

## PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

### VIRTUAL SPACE AS THE ENVIRONMENT FOR THE FORMATION OF the COSMOPOLITICAL PLANETARY SOCIETY

*Larysa Sarakun<sup>1</sup>, Yevhen Pinchuk<sup>2</sup>, Vasily Drapohuz<sup>3</sup>, Igor Oleksin<sup>4</sup>, Natalia Serediuk<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities, National University of Food Technology (Kiev, Ukraine)

<sup>2</sup>Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, chairman of Social Sciences and Humanities Department, National University of Physical Education and Sports of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

<sup>3</sup>Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities, Scientific Secretary, Center for Humanitarian Education, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

<sup>4</sup>Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities Department, National University of Physical Education and Sports of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

<sup>5</sup>Ph.D., senior staff scientist of the scientific and educational methodologies and practices Department of the Liberal Education Center of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

<sup>1</sup>sarakyn@rambler.ru, <sup>2</sup>pinchuk0711@ukr.net, <sup>3</sup>drapohuz@gmail.com,

<sup>5</sup>Sereduk.n.g@gmail.com

**Klemi Subiyantoro, Ina Primiana Sagir, Aldrin Herwany, Rie Febrian. Competitive Strategy Model And Its Impact On Micro Business Unit Of Local Development Banks In Jawa-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(4), 470-484. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Keywords: cyberspace, net space, cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan planetary community.**

#### **ABSTRACT:**

The paper considers the problem of determining the role of virtual space in the formation of the cosmopolitan society, which in the most evident way manifests itself under the influence of globalization. The essential impact of the information processes on the formation of the organizational unity of the planetary community is being emphasized upon. It is argued that digital technologies of network communications have radically transformed all the spheres of

being a modern person. New opportunities opened up by information and communication technologies, have enabled the actual eradication of any borders between the real world and cyberspace.

The paper highlights the role and place of the cosmopolitan paradigm in transnational space and reveals the ideas of cosmopolitan democracy, essence, content, spatial boundaries and further development of the phenomenon of cosmopolitanism.

## **INTRODUCTION**

At the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> c. there appeared a number of phenomena that have radically changed the social life. One of them is the Internet, which dramatically affects the organization of the social structure, transforming the processes of identification, socialization, enculturation etc. As a kind of network space with its specific laws, it allows any numbers of people to interact regardless of the distances. Contemporary information and communication technologies open up new perspectives for the people, providing them with the access to multi-vector information, with the accumulation of social experience, formulation of their life goals, implementation of their personal potential. That means that society has undergone significant qualitative transformations, which attest the beginning of the network era in the development of human civilization. Complex digital technologies of network communications have radically transformed all the spheres of the contemporary human existence, and the networks have been institutionalized as the main form of the organization of social, political and economical life. The cause of the emergence of the network society has been an avalanche-like “information explosion” that expands the boundaries of the virtual world, which could be called *cyberspace* and which is now becoming an integral part of the network society.

## **CYBERSPACE AS ‘THE TERRITORY’ OF HUMAN EXISTENCE**

The contemporary humanity has entered the process of the formation of the single global civilization. According to the famous German sociologist and philosopher Ulrich Beck, the formation of such an open “planetary society” is undoubtedly a fact that does not require any special proof (Beck, 2002). Another researcher, Scott Lash, while describing the current life as technologically abundant, emphasizes that individuals unnoticeably to themselves start to perceive everything that happens around them through the prism of technological systems. The humans and the machines create a kind of alliance of biological and technological systems, which results in the emergence of a complex organic-technological interface where individuals can no longer live without the help of various technical devices (Lash, 2002). Humans are imposed with another goal: first, to improve not oneself, but the conditions of one’s existence; and second, to pursue the way of satisfying one’s hedonistic desires. At that, hedonism does not call for becoming ‘more moral’, or ‘more humane’, but rather proclaims a person being free of any restrictions. Hence, existential issues are replaced by the ‘quality of life’ concept.

British sociologist John Urry used to notice the transition from community’s existence to ‘imaginary presence’ (Urry, 2012). It is his opinion that humanity

has transgressed the bounds of 'individual communities'. A new matrix of the universe should be combined with different types of *mobility*. John Urry has proposed that term as a replacement to the notion of *society*. And it is global cyberspace that serves as a platform enabling mobility; it is characterized by the following features: first, it is the information space, which is a communicative medium, and second, it is formed by technological systems. In other words, cyberspace is an environment created by an organized set of information processes on the basis of common principles and rules of informational and telecommunication systems and their management (Dubov, 2014: 315).

The concept of *cyberspace* is considered as a Greek-Latin word combination, consisting of two parts: "cyber" and "space". In English, the prefix "cyber-" comes from the Greek word κυβερνήτης, which is literally translated as "steersman" (Oxford dictionary of English, 2010). The ancient Greeks used the word "cybernetics" to designate the notion of "art of the helmsman" (literally), and in a figurative way – as "the art of state administration."

In the contemporary usage, "cybernetics" denotes the science of control processes and that of information transfers in complex dynamic systems (technological, computer, biological, neural, or social). The further evolution of cyber-discourse has contributed to the emergence of a number of new terms that designate the connection with the networks of electronic communications and virtual reality.

Despite the fact that there have been vivid debates around cyberspace for almost 30 years already, there is still no clear interpretation of this concept today, and the term is absent from most reference books on sociology and philosophy.

Some investigators (namely, Marshall McLuhan) have predicted the approach of humanity to the final phase of the extensions of humankind, the stage of technological simulation of consciousness, in which the creative process of knowledge is collectively and corporately extended to the whole human society – in about the same way as earlier our feelings and the nervous system have been extended due to various means of communication (McLuhan, 1964). According to McLuhan, after nearly three thousand years of 'externally explosive' history related to fragmentary and mechanical technologies, the contemporary Western world 'explodes inside' now.

Thanks to the invention of electricity, it was possible to expand the central nervous system to universal scales. The constraints imposed by space and time have been thus overcome. The speed of the development, implementation and widespread dissemination of technological innovations in the modern world often creates obstacles for analyzing and forecasting attempts, even in the short term of one to three years. What has recently been perceived by many academicians as mere fantasies of futurist writers, today has become a part of the everyday life of the majority due to cyberspace, which can be further analyzed in the three aspects: physical, informational, and social.

From the point of view of the physical (material) perception of cyberspace, what important is the presence of certain devices (computers, smartphones etc.) that enables it to be reproduced and to function as a virtual environment. Despite the fact that cyberspace is not a repository of real material objects, those are real material objects that create virtual environments, which do not possess spatial and temporal duration, but serve just as places for interaction; they store a huge amount of data and they set boundaries to protect this data or to restrict access to some of its resources.

The informational aspect of cyberspace means analyzing it as a collection of countless information currents through which the digitally transformed information is transmitted with incredible speeds. According to N. Korytnikova, forms of social are web-sites, web-pages, e-mail, mailing lists, Internet forums, and online communication (Korytnikova, 2008). Let us consider them in more detail.

A web page is a set of pages with URL addresses that contain documents, text, graphical information, colored images, and links to other documents. The hyperlink system creates a hypertext that facilitates the information search. They may belong to both private individuals and organizations. In comparison with traditional media, the specifics of a web page is that much more people could initiate such a way of communication thanks to cheaper replication and distribution of information, and there are possibilities to visualize the text and to supplement it with hyperlinks (Bilan, 2011: 48).

Mailing list is a service of sending informational materials to a massive group of users who have voluntarily subscribed to different topics. This form must satisfy the following criteria: mass mailing via e-mail should be voluntary, and in the case of dissatisfaction and complaints from recipients there must be a way to cancel the subscription; the usage of mailing lists involves a special pre-requisite permission to include recipients into those lists; messages, articles, attachments, and news that are going to be sent have to match the original topic. In case of non-compliance with these criteria, a mailing is to be considered spam. Mailing lists allow you to send information via computer connection to a well-known target group, so that the information is prepared and distributed according to personal interests and requests of subscribers. In difference from conventional forms of communication, the benefits of electronic mailing are the speed, quick feedback, and the ability to add visual applications (files, internet links etc.).

E-mail is the most common form of communication between users in the virtual space. Internet forum (Internet conferences, network discussions, guestbooks etc.) is a multi-dialogue form of Internet communications, aimed at obtaining feedback from visitors of a web-site. Online communication is a real-time communication system where people talk to each other on special channels in groups or privately. First, IM (Instant Messenger) allows one person to conduct several conversations simultaneously with different interlocutors, hidden from each other; and second, Chat (Chat) allows you to conduct at the same time several conversations accessible to other people who have the opportunity to join them. That communication form approximates

such interpersonal communication that would have been mediated without computers. The on-line communication form features creativity, invisibility and security (Korytnikova, 2008).

The social aspect of the analysis of cybernetic space is related to the study of all social interactions that take place in this elusive digital environment, including the functioning of numerous virtual communities, as well as the new opportunities for constituting identities.

Obviously, cyberspace and real space are inextricably interlinked and intersect within the general flow of social interactions. In this connection, it could be argued that the new opportunities for humans provided by informational and communicational technologies allow us to actually erase the boundary between the real world and cyberspace. The latter becomes a new environment for the existence of a contemporary human being.

One single feature of cyberspace is virtuality, which is now being actively used as a notion beyond the scope of informatics and computer technology ('virtual corporation', 'virtual communities', 'virtual friends', 'virtual money', 'virtual democracy', 'virtual learning' etc.) At that, virtual reality becomes objective at most, specific to the limit and tangible (Yemelin, 2016:86). This means that cyberspace is not tied to and does not depend on any particular spatial-temporal location. The locus of interaction in cyberspace does not require the agents of such interaction to stay in one particular place at a certain point of time in order for them to meet in cyberspace. The interaction in cyberspace is undoubtedly related to a physical substrate, but it can be synchronous or asynchronous and accessible to agents in literally any geographic location. Virtuality here is not an alternative to reality, however it could well be something different from what it appears to be.

Another important feature of cyberspace is the network connection. The space in question could not be identified with it or described as a set of data stored in computers and made available through computer networks. However, cyberspace depends on the functioning of informational and communicational networks.

Cyberspace as a space for interaction – that's another important feature of it. Examples of interactions in cyberspace are social media, internet banking, gaming, e-commerce, news, online shopping, search engines, e-government, and crowd-sourcing.

The next feature of cyberspace is its fuzziness, the diffusiveness of its boundaries, their mobility and mutability. They are scattered everywhere, and at the same time they transgress the borders of nation states. And the plurality of network structure links creates an infinite number of individual representation options, as well as territories for interactions among different communities, from small closed ones up to open ones with large numbers of subscribers.

According to L. Zbritskaya, the emergence of the Internet subsystem called World Wide Web enabled the utmost full availability of information for the maximum number of users (Zbritskaya, 2009)]. In this connection, the Internet can be designated as the informational model of globalization, since the geographical distribution of its communication networks reflects the spread of the globalization processes themselves in full measure.

Cyberspace is a social space as it involves numerous social interactions between real people who can represent themselves realistically or create a new (anonymous) image. We mean the constitution of a network identity that features flexibility, non-contiguousness and plurality. Because of social networks, the process of self-identification of individuals has grown up to the transnational world level. All the spheres of the life activity of the contemporary 'virtualized' society function by means of virtual communications, particularly by the transmission of images, symbols and texts. Great opportunities for cultural dialogue, exchange of values and traditions, the formation of a single global society could be identified as the positive sides of the information sphere.

Cyberspace manifests itself as a new environment for the contemporary human existence. Regardless of one's will and consciousness, each individual is a part of it, since most of social interactions in today's world occur by means of informational and communicational technologies. Social communication on the Internet today is a certain way of creating a new living space with specific features of cybercommunication. The Internet provides opportunities for the partial realization of individual's intellectual, emotional and social needs in virtual space. However, such a replacement of real social processes with their formal counterparts can never be full-fledged. Social communication in the Internet media is effective only when combined with actual actions of the subjects of communication. A balanced combination of contemporary Internet technologies with human vigorous social activity could provide extra opportunities for personal realization in various spheres of human life.

There is a steadily increasing demand for social media that embraces more and more people of different ages. Through this kind of communication they obtain the opportunity to use a huge amount of information, to expand their thinking and to improve themselves. But one should also note the fact that communication in social media has both a positive and a negative impact on humans. On the one hand, it quite simplifies the life of a contemporary person, but on the other hand, few people understand the degree of danger that comes with online communication. As a person who communicates that way is virtually hiding oneself behind one's virtual image, losing at least some of the abilities for self-presentation in the real world.

Cyberspace can be studied along with the physical and social space, possessing the features of both the first and second. Manuel Castells in his theory of network society describes a new spatial logic – 'the space of flows' that opposes 'the space of places' (Castells, 2009: 33–36). The Spanish sociologist defines space as 'the image of society'. As contemporary societies

are subject to structural transformations, they produce new spatial forms and processes in the form of infinite numbers of flows of capital, information, and technology. As explained by Castells: “By flows I understand purposeful, repetitive, programmable sequences of exchange and interaction between physically disjointed positions held by social actors in the economic, political, and symbolic structures of society” (Castells, 1996: 412).

The investigator distinguishes between the four material layers of the space of flows. The first one is the chain of electronic impulses – the technological infrastructure of information systems, telecommunication systems and transport lines. The space of flows is constituted by a network of interactions, and goals and objectives of each network form out various spatial flows. The second layer consists of nodes, hubs (places of communication) and communication centers. The operation of hubs is based on the electronic network, but that network connects specific places with clearly defined social, cultural, physical and functional features. Therefore, the major processes in the contemporary world, according to Castells, are clearly recorded in networks that have the ability to bind different localities endowed with a certain role and exercises of power. The third layer of the space of flows is a spatial organization of ruling managerial elites. The contemporary elite is noted by its cosmopolitan nature. The spaces of power and wealth penetrate the whole world, while life and experience of the people are rooted in specific locations, in their culture, history, and life styles. The larger the social organization’s dependence on non-historical flows that displace the logic of any particular location is, the more the logic of global power eludes from the control of local and national communities.

The fourth layer is the electronic spaces, such as web sites and messengers (those could be both one-way and interactive flows). This last layer undergoes the most dynamic development today, and it has a decisive impact on the decision-making processes, the production of information and communication (Castells, 2009). To this effect, cyberspace can be considered as an alternative space for the realization of the existence of contemporary human. After all, the single network of electronic communication extends to all the spheres of human experience in real time and regardless of the location of an individual. You don’t need to know the IP-address or the geographical location of a server as in the universal information environment a site, developed by the specialists who are located, say, in the USA, it exists in the long run within the same field of communication as the Internet page created in England. Thus, the universal communication space produces a sense of conciseness and simultaneousness of all the events.

All the stated above enables the transition from locally closed information exchanges to the becoming of the informational unity of the planetary community due to the information exchange of senses, which involves both humans and society. It is network communications that form the attractor for the formation of the said trend. They provide social interaction between people. The language of the Internet is now the most powerful means for organizational thinking and organizational behavior.

## **COSMOPOLITAN SOCIETY: ITS ESSENCE AND SPATIAL BOUNDARIES**

The current trends in world economic and political integration, the development of supranational structures, the steady growth of the scales of external and internal migration, the formation of the information society and the new means of communication, the emergence of the worldwide information network, the Internet and cyberspace, the dissemination of unified cultural standards – all those trends serve as the ground for actualization of the issues of cosmopolitanism. It became apparent today that the existing life style requires significant transformations at all levels of the social system self-realization. Many contemporary researchers argue that the world in general and nation states in particular are in the state of deep and irreversible crisis that manifests itself in a significant limitation of the sovereignty and legitimacy of the state power. According to Zygmunt Bauman, the states, in order to preserve their ability to maintain legitimacy and order, are forced to enter unions and voluntarily renounce part of their sovereignty (Bauman, 1998: 55–57). There is a paradox of newly formed states that seek to “dissolve” their gained sovereignty in supra-state structures. As stated by historian and sociologist Eric Hobsbawm: “As the transnational economy established its grip on the world, it undermined a major and, since 1945, virtually universal, institution: the territorial nation-state, since such a state could no longer control more than a diminishing part of its affairs” (Hobsbawm, 1994: 424). The loss of national identity is correlated to the abolition of states.

Various aspects of cosmopolitanism are reflected in the writings of many contemporary scholars (Daniele Archibugi, Kwame Appiah, Zygmunt Bauman, Ulrich Beck, Homi Bhabha, Immanuel Wallerstein, Anthony Giddens, David Held). In particular, Daniele Archibugi introduces the concept of “cosmopolitan democracy”, and Immanuel Wallerstein reduces the contradictions between cosmopolitanism and patriotism to the problem of social inequality. Kwame Appiah, currently professor of philosophy at New York University, studies the transformation of ethical values under cosmopolitanism. It is particularly important to mention his idea that cosmopolitanism does not abolish homogeneity, but, on the contrary establish it in the spirit of liberalism (Appiah, 2007). John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene, while considering the problem of the global lifestyle and cultural nationalism that is opposed to it, argue that the world is becoming increasingly cosmopolitan, and we all influence each other (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990). Julia Kristeva’s words sound rather concordant within this context of senses: “As a supporter of cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment, I sincerely believe that if Europe has a future – it is unthinkable without the spirit of universalism. We have to overcome national boundaries as archaisms, while respecting national peculiarities” (Kristeva, 2002).

Mechanisms of cultural universalization under globalization lead to *the unity in plurality*. Initially, the concept of ‘cosmopolitan’ was defined through the lack of the ideas of patriotism, nationality, a sense of fatherland, etc. We can agree with the opinion of V. Dianova, who in her report at the international conference “Art and Civilizational Identity (the experience of functional

analysis of crisis situations in art and society)” has emphasized that the concept of ‘cosmopolitan’ is to be determined basing on the availability and completeness of uniting values of different cultures, national traditions, and various regional spaces (Dianova, 2007: 11). Thus, a cosmopolitan manifests oneself as the subject that combines in one’s Weltanschauung a multitude of human dimensions and thus is able to understand the individual peculiarity of those who preferred to preserve their national or ethnic identity.

Cosmopolitanism, being a complex, multilevel and multi-layered phenomenon, manifests itself in a wide range of social spheres, including moral, political, social and cultural aspects. The moral aspect of cosmopolitanism is directed to shaping out global or cosmopolitan ethics able to govern the world community. Its political perspective is based on a set of universal political principles and institutions that can become the ground for collective actions in a globalized world. For the political point of view it is fundamental to recognize that due to the growing connection between different localities we live in a ‘community of communities’ that call for collective solutions at local, regional, and global levels. Thus, cosmopolitanism as a political project is focused on four interrelated areas: universal political principles, cosmopolitan democracy, global civil society, and cosmopolitan citizenship. All that is aimed at promoting cosmopolitan world order and global justice.

During the recent years the leading investigators (namely, Ulrich Beck, Gerard Delanti and David Held) have tried to prove the thesis that cosmopolitanism is becoming an ideological and Weltanschauung platform for social development, and the principal trend is the emergence of the ontological unity of the planetary community, which quantitatively changes the morphology of the planetary world towards consolidation of organizational structures (Union of South American Nations, Eurasian Economic Union, European Union etc.), and qualitatively – it changes the properties of a structure that goes from “center status” (created by a set of national states) up to the level of the global information society. Parameters for managing the ontological development of such a structure of society are the social media of the Internet: Facebook, YouTube, LinkedIn, Instagram, Qzone, Twitter, Google search engine, new forms of radio communication – voice messages and texting on mobile phones, WiFi and WiMax, etc. It is obvious that all of them have become widespread and influential in the contemporary world. In particular, Google search engine (owned by Google corporation) is the world’s most popular site. Six out of ten web users access this system to meet their information needs. Since 2004, Google owns a charitable foundation and allocates a certain amount of money to solve problems that affect all the inhabitants of the Earth. By accumulating intentions for the improvement of civilization, it contributes to the development of the idea of the good on the planet. The corporation in question has created favorable conditions for the development of the intellectual potential of civilization, since the ability to ‘sell’ ideas motivates people to generate them and to share them.

There are cardinal changes that have taken place in information technologies (IT) as well. First of all, it’s a new generation of mobile devices, tablet PCs,

cloud programming and cloud databases. Innovations in contemporary information technologies have even more profound consequences, including changes in life style, localization or global integration of economic activity. Innovative dynamics in IT generates qualitative changes in education and medicine, it also has severe social, political, international and military-strategic effects, including the emergence of new ways of conducting combat intelligence and military operations. There is also a high probability of the transformation of the spheres of professional activity, the disappearance of many mass professions, the emergence of high and stable structural unemployment, the growth of massive international and internal migration, the dissolution of the middle class and, consequently, the further polarization of income (Global Perestroika: 209, 227-229, 277).

It follows therefrom that the informational picture of the world in the 21<sup>st</sup> c. is based on the realization of the new life style for the planetary community – a planetary social organism. The European community, as a constituent of it, gradually but surely turns into a cosmopolitan society with a common European citizenship. At that we have to agree with Joseph Nye, the author of the ‘soft power’ concept, that the information space and cyberspace can’t replace the geographical space and do not foreshadow the abolition of state sovereignty (Nye, 2011). Rather, it is all about new instruments of strengthening / weakening of state power and state sovereignty, about the significant impact of information and communication technologies (ICTs) on politics and geopolitics, the derivatives of which are spheres of technopolitics and technogeopolitics (Yannakogeorgos, 2009). While stressing the essential ‘geographical’ understanding of states, German geographer Friedrich Ratzel still used to note in his times that the scope of the concept of ‘space’ is broader than its definition that follows purely geographical boundaries. And his concept of *Lebensraum* used to ambiguously link the geological and biological environments after all. Ratzel’s idea of state-organism makes a state’s aspiration to territorial expansion sound quite natural (Cit. by: Dubov, 2014: 16).

Today we can talk about the deep crisis of ‘the state-centered spatiality evaluation’, as noted by British-American political geographer John A. Agnew. According to his arguments, the crisis is characterized by a reevaluation of the three geographical postulates that used to serve as the bases of world order for a long period of time: first, states have exclusive sovereignty over their own territory; second, the ‘internal’ and ‘external’ spheres are clearly separated; and third, the borders of states determine the boundaries of ‘societies’ (Cit. by: Ó Tuathail, 2000).

However, modern information technologies make the borders a political conditionality, and the emergence of new forms of transboundary socialization (through entertainment, work, attachment to subcultures and interest groups, etc.) makes communication with ‘the fatherland’ even more illusory. There is a person being formed that is indifferent to one’s territorial connections, to the ‘calling of ancestors’, to a cultural tradition. Territories at that appear as mere sources of resources and ‘empty’ space. All that led to the emergence of ‘nomads’ of technical civilization deprived of any territorial cultural identity.

Such a course of events can affect the way in which society is organized in general. Thus, Irish-American researcher Gearóid Ó Tuathail notes that the interrelated processes of globalization and informationalization of the society of risk directly challenge and ruin the boundaries of the modern interstate system, creating new regimes of interconnection between spaces throughout the globe, transforming the scalar relations between the local, the national and the global, introducing unprecedented interaction and communication speeds and creating increased interdependence and vulnerability to dangers all around the world (Ó Tuathail, 2000). And since informationalization of society is a social process of the production and the widespread usage of information as a social resource, it has been transformed “from the object of theoretical analysis of researchers regarding evaluation of the power of states up to becoming the most important factor in the struggle of a nation for economical, political, cultural and military advantages, as well as a factor for the survival of all the humankind” (Momot, 2011: 68-69). The contemporary Ukrainian researcher P. Fedoruk stresses in that context that the information space becomes the platform through which external players impose their ‘geopolitical vision’, their ideas about ‘geopolitical codes’ of countries and regions, through which today’s geopolitics actually equates real and virtual spaces (Fedoruk, 2012: 184).

The current highly controversial information processes have a significant impact over the formation of the organizational unity of the planetary community aimed at the transition from existing national systems of state administration to the formation of an organic system of the World power (non-state, legislative, executive, judicial). The main executive body of the Global state on a democratic basis could be presented as the World Government – the only normative and legal system in the form of common civilization values, morality and the universal law. In other words, the future planetary community would establish a cosmopolitan democracy, which, as argued by Russian researcher Yu. Kirshin, would include cultural, ethnic and religious habits of all the people of the world and would not only preserve human values, but also raise them to a higher level that “will help to eliminate imperfections of the humankind” (Kirshin, 2016).

As a new political reality, cosmopolitan democracy will be aimed at globalizing the democracy within states, between states and beyond states and at creating the conditions for civic participation in decision-making at both regional and global levels. As an institutional model, cosmopolitan democracy will strive to implement a new form of global governance that would include the legal order and the formal construction of supranational democratic institutions that would exist alongside the state system.

Although cosmopolitan democracy is often criticized for being impractical (Archibugi, 1995), it is still gaining influence in democratic processes in different parts of the world. Another locus of the cosmopolitan world order is the global civil society, which is considered to be a socio-political link between the human, the state and the world and which acts beyond the boundaries of national societies, state entities and economies. The global civil

society is becoming more and more evident in transnational social movements, networks and NGOs – all those define their goals in universal or international terms and carry out projects that have global implications, expressing human solidarity and demanding global equity.

If we concentrate on the features of the fundamental principles of cosmopolitanism or on comprehending the fact that in a world without borders the cosmopolitan matrix of the world order is required from the point of view of the synergetic paradigm, then we can see a whole new sphere of dispute between the supporters and the opponents of cosmopolitanism.

Ulrich Beck singles out the enemies of cosmopolitanism: those are nationalism, globalism and democratic authoritarianism. Cosmopolitanism refutes the idea that solidarity conceptually exists exclusively within the boundaries of a nation state. Beck defines the three directions for the denial of nationalism. First, in his opinion, the supporters of nationalism do not strive to establish ‘the greatness’ of their nation, but only to ‘preserve’ their identity and isolation from the outside world, while the cosmopolitan perspective implies a sense of globality and infinity (Beck, 2008: 5). As explained by Beck, reckless infatuation for a nation state contradicts its own historicity: one can but be surprised by its naivety, as it perceives a nation state as something eternal and natural, while only two or three centuries ago it was considered to be unnatural and absurd (Beck, 2008: 258). Second, the author stresses the ambiguity of the foundations of nationalism. Third, he states that nationalism increasingly demonstrates its inability to explain the contemporary world, since reality has long outstripped textbooks, and what could not be described by established categories becomes subject to moral defamation. It is the world that is false, and not the concepts used to describe it (Beck, 2008: 232). Also, Ulrich Beck blames nationalists for failing to understand the nature and causes for global inequality and for the problem of transnationalization of social inequality. The cosmopolitan approach, on the contrary, allows us to see how a nation state principle legitimizes global inequality (Beck, 2008: 56). The researcher also accuses the alter-globalists who oppose purely economic globalization (‘globalism’) – and at the same time they begin to promote the universality of human rights, the rights of working people, women and so on (Beck, 2008: 176). At that Ulrich Beck points out the contradictions in their views. On the one hand, they are both opponents of globalization (and hence of cosmopolitanism), and on the other hand they are its supporters. That demands for not only the development of new categories, but for the revision of the foundations of sociological and philosophical theories as well. Cosmopolitan practices of the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> c. require the development of a new ‘syntax’, namely, the ‘syntax of cosmopolitan reality’. In this context, Alexandr Panarin (Panarin, 2000) notes that the problem is not whether we recognize the reality of the contemporary interdependent world in which isolationism is impossible, – the problem is how we envision this global world: as a truly pluralist, based on the partnership of the bearers of sovereignty who respect each other, – or as a subordinate to self-serving owners of the uncontrolled world power dictating their will to all the people.

There are alternative versions and scenarios for the global order, just like for anything else, and our human dignity lies in asserting the most humane and just forms of them as best as we can – and rejecting the attempts of a new predatoriness that seeks to lay its hands on the world under the slogan ‘there is no other way’.

## CONCLUSION

To summarize, cosmopolitanism is a long-awaited but still insufficiently clear and well-grounded answer to the current challenges of the globalized world, in particular the transition to a networked society, which in our days does not cover the whole world yet, but forms the core of the world social structure and tends towards the rapid expansion of cyberspace. Today it became apparent that the existing life style has exhausted itself and demands for significant transformations at all the levels of the self-realization of the social system. The cosmopolitan Weltanschauung allows to grip the shifts in socio-political rules, as well as the processes of state integration. The principle of ‘either within or beyond’ is being replaced by the principle of ‘both within and beyond’. And the virtual world (cyberspace) is the environment where the individual contribution towards the development of society can become global. The cosmopolitan approach enables us to discover the infinite set of spatial, temporal and practical realities subordinated to the principle of ‘both this and that’.

## REFERENCES

- Appiah, Kwame (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Archibugi, Daniele (2000). *Cosmopolitical Democracy*, in *New Left Review* 4, S. 137–150.
- Archibugi, Daniele (1995). *From the United Nations to cosmopolitan democracy*, in: D. Archibugi and D. Held (eds), *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a NewWorld Order*. Oxford: Polity, pp. 135–155.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1998). *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beck, Ulrich (2000). *The Cosmopolitan Perspective*. *Sociology for the Second Age of Modernity*, in: *British Journal of Sociology* 51, S. 79–106.
- Beck, Ulrich (2002). *Macht und Gegenmacht im globalen Zeitalter*. *Neue weltpolitische Ökonomie*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Castells, Manuel (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. I, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Held, David (1993). *Democracy: from city-states to a cosmopolitan order?* In: D. Held (ed.) *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West*. Oxford: Polity, pp. 13–52.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1994). *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Lash, Scott (2002). *Critique of information*. London, Sage Publications.

- McLuhan, Marshall (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Naisbit, John, and Aburdene, Patricia (1990). *Megatrends 2000: Ten New Directions for the 1990s*. William & Morrow Company, Inc.
- Nye, Joseph S. (2011). Nuclear lessons for cyber security? In: *Strategic Studies Quarterly*. 2011. No. 5(4), pp. 18–38.
- Ó Tuathail, Gearóid (2000). The Postmodern Geopolitical Condition: States, Statecraft, and Security at the Millennium, In: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 90, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 166–178.
- Oxford dictionary of English (2010). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Urry, John (2007). *Mobilities*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Yannakogeorgos, Panayotis Alexander (2009). *Technogeopolitics of Militarization and Security in Cyberspace*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.
- Beck, Ulrich (2008). *Kosmopoliticheskoe mirovozzrenie. – M.: Centr issledovaniy postindustrial'nogo obshchestva, 2008. – 336 s. (In Russian)*
- Bilan, N.I. (2011). Internet jak prostir riznih vidiv social'nih komunikacij. Aktual'ni problemi mizhnarodnih vidnosin. Vipusk 103 (Chastina I). 2011, pp. 46–50. (In Ukrainian)
- Global'naja perestrojka (2014). *Otv.red.akad. A.A. Dynkin, akad. N.I. Ivanova / IMJeMO RAN. M.: Ves' Mir, 2014. 528 s. (In Russian)*
- Dianova V. M. (2007). *Kosmopolitizm v jepohu globalizacii / V.M. Dianova // Voprosy kul'turologi, 2007. – # 1. – S. 8–12. (In Russian)*
- Dubov D. V. (2014). *Kiberprostir jak novij vimir geopolitichnogo supernictva : monografija / D. V. Dubov. – K. : NISD, 2014. – 328 s. (In Ukrainian)*
- Yemelin V.A. (2016). *Simuljakry i tehnologii virtualizacii v informacionnom obshchestve // Nacional'nyj psihologicheskij zhurnal. 2016. # 3 (23). C. 86. (In Russian)*
- Zbrickaja L.G. (2009). *Globalizacija i ee informacionnaja sfera: sushhnostnye cherty i osnovnye jelementy / L.G. Zbrickaja // Visnik SevDTU. – Vip. 94. – Filosofija: zb. nauk. pr. – Sevastopol': Vid-vo SevNTU, 2009. – S 48–51. (In Russian)*
- Kirshin Ju.Ja. *Koncepcija kosmopolitizma / Ju.Ja. Kirshin – Jelektronnyj resurs – Rezhim dostupa: <http://scicenter.online/politicheskaya-filosofiya/kratkaya-biografiya-130904.html>. (In Russian)*
- Kirshin Ju.Ja. (2016). *Kosmopolitizm: bor'ba s nesovershennostjami chelovechestva. – Klincy: Izdatel'stvo GUP «Klincovskaja gorodskaja tipografija», 2016. – 128 s. – <http://scicenter.online/politicheskaya-filosofiya/soderzhanie-130996.html>. (In Russian)*
- Korytnikova N.V. (2008). *Internet-predstavitel'tvo kak kommunikativnyj resurs gosudarstvennogo upravlenija : diss. na soisk. nauchn. stepeni kand. soc. nauk.: spec. 22.00.04 «special'nye i otraslevye sociologii» / N. V. Korytnikova. – 2008. – 190s. (In Russian)*
- Kristeva Ju. (2002). *Chuzhdye sami sebe: mechta ob iskljuchitel'nosti // Kerni R. Dialogi o Evrope. M., 2002 – S. 17–18. (In Russian)*
- Martynenko T.S. (2017). *Transformacija predmeta sociologii v rabotah B. Latura i Dzh. Urri // XX Mezhdunarodnaja konferencija pamjati professora L.N Kogana “Kul'tura, lichnost', obshchestvo v*

- sovremennom mire: metodologija, opyt jempiricheskogo issledovanija”, 16-17 marta 2017 g. Ekaterinburg, 2017. S. 158. (In Russian)
- Momot A. S. (2011). Informacijni chinniki vplivu na stalij rozvitok svitosistemi // A. S. Momot // Nova paradigma. – 2011. – Vip. 104. – S. 67–77. (In Ukrainian)
- Napso, M.D. (2016) Kosmopoliticheskoe mirovozzrenie v traktovke U. Beka. *Filosofiya i kultura*, 10(106), 1383-1387. <https://doi.org/10.7256/1999-2793.2016.10.20581>. (In Russian)
- Panarin A.S. (2000). *Iskushenie globalizmom* / A.S. Panarin. – M.: Russkij Nacional'nyj Fond, 2000. – 381 s. (In Russian)
- Fedoruk P. (2012). Kul'turno-civilizacijnij kontekst geopolitichnih prioritativ Ukraïni / P. Fedoruk // Nova paradigma. – 2012. – Vip. 107. – S. 181–191. (In Ukrainian).