forms, the processes of exclusion result in the phenomenon of a "*structurally superfluous man*" (Zygmunt Bauman), a poor person falling out of all time and is useless from any point of view" [18].

At the present stage of Globalization, the growing interdependence is asymmetrical. Unequal starting opportunities predetermine the distribution of roles and lay the seeds of future conflicts between winners and losers - the favorites of Globalization and its outsiders, the marginalized. The layering of times/"simultaneity of different times" as a specific feature of the modern world allows researchers to define the global society as "diversity without unity". (M. Albrow), "an archipelago of diasporas" (Z. Bauman), "a world horizon that cannot be integrated" (U. Beck). In this context, the concept of *risk* gets a broad interpretation and goes beyond the boundaries of the political, economic, and environmental spheres. Risk as a *stowaway* (U. Beck) enters the sphere of human communication. It generates clashes of values, traditions, misunderstandings between people, cultural animosity, and national intolerance.

Globalization is being mainly criticized because of the severity of the payback for it. The recultivation of peoples unwilling to give up their past (pulling history back into traditionalism), but simultaneously observing the malignancy of lagging behind the first echelon of countries, is extremely painful. The economic, social and many other challenges associated with the pervasive influence of globalism led to the emergence and spread of anti-globalism. The anti-globalization movement includes various currents, e.g., those who challenge Globalization per se, with no constructive alternative, and those who see their goal in the search for an alternative model of Globalization. The Alter-globalists are not against progress and Globalization, but for a *different* Globalization, integrating *from below*, coming from the interest of the outsiders, the marginalized ones. It is about bringing global processes to a symmetrical state in such a way that the participants are equal and equitable, and decision-making is carried out through dialogue, not diktat.

But so far, these are just projects. Time will tell whether this model will be made a reality. As of today, it is safe to assume that there is no alternative to Globalization, but there are alternatives (options) within it. We may not cancel it, yet there's a possibility for that. All in all, it is necessary to choose your way of entering it.

7   Conclusion

We may state that the globalization process was a reaction to the crisis of the existing civilization, but the current stage of globalization is spontaneous, with a tendency to escalate risks. However, this does not exclude the positive aspects of this process, the realization of which requires cooperation and joint action. Globalization contains many

possibilities, and their choice will determine the preservation of the integrity and unity of the world.

Authors' Contributions.   This paper is independently completed by Olga Bondar.

References

1. A. Giddens, Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives, M., Ves Mir Publishing House, 2004, pp. 23-37.
2. U. Beck, What is Globalization? Errors of Globalism – Answers to Globalization. M., 2001.
3. P. Grechko, Phenomenon of Globalization as a Social and Cultural Problem. In: Globalization and Multiculturalism, M., PFUR, 2005.
4. Information Society as Postindustrialism: Daniel Bell. In: F.Webster, Theories of the information society, M., Aspect-Press, 2004, p.55.
5. Information Society as Postindustrialism: Daniel Bell. In: F.Webster, Theories of the information society, M., Aspect-Press, 2004, p. 57.
6. Castells M. Formation of a society of network structures. In: Inozemtsev V.L. (ed.) New post-industrial wave in the West. Anthology. Moscow: Academia, 1999, pp. 492-506.
7. U. Beck, What is Globalization? p. 44.
8. U. Beck, What is Globalization?, p. 133
9. A. Toffler, Future Shock, M., AST, 2002, pp.88-109.
10. U. Beck, What is Globalization? p. 133.
11. U. Beck, Risk Society. On the Way to Another Modern, M., Progress-Tradition, 2000, p. 5.
12. U. Beck, Risk Society. On the Way to Another Modern, M., Progress-Tradition, 2000.
13. N. Luman, The concept of risk, THESIS, 1994, No 5, pp. 135-160.
14. A. Giddens. Fate, Risk and Security, THESIS, 1994, No 5, pp. 107-134.
15. A. Giddens. Fate, Risk and Security, THESIS, 1994, No 5, p. 107.
16. I. Wallerstein Analysis of world systems and the situation in the modern world. St. Pbg: University Book, 2001, p. 11.
17. 18. R. Inglehart, Postmodernity: Changing Values and Changing Societies, Polis, 1997, No. 2. pp. 62-77.
18. U. Beck, What is Globalization? p. 106.