



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VI      Número: Edición Especial      Artículo no.:62      Período: Diciembre 2018.**

**TÍTULO:** Acerca de la lógica de las etapas del desarrollo de la humanidad: de las etapas del "bárbaro" y "civilización" a la etapa de "cultura propia".

**AUTORES:**

1. Gennadii P. Menchikov.
2. Anton S. Krasnov.

**RESUMEN:** El problema del desarrollo gradual de la humanidad: en qué "era" vivimos, a dónde nos movemos y por qué, es situación de atención de la humanidad en el planeta y se vuelve especialmente aguda, ya que ésto no está asociado solo con tácticas pero también con la estrategia de la vida humana, asociada en esencia con la principal motivación existencial de la vida en sociedad y de cada uno de nosotros. Los errores ponen la vida de la humanidad al borde de "ser y / o no ser". La idea de algún tipo de nueva etapa futura del desarrollo de la humanidad está en el aire, y aunque comienza a ser discutida en la academia, aún no hay una comprensión clara, ni siquiera hay algo definido para una siguiente etapa.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** filosofía neoclásica, realismo constructivo, principio antrópico, observador de tipo neoclásico.

**TITLE:** About the logic of the stages of development of humanity: from the stages of "barbarian" and "civilization" to the stage of "own culture".

**AUTHORS:**

1. Gennadii P. Menchikov.
2. Anton S. Krasnov.

**ABSTRACT:** The problem of the gradual development of humanity: in what "era" we live, where we move and why, is a situation of attention of humanity on the planet and becomes especially acute, since this is not associated only with tactics but also with the strategy of human life, associated in essence with the main existential motivation of life in society and of each one of us. Errors put the life of humanity on the verge of "being and / or not being". The idea of some kind of new future stage of the development of humanity is in the air, and although it begins to be discussed in the academy, there is still no clear understanding, not even something defined for a next stage.

**KEY WORDS:** neoclassical philosophy, constructive realism, anthropic principle, neoclassical-type observer.

**INTRODUCTION.**

The study of the problem shows that in the theory of the gradual development of society, repeated attempts were made to answer the above question. There have been accumulated different concepts of stages of development of mankind, with different criteria:

**Freedom-forming.** According to the degree of development of freedom and the need for an absolute spirit in society, Hegel identifies four stages of the ascent of freedom of the spirit of society: the Eastern world, the Greek world, the Roman world, and the German world.

**Intellecto-developing.** According to the development of intelligence in society, A. Komte identifies three stages of the development of the intellect of society: Theological, Metaphysical, and Positive (scientific) stage.

**Cognitive.** According to the development of cognitive culture in society, P. Sorokin sees three types of development of the intellectual culture of society: Sensual culture, Ideal culture, and Idealistic culture.

**Cyclic.** By the type of cyclical existence of a culture of society, they distinguish eight cyclic types of culture: Egyptian, Indian, Babylonian, Chinese, Greco-Roman, Byzantine-Arabic, Mayan, and Russian-Siberian.

**Communication.** According to the nature of people's communication in society, the correlation of collectivism and self-interest in it; F.M. Dostoevsky sees three stages in the development of society: patriarchy, natural collectivity, civilization, painful individualization, Christianity, their synthesis.

**Difficulties of existence.** By the degree of complexity of society's life, K. Leontiev defines three stages of development of simplicity-complexity of a society: initial simplicity, blooming complexity and mixing simplification.

**Economic and developing.** According to the degree of economic growth, U. Rostov and A. Tofler define five stages of the development of society: Traditional society, Transitional society, Society of Shift, Industrial society, and Post-industrial society.

**Comfort-developing.** According to the degree of development of technology, information and comfort, J. Galbraith and R. Aron distinguish such stages of development of society as: Agrarian society, Industrial society, a new industrial society or informatization, a society of convergence, a society of general prosperity.

**Social and economic formations.** By the degree of development of the economy, politics and ideology, primitive communal society is distinguished in society: Slave-owning, Feudal, Capitalistic, The socialist and communist formations themselves.

**Civilization.** By the degree of civilizational development of the society, L.G. Morgan and F. Engels distinguish three stages of human development: Wildness; Barbarism; Civilization, etc.

Thus, each of them has a lot of valuable, but one-sided and often intuitive. They complement each other quite well, if they are not opposed to each other, and can teach something.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

### **Materials and Methods.**

It cannot go unnoticed that their main drawback is the arbitrariness, the ontological unreliability of the criterion and the scientific doubt arising therefrom.

It is no coincidence that there is a direction of views that opposes in general the theory of the gradual development of mankind, which doubts the existence of a single man (the telos) and denies the whole sequence of its development ("the end of meta-narratives") [Rzaeva R.O., 2014]. Of course, man has freedom of choice, the history is open and the laws of history are of probabilistic nature, for doubt, there are some grounds.

We note that the conversation is not about a single line of development, but about the stages of the development of society in the meaning of a single, integrated humanity and any part of it. Such a conversation is legitimate and realistic-vital. It is methodologically important at the same time not to replace "the idea of a single mankind with the program for the formation of a common human mega-crowd, obedient to a power hand" [Samokhvalova V.I., 2016]; it is also important not to identify in its existence a "single" and the "only", but coming first of all ontologically, one cannot ignore that the real bearer of mankind is a living person, and that the basic contradiction in being and its being is still the relation of life and "death" [Menchikov G.P., Krasnov A.S., 2016].

Given the "difference", humanity cannot be called "just a word for the youths, profane, clerical and social scientists" [Sloterdijk P., 2001]. Mankind, as a reality in the universe, as a phenomenon, and not an epiphenomenon of being, as earthmen, has already happened and exists. We will not understand anything in ourselves or around until we finally come to everything from the standpoint of the methodology of universal evolutionism, or Big History [Kniazeva E.N., 2015], to see the

"end-to-end determination of being", where humanity is inscribed as an integral part of the ontologically whole.

A glance from eternity-infinity says that humanity, formed as co-reality, is already "built into eternity" and it is precisely its path with its stages and "represents history". Humanity not only exists, but there is also its gradual development, even the search for and regularities of this global continuous-discontinuous, that is, stage development [Venda V.F., 2017].

We have to state that our Russian society and mankind is also latently guided by the paradigm of well-known socio-economic formations, whose dignity and theoretical insufficiency; unfortunately, is evident after many years and is sufficiently comprehended [Zotova E.S.; Reactualization of K., 2017]. Its main shortcomings, in our opinion, are that this is not the stage of development of society as a whole, but the stage of development of one of its sides (socio-economic, more precisely, economic and political).

The context has involved other important areas for human life, such as spiritual, cultural and personalistic. But the most important flaw is that care for people's living conditions has been superseded, and ate people themselves. People, alas, can turn into "food for conditions". Especially absolute, ideal conditions, without fail to be absolute, instead of real - "good" [Fedotova V.G., 2005]. A kind of substitution of the thesis took place. The concept was without people, impersonal and dehumanized. A man fell in this concept, - a man in his essence, a man as a man [G. Menchikov, 2018]; a man turned to be like a thing. In other words, the formational concept has a rational kernel, but as a holistic, general methodological one, it turned out to be one-sided, actually private-scientific. It is not accidental that it is considered to be reduced, the concept of economic determinism.

Closer to the essence of human life is, apparently, the Morgan-Engels concept with its stages of savagery, barbarism and civilization, which is increasingly used today to understand the stages of

development of society. But it also needs to be substantially refined, since it has fundamental shortcomings. First, it stops at the stage of "civilization", and secondly, there remains the same "inhumanity": we are talking about the stages of development of a society where a man again remains only in the context of history, especially a fatalistic one (separate from a living human, existing as if over, outside a man). But the main thing, thirdly, it does not follow therefrom what will happen next. Today civilization, as a stage of development in relation to a man has especially revealed its cynical and dangerous essence. "Civilization" as a stage of the development of mankind is usually associated primarily with the development of the state of external (and not internal) and material and technical (and not spiritual) living conditions, rational-mechanistic order of life surrounding a man, but not the man himself. Today, the situation with the depopulation of history has become blatant.

### **Results.**

The stage nature of society cannot cover all aspects of its being, but excluding the existence of man himself in human society or seeing him as the epiphenomenon of society, the planet, the universe - seems an incorrect formulation of the question and scholasticism. Therefore, we believe that the development of human society is based on the development of a man himself as a person, and of course, taking into account the development of the conditions of his life, which are referred to above concepts of stage nature.

Neoclassical anthropological expertise clarifies, at the same time, a) what a person is, without confusing the nature and the essence of man; it explicates the substantial essence of man as a human being as a cultural being, although, naturally, in different degrees and forms of manifestation, and also takes into account, b) what culture is, not identifying culture with society, distinguishing the "norm" and "essence" of culture. This means that man as a human being, as an event of the universe, is able to live normally (ontologically realize the meaning of his life as its basic

determinant), not being "nervous" or going "crazy" in various forms of destructiveness, only in culture.

Since any person is initially a substantively cultural being, although in different degrees and form, then we represent the further stage of the development of society on such an essential, cultural basis: these are the stages of "savagery", "barbarity", "civilization", and "proper culture". Terminologically, there is a coincidence with the civilizational concept of the stage of development of society, but in fact, they are different.

Why - to the stage of "proper culture"? First, and most importantly - the stage of "proper culture" does not replace the life of a living person under certain conditions with the conditions of his life. Yes, a man cannot be torn from the conditions of his life, but there is no coincidence: "living conditions" and "life in conditions" are far from the same. We proceed from the essential criterion - from the fact that the real bearer of society is the living person, and the development of humanistic in man is the very essence of human society. Therefore, the generalized criterion of the stages of the development of society is the development of man himself as a species in the universe; of course, together with a change in the necessary and sufficient conditions for culture - material, economic, social, organizational, political, spiritual and cultural.

How strongly man himself has changed? The humanistic in man has changed in the general conditions created by him, and not only his conditions, such are the stages of the development of human society. It is important not to confuse "the nature of man" (its genesis) and "the essence of man" (its essence of man as a person). With such illegibility, the essence of man is involuntarily identified with the essence of the animal with all the impermissible relation to man, and man to himself. Since we do not confuse the nature of man and the essence of man, that man in his essence, by definition, is neither an animal, nor a thing, nor a means, but a supernatural being with a fundamentally different type of determination, aristocratic, spiritual (consciousness + soul +

unconscious sphere of spirit), the cultural, constructing the world and itself in it; or briefly speaking, man is a cultural being - able to live as a person only in culture as the 3rd House of Genesis - that is capable of not being tormented and "nervous" (wars, social revolutions, repressions, terrorism), then this essential fact can be put in the basis of the stage-by-stage development of the human community.

As for the civilizational approach, then, like others, it creates a theoretical insufficiency in the analysis of the stage nature of society. Since "civilization" as a stage of development of society, as a quality and as a term, no longer expresses the essence of human society. The life of mankind has gone further; it is not like "civilization" (in its original sense). On the Earth, a qualitatively new stage of human history begins, which according to A. Schweitzer, is called "proper culture" with all its previous proto-strictly cultural stages of development.

In the stage of "proper culture", despite its painful development, real substantial proper cultural characteristics [Bulavka-Buzgalina L.A., 2017] begin to be viewed, both in the development of man himself and in the conditions of his existence. The stage of "civilization" along with the positive aspects of its development bears within itself a dangerous essence - the formation of an informed and creative, but cynical person. Capitalism is capitalism (a society organized according to the laws of the jungle), with its steady slipping to self-destruction of both itself and humanity) [Deleuze J., 2008].

One of the discoveries of neoclassical philosophy is precisely that it, under the influence of the realism of life and modern discoveries, does not identify such phenomena of being as "society" and "culture" (at least the volumes of these concepts), the "first, second and the third house of human existence". It is difficult for us to agree with the widespread point of view on the essence of culture, that "culture is the second nature"; i.e., everything made by society.

The essence of culture is understood to be not all that and how society does, not all the constructs of the spirit, because they produce everything and in every way, but only those that are associated with the ennobling of being, the more human being. Therefore, the concept of society is broader than culture. Often the essence of culture, especially historically, is reduced either to Production, or to Creativity, or to the Depot of values.

Since culture is associated with the ennobling of being, the culture of any society is legible, involuntarily selective; therefore, it is not identical in society to all of its Production, to all of its Creativity, to the Depot of created "things", etc. Still, the deep essence of a culture of the first order is in the connection of man with the eternity of being; in its own ontological understanding, culture is the biophilic qualitative side of what is done, committed by society. "The culture of war" is, of course, an oxymoron or complete misunderstanding of the essence of neither one nor the other.

## **CONCLUSIONS.**

The mankind rather wants to know who it is, where it is and what will happen to it next. Turning to the theory of stage nature, it turned out that this problem includes many "concepts of social development". The most realistic, in our opinion, is the civilizational concept that distinguishes three stages of human development: Wildness, Barbarism and Civilization, but it needs its refinement, processing, since Civilization as a stage in the development of society is outliving itself, showing its real doomed anti-human essence, dangerous not only for the human species, but for all life on our small planet [Menchikov G.P., Sharifullin B.Z., 2015].

Why is it doomed? Because civilization as a construct, stage of social reality, a) is built according to the law of the jungle, in violation of the law-governed logic of the existence of the universe [M. Schelkunov, 2018] - a complex coevolutionary, fractally deterministic logic of the coevolutionary formation ("genesis") of people, humanity on our planet, its existence and development in space and in the universe; b) is built according to the law of the animal's life, and not of the human world

and on principle inadmissible for the essence of man, if we do not confuse and identify in man its "nature" and "essence", "the conditions of human life" with "the life of man in conditions," and do not reduce "living conditions" to any single, totalitarian "dominant" factor.

Analysis of the criterion of the gradual development of mankind leads us to the fact that the next stage in the development of mankind can be the stage of "proper culture": the stage of a new quality of human interaction, in mankind as a telos, based, finally, on the core of culture - the cultural imperative with its labor morality and moral core. In the neoclassical understanding of the essence of culture, it is incorrect to identify "culture" with "society": with everything that society produces, creates and "messes".

The cultural imperative is neither a factor nor one of them. The classical and non-classical is replaced by neoclassical philosophy, based on the evident synergetic discovery of the determination of the universe, and this means, that humanity will gradually and inevitably change, changing the way it brings its up. Firstly, it means gradually leaving the Absolute(s) - to place hope in well-being only on the grown mankind only in themselves; to part with absolutist and relativistic thinking, representation and behavior (not to perish), to cultivate heterarchy. Then, cultural natural selection, instead of the natural biological, will possibly and necessarily work.

To begin reimpose hope in prosperity only on understanding the essence of man not as an animal, thing, means, tool, cog in the machine of being, thinking reed, etc., but as a cultural being, as a subject-object of culture, as he is ontologically in being.

### **Acknowledgements.**

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Bulavka-Buzgalina L.A. (2017). Counterpoints of Humanism: Renaissance and Soviet Culture // Philosophical Sciences. No.2. p. 19-34.
2. Deleuze J. (2008). Anti-Edipe: Capitalism and Schizophrenia / J.Delez, F.Gwattari. - Yekaterinburg: U-Factoriia, - p. 408.
3. G. Menchikov (2018). The essence of man: classical, non-classical and neoclassical discourse // Bulletin of North (Arctic) Federal University. Ser.: Humanities and social sciences. No.1. p. 62-74.
4. Fedotova V.G. (2005). Good society. M.: Progress-Tradition. p. 544.
5. Kniazeva E.N. (2015). Universal evolutionism: patterns that connect us // Philosophical sciences. No.3. p. 90.
6. Menchikov G.P., Sharifullin B.Z. (2015). Global Evolutionism and Heterarchical Thinking. //The Social Sciences 10, P.1250-1254.
7. M. Schelkunov (2018). The risks of the classical university in modern society? // Philosophical sciences. No.2. p. 85-95.
8. Menchikov G.P., Krasnov A.S. (2016). Anthropic principle and "observer of neoclassical type" in contemporary social theory// Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict Volume 20, Special Issue 3, P.14-19.
9. Rzaeva R.O. (2014). End of metanarratives in the context of the problems of the past and the challenges of the future // Issues of philosophy. No.2. p. 23-29.
10. Samokhvalova V.I. (2016). The reality of the globalized world and the image of man. Part 1. / Philosophical Sciences. No.4. p. 7-17.
11. Sloterdijk P. (2001). Criticism of cynical reason. Yekaterinburg: Ural University., p. 9.

12. Venda V.F. (2017). On the laws of mutual adaptation and transformation of systems // Questions of philosophy. No.2. p. 94-106.
13. Zotova E.S. (2017). Reactualization of K. Marx's Capital: Philosophy, Methodology, Theory (Review of the International Conference) // Questions of Philosophy. No.12. p. 206-212.

**DATA OF THE AUTHORS.**

1. Gennadii P. Menchikov. Kazan Federal University. Email: [menchicovgp@mail.ru](mailto:menchicovgp@mail.ru)
2. Anton S. Krasnov. Kazan Federal University. Email: [anton-krasnov1987@yandex.ru](mailto:anton-krasnov1987@yandex.ru)

**RECIBIDO:** 2 de noviembre del 2018.

**APROBADO:** 11 de noviembre del 2018.