

DOI 10.23947/2414-1143-2017-12-4-1-6

UDC130.2

EXPLICATION OF HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN CONTEXT OF RUSSIAN CULTURE NATIONAL SECURITY FORMATION

Yury A. Shestakov

*Institute of service and entrepreneurship (branch) of Don state technical university.
Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation
shesyur@mail.ru*

The cultural and philosophic explication of the notion “national security culture” is presented. It is argued that the essence of the “national security culture” definition is reflected in the cultural certainty of the goals and methods of national security generated by the influence of both exogenous and endogenous factors. In Russia, such certainty is impossible without the community of axiological unity around its cultural and historic core. It is impossible to achieve this unity without a consensus about the cognition and evaluation of its past, that is, without the formation of a common historical consciousness. Historical consciousness fragmentation under the globalization processes influence in modern Russia leads to the diffusion of cultural certainty and security purposes and means of determinancy. This, in its turn, determines the hazard of safety culture elimination. In consequence of the national security culture temporal certainty, foundation of its unite national historical consciousness is considered to be the main formation factor. Therefore, in order to ensure national security, it is necessary to build the self-awareness of Russian citizens on the basis of not individualistic and pragmatic, but historically formed collectivist and spiritual values. Mainly they define the Russia civilization archetype and appear to be the main determinant of its cultural identity preservation. Since the historical consciousness is a basic factor in ensuring the society axiological consensus, while collectivistic and ideocratic components are the dominant in the Russians’ mentality the following author conclusion appears to be legitimate. The cultural-historical certainty of the goals and methods of national security determines the necessity to provide the historical consciousness with the priority status of a national security object. Citizens associations under the dominant role of the state will act as the subjects of national security ensuring.

Key words: historical consciousness, culture, society, national security culture, Russia.

[Шестаков Ю.А. Экспликация исторического сознания в контексте формирования культуры национальной безопасности России]

Представлена культурфилософская экспликация понятия «культура национальной безопасности». Утверждается, что сущность определения категории «культура национальной безопасности» выражается в культурной определенности целей и методов обеспечения национальной безопасности, порожденной влиянием как экзогенных, так и эндогенных факторов. В России такая определенность невозможна без ценностного единения общности вокруг своего культурно-исторического ядра. Достичь этого единения невозможно без консенсуса по поводу познания и оценки своего прошлого, то есть без формирования единого исторического сознания. Фрагментаризация исторического сознания под влиянием процессов глобализации в условиях современной России ведет к размыванию культурной определенности и детерминированности целей и средств обеспечения безопасности. Это, в свою очередь, обуславливает опасность элиминации культуры безопасности. Вследствие темпоральной определенности культуры национальной безопасности главным фактором ее формирования является фундаментализация единого национального исторического сознания. Поэтому в целях обеспечения национальной безопасности необходимо формирование самосознания граждан России на основе не индивидуалистических и прагматических, а исторически сложившихся коллективистских и духовных ценностей. Именно они определяют цивилизационный архетип России и являются основной детерминантой сохранения ее культурного своеобразия. Поскольку историческое сознание является основным фактором обеспечения аксиологического консенсуса социума, а коллективистская и идеократическая составляющие являются доминирующими в ментальности россиян, представляется правомерным следующий вывод автора. Культурно-историческая определенность целей и методов обеспечения национальной безопасности детерминирует необходимость предоставления историческому сознанию статуса приоритетного объекта обеспечения национальной безо-

пасности. Субъектами обеспечения национальной безопасности выступают объединения граждан при доминирующей роли государства.

Ключевые слова: историческое сознание, культура, социум, культура национальной безопасности, Россия.

Yury A. Shestakov – candidate of history, associate professor. Institute of service and entrepreneurship (branch) of Don state technical university. Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Шестаков Юрий Александрович – кандидат исторических наук, доцент. Институт сферы обслуживания и предпринимательства (филиал) Донского государственного технического университета. г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия.

The modern situation in the world makes the resort of philosophical thought to the national security problem to be topical. Since culture is now understood as a “national security foundation” [1, p. 18], its reflection within the framework of the culture philosophy is extremely important. The cultural and philosophical aspect of this problem solution, in its turn, is inconceivable without a clear definition of the notion of “national security culture” and the definition of the most important factors of its formation, based on it. On the basis of culture versions as: “a factor of organization and education of some society life” [5, p. 14]; “social life genom” of the concrete society [9, p. 35]; “defined kind and method of creativity work” specific for this or that culture system, it can be acknowledged that any culture, including, national security culture, cannot have categorically predetermined, objective study.

Obviously, it is connected with the peculiarities of a specific national-state and (or) civilizational community. This idea is also confirmed by the fact that since “danger contributes to the realization of its specific certainty in relation to other communities” [3, p. 20] the presence of threats determines the understanding of the socio-cultural system of its specific certainty in relation to other communities, including the aspect of their own safety culture forming. In other words, the identity of national security culture permits and makes within the community framework to create special “security threats interpretations” [7, p. 139], contributing to national consciousness growth.

The validity of this provision confirms, in particular, the following circumstance. The main universal security threats, taking place in the modern world due to the growing processes of globalization, are legally fixed at the international level. However, each “cultural organism” within the state or interstate association places the priorities for responding to threats, dangers, challenges, in its own way. This does not mean ignoring the global problems of our time, but it means a diverse hierarchy of their solutions prioritizing relatively with one another and local problems. The circumstance about specific safety threats certainty testifies that the system forming central element of culture, including safety culture, is a culture formed and culture forming specific ideology, a kind of world view, which imposes an imprint on the perception by the society, for example, of interstate relations. Thus, if cultural identity is built on the image of “imperial Russia” for a row of the former Soviet Union states then for Russia, accordingly – mainly on the basis of “hostile West”, for Western and Central Europe – on the concept of the “unite civilizational European space”, informally restricted (interstate conflicts within the European Union are explained mainly by this) by this or that areal, for USA and Canada – on the conception of “Atlanticism” and etc.

Security methods are also culturally deterministic. For instance, American culturologists and politologists back in the 1970s. came to the conclusion that “... historical experience, political culture, geopolitics and other characteristics of the socio-political system will determine the possibility of the use or non-use of nuclear weapons” [3, p. 22]. The

feedback is also important there. The using of these methods is mainly conditioned by cultural society perception by the other cultures, in accordance with their axiological preferences, ideals, norms and "other" estimations resulting from them.

Thus, both the teleological, terminal, and instrumental components of the safety culture have a qualitatively distinctive character of the specific cultural certainty. The dominant, strategic directions for national security ensuring are culturally defined. Moreover, the culturally determined goals and methods of ensuring security, the viability of the national-state community and the civilizational community are endogenous only at first glance. Considering the national-state community as a complex, open, dynamic system, we come to the conclusion that there is a close interaction of endogenous and exogenous threats and their interdependence. This is explained by the fact that mainly the threat of identity loss under the influence of external danger that stimulates the community to search for those cultural bonds, which will provide value consensus and the consolidation of society as a means of preserving its certainty as a history subject in the system of interaction of various actors, having this status.

Mainly for this reason the absence of axiological consensus inside the Russian society, and also axiological matrix diffusions of the Russian civilization are explicated by the Russians mass consciousness and the domestic scientific community, rationalizing its basic determinants. In fact they trace the reasons of these phenomena in the expansion of "western centrist" understanding of the globalization process, as various cultural diversities deletion on the basis of total dominance of world view ideals, specific for the West. This threat is directed against all the most stable value orientations, which have developed in the course of the historical development of Russian civilization and which determine its cultural essence, constitute its axiological core. The collectivism values, embodied in the national ideal of "collegiality", presupposing orientation to opinion agreement, axiological consensus, and also organic opposition to the West in a quality of stable culturally-historical constants, appear to be a sufficient basis for these axiological determinants specification as relevant to vitality preservation of Russian nationally- governmental society and the basic objects of its safety. One can refer community union, separated by the most part of population and scientific society, around the national idea, introduced into the mass consciousness by all basic socialization institutes – family, church, educational institutions, mass media, and social organizations thank to the state coordinating function to the security protection methods, conditioned by the Russian society cultural originality. As ideocratic ideal of political organization was formed in the course of historical development of Russia and, owing to this circumstance, it is considered to be the most important characteristic of a Russian person mentality.

Thus, mainly the cultural certainty of goals and methods of national security protection, generated by the influence as exogenous, so endogenous factors, comprises the essence of category definition of "national safety culture". This definition in general does not contradict the existing definitions. So, under the culture of national security, V.N. Kuznetsov understands "the process of preserving and developing the goals, ideals, values, norms and traditions of man, family and society; social institutions; ensuring sustainable and constructive interaction of people, with their protection from unacceptable risks, threats, hazards and challenges" [4, p.18]. V.V. Cheban expresses the national security culture in a quality of an element of the country's culture, representing "...a complex of material and spiritual values, created by people, characterizing the content and originality of cognition method and reproduction the relations of safety being, functioning and developing of a personality, society and state of the Russian genotype" [10, p.13].

It follows from the above mentioned definitions that national culture safety essence consists in temporally-determined cultural originality, as the security protection object itself, so the methods of its achievement. Since the social consciousness is the spiritual

basis of social life, so mainly “the public conscience forms require the corresponding security supplying” [6, p. 11]. Specifically-social causality of national security culture lets one see that “national security concept is inseparable from national consciousness” [2, p. 20]. In its turn, historical consciousness is the national consciousness defining moment. Since the formulation and overcoming of national security threats is inconceivable without axiological specificity, realized by the society, formation of an adequate to realities culture globalization of national security is inconceivable without community axiological union around its culturally-historical core. In its turn it is impossible to be achieved without consensus concerning cognition and estimation of its past, that is without unite integral historical consciousness.

In modern conditions it is, under the influence of exogenous factors, characterized by pronounced fragmentation, the elimination of a strong connection along the “past-present-future” line, the relation to certain events and processes of the domestic history as erroneous and accidental. This provokes “schizophrenia” of both individual and mass historical consciousness. A person with such a historical consciousness is culturally limited, since he associates himself only with certain fragments of Russian history that coincide with the value orientations of “pseudoglobalism”. It strives to adjust the cultural standards of diverse communities to the patterns of an individualistic, utilitarian, economocentric Western civilization. In addition, this orientation, which contradicts the long-term cultural determinants, the mental characteristics of the Russian population, provokes a sense of artificiality, and, consequently, the fragility of the present, and detracts the hope of the predictable future building. This provokes socially-psychological phenomena of mass apathy and indifference to the motherland destinies. Such “schizophrenia” is dangerous in that it does not create the prerequisites for acquiring a cultural and historical unity, a valuable unity of Russian society, as without an axiological consensus in relation to the past, it is impossible to attain such a consensus in relation to the present. In its turn it contributes to national consciousness level fall that jeopardizes the Russian society existence as an independent cultural, and, consequently, political, and socially-economical qualitatively original organism [11].

It is necessary to remember that absence of efficient objectives axiological reflection, adequate society essence, inevitably leads to stereotyping, narrowing of its members consciousness. Culture appears to be first of all the expression of a person creative nature, his constant aspiration to go beyond the borders. That is why orientation to the abstract valuable orientations, aspiration to identify axiological determinants of the society development with available supplies and present situation leads to the oppositely expected results. Beyond following its civilization determinants, formed in the course of historical development, cultural succession and consolidation, society resources mobilization, correct threats perception are impossible. All these leads to cultural certainty diffusion and determination of goals and means of security supplying, and, consequently, to the culture security elimination. In its turn this cannot help leading to possibility absence of an adequate definition of goals and methods, contributing to preservation and development of our motherland as an independent sociocultural system.

Consequently, in order to consolidate the Russian society in the form of such spiritually-moral unity degree obtaining, which would provide the stable development of nationally-governmental and civilizational society, it is necessary to achieve unification and integrity of historical consciousness. In this aspect the historical consciousness treatment appears to be valuable as “a person’s comprehension of his “I” in the family ancestry and in the history of its people, understanding the collective “We” in national and cultural community of a country, and also within the framework of panhuman civilization, namely as a part of individual consciousness, forming the cultural community consciousness” [8, p. 173]. As “national identity obtaining and various social levels and groups consolidation in

the integral socially-historical community, possessing the similar perception type and estimation of its historical past" [8, p. 173-174] appears to be the dominative function of historical consciousness, in order to provide national security it is necessary to form consciousness of our country citizens on the basis of not individualist and pragmatic, but collective and spiritual values. Mainly they define civilizational archetype of Russia and appear to be the basic preservation determinant of its cultural originality.

Considering: that integral historical consciousness formation is necessary condition of national security providing in the context of intensification of the exogenous threat of national-state and civilizational identity that collectivist and ideocratic constituent appears to be the predominant in the Russian's mentality, and that "systematic approach to the phenomena analysis in nature and society intensively develops in the last decade" [6, p. 7], and that is why the method of position and solving the problems of national security, based on it, is admitted by its methodologers as the most adequate to modern sociocultural realia, the following conclusion occurs to be rightful. As the national security culture is closely connected with protection from unacceptable risks and threats of that historical consciousness type, which can contribute to it, advisably allow historical consciousness the priority object status of national security providing, the citizens' unifications under the government predominant role will act as its supplying subjects.

Consequently, firstly, the explication of the national security culture as a cultural certainty of the goals and methods of ensuring national security seems to be the most adequate to the contemporary sociocultural realities that guide the Russian society, as a result of the critical, crisis moment of the existence of our civilization, to a greater extent, isolation, and not to the national culture openness. Secondly, due to the obvious temporal certainty of the national security culture, the functioning of a single national historical consciousness is the determining factor in its formation. Thirdly, culturally-historical certainty of goals and methods of national security providing determines necessity of national security object status priority, the citizens unities, under the government dominant role, will act as supplying subjects.

Литература

1. *Гуревич П.С.* Философия культуры: учебник для высшей школы М.: Издательский дом NOTABENE, 2001.
2. *Задохин А.Г.* Национальная безопасность: культура и историческое сознание // Геополитический журнал. 2015. № 3(10).
3. *Кошкин Р.П.* Культура и безопасность в современном мире // Стратегические приоритеты. 2012. № 14.
4. *Кузнецов В. В.* Социология безопасности. М.: Книга и бизнес, 2003.
5. *Полищук В.И.* Мировая и отечественная культура: учебное пособие. Екатеринбург, 1993.
6. *Савицкая Е.А.* Методологические подходы к исследованию безопасности как системной парадигмы // Агропродовольственная политика России. 2012. № 12.
7. *Смирнова А.Г.* Культура безопасности как фактор познания угрозы в международных отношениях // Вестник социально-политических наук. 2013. № 12.
8. *Соснин В.А.* Проблемы безопасности и консолидации российского общества // Прикладная юридическая психология. 2015. № 2.
9. *Степин В.С.* Личность в технотронную эпоху // Наука в России. 1993 . №2.
10. *Чебан В.В.* Культура национальной безопасности России (социально-философский анализ). Балашов, 1997.

11. *Nesmeyanov E.E., Rudenko A.M., Kotlyarova V.V.* Sociocultural analysis of cyberterrorism in social nets within the problems of information safety of Russian society // Научный альманах стран Причерноморья. 2015. № 4. URL: <http://science-almanac.ru>

References

1. *Gurevich P.S.* Culture philosophy: textbook for higher school M.: Publishing house NOTABENE, 2001.
2. *Zadokhin A.G.* National security: culture and historical consciousness // Geopolitical journal. 2015. No 3(10).
3. *Koshkin R.P.* Culture and security in the modern world // Strategic Priorities. 2012. No 14.
4. *Kuznetsov V.V.* Sociology security. M.: Book and business, 2003.
5. *Polishchuk V.I.* World and national culture. Ekaterinburg, 1993.
6. *Savitskaya E.A.* Methodological approaches to the safety research as a systemic paradigm // Russia Agrogrocery policy. 2012. No 12.
7. *Smirnova A.G.* The security culture as a factor of threat cognition in international relations // Vestnik of socially-political studies. 2013. No 12.
8. *Sosnin V.A.* Problems of security and consolidation of Russian society // Applied legal psychology. 2015. No 2.
9. *Stepin V.S.* Personality in the technotronic era // Science in Russia. 1993. No 2.
10. *Cheban V.V.* Russia national security (socially-philosophical analysis). Balashov, 1997.
11. *Nesmeyanov E.E., Rudenko A.M., Kotlyarova V.V.* Sociocultural analysis of cyberterrorism in social nets within the problems of information safety of Russian society // Science almanac of Black Sea region countries 2015. N 4. URL: <http://science-almanac.ru>

November 11, 2017