Worldview: Facets of Meaning and Breakpoints

Rybakov Nikolay Sergeevich[1][a], Tatyana Viktorovna Torubarova[2][b], Musat Raisa Pavlovna[3][c], Kolomoets Elena Nikolaevna[4][d] and Korshunov Vasily Leonidovich[5][e]

[1]*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theology, Professor of the Pskov State University, 2 Lenin Place, Pskov, 180000, Pskov region, Russia*

[2]*Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Philosophy, Professor of the Kursk State University, 29 Radishcheva St., Kursk 305000, Kursk Region, Russia*

[3]*Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Information Technologies in Cultural and Creat Industries of the Siberian Federal University, 79 Svobodny Ave., Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Krasnoyarsk, Russia*

[4]*PhD in Philosophy, associate professor of the Department of Sociology, Psychology and Social Management of the Moscow Aviation Institute, 125993, Volokolamskoe shosse, 4, Moscow, Russia*

[5]*PhD Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Faculty of Physical Education, Pacific National University Karl Marx Street, 68 Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, 680000*

doctoruniversalis@yandex.ru

Keywords: Worldview, Basic intuition of the worldview, Cosmocentrism, Theocentrism, Individuocentrism, Plurocentrism, Conciliarity, Concept of individuocentrism, Concept of plurocentrism, Concept of concili-arity, Whole, Part, One, Many.

Abstract: The article compares the Western and Russian worldviews. The Western worldview is consid-ered in its historical evolution – from antiquity to modernity. A brief description of each of the se-lected types of worldview is given and their historical transformation is revealed. The Russian worldview is analyzed through the prism of conciliarity. The concepts of "the concept of individu-ocentrism", "the concept of plurocentrism", "the concept of conciliarity" are introduced and a com-parative analysis of these concepts is carried out. The research is conducted in the language of the methodology of whole-part relations.

1 INTRODUCTION

This article is devoted to a well-known problem that covers almost everything that concerns our life not only in the present, but in the past and in the future. This is a problem of worldview. It is spoken about everywhere, and, nevertheless, a many still remains unclear and debatable.

The worldview, as a rule, is not on the surface of our actions. Rather, it is the foundation on which problems arising at the next turn of history can be built and justified. And no matter what we do – state-building, economy, armed forces, education, etc. – without a serious ideological basis, our efforts will be ineffective, if not in vain.

The centuries-old confrontation between Russia and the West once again forces us to turn to its deep ideological origins and reflect on this problem. We have become witnesses and contempo-raries of how, in the confrontation of various social systems, a huge state, the USSR, was destroyed by the unprecedented substitution of one ideological principle with another. Many pages have been written about universal values, they have been discussed by scientists, politicians, and educators. It was argued that universal values are the highest criterion for all other values, that they are a condi-tion for the existence of society as a whole, and "the principle of priority of universal values" is not just a good wish and a beautiful phrase, but an axiological imperative ... without which humanity will cease to exist". [1, c. 95].

[a] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1007-6001
[b] https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7319-6428
[c] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2661-2289
[d] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4632-6757
[e] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7354-0900

The problem, however, is that universal values, like any other, are ambivalent, so their abso-lutization and fetishization are not excluded. Depending on the specific conditions, on the context, the same value can change its polarity. According to the linguistic form, it can remain the same, but implicitly take very different meanings, up to mutually exclusive. Therefore, under the guise of pro-claiming universal values, it is possible to drag values with any content that meet the very narrow and selfish interests of a group of people.

Using the example of one's own country, one can once again be convinced that seemingly ab-stract and detached from life, therefore not always clear to the layman, philosophical principles turn out to be not harmless scholastic inventions at all – on the contrary, they powerfully influence the course of history. Behind the facade of ideological confrontation, deeper layers of meanings and values are hidden, for the possession of which a real struggle is unfolding. To clarify this situation, it is necessary to turn to the problem of worldview.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the process of working on the problem of worldview, various materials have been studied, in-cluding primary sources, and various methods have been used. Among them are textual research of primary sources and modern materials, the comparative method, methods of system analysis and analogy, logical and historical methods, the method of integral relations, the combination of abstract and concrete approaches.

3 FINDINGS

The term "worldview" seems to many quite ordinary, self-evident. Over the past 30 years in Russia, the problem of worldview has been studied rather sluggishly, here they were limited mainly to fig-ures of silence. Currently, there is an increase in attention to this problem. In particular, the October issue of the Journal of Political Studies for 2022 is entirely devoted to the phenomenon of worldview, and the journal invites the academic community of Russia to actively engage in the dis-cussion of worldview issues.

The editorial says: "If the worldview dissonates with the very essence of the country's social and political institutions, then any creative transformations, projects, directions of domestic and for-eign state policy are futile. A fragmented worldview saturated with contradictions also does not contribute to social harmony, solidarity, social consolidation, the development of stable forms of relations between man, society and the state, oriented towards creation" [2, p. 4]. In fact, it is stated here that the worldview is the dominant of all social, political, and personal transformations.

If the worldview is the dominant of the processes taking place, then it is the key that allows to discover the meanings of what is happening. To do this, philosophers usually look for some common ultimate ideological foundations, which are called in different ways: the initial principles, the basic intuitions, the universals of culture, etc.

S. Langer speaks of them as natural ways of thinking: "The average person does not recognize such self-evident "ways" - he simply follows them. He is not aware of accepting any basic princi-ples. These latter are his "Weltanschauung" (as the German world calls it), his mindset, and not cer-tain points of faith. They make up his worldview; they are deeper than the facts that he can note, or assumptions that he can discuss" [3, pp. 9-10].

A. F. Losev states: "Each culture is based on its own specific pra-symbol, from which the real history of this culture grows…

Antiquity is the intuition of a finite body filled and completed in itself. The New Europe has an intuition of infinite space, infinity" [4, p. 39].

The identification of such intuitions allows, firstly, to raise the question of the origin of a par-ticular type of worldview, secondly, to investigate its features, thirdly, to reveal the dynamics and direction of its evolution, and fourthly, to establish the external and internal determinations of the worldview in a particular era. Therefore, the question of A. F. Losev about what is the pra-symbol of ancient culture and what basic intuition underlies its creations can be extended to all subsequent historical epochs, to all types of worldviews and cultures.

Let's start with the Western worldview. The ancient worldview, called cosmocentric, has been thoroughly studied. It received its highest expression in Neoplatonism, where the category of the One acquired the meaning of a semantic principle in the light of which all world processes were considered. The One as "the supreme principle is... the ineffable, the inexpressible, ... stands above all..." [5, p. 86]. Such a semantic principle is called the Absolute. The opposite of the One is the many (set) as an absolute dispersal, the scattering of the whole into parts. The one and the many form a binary opposition of the A–

not-A type. It is important to emphasize that "Plotinus begins by pointing to the central idea of his philosophy, to the problem of good as formalization and evil as dispersion... "The good" is the absolute unity of everything" [6, p. 720].

The Greeks, Engels notes, did not reach the dismemberment, the analysis of nature, it is "still considered in general as one whole. The universal connection of natural phenomena is not proved in detail: it is for the Greeks the result of direct contemplation" [7, p. 369]. This remark is valuable be-cause it allows to build a theory of worldview based on the categories of One and many, whole and part. Proclus solved this problem as follows: "Every multitude is somehow involved in the one" [8, p. 9]. The One and the many are not just inextricably linked to each other, but, more importantly, the One is always primary in relation to the set, which, apart from involvement in the One, cannot even be understood as a set.

The decomposition of antiquity, which lasted about 400 years, led to a change in the basic in-tuition (the pra-symbol) and a new era - the Middle Ages. If in antiquity the One as an Absolute represented an impersonal-objective expression of the integrity of the world, then in the new condi-tions it is transformed into an Absolute having a personal form – it is an Absolute Personality. Theo-centrism arises – a new worldview based on this pra-symbol. The Absolute Personality, as the su-preme principle, is above all and embraces everything that exists. The primacy of the Absolute Per-sonality means that for a medieval person the world has a personal dimension, filled with divine meanings that need to be comprehended.

A symbolic understanding of the world is born. This is how Johan Huizinga describes it: "The vital value of the symbolic interpretation of everything was limitless. Symbolism has created an im-age of the world that is stricter in its unity and inner conditioning than natural scientific thinking based on causality would be able to do. It embraced all nature and all history in its strong embrace" [9, p. 349]. Let us emphasize that the symbolic understanding of the world could only be the cover-age of the world as a whole – this is the contemplation of the whole. Despite the fundamental dif-ferences in content, the ancient and medieval worldviews have a similar abstract-logical scheme of deployment.

The symbolic understanding of the world, becoming total, turns into its own other, degener-ates. J. Huizinga writes: "The whole world has become a field of action of all-encompassing symbol-ization and is covered with stone colors of symbols. But symbolism has from time immemorial shown a tendency to become purely mechanistic" [10, p. 351]. The totality of symbolism means that any thing becomes a symbol of any other, in the limit – a symbol of itself. Symbolism, designed to reproduce a huge variety of relationships between things, turns into a rupture of representational connections between them.

Theocentrism is weakening and disappearing from the historical scene, and a person who pre-viously looked exclusively up, awakens interest in what is happening in earthly life, here and with him. And if a medieval man found support in the Absolute Personality, felt his dependence on it, then a completely different attitude develops in a person of the coming new era, a new pra-symbol is born. "Everything is valuable," writes A. F. Losev, – what a person saw or anticipated in the ob-jective world, otherworldly or earthly, he placed in himself, in the depth of his personality... The European man began with a very simple and natural desire – to be himself, to demand for himself natural rights and the liberation of his personality. And it came to the complete deification and ab-solutization of the individual..." [11, p. 737]. The new Absolute becomes an ordinary person – I, as a real isolated, separate empirical individual, the new worldview is called anthropocentrism, although more precisely it should be called individuocentrism. There is, according to the expression of A. F. Losev, a change in absolutes: man "freed himself from obedience to transcendent being", but found himself "dependent on another absolute; and although this absolute appeared to himself, this ordi-nary, earthly man, with his head, arms and legs, it did not get any better..." [12, p. 376] The absolute in its meaning is that which relies on itself, has no point of support outside of it-self. A European man, states A. F. Losev, transferred everything valuable to the depths of his per-sonality and thereby lost support in the outside world.

This is where the adventures of a European man begin. Left to himself, not depending on an-yone or anything, he is absolutely free. And since there are other absolutized individuals along with him, freedom extends to them as well. Everyone is absolutely free, and no one has any advantages over others – everyone is equal. Hence arise two famous principles of the new (bourgeois) worldview: the principles of freedom and equality, on which the West still stands.

On the basis of this pra-symbol, liberalism appears in Modern times (from Lat. liberalis – free) – a rather motley ideological trend that proclaims the freedoms and rights of the individual as the highest

value and has a difficult fate. L. Von Mises emphasizes: "Liberalism has not been allowed to fully materialize anywhere. Nevertheless... it was enough to change the face of the world" [13]. F. Fukuyama believes that liberal democracy "remains the only logically consistent political aspiration, and it dominates various regions and cultures around the world", liberal principles of economics ("free market") "have managed to create an unprecedented level of material well-being" in various countries [14, p. 7]. And he states that there is a "fundamental process that dictates a common evo-lutionary pattern for all human societies, and – in short, there is a kind of Universal history leading towards liberal democracy" [15, p. 50].

When an empirically limited individual tries on the clothes of the Absolute, problems arise leading to a change in his lifestyle. The individual is finite, the Absolute is infinite. If the infinite is "squeezed" into the finite, the deformation of the Absolute will inevitably occur, leading to an inad-equate state of the individual. If, on the contrary, a finite individual tries to "expand" to an infinite Absolute, he will inevitably fall apart – this is how the famous European split Self arises. This hap-pened in the external life of the individual, when in the industrial sphere, following the division of labor, the individual turned into a differentiated set of functions. The so-called partial (one-dimensional) man appeared, "the beginnings of inner life" writes P. A. Florensky, – have disinte-grated: sanctity, beauty, goodness, usefulness", which "not only do not form a single whole, but even in thoughts are not subject to fusion now" [16, p. 148, 149].

A whole worldview is lost, a fractional, partial perception of reality is formed. The individu-al's abandonment to himself turned into a feeling of abandonment in a hostile world, a feverish search for support in the supporting world, loneliness, despair, fear, care, emptiness, loss, disillu-sionment, anxiety, longing, etc. O. F. Bolnov writes that "every vital relation (Lebensbezug) that goes beyond the limits of an individual, which could give him support, every vital meaning that could indicate a goal to him, turned out to be illusory. And the world with a previously unknown threat came out in relation to man as alien (unheimlich) and dangerous. Man realized himself in a kind of hopeless loss, doomed everywhere to destruction penetrating into him. At the same time, it was not only about the terrifying bottomlessness of the outside world, but also, perhaps, about the even more threatening depths of one's own soul" [17, p. 138].

The worldview of individuocentrism radically changed the individual's attitude to being. These changes are schematically expressed in the following. Cosmocentrism proceeds from a holistic view of the world, the theocentrism of the Middle Ages elevates the world to a supernatural and at the same time integral (unified) state.

The individuocentrism of the New time splits the world, reverses the previously formed pic-ture.
Cosmocentrism is based on relationships: the whole is a part, the one is a many. Theocentrism continues this line: the whole is a part, the one is a many.
Individuocentrism forms the opposite attitude: part – whole, many – one.

A many and a part are put forward in the first place, the one and the whole are moved to the background. In other words, individuocentrism generates an inverse worldview. There is a revolu-tionary transformation of both the worldview and the way of life of the individual and society.

The next step in this direction was taken by postmodernism, which turned many things (mul-tiplicity, plurality) into the initial principle of man's attitude to the world. The beginning of the mul-tiple view of the world was laid by the worldview of individuocentrism, but it was fully revealed in the worldview of plurocentrism, based on a new Absolute, which is a many. A many is insidious because taken by itself, it can crumble into new multiplicities – and so on indefinitely. The limit of this scattering, if it can be talked about at all, is the state of singularity, a complete and absolute gap between any parts and fragments of the world: each part has only its own isolated being outside of relation with other parts.

Postmodernism resolutely rejected the binary opposition in thinking, putting forward in its place the concept of rhizome (fr. rhizome), which can be qualified as a pra-symbol of the postmod-ern worldview. A rhizome is an onion, a bundle, a tangle. The rhizome is arranged in such a way that none of its elements can be called a center in relation to others. And if the rhizome has no cen-ter, then there is no periphery, if there is no main element, then there are no secondary ones. It is ca-pable of growing in all directions, forming new roots, the main one among which will not be. There-fore, its multiplicity turns out to be the most important condition for the existence of its other – sin-gularity, and this other is that which extends, outlines and transforms multiplicity. G. Deleuze and F. Guattari write: "The Rhizome does not allow itself to return to either One or many. It is not One that becomes two, nor even one that would directly become three, four, five, etc. It is

not much that is deduced from One, or to which One is added (n+1). It is not made of units, but of dimensions, or rather of moving directions. It has neither a beginning nor an end, but there is always a middle from which it grows and overflows" [18, p. 37].

Postmodern plurocentrism depicted the possible world where multiplicity is elevated to the Absolute beyond the slightest attempt to conceive of the existence of the one, and showed what it is like for a person to live in such a world. In particular, it states that there is no general knowledge, that any knowledge depends on the specific situation in which it is produced, this is the so-called situational knowledge. Any life situation in which an individual is placed can be considered the ba-sis for the emergence of situational knowledge that claims to be scientific. Due to the multiplicity of situations, there is no reason to talk about a single science – there is the science of men and women, the science of western and eastern, the science of Conservatives and Democrats, the science of blacks and whites, the science of immigrants and aborigines, the science of rural residents and townspeople, the science of youth and mature people. It is argued that knowledge depends on gen-der, on the political status of the group to which the individual who possesses this knowledge (or creates it) belongs.

In everyday life, people constantly encounter the original multiplicity, not even considering it necessary to think about the connection, the unity of many events. Quite often there is no such con-nection between them. But, be that as it may, the ratio of the One and the many divides people into two classes: supporters of the One adhere to the logic of human development within the framework of binary relations from the One to Many, supporters of the many (pluralism), on the contrary, con-sider the historical process in the coordinates of the Many-One, talking about the plurality of the one, about the pluralistic concept of unity, about the self-sufficiency of an exclusively pluralistic understanding of the world. Thus, an attempt is being made to get away from the inverse binary op-position.

In the case of postmodernism, the experience of extracting from the depths of the history of philosophy the concept with which the consequences that may occur in the case of the implementa-tion of plurocentrism are "worked out" and "thought through to the end" is valuable. B. V. Yako-venko formulates the most important problem of philosophy as follows: "For philosophy ... the prob-lem of the relationship between the one and the many is of fundamental importance. All other im-portant problems... the relationship of the absolute to the relative, the transcendent to the immanent, the ideal to the real, freedom and necessity, good and evil, beautiful and ugly, God and man, social-ism and individualism, and so on — all of them are somehow explicable and solved in direct de-pendence on how it appears — consciously or not even unconsciously — the essence of being: one or multiple" [19, p. 282].

The pra-symbol of the Russian worldview deserves special attention. Designated as conciliari-ty (unitotality, organicism, integrity and even collectivism), it is described in many works of Russian philosophers, not to mention Orthodox thinkers.

Let's turn to S. L. Frank: "In contrast to the Western, the Russian worldview contains a pro-nounced philosophy of "WE" or "WE are philosophy". For it, the last foundation of the life of the spirit and its essence is formed by "WE", not "I", "WE" is not thought of as an external unity of the majority of "I", only then coming to synthesis, but as a primary, further indecomposable unity, from the womb of which only the "I" grows and through which this "I" becomes possible. "I" and "YOU", my consciousness and consciousness alien to me, opposing me and connected with me, both of them form integrated, inseparable parts of the primary whole — "WE"... But the "I" in its freedom and originality is not denied by this. Only the originality and freedom of the "I" are formed by such a connection with the whole, the vitality of the "I" is created by the superindividual integri-ty of humanity" [20, p. 159].

The following features of "WE" attract attention: a) it is thought of as a primary and in-decomposable unity; b) "I" grows out of it; c) "I" is possible only through "WE"; d) "I" and "YOU" are connected to each other; e) they form integrated and inseparable parts of the primary whole "WE"; f) "I" is contained in "WE"; g) each "I" contains "WE"; h) "WE" is the last anchor point, root and carrier of "I"; i) "WE" is an organic whole that is completely present in its parts; j) the freedom of the "I" is not denied by this presence; k) the existence of the "I" is ensured by this "WE" as a su-perindividual integrity.

Further S. L. Frank continues: "From this point of view, attempts to build individual ethics and individual psychology are simply chimerical. (Emphasis added by us. – auth.). It is in vain to seek the life, destiny and welfare of an individual in his own isolation, outside of his ties with humanity" [21, p. 160]. In fact, the philosopher's reasoning sets out the methodology of whole-part relations, which requires a transition to the language of the part and

the whole, but at the same time we must not forget about the relationship of the One and the many.

The intuition of conciliarity expresses a collective meaning, the intuition of individuocentrism emphasizes the separateness of elements. This feature of conciliarity makes fundamental differences in the cultural and genetic code of Russian civilization in relation to the Western world. For further consideration of the features of the described worldviews, we will turn to the methodology of whole-part relations.

Note that in the first approximation, we combine the One with the whole, a many with the part. At the same time, the very concept of the One in the literature is used as if by itself, intuitively clear. But not everything is transparent and obvious here. A. F. Losev showed that Proclus already establishes 12 types of unity. Unity, says A. F. Losev, can be considered simply as a union of parts. In most cases, this is exactly how it is thought. But Losev continues: "It will be the unity of the plu-ral. However, such unity is not enough" [22, p. 720]. Therefore, an additional study of the correla-tion of the mentioned concepts in the context of different types is required. Then the details of the relationship between the whole and the One, the part and the set will be needed. But when, relying on the ratio of the whole and the part, we say that the parts exist only as part of the whole, and the whole is impossible without parts at all, then the separation of much from the One and the operation of the set without comparing it with the One becomes very, very controversial, and the admissibility of this turns out to be problematic at all, just as a perpetual motion machine is not feasible.

4 DISCUSSION

Let's continue the analysis of the meanings of the worldview, using the concept of the concept. By the concept we mean a certain mental structure built with the help of a certain methodology. A con-cept is a dynamic structure containing quanta of meanings and intended for a relatively holistic re-production of the phenomenon under study.

The concept of worldview is the result of combining the concepts of "concept" and "worldview", representing a kind of worldview construction, based on which one can study the real phenomenon of worldview, explicate its meanings generated in a particular culture. It is important to distinguish between the real worldview as an objectively developing, functioning and evolving polysyllabic phenomenon of social life and its numerous constructions in which this phenomenon is reproduced. It is in this case that the worldview turns out to be not only the subject of theoretical research, but also the means (tool) with which thinkers try to understand situations of a socio-cultural, individual and total-historical nature. It should also be noted that in this case, the details of the ideological phenomenon are not in the foreground, but its schematism.

The concept of individuocentrism is based on the primacy and autonomy of the individual as a part in relation to society as a whole. Autonomy is transparency, linearity of relations between individuals, the possibility of rational coverage of the event series. It testifies that the existence of individuals is carried out in the world external to them. Therefore, for each individual, an individual who is not himself is another individual. In such a situation, the concept of the Other as a stranger inevitably arises.

The concept of postmodern plurocentrism is a continuation and transformation of the concept of individuocentrism, brought to its limit. The worldview built on the rhizome is based on the principle of multiplicity, which no longer has any relationship with the One. Therefore, it is not tied to anything, it can connect the non-connected, belonging to incompatible toposes, for example, a wasp and an orchid. If plurocentrism thinks only within the framework of plurality, where the plurality of the one itself is recognized, and the one is taken as a unit of plurality, then the following options for assessing this situation are possible.

First, if the unit of multiplicity is taken only as a part of this multiplicity, then thinking turns from one particular judgment to another. And logic forbids doing this, since no definite conclusion follows from two particular judgments. And then the whole plurocentrism is nothing more than lin-guistic sophistry that has nothing to do with the analysis of being.

Secondly, if the unit of multiplicity is preserved precisely as a unit, then in this case there are not whole-part relations, but relations of the whole with the whole, which implies the development of the methodology of whole-whole relations.

Thirdly, it is the whole units that can be incompatible directly. Although, let's make a reservation, the parts in the whole may also be incompatible, for example, blood and bone tissue in the body. But the relations of incompatible integers at one level n can be quite understandable at anoth-er level n+1 when we expand the map space. The wasp and the orchid in the general flow of life support for each

other are completely combined, moreover, they are closely connected, forming a kind of unity.

Finally, fourthly, N. O. Lossky, considering whole-part relations, noted that "1) each part ex-ists for the whole, 2) the whole exists for each part, and 3) each part is the whole in some special aspect of it" [23, p. 276]. A part in a certain aspect is a whole, because the world is "packed" into a whole-private shell, forming a continuous tangle of being, an onion, a rhizome.

The connection between the one and the many is so indissoluble that, sooner or later, unity is revealed behind the most unimaginable statements of multiplicity, but unexpected new forms of connection between them are possible, and the literature also talks about the emergence of a new form of the One. About this, in particular, writes A. Badiou: "Deleuze's main problem, of course, is not the liberation of the plural, but the subordination of the thought of the plural to the updated concept of the One" [24, p. 20]. Despite the efforts of postmodernism to break the link between the one and the many, it proved beyond its power.

The era of plurocentrism is transitional, new relations between the one and the many are emerging in it. The logic of history on a global scale unfolds from the one to the many and from it to a new form of the one. What this form will turn out to be – we can only speculate so far.

The concept of conciliarity sets the movement of thought from the whole to the part. And this implies a different understanding of ontology in relation to the being of the individual, in which the part – the individual – owes its existence to the whole. There is no question of relying on oneself, there is no concern for self-preservation – all this is guaranteed to the individual by his belonging to the whole. The concept of conciliarity, according to S. L. Frank, each "I" internally contains "WE" as the basis and carrier of each "I". Therefore, for such an individual, another individual is not ex-clusively external and alien. If this concept generates an identity problem, then it takes on a differ-ent meaning. There is no need to look for oneself as part of the conciliar whole, everything is WE, and therefore identity is ensured by the involvement of [I] in the whole, collected.

Therefore, in an effort to complete himself to the fullness of connections with the whole, the individual comes to the idea of unity, in the limit – identity with this mysterious whole. The whole-[WE] is concentrated in the part-[I], the part permeates the whole. It is their mutual concentration that gives rise to such a topology of being, where a person feels himself involved in eternity and in-finity [25, p. 49-63]. In the concept of conciliarity, the fullness of personality is realized not at the expense of self-activity and self-sufficiency, after which the individual no longer cares about any-one, but by expanding and strengthening ties both within the whole and with the whole. Therefore, in an effort to complete himself to the fullness of connections with the whole, the individual comes to the idea of unity, in the limit – identity with this mysterious whole. The whole-[WE] is concen-trated in the part-[I], the part permeates the whole. It is their mutual concentration that generates such a topology of being, where a person feels himself involved in eternity and infinity [26, p. 49-63].

We emphasize that the situation with conciliarity is not so simple, there should be no mistake. Within the mystical whole, individuals turn out to be internal links of one grandiose chain, the con-nections between which are far from idyllic and joyful. The methodology of whole-part relations shows that if the whole begins to be active towards the parts and oppress their own self-activity, this turns into totalitarianism, which inevitably leads the whole to destruction, since the whole lives at the expense of the internal activity of its parts. If, on the contrary, the activity of the parts reaches its maximum, this leads to a rupture of the connections between them, between the parts and the whole and, as an inevitability, to the death of the whole. In the history of society, such a variant of their behavior is expressed by the phenomenon of anarchism. Both totalitarianism and anarchism are real phenomena in the history of mankind.

The concept of conciliarity produces a different logic of thinking and action, revealing other meanings of existence. We have not yet mastered this logic, have not created the concept of concili-arity, have not investigated its structure, have not studied the technologies of conciliatory thinking, have not developed methods for its use. Now we are going through a difficult historical moment. But this is not a clash of civilizations, but a confrontation of deep mental and conceptual structures – worldviews, without the awareness of which it is difficult to build relationships with civilizations based on other worldview concepts.

5 CONCLUSIONS

What prospects of convergence of worldviews can we talk about? Of course, those worldviews whose pra-symbols have gone down in history are unlikely to have a serious impact on modernity. However,

individuocentrism continues to influence the state of the worldview in different regions of the globe. Plurocentrism with its claims to the original multiplicity, divorced from any single one, has not yet exhausted its possibilities, has not developed to its limit, and therefore, due to unusual and unclear in its consequences, or even simply shocking statements, will attract the attention of various thinkers. If it demonstrates its heuristic abilities, it will be able to have a strong impact on historical events. In the meantime, it manifests itself more as an outrageous attitude to the world, in particular, through the denial of the principle of binary relations and the proclamation of, say, non-binary personalities, i.e. individuals who do not consider themselves to be of any gender, as well as other trends that we talked about earlier. In general, plurocentrism opens up many opportunities for modern civilizational choice. The worldview of conciliarity in this regard looks more hopeful and promising, but its careful and systematic development is necessary, taking into account the capabili-ties of modern technologies. Of course, there are no absolute boundaries between worldviews, one way or another there are whole lines of interactions, borrowings, but there are also rejections, re-sentment of elements of other worldviews. This was especially evident in modern conditions.

At the same time, it is extremely important to understand that analytical work on the study of worldviews should be based on a certain methodology. We have demonstrated the possibilities of the whole-part relationship methodology, which describes the behavior of the whole and parts in relation to each other. Now we will transfer these arguments to some problems that are discussed in one way or another in the world literature and have, of course, ideological content.

The first problem is globalization. For the last 30 years, this problem has been widely dis-cussed on the pages of various publications, and there are both active supporters and equally active opponents of globalization – it is too complex and contradictory a process.

The essence of globalization is that states, interacting with each other, find common points of contact, which creates conditions for new forms of cooperation, up to the formation of a certain sys-tem of states covered by the concept of one. The description of this process in the categories of whole and part means that the parts – states – gradually merge into a kind of community – a whole that could be called a megastate. Can such a megastate embody the establishment of a unipolar world? Such a process sooner or later leads to the oppression of the whole, since it is composed of parts. So this mechanism of globalization is both conceptually and practically doomed to failure. The creation of a certain whole – a megastate as one pole – in these conditions is very doubtful and unproductive, since the whole has nowhere to appear here.

Another variant of the formation of the whole can be realized provided that the independence and activity of the parts are preserved, which, interacting with each other, seem to "get used" to each other, acquire a common rhythm of functioning while preserving their own originality. In the language of the methodology of whole–part relations, this means the interaction of each part and all parts with the whole, which (the whole) begins to coordinate and direct their – parts – activities to strengthen this whole. In the language of geopolitics, this means the formation of a multipolar world based on the preservation of the integrity and equality of all states (parts) involved in this complex and lengthy process. And the final touch of the panorama of the worldview depicted by us in the article. In Janu-ary 2023, after the pandemic, the Davos Forum was held in person under the slogan "Cooperation in a fragmented world". It follows from the slogan that the forum participants formulated their vision of global problems in terms of the whole and part. Globalization as a whole is challenged: the world is fragmented, divided into parts (regions), new centers of activity are being formed. What's ahead?

The leading ideologist of the forum is the German economist Professor K. Schwab. He pre-sents his ideas in a number of publications, translated into Russian, among others. Let's look at what he writes in the light of the methodology of whole-part relationships. K. Schwab examines the transformations of the modern era and formulates far-reaching consequences. In particular, he states the following features of the modern era: interconnection, speed and complexity. Systemic relation-ships mean that solving any problem in isolation from others is meaningless and useless. Modern processes are proceeding extremely quickly, a culture of immediacy is being formed, a new phe-nomenon called the "dictatorship of urgency" is emerging. Complexity is associated with large amounts of information or a huge number of components (parts) in the system, the relationship be-tween them and the nonlinearity of processes as a key feature of complexity. Nonlinearity is often expressed in terms such as "butterfly effect", uncertainty, etc. "The fundamental point here is as fol-lows: complexity

limits our knowledge and understanding of things" [27, p. 15].

K. Schwab talks about the coming changes of a huge scale that will destroy our previous be-liefs, change our lives, work and communication. A system of total worldwide centralization of power controlling all spheres of human life will be created. People will have nothing and they will be happy. The elite who started the Great Reboot will own everything. New technologies will arise to change our behavior. The Fourth Industrial Revolution will change us as well. The multifaceted influence "will affect our identity and various facets of its manifestation: our ideas about privacy, about property, the nature of consumer behavior, how much time we devote to work and leisure, how we develop our career and improve our skills. This will affect how we make acquaintances and develop relationships, the hierarchies on which we depend, and our health. And, perhaps, faster than we can assume, this may lead to such forms of increasing human capabilities that will force us to question the very nature of human existence. Such changes cause us joyful excitement and at the same time fear ..." [28, p. 78].

If we translate the paintings of the future depicted by K. Schwab into the language of the methodology of whole-part wearing, then we get the following. Total control by a Single center over everything that happens in society means increased activity of some parts as part of a whole and suppression of others: people will have nothing, but they will be happy. But by suppressing the parts, the whole perishes itself. The ideologist of the Forum actually paints pictures of the coming destruction of humanity, which once again makes us think about the event projections of whole-part relationships.

So, firstly, the analysis of the processes of modernity always assumes as its basis a certain worldview, explicitly or implicitly present. It is good if this position is realized and clearly ex-pressed. It is necessary to take into account semantic intentions, points of divergence of worldviews and their mutual influence.

Secondly, philosophy as a theoretical basis of the worldview is necessary for understanding the modern world. It is required for a more accurate and subtle understanding of what is happening to us, representing a kind of laboratory of ideas, where the analytical and conceptual accuracy of the problems discussed is revealed. Dialectics as a teaching about the universal connection, develop-ment and transformation of reality will be quite useful here.

Thirdly, effective methodologies are needed, among which, hopefully, the methodology of whole-part relations, which allows a systematic perception of the world in all its complexity and de-veloping methods of its transformation, is far from the last.