Part II. GLOBALISTICS, GLOBAL STUDIES, AND GLOBAL PROCESSES

Global Studies in Modern Science

Ilya V. Ilyin and Arkadi D. Ursul

The authors consider it necessary to determine the status of Globalistics and the place of the scientific exploration of global processes in modern science, to build a common vision and estimate the prospects for Global Studies. Irrespective of either a narrow or broad definition of the subject, Globalistics is assumed to be only a part of a broader scientific field – Global Studies, as well as a part of the general process of globalizing science. It is shown that to change the subject field of Globalistics as well as of Global Studies (that expand that field) one needs not only historical, but also evolutionary vision both of the already studied global processes and of new challengers for the same 'role', including global natural processes.

It is shown that Vladimir I. Vernadsky conducted a pioneer research in Global Studies, and many of his ideas extended to a planetary scale. One can speak about his anticipation of a special – that is a global – stage and development trend in science in general, as well as of his anticipation of the age of globalization in human history. Vernadsky's idea of the 'planetary' character of scientific thought has already acquired a specific shape both in the global processes taking place in the world and their understanding, and in anticipation of future social and socio-natural evolutionary processes.

Keywords: *globalization, Globalistics, Global Studies, global knowledge, global education, global processes, global evolutionism, historical approach, Evolutionary Globalistics.*

Global Stage in the Development of Science

The research in global processes was a logic scientific response to the global challenges of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The comprehension of the important role of globalization, global problems and other planetary-scale phenomena, as well as understanding of the prospects of further expansion of cumulative global activities became an important milestone in the elaboration of scientific paradigm and scientific worldview. Earlier the augmentation of scientific knowledge occurred most effectively within certain scientific disciplines through further differentiation and specialization. But today as one can observe in the majority of scientific disciplines, including Global Studies, the leading position is taken both by the interdisciplinary knowledge synthesis and the synthesis process between fundamental and applied studies, forming and extending the integration

and globalization waves throughout the science and education spheres. However, Global Studies become a leader of current scientific and educational process not only because of their integrative and general scientific potential, but also because they become a new important constituent of the present-day scientific worldview as well as due to a number of other fundamental circumstances, which together have significantly boosted the growth of the scientific knowledge on the global scale.

Notwithstanding the rapid and spontaneous development of studies of global processes and the emergence of a corresponding type of education in the world, a justified concept and strategy for their further theoretical and practical development have not been defined yet. Currently, the notions and subject fields of Globalistics and Global Studies have not been defined, as well as the essence and prospects of the globalization phenomenon and, in particular, globalization of science and education. Besides, the relations between the newly emerging Global Studies branches and traditional disciplines have not been identified and evaluated either. In this connection, it has become necessary to develop a common concept of the global phenomena in contemporary science and estimate the prospects for the development of Globalistics and Global Studies.

When speaking about the origins of Global Studies, it is not often recalled that global ideas in many branches of knowledge belong to Vernadsky. Meanwhile, the studies of global and planetary processes have originated from Vernadsky to a considerable extent, whereas Vernadsky attributed much importance to science in terms of creating the 'sphere of human thought' (*noosphere*). In addition, the formation of the sphere of 'human thought' starts when the scientific ideas reach the global and even universal scale. Vernadsky constantly emphasized this idea in his works: 'Under the influence of the scientific ideas and human labor, bioshpere is transformed into *noosphere*. Humankind, logically moving over a period of a million years or so with ever increasing pace, inhabits the whole planet, separates and moves away from other living beings as a new unprecedented geological force' (Vernadsky 1991). When globalization of science (currently, that notion is quite often used) is considered, most publications refer to the academic mobility, 'brain drain', the planet-scale knowledge expansion, publications and citations, applying of new emerging information technologies, international cooperation and formation of international scientific organizations (quite often aimed at solving global problems), which contribute to international and global expansion of science. However, hereby we will not consider these 'activity-based', often generally sociological or science-based aspects, which generally confirm the establishment of the scientific thought as a 'planetary phenomenon' (Allakhverdyan *et al.* 2009; Kozhanov 2010). It makes sense to consider the aspect of globalization of science, which is connected with Global Studies development that is insufficiently studied in recent publications on the Globalistics-related issues.

Many scientific fields get a global dimension mostly under the influence of Globalistics and Global Studies. However, not only Globalistics, but other Global Studies also generate global knowledge and contribute to the increasing globalization of science. Globalization of science manifests itself in the emergence of global characteristics and features, which during the 'pre-globalization period' were absent or not perceived (as, for instance, they did not use the word 'globalization' for the issues which Vernadsky spoke about although one can hardly deny today that was the point).

At the same time, one should not reduce the scientist's impact on science on the global scale just to his pioneer research in Global Studies, and that many of his ideas extended to a planetary scale. Perhaps, it is possible to speak about his anticipation of a special – global – stage and general development trend of science, the age of globalization in history of humankind. Vernadsky's idea on the 'planetary' nature of scientific thought has already acquired its specific shape both in the global processes taking place in the world and their understanding, and in anticipation of future social and socio-natural evolutionary processes.

The formation of Globalistics in Russian literature is often dated from the end of the 1960s till the beginning of the 1970s. As A. I. Kostin notes, that period was characterized by a profound study of two global issues of modern times – the space exploration and environmental protection (Kostin 2003; 2005: 21). This does not mean that other issues which later were called global were in no way covered in the academic literature. They were just not perceived as global issues connected with each other, although some of them were studied by the scientists, following mondialism – the ideology and movement, aimed at the transition from the current variety of forms of the planet's human population practices to the unified globally managed world. In addition, in order to maintain the international peace and safety, the United Nations Organization was created in 1945, aimed at solving the global problem of war and peace.

As one can see, at least three above-mentioned global issues were already studied and perceived from the middle of the last century, but they were analyzed separately from each other, although their universal and planetary status was obvious. There were well-known reasons and circumstances for understanding the problem of war and peace, while for the research of space exploration that was the launch of the first satellite and the first man in space by the USSR. The problem of environmental protection was driven by the first UN Conference on the Human Environment that took place in Stockholm in 1972. As regards the issue of space exploration, the time of its first evaluation can be shifted from the end of the 1960s to the middle or even the early 20th century, when the works on philosophical aspects of space exploration first appeared in the world literature (Ursul 1964; Faddeyev 1964).

However, that is not the main point, but rather that the start of formation of Globalistics can be shifted even to the first half of the last century. It was particularly during that period of time, in the second half of the 1930s, that the global process, which we currently consider to be globalization, started to be investigated, but was not yet denoted by the term 'globalization'. Thus, Vernadsky put forward the following ideas: 'For the first time in the history of the Earth, the human being colonized its whole surface and humankind became a single totality in the life of the Earth' (Vernadsky 1991: 240). In his book the scholar gives the same facts and arguments, as the contemporary scientists do, indicating the humankind endeavour to its unity and integrity. In fact, it is the globalization process that is being researched hereby. But if the term 'globalization' was not used, can we argue that Vernadsky started to study the globalization process much earlier than the scientists of the late 20th century? What is more important: the introduction of a term or investigation of the process itself? Apparently, the latter is more important, but there are also proponents of the linguistics contribution to the problem, who consider that globalization started from the last decades of the 20th century.

When reading Vernadsky's work 'Scientific Thought and Scientific Work as the Geological Force in Biosphere' (Vernadsky 1991: 13–190), one comes to realize that the scientist considers, in fact, the same issues that we usually come across in many works on Global Studies, in particular, the globalization issues (though in Vernadsky's works the terms 'global' and 'globalization' were not used). Instead, he uses the term 'planetary', sometimes 'universal', which has almost the same meaning in his works. The scientist believed that

> for the first time in the history of mankind we are in the situation of the *unified historical process, fully embracing the whole planet's biosphere.* The complex historical processes have just completed, which continuously and autonomously had been going on during the life-span of several generations, and which eventually... in the 20th century led to the creation of *the unified and inextricably interconnected entity...* And, perhaps, the most importantly is that the material and solid connectivity of the humankind and its culture is rapidly and inevitably deepening and strengthening... The increase in the universality, connectivity of all human societies is continuously growing and becoming obvious almost every year... (Vernadsky 1991: 82)

From the very beginning the scientist developed in his works the concept of the *noosphere* within the planetary-wide perception as a worldview of noospheric globalism, according to which globalization and noosphere formation ideas appeared to be combined in a peculiar integral form of worldview. In his scientific works, Vernadsky was several decades ahead in the perception of global processes in society and science, which enables us to consider him not only one of the founders of global world perception (nobody would argue this fact), but even the founder of Global Studies (Ilyin and Ursul 2012).

Later, in the second half of the 20th century, the global processes perception originated in the studies of global issues, while in the last decades – it manifested in the study of the globalization processes. That even became the basis to determine 'Globalistics' as 'an interdisciplinary branch of scientific studies, aimed at identification of the essence of globalization, the causes of its emergence and development trends, as well as the analysis of its positive and negative implications' (Chumakov 2012: 5).

In recent years, starting from the publication of the monograph *Evolutionary Globalistics* (Ilyin and Ursul 2009), we are inclined to indicate the beginning of the next development stage of Globalistics and Global Studies, which concern not only globalization and global issues but the whole range of global processes (including natural planetary-scale processes). As a result, globalization of the whole science is accelerating. That stage could be nominally called 'evolutionary', but since it has only started, it makes sense to wait for a more adequate name for it.

The globalization of science primarily manifests itself in the emergence and development of Globalistics and Global Studies in the broadest sense. Their impact on the other part of the scientific knowledge constitutes a significant part of the globalization of science, however not to such a considerable degree yet. However, it is not the only component of the science globalization process: indeed, the 'global seedlings' in any particular scientific discipline or issue can spontaneously appear regardless of the application of the results of the performed global research, and cannot lead to the emergence of global trends

within the fields of research. Thereby, science can be gradually 'saturated' with some, perhaps, not yet significant global knowledge, which will not lead to significant transformations similar to the origin of a new global discipline.

One can also point that an obvious process of scientific knowledge globalization is taking place, when, for instance, 'global' is somehow added to the already existing sciences (disciplines) either in the form of a branch within Globalistics, or the term 'global' is placed before the name of the branch of science. Economics which becomes *Global* Economics typifies here and also generalizes those new phenomena that have emerged in the world economy within the last decades and will continue to occur under the influence of globalization and other global processes.

Perhaps, in the near future we will witness the emergence of Global Political Science that will appear in addition to Political Globalistics, included in the subject matter of Globalistics (Ursul and Ilyin 2010). Here the major factor is the dominant impact of either Globalistics or Political Science. Another example is Geopolitics which is not included in Globalistics (although it is closely connected with it), but which is already obtaining the global character (and even claims for the cosmic continuation). This is the development path that will be taken by many scientific disciplines under the influence of the 'global attractor' of growing knowledge. Within a short period of time we will witness that many established and traditional disciplines will get 'global' addition to their names, as it has already happened with the 'cosmic' addition under the influence of space exploration and development of astronomy. Thanks to Globalistics, an increasing number of scientific fields become globally oriented and are included in the scope of Global Studies, enriching and expanding them. Some of them can still be included in Globalistics and will enlarge it, while others can remain outside the Globalistics purview and enrich Global Studies. The further evolution of Global Studies will occur both due to the 'globalization' of the currently existing scientific disciplines and fields, as well as the Globalistics development together with other fields of scientific inquiry that will be globalized to a certain extent.

The Expansion of the Subject Field of Globalistics

As it has been stated above, until recently in Russian academic literature Globalistics has been most commonly defined as an interdisciplinary and integrative field of scientific inquiry, focused on the identification of the essence of globalization and global issues, causes of their formation, laws and trends in their development, encouraging the positive implications and mitigation of the negative implications, aimed at maintaining the humankind survival and biosphere preservation (that notion was included in the first international encyclopaedia on Globalistics: Mazour and Chumakov 2003: 199).

However, in a recent article, one of the authors of the above stated definition has already defined Globalistics as '*the interdisciplinary field of scientific studies, focused on the identification of the essence of globalization, causes of its emergence and development trends, as well as the analysis of its positive and negative implications*' (Chumakov 2012: 5). So global problems are not mentioned any more, since they are considered the implications of the centuries-long natural and historical process of globalization and its consequent result. *One can quite agree with the statement that globalization gives rise to global problems, should the literature provide arguments in favour of their unambigu-*

ous cause-and-effect relationships. That would be the way, if globalization was the sole global process causing global problems. However, in our opinion, there are other global processes (some of them will be mentioned further on), and thus, mere logical reasoning does not allow supposing that global issues are caused solely by globalization.

There exists a broader approach. For instance, Ulrich Beck argues that global problems originate in the non-linear character of the world development (Beck 2001: 23–26). One can generally agree with that statement: the emergence of global issues is the result of the humankind overall historical development in which globalization played a certain role. The question is whether globalization was the only and the major factor. However, it will be not so easy to determine which global problems result from the preceding globalization processes and which – from other global processes and the worldwide process of civilization development. Besides, such an approach does not seem to be a proper way of research. That is why it seems logical to use the definitions of Globalistics which present it as an investigation of humankind in its planetary-wide entirety (Cheshkov 1998: 129; Fedotov 1999: 20; Ursul 2008). We consider this approach to interpreting Globalistics as quite promising; however, one should add here the issues concerning the interactions between civilization and nature.

It is worth noting the facts demonstrating that global issues originate not only from globalization (if we consider that globalization started just several centuries ago, as for instance, within the Europe-centric approach – with the geographic discoveries). If we consider the earlier humankind history, we will be able to find the processes similar to the global issues occurring as early as in the Palaeolithic and during the transition from the Palaeolithic to the Mesolithic and Neolithic. One can consider that global issues in a somewhat different form appeared earlier at the times as well, when globalization was not present yet in the sense it is currently understood by the scientists.

Vernadsky discusses these processes and speaks about mastering fire, one of the natural forces, and he calls it 'a great discovery' and even 'a planetary revolution' conducted by a man. According to the scientist, this discovery was made, in one or two places and slowly spread among people. Thus, mastering fire gradually became planetary-scale and helped humankind to survive during the Ice Age (Vernadsky 1991: 136).

The second planetary-scale process that Vernadsky highlights is the transition from hunting and gathering to food production. It is doubtful whether the transition to the Neolithic (the Agro-neolithic revolution) can be considered as the globalization process, although such a point of view exists. However, there is no doubt that this is a peculiar global-systemic and socio-natural process of humankind development, covering thousands of years.

Before the transition to the food production, the hunter-gatherer economy was extensively spreading across the planet. At that point there occurred an economic 'clash' between the mode of subsistence and the local-regional conditions, which are essentially global restrictions manifested in each ecosystem of the planet (depending on the biodiversity of the area the hunters and gatherers needed dozens of square kilometres to supply subsistence). It led to global crisis of this primary economic mode and of the type of life support at the planetary scale.

Hereby one can clearly observe the spatial expansion of that economic mode that was extensive in its nature with the trend of the hunter-gatherer bands getting closer from

the geographic standpoint. However, the extensive development of that economic pattern encountered not only local, but also global implications and constraints. They were caused partly by the extirpation of the megafauna as the major source of protein-rich food, as well as by its possible disappearance due to the changed natural climatic and ecological conditions.

The clash of the hunter-gather economy with the above-mentioned local-global (glocal) constraints resulted in the planetary-wide food-related crisis during the Upper Palaeolithic period and a significant decrease in the planet's population (approximately by the order of magnitude[1]). The continuation of that extensive type of economy could result in the extinction of forming humankind and objectively required the transition to a principally new way of interacting with the nature, enabling survival of population in various areas of the planet.

It was just at that period of time that the global crisis not only in terms of the type of economy (hunting and gathering) occurred, but actually, in terms of humankind's existence as well; it can be rather compared with the emerging set of current global problems, which also predict either the collapse or a transition again to a new socio-natural economic mode and simultaneously – the survival of civilization. Solving the planetary-wide problems of the higher Palaeolithic led to the formation of the productive economy as a conceptually new process and the deployment of a number of humankind development trends that were later perceived as the globalization processes. As we can see, something similar to the current global processes had already occurred during the ancient history, and now the humankind virtually faces the similar problem of survival and of the formation of a new economic type as well as securing its own safe existence on the planet.

Globalistics can be perceived not only as a multi- and interdisciplinary, integrative and general field of science, but as a currently expanding global practical activity (in particular, following Vernadsky's ideas, as the geologic activity), aimed at the mentioned promotion of positive implications and mitigation of the negative ones of those processes as regards the humans and biosphere. In this connection, in a broad perspective Globalistics is considered not only in the scientific and research aspect, but also as a social and activity-based aspect. It 'embraces' global issues, processes and systems as objective phenomena which it not only studies, but to which it is directly relevant via subject-practical global activity. Thus, Globalistics as a scientific thought and its manifestation in the global activity contributes to the global (universal) evolution.

Since Globalistics can be interpreted not only as a scientific field, but also as a sphere of human activities, taking or already having the planetary-wide scale, in that sense it is similar to informatics and space science whose intensive development somewhat preceded the development of the phenomenon under study in the present paper. Besides, those branches of scientific inquiry also brought about such trends as advancement of information and space technologies, as well as the development of corresponding industrial and economic networks. However, here we will speak only about the scientific aspect of Globalistics, and not issues of global economic, political, legal or some other activities, since many currently existing practices have been developing their global dimensions.

[1] One of such global natural catastrophes took place approximately 75 thousand years ago, when the eruption of Toba super-volcano in Indonesia resulted in the drastic (by no less than an order of magnitude) decrease in the number of the human predecessors.

With respect to the further analysis it is important to note that the formation of Globalistics is also connected with the development of the planetary-scale scientific studies and with the trend of globalization of science.

The position of Globalistics in the system of scientific knowledge and at the level of the scientific worldview has not been defined clearly enough. We can only welcome the attempts to solve this problem, which are covered in the article by Alexander Chumakov and a number of other works (*e.g.*, Cheshkov 2005). In our opinion, Globalistics is the major subject field, a certain 'core' of the of Global Studies area, which is called 'Global Studies' in English-language literature. Although in the Russian-language literature that word combination is translated as *глобалистика* ('Globalistics'), we are convinced that it has been appropriate only at the initial stage of 'comparison' of the Russian and foreign research in the similar or adjacent fields of research.

If we reduce the subject field of Globalistics to globalization alone or add global issues hereto as well, then other global phenomena inherently included in Globalistics, will prove to be included in the subject field of Global Studies. Here we meet an unidentified and not always evident difference between Globalistics and Global Studies: as currently nobody can provide an unequivocal definition of Globalistics then all other global processes will be included in the purview of Global Studies. By the way, Globalistics in that sense is also included in Global Studies. That is why the task of identifying its subject field as differing from that of Global Studies, appears to be not so fundamentally important, as it seemed earlier (although it remains necessary).

Currently, it is difficult to state, whether one should equal Globalistics with Global Studies, as it quite often happens. Time will show whether it is a right choice, but even today one can argue that Global Studies are much broader than Globalistics, at least because Globalistics (in particular, in terms of its narrow definitions) does not and will not comprise a number of fields of those studies.

Globalistics is an interdisciplinary and integrative field of the scientific knowledge, which acting as a certain 'global attractor' has already started to engage various other disciplines, thus expanding its subject field. In that sense, Globalistics, even if it focuses only on the phenomenon of globalization, will any way continue to expand its subject field through the interactions with other disciplines. In addition, it has been empirically proved that on the interfaces between a number of scientific areas there have appeared the historical, political, information, legal, cosmic and other forms (branches) of Globalistics, which expand its discipline-specific field, and it seems that this process is just about to involve the most fields of scientific knowledge.

That expansion is still characterized by undefined limits, but it is evident that Globalistics cannot embrace the full scope of science, even at the stage of its ever increasing globalization. Global Studies go beyond the limits of Globalistics and generally involve many, if not all, scientific fields (a priori excluding only those having a fundamentally local or regional character). Globalistics may follow the path of the space sciences that have been significantly expanded as a result of the practical space exploration, but at the same time it gave rise to the formation of quite a large number of scientific fields with the 'cosmic addition' – cosmic physics, cosmic biology and medicine, *etc*., which is considered as the science 'cosmization' process.

That is why alongside with the further development of Globalistics, the globalization of scientific knowledge has started, impacting an ever increasing number of disciplines. Anyway, it seems possible that the majority of scientific fields will still avoid 'giving away' their fields of Global Studies in favour of the subject field of Globalistics, as has already happened with the global economics (the name 'economic Globalistics' is not used just for that reason). Even 'legal Globalistics' that has already obtained its name, will probably change its name to 'global jurisprudence' or continue Global Studies in that area (Ursul 2012a). Along with 'political Globalistics', the term 'global politics' is used, especially in foreign literature (Anheier and Juergensmeyer 2012).

That is the way how two closely interdependent but anyway different processes are occurring – globalization of knowledge (within the process of the broadly perceived Global Studies) and the formation of global knowledge, mainly due to the development of Globalistics as such (Ursul 2011a). It has been often noted in the literature that in the last two decades Globalistics switched to the research in globalization, paying less attention to the study of the global issues. Besides, if earlier the subject field of Globalistics included only the research in global issues (Dubnov 1991–1992), now most scientists focus their research mainly on globalization. While other global phenomena within the subject field of Globalistics receive insufficient attention, anyway it seems that global issues and globalization constitute the main subject of research in Globalistics.

Meanwhile, when Globalistics was still associated with the research in global issues, globalization was also developing, although in different forms. The global process, which we currently consider as 'globalization', has also been represented to a certain extent in the scientific literature (including Vernadsky's works), however, that process was not yet identified as 'globalization'. And this refers not only to Vernadsky, but to other scientists as well, for instance, Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein studied the same process within their own approaches.

However, there also exists quite a strong connection to the term 'globalization'. From that 'terminological point of view' it is often considered that the term was coined by Roland Robertson[2], who used it for the first time in 1983. He used the term 'globality' in the title of one of his articles, later he analyzed and explained the notion of 'globalization', and then, in 1992 he developed a holistic conception presented in a special study (Robertson 1983, 1992).

If we now reduce Globalistics only to the globalization research, it is quite possible that after a while one or several global processes will start that will draw the most scientists' attention, and then there will be a need to redefine the notion of Globalistics. Otherwise, as it has already been stated above, all other global processes should be shifted to the subject field of Global Studies.

Within current discussions on globalization, most scientists focus their attention on the social aspect, considering that globalization represents a mega-trend towards the unification of humankind and the civilization global entity (Granin 2008). However, the imminent threat of anthropological and ecological catastrophe has demonstrated the simultaneous necessity to solve the full range of social and socio-natural problems as well as to develop

[2] In this connection, it seems appropriate to state that one of this article's authors used the term 'globalization' in a different context before Robertson (see, *e.g.,* Ursul 1981: 204).

the co-evolutionary relations between the society and environment, *i.e.* humanity's future integration must be combined with ecological safety at the planetary scale. From this perspective, globalization is a global process of humanity's integration and, simultaneously, the formation of the co-evolutionary relations with nature, which can be realized through the global transition to sustainable commitment to noosphere.

The notions of 'globalization', 'globalism', 'Global Studies', and 'Globalistics' derive from the term 'global'. Meanwhile, it is important to note that there exist various interpretations of the term 'global' (Ilyin *et al.* 2012). The work within various areas of Global Studies results in both globalization of science, as well as in the creation of a particular form of scientific-interdisciplinary knowledge, which it is reasonable to call the global knowledge, that is the knowledge that reflects all global processes and systems existing and developing on the Earth within the framework of the planetary-wide unity and evolutionary significance.

Evolutionary Aspect of Global Studies

Vernadsky, who was at the origin of Global Studies, primarily studied natural (mainly geological) planetary (that is global processes), as they are currently named, which until recently have been missing in the scientific discourse in the current research in global phenomena. We also suggest including global natural processes in the field of Globalistics, and that corresponds to Vernadsky's ideas (although, perhaps, it is more relevant to Global Studies in the broad sense). Should one include these processes in Global Studies, and, in particular, in Globalistics? Or should they remain, as before, within the sphere of natural sciences, for instance, of Earth sciences? And should Globalistics limit to only social and humanitarian research?

The issue of inclusion of the global natural processes in the scope of Globalistics escaped scientists' attention for a long time, since many of them were actually engaged in the sphere of social and humanitarian knowledge, especially due to an extensive research in globalization processes. Global Studies should take a certain account of the global natural processes, as their impact on the society's (and vice versa) development is evident. And if they are introduced into Globalistics or Global Studies, they should be introduced not in the form in which they are considered in Earth sciences, but rather in connection with the mutual influence with the humans and humankind.

In principle, the whole range of the existing global processes (and the global systems they form) can be now subdivided into three groups: social, socio-natural and natural processes, which emerge, develop and manifest themselves on the planetary-wide scale (that classification differs from the classification of the global issues). The given classification of the global processes provides a clearly defined evolutionary approach: first, the global processes were natural, then with the development of social stage of evolution there appeared social and socio-natural processes, which Vernadsky considered as the geological anthropogenic process. The application of the evolutionary approach in Globalistics contributes to the formation of the new trend or even of a new stage in the development of Global Studies, which has already been named Evolutionary Globalistics (Ilyin and Ursul 2009).

If the evolutionary approach is applied to Global Studies, there will be a need to provide a more grounded and definite answer to the question regarding the expediency of including natural global processes in Globalistics. Perhaps, it makes sense to include global natural processes only into the subject field of Global Studies in their broad interpretation. However, since they have already been included in Evolutionary Globalistics, they will continue to be represented in that field, even if in the course of time Globalistics appears to be an interdisciplinary but at the same time social and humanitarian knowledge. However, irrespective of these prospects, in principle, it is necessary to determine how the global processes evolve, starting from the global natural processes. The issue is not only in the mutual influence between people and planetary processes, but also the way in which an inanimate nature in its globality resulted in the biological and later in social evolution. Is there certain continuity in the evolution of global processes?

In fact, until the emergence of Evolutionary Globalistics many natural and other global processes were not treated as proper global phenomena, included in the subject field of Globalistics. Within the purview of then significantly differentiated science, those were considered as the subject of only natural scientists' research. In fact, in its fully developed form globalism as a worldview system with prevalence of the planetary-wide characteristics and constraints, has been formulated rather recently in terms of historical time, and not during the Axial Age, when there existed solely ‘seeds’ of many worldview approaches. However, as with the application of the evolutionary approach to Globalistics there takes place a synthesis of globalism and evolutionism, therefore it was extremely important at first to expand the ‘nomenclature’ of global processes, at the same time identifying their role in the humankind's further life-sustaining activities.

In the second half of the last century within the process of the global mentality formation there appeared such a worldview-related phenomenon, as globalism, which has a significant and even a determinant influence on Global Studies as well as on the education sector. Globalism is generally understood as the worldview, based on the perception of the Earth as an entirety and the humankind as an interconnected world community, having a common destiny and responsibility for the planet's future. Globalism is a way to view the world, which humankind inhabits, as the global world with prevailing planetary-wide characteristics, including the time-spatial ones. Such a broad perception of globalism stems from the Vernadsky's scientific works.

On the one hand, globalism as a systemic and planetary-wide worldview, significantly expands the time-space features of social and socio-natural interactions to cover the scope of the Earth's biosphere. However, on the other hand, that expansion is limited by the planetary (biosphere-related) constraints, which put an objective limit for the further expansion of social and socio-natural processes and assume their ‘contraction’ and attaining the holistic nature within the scope of the biosphere (excluding the possibilities for the further cosmic expansion that is still associated with large difficulties). Besides, quite often the spatial, temporal or other constraints presented by the natural factors, are not even mentioned in the works on Global Studies.

Meanwhile, the forming global world attains its entity not only under the influence of the human activities, but also of the natural – global constraints and specific features. The global world appears holistic, although constrained by the socio-natural interactions

on the planet, influencing and even determining all the other processes on the planet. The most evident constraints include not only geographical constraints, defining the limits to further extensive development, but also the exhaustible character of natural resources and global ecological threat, *etc*. Those also include the constraints of temporal nature, associated with spatial constraints, quite often providing the time-related limits to the development of particular processes on the Earth, including the existence of humankind.

Eschatological topics are abundant in pseudoscientific and scientific literature, as well as in mass media (Ursul A. and Ursul T. 2013). Besides, the global warming or the hypothetical forthcoming Little Ice Age are not the only future threats to the planet caused by natural processes. The Earth is expected to be threatened, for instance, by volcanic activity, since the seismic activity is increasing, the main danger will be posed not so much by the volcanoes but by the super-volcanoes (more than two dozens of them are known on the planet with quite rare eruptions [approximately one per 100,000 years]), as well as the danger posed by asteroids and comets. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries Konstantin Tsiolkovsky drew attention to those constraints; he proposed to eliminate them by means of inventing a rocket as a transportation vehicle for the cosmic exploration.

Karl Jaspers (1994) was probably the first among the philosophers who focused on these constraints. The philosopher perceived those constraints manifested via particular terrestrial catastrophes that currently draw attention of the environmental scientists and other experts who are concerned about environmental degradation and depletion of natural resources. According to the German philosopher, natural resource depletion represents the major threat to our planet's future and he believes that: 'carelessness, with which the limited raw materials reserves are used, any way provides a chance to assume the possibility or probability of the full depletion of these reserves in the future' (Jaspers 1994: 159). However, that issue has currently faded into insignificance relative to the necessity to preserve the environment as the natural basis for life and intelligence in the biosphere. Besides, Jaspers speaks not only about the possibility of natural resources depletion, but also the coming cooling down of the Earth, 'which will result in the life decline'(Jaspers 1994: 413).

Globalization, global issues and other global processes closely connected with the cosmic processes emerged exactly due to the spatial spherical form and, consequently, circularity of our planet as a celestial body, global limitation of the globe and its biosphere in which human activities are unfolding. Globalization and a number of other socio-natural global processes have been already 'predetermined' by the natural characteristics of the globe. Globalization proved to be caused by the natural characteristics and peculiarities of the biosphere and even by the cosmic features of the planet as a celestial body. That has defined the spatial-natural specific features of all global processes, including globalization and global issues.

That specific feature of globalism as a particular world perception is not always understood in full. The trends which are expanding and connecting society's fragments are quite often emphasized, although the emerging restrictions and limits turn out to be inherently connected with that spatial-temporal expansion. The spatial aspect of globalism was the first one to be realized. At some point, the Club of Rome put forward a 'spatial-territorial' slogan – 'think globally, act locally' – which some scientists consider almost fundamental

in modern Globalistics (Leybin 2003). Meanwhile, that 'principle of Globalistics' already in its brief representation contains an evident contradiction and, in fact, a 'spatial gap' between thinking and acting.

Much earlier, Vernadsky noted that the human as 'the planet inhabitant'

> must think and act within the new aspect, not only within the aspect of an individual, family or kin, states or their alliances, but also within the planetary aspect. As any living being, he can think and act within the planetary aspect only in the field of life – the *biosphere*, within a particular planetary cover with which he is inextricably, consistently connected and which he cannot leave. His existence is its function. He takes it with him everywhere he goes (Vernadsky 1991: 28).

As we can see, the scientist realized the role of humankind as the global factor of development but did not divide thinking and practical activities into local and planetary spatial components.

However, in addition to the spatial one, the temporal aspect of global thinking plays an important role as well (Ursul 2012b). When considering the globalism notion it is hardly possible to confine oneself only to the spatial aspect, what in fact happened 'by default'. Such a 'spatial-based' world perception within the framework of globalism breaks the actual interrelations of space and time (Vernadsky always objected this point) in thinking and activity. It is important to identify the specific features of the global worldview. Besides, as it has already been stated above, in terms of temporal aspect one can see that the temporal range, as well as the perspective of the global processes perception (concerning both the past and the future) will be expanded significantly, and the non-linear nature and system interactions between the periods (moduses) of the time will be taken into account as well. The expansion of the perception horizon concerns both the past and the future, not to mention the present, but at the same time there is a necessity to focus on the futurization process, which generates the emergence of the advance mechanisms in all spheres of activity (Ursul 2012c).

The globalization (along with futurization) of the time is less evident than globalization of space, but due to the essential interdependence between space and time, the latter acquires new characteristics, which are not so significant for the 'pre-global' world perception. The global approach enables to perceive the humankind future not as a simple and continuing expansion of the Oecumene, but rather introduces fundamentally new non-linear adjustments in the prospects of the evolutionary processes, involving humans.

Although Global Studies included the historical dynamics (the origin and development of global knowledge is sometimes considered as the historical Globalistics) (Ionov 2001; Shestova 2011) nevertheless, the purposeful application of the evolutionary-related perceptions as regards the research in the global processes was not of the focused and systemic nature. In part it was connected with the fact that the subject field of Globalistics was limited by the on-going, that is mainly contemporary social and historical processes (and the focus on globalization), which were not considered (and even sometimes negated) to include the long-term mega-trends and evolutionary retrospectives and perspectives. However, the expansion of the subject field of Globalistics and Global Studies has

required the evolutionary perception of both the currently studied global processes, as well as the new candidates to the same 'role'.

Evolutionary Globalistics (Global Studies) as a form of scientific knowledge is developing as a conceptual interdisciplinary approach to the study of the global processes and systems in the evolutionary perspective and, primarily, on the basis of the results obtained within the research in global (universal) evolutionism. In this connection, it is necessary to note the correlation between historical and evolutionary approaches in Globalistics. Historical Globalistics appears to be rather as a description and, to a certain degree, a factual-temporal reflection of the world dynamics of the human existence, while Evolutionary Globalistics can be considered as the study of the evolution and co-evolution of global processes and of their systemic-synergetic phenomenon – the global development.

Leonid Grinin argues that 'in contrast to the historical method, the evolutionary method of the processes and phenomena analysis considers not the full scope of temporal changes, but rather solely the most important, qualitative changes and transformations (reorganizations), and estimates the directions of such changes, for instance, if they provide for an increase or decrease; a new evolutionary level or a phenomenon similar to the biological adaptive radiation; if the historical-genetic link can be traced, or if it is not possible to ascertain such a connection' (Grinin 2011: 106). The evolutionary approach also differs from the logical one, which is opposed to the historical method.

The historical approach, as an olden one in comparison with the evolutionary approach, is considered more as the description and, to a certain degree, the comprehension of the existential-processional dynamics of human existence. At first, within its scope it did not extend to the nature-related aspects. The evolutionary perceptions were 'entwined' into the historical approach to a certain degree, but they are not emphasized, and those are still to be singled out within the process of creation the picture of the process under study. However, the situation is changing, and if History as a science covers the nature, it will not be the history of the society, but at least, the socio-natural history.

The term 'history' is ambivalent: in its ontological meaning, history is considered as the chronological sequence of already completed events of the human society's global existence. Within epistemological perspective, history is the science dealing with the phenomenon of the human and humankind, all types and forms of human activities that have taken place in time and space of historical process. History is considered as the science about the past: the historical phenomena that are of interest within the history science are, primarily, the events that have happened before, facts, processes (Learning… 2011). However, the historian deals not with the past per se, but rather with the information it left it in the present, which he then analyses, meanwhile the accumulation of information within the material forms constitutes the progress in history (Medushevskaya 2010: 72; Medushevsky 2009).

History as a science appears as a collective memory about the past of the humankind; it performs the function of retaining the knowledge about the civilization and culture. Historians also believe that the retrospective study of the historical process enables to understand humankind's current situations, which is essential for the evaluation of the prospects and place in the universe, its destiny, ways and methods to enable the survival and subsequent development.

Science studies historical processes which to some extent contain information about the evolution of the subject (and of the object) of the research. In addition, the historical approach to a particular degree provides the research into the processes of the emergence, development, maturity, deterioration and collapse of the studied phenomena. The past, in one way or another, objectively always (or almost always) comprises evolution, understood as the development in the broadest sense. However, from the theoretical view, they are not always reflected adequately enough. There have existed a point of view which considered the historical process either as a progress or a regress or a cyclical process – quite recently one have to discard that viewpoint. It became clear that history contains a larger range of development pathways and trends than it was considered by the proponents of humankind's unilinear movement in time.

Historical and evolutionary processes are quite often inextricably connected within History as a science and one can hardly separate them; thus, such a division depends on the objectives of the research performed. When the historical process is considered from the evolutionary standpoint, the focus is on the results of the actual development process, that is, as a rule, on the progress or regress of the object under study.

Today the majority of scientists follow the idea, which has already been stated above, that increasing deterioration-regressive trends are clearly determined in the historical process, anticipating in that way or another 'the end of history'. If we take it not as an allegory, but rather as a possible tragic end of the humankind existence, that, in particular, will mean the coming of the time, when humankind history ends, and, consequently, there will be no historians afterwards (if not to consider the possibility of the existence of their extra-terrestrial colleagues).

The efforts to resist the further deterioration of humankind (*e.g.*, in the form of implementing the global sustainable development strategy) suggest rejecting the perception of the future as a chaotic and linear continuation of the human history. There appears a new perception of the future that does not fit the traditional historical schemes and requires introducing new ideas and approaches with a fundamental evolutionary content into the history science. The purported 'long-term history' can now be considered as a particular futurological 'normative evolution' of the whole human civilization, whose strategic objective will be to sustain life in the natural environment.

Thus, the traditional linear representation of history as a chaotic process is not viable any more, as in order to continue history one should not only describe the events that have happened, but also develop the 'required' future to enable the survival of civilization. The history will continue to focus on humankind's existential-processional dynamics, but will have to take a larger account of the desirable evolutionary direction of the genesis process. The perception of our common safe and sustainable global future will most likely play the central role in this 'evolutionary revolution' in History. History as a science, starting from a certain point, will have to account for the past and the present, considering also the humankind's future destiny – on the worldwide and then cosmic scale. History will be globalized, becoming at least Global History and also will extrapolate not only through the space, but also the time, that is it will be futurized, providing its historical forecasts for the scientific basis of humankind's survival strategies. There will be a necessity to identify negative and positive features of the past in order to strengthen some of them and mitigate

the others, as well as to identify new capabilities for the polyfurcation of the evolutionary-historical development pathways, optimizing the progress trajectories on the way to the desired safe future.

However, one can hardly include the described above 'long-term history' in the conventional historical science, including its global version, as the latter deals with the facts and reflection of the events that already took place. The future is devoid of such facts and truths and is considered solely in the form of predictions, forecasts and probable scenarios of the unfolding process under study. However, that gives opportunities to work out the desired (normative) evolution of those processes from the present on the basis of the results, obtained within the virtual investigation of the future. The absence of the 'factual foundations' in the 'futurological history' ('historical futurology') is associated with such a positive factor, as an ability to build the future, providing it with the normative features to a particular degree. This means that when studying the future, the evolutionary approach in its 'normative-requirement' variation is represented in a more effective and prominent way and becomes the scientific-historical approach only when a particular future scenario is realized.

Consequently, the study of the future will virtually remain within the purview of the evolutionary approach, while the past and the present of global processes will continue to be the purview of the historical approach in its generally accepted perception. That is why, in order to apprehend the future we will abstain from using the term 'universal' or 'global' history, generally attributing these notions to the past and the present. Unlike other authors, who make no distinction (or equate) history and evolution, we will focus on the issue of evolution, when referring to the future, although the historians have already been significantly concerned with the emergence of historical forecasts.

The humankind should take concerted efforts to overcome any given global crisis caused by negative global issues and processes. The deteriorative and regressive character of the implications of chaotic evolution of the global issues requires solving them in order to turn the vector of global development to the trajectory of progressive development (or, as it became known more than two decades ago, to the trajectory of sustainable development as a new type of development, preserving the civilization and biosphere). But that requires the formation of a new type of governance – the global governance (Weber 2009; Chumakov 2010; Ilyin 2011). The evolutionary perception of global processes is a natural step in their apprehension; that approach enables their more effective application to maintain global activities and, in particular, global governance.

The evolution of global processes as forms of global development provides a clear picture of the interaction between progressive and regressive processes and trends in the world development. One of the objectives of forming Globalistics (in particular, its applied investigations) will be to identify these evolution trends as global processes in order to provide recommendations about the implementation of effective measures, focused on the mitigation of negative (regressive) implications and promotion of positive (progressive) trends.

When focusing on the study of global development as an evolution of global processes, the latter can and should be considered within a broader temporal interval – accounting not only for those occurring at the present moment, but also those having occurred

in the past and emerging in the future. When we consider a broad spatial-temporal scale, it is possible to identify certain directed changes of the whole range of global processes, mainly as a result of humankind's aggregate activities and the unfolding of the social (socio-natural) stage of the planetary evolution. That value-based ranging is worthwhile not only for the further research, but, in particular, for the practical global-wide activities, as the world community's aggregate activities, focused on searching for solutions to global issues and identifying the positive orientation of other global processes that will eventually determine the destiny of the civilization and biosphere.

With respect to the concerted application of axiological and evolutionary approaches within Global Studies, global processes can be identified as progressive, regressive, or cyclical. The evolutionary vector of global processes forms the conjoint-resultant direction of global development. When developing global activity, it is important to arrange it in such a way that promotes the positive trends in global development and mitigate the negative ones with a focus on the preservation of civilization and biosphere and their coevolution. The transition to the coevolutionary safe and progressive type of planetary evolution can considerably change the character of anthropogenic activities, optimizing it in the anti-entropic direction, as there is a need to take actions preventing the deterioration of the capabilities to meet the vitally important needs of the present and future generations. These prospects can be realized in the process of subsequent global transition to the sustainable socio-natural development.

That refers to the possibility of development of Evolutionary Globalistics as one of the fields of Globalistics or, perhaps, in an even broader perspective – of Global Studies in all their aspects, as well as to the formation of a new stage of development of global knowledge itself. Perhaps, Evolutionary Globalistics will at first develop as one of the branches of Globalistics, along with other branches of Global Studies. However, as the necessity to apply the evolutionary approach within Global Studies becomes clear, the latter will be 'filled' with new development-related ideas, and it is quite possible that these will start a new – 'evolutionary' – stage in the development of global knowledge (as it has already happened in biology).

The evolutionary approach within Global Studies can be considered as a tool for the study of the evolution and coevolution of global processes, as well as of their systemic-synergetic phenomenon – the global development. In this connection, from the temporal perspective there is an ongoing process of the formation of various branches within the scope of Globalistics, in particular, the formation of Paleo-Globalistics and Futuro-Globalistics, along with the currently existing Globalistics (Global Studies of the present), which is actively discussed in the literature but not only from the temporal perspective, but also from others, for instance, the spatial one (Ursul 2010, 2011b).

Conclusions

The further elaboration of Globalistics and Global Studies is characterized not only by scientific , but also by educational and methodological aspects. The scientific and research aspect consists in providing a more profound understanding, development and long-term forecasts of the most effective approaches within the development of Global Studies, and, in particular, Globalistics as a new and fundamental field of interdisciplinary studies, in-

fluencing the general process of globalization of science. The educational aspect is connected with the scientific and research aspect and is focused on the introduction of new knowledge obtained within the conducted research in the training process, firstly, at the Faculty of Global Studies at Moscow State University and other educational departments of the University. This results both in the development of curricula (*e.g.*, Evolutionary Globalistics that is already taught at the Faculty), and in the formation of 'global components' within the already taught conventional courses, creating the links of the subjects and their research methods with global knowledge. This also refers to the establishment of its own educational standards in the field of the most effective application of global processes, which provides the Moscow State University, as the Russian university of the future, with fundamentally new integrative and interdisciplinary development opportunities, diverging to a particular degree from the conventional disciplinary vision of science and education.

With the establishment of the integrated scientific and educational system focused on the development of new global knowledge and its effective usage within the educational processes, the Faculty of Global Studies (Moscow State University) will become the leading development centre not only with respect to Global Studies, but also the leader of education of a new type that is already known as the global education. This also refers to the further globalization of the scientific-educational environment not only within the Faculty of Global Studies, but also within the Moscow State University and the wide spread of these 'global trends' among other higher educational establishments and academic institutions of Russia and, primarily, in the CIS countries. That will promote the recruitment of new foreign and national experts and involvement of higher educational institutions, focused on the research in global issues and contribute to the increasing efficiency of the scientific and educational processes in Russia, as well as an optimal coordination of development trends in Russian and worldwide science and education with the relevant global trends.

References

Allakhverdyan, A. G., Semyonova, N. N., and Yurkevich, A. V. 2009. (Eds.). *Science under Conditions of Globalization.* Moscow: Logos. *In Russian*.

Anheier, H. K. and Juergensmeyer, M. 2012. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Global Studies.* Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.

Beck, U. 2001. *What is Globalization? The Mistakes of Globalism – the Responses to the Globalization.* Moscow: Progress Traditsiya. *In Russian*.

Cheshkov, M. A. 1998. Globalistics: The Subject, Problems and Perspectives. *Obschestvennyie nauki i sovremennost* 2: 129–139. *In Russian.*

Cheshkov, M. A. 2005. *Globalistics as Science. Essays on Theory and Categories.* Moscow. *In Russian*.

Chumakov, A. N. 2010. Global World: the Problem of Management. *Vek globalizatsii* 2: 3–15. *In Russian*.

Chumakov, A. N. 2012. Global Studies in the System of Modern Scientific Knowledge. *Voprosy Filosofii* 7: 3–16. *In Russian*.

Dubnov, A. V. 1991–1992. *Globalistics.* Novosibirsk. *In Russian*.

Faddeyev, E. T. 1964. Some Philosophical Problems of Space Exploration. *Dialectic Materialism and Issues of Natural Sciences.* Moscow: Moscow State University. *In Russian*.

Fedotov, A. P. 1999. *Introduction to Globalistics: Science Outlines about Modern World.* Moscow. *In Russian*.

Granin, Yu. D. 2008. Globalization or Westernization? *Voprosy filosofii* 2: 3–15. *In Russian*.

Grinin, L. E. 2011. Evolution: Cosmic, Biological, Social – Potentiality of a Single Paradigm. In Abylgaziev, I. I., and Ilyin, I. V. (eds.), *Globalistics as a Field of Scientific Research and Teaching.* Vol. 5. Moscow. *In Russian*.

Ilyin, I. V. 2011. Forming of Global Political Processes and Global Management. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*. Vol. 12: *Politisheskie nauki* 1. *In Russian*.

Ilyin, I. V., and Ursul, A. D. 2009. *Evolutionary Globalistics (Concept of Evolution of Global Processes).* Moscow: Moscow State University. *In Russian*.

Ilyin, I. V., Ursul, A. D. 2012. Globalistics and Global Studies: the Problems of Methodology. *Vestnik MGU imeni Lomonosova.* Vol. 27. Globalistics and Geopolitics № 1–2. *In Russian*.

Ilyin, I. V., Ursul, A. D., and Ursul, T. A. 2012. *Global Evolutionism: Ideas, Problems, Hypotheses.* Moscow: Moscow State University. *In Russian*.

Ionov, I. N. 2001. Historical Globalistics: Subject and Method. *Obschestvennye nauki i sovremennost* 4: 123–137. *In Russian*.

Jaspers, K. 1994. *The Origin and Goal of History.* Moscow: Politizdat. *In Russian*.

Kostin, A. I. 2005. *Ecopolitics and Global Studies.* Moscow: Aspekt Press. *In Russian.*

Kostin, A. I. 2003. Global Studies Formation. In Mazour, I. I., Chumakov, A. N. (eds.), *Globalistics: Encyclopaedia*. Moscow: Raduga. *In Russian*.

Kozhanov, A. A. 2010. The Concept 'Globalization of Science' as a Subject and Instrument of Sociological Research. In Devyatko, I. F., and Fomina, V. N. (eds.), *Globalization and Social Institutes: Sociological Approach* (pp. 227–240). Moscow: Nauka. *In Russian*.

Learning about Past in Modern Culture. 2011. Panel Discussions Materials. *Voprosy filosofii* 8: 3–45. *In Russian*.

Leybin, V. M. 2003. To Think Globally, To Act Locally. In Mazour, I. I., Chumakov, A. N., (eds.), *Globalistics: Encyclopedia* (pp. 643–644). Moscow: Raduga.

Mazour, I. I., and Chumakov, A. N. 2003. (Eds.). *Globalistics: Encyclopaedia.* Moscow*:* Raduga. *In Russian*.

Medushevskaya, O. M. 2010. Cognitive-Informational Theory in Sociology of History and Anthropology. *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya* 11: 63–73. *In Russian*.

Medushevsky, A. N. 2009. Cognitive-Informational Theory in Modern Humanitarian Knowledge. *Rossiyskaya istoriya* 4: 3–22. *In Russian*.

Robertson, R. 1983. Interpreting Globality. *World realities and International Studies.* Glenside, PN: Pennsylvania University Press.

Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Shestova, T. L. 2011. *Global Historicism and Its Role in the Development of Society Knowledge.* Moscow. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 1964. *Some Philosophical Issues of Space Exploration.* Moscow: Znaniye. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 1981. *Philosophy and Integrative-General Scientific Processes.* Moscow. *In Russian.*

Ursul, A. D. 2008. Globalization, Safety and Sustainable Development. *Vek Globalizatsii* 1: 17–22. *In Russian.*

Ursul, A. D. 2010. Formation of Cosmo-Global Studies. *Filosofiya i kultura* 11. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 2011a. *Global Knowledge and Global Education (Evolutionary Approach).* Lecture. Krasnoyarsk: SFU. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 2011b. Cosmo-Global Studies in Terms of Information Hypothesis of Exploring the World. In Abylgaziev, I. I., and Ilyin, I. V. (eds.), *Globalistics as a Field of Scientific Research and Teaching.* Vol. 5. Moscow. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 2012a. Globalization of Right and Global Right: Conceptual-Methodological Problems. *Pravo i Politica* 8: 1284–1297. *In Russian.*

Ursul, A. D. 2012b. Formation of Global Thinking: Spatial Temporal Perspective. *Prostranstvo i Vremya* 3. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D. 2012c. Phenomena of Futurization and Advanced Reflection. *Filosofia i kultura* 10: 33–45. *In Russian*.

Ursul, A. D., and Ilyin, I. V. 2010. Global Studies and Political Sciences: Formation of Evolutionary Approach. *Pravo i politika* 2: 2097–2105. *In Russian.*

Ursul, A. D., and Ursul, T. A. 2013. The Future of Mankind: Apocalypse or Further Evolution? *Politika i obschestvo* 2. In press.

Vernadsky, V. I. 1991. *Scientific Thought as a Planetary Phenomenon.* Moscow: Nauka. *In Russian*.

Weber, A. B. 2009. Modern World and the Problem of Global Management. *Vek Globalizatsii* 1: 3–15. *In Russian*.