

Horujy Sergey S.

Globalistics and anthropology: an approach to the problem

At first glance, even at a scholar's glance, it may seem that the two subjects which are in the title of the text have nothing in common. Contemporary globalistics is not concerned with a human being, but with the problems of global, planetary reality. According to the theory of systems, this reality is viewed as "a many-level hierarchical system". Since the system is global it must include levels, corresponding to everything, and to the anthropological reality, i. e. to a human being, as well. But in the global reality a human being is a microscopic thing and the levels corresponding to it in the level hierarchy of a global system are situated quite far from those, that describe the processes of contemporary globalization, and are therefore in the centre of attention for the globalists. These processes are large-scale, planetary, and macro-social, and between them and the anthropological reality lies a variety of layers - the whole social and historical reality, all levels, that correspond to the economical, ethno-cultural, political and ecological processes. All these intermediate layers, lying next to the plane of macro-reality, are taken into consideration by globalistics, it studies them in their influence upon macro-reality. The anthropological levels lie however too far, their influence is mediated by the afore-mentioned planes, and in global discourse they inevitably drop out of sight. De facto, this discourse puts all anthropological factors, everything that occurs directly to a person, into the category of insignificant factors. Globalistics ignores anthropology, that's how its present positions can be roughly summed up.

Such positions are in accordance with the traditions of the European science, which is used to ignore anthropology. The roots of this approach one may find in the very origin of the European school of thought - in Aristotle's essentialist metaphysics. Creating basis for the very way of thinking in concepts, crucial for philosophy and for science as such, this metaphysics at the same time inflicted some sort of initial trauma to anthropology - it has performed a disuniting of human person. Describing reality on the basis of essences of various types and classes, it represented man as an aggregate of substances of different kinds, actualized in different kinds of activity. The discourse on man was split into a variety of disciplinary discourses, any of which was studying only certain sides or characteristics of man - but man as such, an integral man in all his dimensions and with all the totality of his manifestations, could not go into either any of disciplines on him or the sum of all these disciplines, and, as a result, he practically has dropped out of sight of the science. It was not, however, a conspiracy against him, but bare epistemological necessity: as all future history has proved, The-Man-as-a-whole cannot fit indeed in essentialist discourse, in its definitions and concepts.

The consequent stages of the European thought have not improved the condition of The-Man-as-a-whole. The classical European metaphysics developed the concepts of the subject and the individual, but they are quite different from The-Man-as-a-whole. Though the subject became a central concept of the philosophy of the Modern Age, and a very effective tool for all special anthropological discourses (by means of projecting itself into all spheres of the anthropological reality, which meant birth of the ethical subject, the political subject, the legal subject and so on), it, nevertheless, reinforced the striking absence of The-Man-as-a-whole in the basic European anthropological model. The disuniting of man is added by his secondary and subjugate position. This additional defect is also not a result of a malicious intent, but is caused by basic properties of the Aristotelian episteme. In the system of

substances the cause-and-effect relations operate - linear implications, determination and subordination, which make it more or less hierarchical. And in a hierarchically structured reality a human being, conceived as an individual, turns out to be ineluctably allotted to the lowest level and subordinate to some higher levels or principles or authorities. The most typical way of such subordination is sociocentrism, which regards a man as determined by the social reality in some of its forms, and secondary and auxiliary towards the socio-collective values and principles. For instance, a case of extreme, hypertrophied sociocentrism has been provided by the official ideology of the USSR, dialectical and historical materialism, in which a man was proclaimed "a product of the social relations". More moderate versions of sociocentrism were inherent in all the main types of the modern European outlook. It is quite easy to agree that the ignoring of anthropology by the modern globalistics also reflects the traditional sociocentric tendencies.

Although the sociocentric and other forms of the anthropological reductionism, forms of disuniting, reducing and neglect of man were prevailing, they have never exhausted the whole spectrum of the European thought. Dissatisfaction with the classical anthropological model of Aristotle-Descartes-Kant sprang from many sources. The experience of religion and art evoked intuitions of man's integrity and the desire for restoration of his integral character. This intuitions and aspirations were reflected in the romantic philosophy, then in existentialism, in the philosophy of life, in Nietzsche's and Bergson's philosophy, in the philosophy of some Russian thinkers... As time was going by, this tendency towards "the return of man" was growing stronger, revealing at the same time a typical peculiarity: it sounded more convincingly and had more success in its criticism of the classical model, than in its efforts to present a sound anthropological alternative.

Nowadays the development of the anthropological situation finds itself in a special and a rather alarming stage. The postmodernist and poststructuralist discourse have brought the criticism of the classical anthropological model to the deconstruction of the very basis of it. Following the usual advertising and ironic style of this discourse, the conclusions were presented as garnish slogans, like the notorious "death of the subject". An alternative model has not been produced, however, and, because of its absence, the classical model continues to be in use - in applied spheres, at least. In particular, it serves as the basis for globalistics in working out the scenarios of globalization: though ignoring anthropology as a part of the problem field, the globalistics, nevertheless, is bound inevitably to use some ready-made postulates and ideas on man (for instance, the concepts of the legal, cultural etc. subjects are very actively exploited). This is an unsatisfactory moment, because basing on the old essentialist model of man, today is not only theoretically unjustified any more, but also practically dangerous. The old arguments against this model are supplemented lately with some new ones, quite crucial: the model itself begins to differ from real facts, loosing any explanatory power.

It is well-known that the contemporary global phenomena are in no way exhausted by the planned and carried out scenarios and processes of globalization of the world system, but they also include a vast repertoire of the unplanned but however occurring crises and catastrophes. Undoubtedly, such events were always a part of the global reality. In the different ages they have been playing different roles, and sometimes reached gargantuan size, filling nearly the whole scene. The social systems crashed, the kingdoms collapsed, the empires died, the whole historical worlds, "formations" vanished without a trace, so that to the middle of the third century b. C., when the Book of Ecclesiastes has been written, the history, according to this wise man, had seen everything. But let us wait agreeing with the Qoheleth. During all the eons, one remedy was always effective against all global historical crises and catastrophes. Since the XVIII century one used to formulate this remedy after "Candid": Il faut cultiver son jardin. One must cultivate one's garden. The empires and "formations" die,

but the Man remains, he will keep observing his garden and himself, he will keep giving birth to children - and the new formations will arise, kingdoms or democracies, jamahiries, UIS... - and life, existence of the human species will continue. The efficiency of this remedy proves that history with her empires, with her global and majestic scale may ignore man, as she pleases, may count him a slave, a substrate, a "product", but in front of the catastrophic reality, in its light, the roles inevitably change, and as in the moment of truth, it clearly comes out that the Man is truly the guarantor of history. And he bears this mission of the guarantor, not by his own will or choice and not by some "social treaty" - but simply by his existence in his place and in immutability: immutability in the main and basic, in his substance and nature.

The situation has always been such, but not now. Not now, because man stops being "in his place and in immutability", and, what is more, it turns out that he does not possess any substance or essence, either immutable or mutable. These statements are extreme, even frightening, but, nevertheless, they are straight conclusions from the contemporary state of things, from the anthropological situation. Sudden changes started to occur with man, he became a subject of some intensive and sharp dynamics, which may concern the whole scope of the levels of his organization and constitution, from the spiritual world to the genetic foundation. It is this revolutionary dynamics that is expressed in those symptoms of modernity that make headlines in the newspapers. Their range is vast and continues to broaden. There develop and deepen genetic experiments, and, in particular, the prospects of human cloning make a key anthropological problem of identity the subject of practical improvisations with completely unpredictable consequences. Gender experiments and revolution, triumphant spreading of the sex-minorities undermine the future of the Life's well-tried remedy: how can we nowadays assert that man will continue "to observe himself and give birth to children"? What or whom will he exactly observe? To whom and how will he give birth? To "Rosemary's baby", perhaps? Transgression practices of all kinds are spreading and even find eloquent philosophical apologies, and it is important to stress especially that for the modern view the borders between these kinds are nearly erased: theft of a banana in the supermarket, sadomasochist exercises, blowing up a plane with a hundred of people - all this seems to be almost the same, because in all this it is only the pure anthropological aspect of the deed that matters now, i. e. the transgression as such, the effect of trespassing by a man of any border that confronts him, let it be a commandment or law or line of mortal risk or surface of another one's skin. It is quite clear that human person performing these practices is something/somebody totally different from "moral subject" of classical European anthropology and the spiritual and psychic world of this new man is incomprehensible for it.

The list of modern anthropological innovation can easily be extended, it is in no way complete (for instance, we haven't mentioned the extremal psychopractices and body practices, experiments with mind expanding and altered states of consciousness, with the reconstruction of pre-natal matrices, and, last but not least, all the host of virtual practices). But there is enough ground for the first conclusions. First of all, for all this repertoire of new practices it is correct, what is correct for the transgression practices: these phenomena are immanently anthropological; they can't be regarded as epiphenomena, or consequences of some processes or events on other levels of reality, especially on social level. Though they certainly have connections, correlations with historical and social processes, and the origins of the anthropological phenomena as well as motivations, and strategies of man are usually of complicated and mixed nature, we may confidently say, that the roots of the discussed phenomena lie in man himself. This thesis is supported especially by the fact that man in these practices relegates to the background or directly rejects, as alien to him or irrelevant, all the models of himself and his behavior, which are prescribed to him from without, be it from God (if God is regarded as an external instance), from society, from CPSU or from the liberal-democratic culture. Rejecting to accept these models, whoever may propose them, man

chooses instead to base on himself, in the first place, and, starting from himself, probe his own borders. And this means, that the new dynamics, being unexplained and incomprehensible so far, is in any case not inducted from the social, economical or whatsoever sphere, but is truly anthropological one: the proper dynamics of the anthropological reality as such. In other words, the anthropological processes and manifestations, at least those new, that are discussed here, are not determined by other levels of the global system (it doesn't exclude the possibility that in other epochs satisfactory explanation of the anthropological reality could be given on the basis of socioeconomic reality or, say, ethno-cultural, tribalist reality, in the case of primitive societies). Man has radically changed and continues changing. During these changes he has gained a considerable independence, has emancipated. What is now occurring with him constitutes a new independent - anthropological - level in the global reality dynamics.

Hence it follows obviously that this new independent level must find its own place in the episteme, in contrast to the old Aristotelian episteme, in which, as it was mentioned above, anthropological discourse as an independent and irreducible one is absent, and instead there is only a set of partial discourses and disciplines none of which deals with the-Man-as-a-whole. But we may say more. The coverage and the mass character of the new anthropological phenomena grow larger, their scope is wide, they touch upon more and more spheres of the modern life, and one may guess that for many problems in many fields the anthropological level is decisive and anthropological problems play the chief role. Therefore "the anthropological revolution" seems to be a very real perspective in the evolution of the European episteme. In such revolution, the primacy of historical and social discourses is to be replaced by the primacy of the anthropological discourse. This makes us remember the famous forecast of Foucault, which is directly opposite and treats the tendencies of the contemporary development in a radically anti-anthropological key, as the signs of the end of the anthropological discourse, "the death of man". The comparison with Foucault's considerations is very edifying.

First of all we notice, that the both perspectives are quite compatible, though opposite - because the new phenomena, that demand the anthropologization of the episteme may a priori have a crisis nature, leading not only to the epistemological "death of man", but even to the empirical death without any quotation marks: the most impetuous anthropological dynamics is known to be the dynamics of agony. And a posteriori we notice that such crisis nature is most probable - so that the agreement with Foucault's conclusions seems to be reached. This statement is however premature. Foucault's analysis is completely and even militantly secular, and it excludes for man any possibility of meta-anthropological strategies: such strategies that are oriented towards the ontological transcending into the different mode of being. But is the rejection of such strategies completely well-founded? Their existence is thematized, in particular, by philosophy that considers man as "being-presence" (Dasein), which is endowed by a constitutive relation to the being, as different from the existing, the empirical being. These strategies are also actually realized in spiritual practices, created in the world spiritual traditions. Independently from the above-discussed contemporary phenomena, the endowment of man by the constitutive ontological relation implies his immanent and a priori epistemological irreducibility, a kind of epistemological primogeniture that no other level of the global reality can possess. Clearly, such standing does not accept both anti-anthropologism (Foucault's too) and anthropological reductionism which regards the anthropological reality as completely determined by some other levels of the global reality. As for our discussion of global reality, the constitutive ontologism of man, his meta-anthropological strategies and spiritual traditions will play the central role in it.

Coming back to globalistics, we may conclude, that both the new anthropological phenomena and "constitutive ontologism" of man are solid reasons implying that globalistics

can't ignore anthropology any more. The developing anthropological processes may play not only noticeable, but decisive role in the global dynamics. For instance, as we have seen, it is perfectly possible that man stops to be "a guarantor of history"; and this inevitably should tell upon the global architecture. The scenarios of globalization, that do not take sufficiently in account the anthropological reality with its acute problems will certainly meet fundamental obstacles, and will provoke aversion. One cannot but admit, that contemporary anti-globalist movement springs, among other factors, from anthropological protest, from protest of man against building of the mondial mechanisms, uncoordinated with and unconformable to him.

Thus, contemporary globalistics in all its sections and functions - as the theory of the global system, monitoring of global trends, analysis of scenarios and processes of globalization - must be complemented by anthropology, must be endowed with a sound anthropological dimension. How can we reach this?

2.

Absence, or at least insufficiency, of the anthropological plane in contemporary global discourse is not accidental and is not caused by tendentiousness. It is based, as we have seen, on the combination of two factors: the empirical factor of the radical difference between the scales of anthropological and global phenomena and the epistemological factor of deficiency of the anthropological discourse in the Aristotelian episteme. There are many possible ways to overcome these factors. We shall discuss now one of such ways rooted in the spiritual experience of the Eastern Christianity.

Let us turn to a specific field of anthropological experience, which existed in many cultures of the world from antiquity, the above-mentioned field of the spiritual practices. This experience was rarely articulated philosophically, but, nevertheless, it always represented a real alternative to essentialism, because it expressed not essentialist vision of anthropological reality, but different from it, energetical one. This kind of vision corresponds to anthropological experience, which is not simply the experience of introspection (at closer analysis, introspection turns out to be very deceptive), but is the operational experience of man's work with himself, or, in other terms, the experience of practices of the Self (*pratiques de soi*, the term by Michel Foucault). Spiritual practices are anthropological practices of this type. Here man performs a successive and thorough, rigorously organized transformation of himself: more precisely, of his energetical self, representing a configuration of various energies, spiritual, psychical, physical. As said above, this transformation is directed towards the ontological transcending and constitutes not only anthropologic, but also meta-anthropologic strategy. This unique type of strategies needs special pre-conditions. Spiritual practice is a delicate occupation, which cultivates not only psychic and somatic, but some intellectual techniques as well; it demands precise monitoring by man of his own inner world, identification and control of states of consciousness in their dynamics. But, on the other hand, it remains a completely practical, experiential activity and therefore it does not associate any essences to man. At the same time an efficient discourse is worked out here, and vast knowledge about man, a rich pool of anthropological information is accumulated, including many discoveries, tools and methods. Rich experiential anthropology is created here, and, in contrast to the classical European anthropology, it is energetical and not essentialist. It is very difficult to produce a systematic conceptualization of this energetical approach, because of its fundamental unessentialism, and therefore, it remained always without the scientific and cultural mainstream. On the other hand, for the same reason it avoids the contemporary misfortunes of essentialism, turning out to be a valuable resource for the nowadays search of the intellectual alternatives.

But does it give us any ways to resolve our problem of "anthropologization of globalistics"? From the two difficulties of this problem, described above, anthropology of

spiritual practices helps us to overcome the second one, epistemological. The first one however remains. Spiritual practices are too distant from the sphere of global processes, so that this phenomenon may provide an alternative to the essentialism only in spheres and topics that are far from globalistics.

This conclusion is, nevertheless, too hasty. There are some intermediate links, with the aid of which the experience of spiritual practice, its principles and methods, may be translated into wider spheres of reality. The most important of these links is spiritual tradition. By the very definition, spiritual practice is an individual phenomenon, something practiced by a concrete person, but it is inseparably connected with a certain trans-individual, historical and social phenomenon. The main reason for it lies in ontological and meta-anthropological nature of spiritual practice. Implementing the "constitutive ontologism" of man, this practice is not directed towards any empirical goal, but is oriented to the limits of the horizon of human existence and experience, towards ontological transcending. And hence it follows that it can not be purely individual. It must include certain tools or, to be more precise, a certain organon of organization, interpretation and checking-up of its experience, that must ensure the orientation and advancement towards this so specific meta-empirical - and hence empirically impossible! - goal. Both the creating and operating of such an organon demands going far out of the limits of individual existence. It is highly inter-personal and trans-individual; each of spiritual practices, that the history knew, spent centuries to form the organon of its experience. The example of the hesychast organon, reconstructed by us in detail, clearly demonstrates that the experience of spiritual practices is achieved, checked-up and interpreted by means of a delicate and complicated mechanism, consisting of many anthropological, psychical, hermeneutical procedures and methods. Maintenance of this organon is secured by the combined activity of many participants, of a community, which lasts through generations, through history. Such a community forms a necessary collective environment in which spiritual practices can only take place (though the practice itself is "a private business", a strategy chosen and followed by a man in his individual existence, and, what is more, it demands a special, extreme concentration on one's individual experience). This community that embraces spiritual practice of a man in all its entirety and makes it possible, is exactly what we call a spiritual tradition.

Owing to its constitutive connection with spiritual practice, spiritual traditions are unique among all traditions that take part in life and history of society: they serve for the translation of especially personal anthropological (and meta-anthropological) experience and they perform this translation also in a most personal and uninstitutionalized way; and hence it follows that they represent not only a social phenomenon, but also a personal, anthropological one, and belong to the sphere of personal being. Therefore they represent a certain link between the anthropological reality and the global one. On the other hand, the spiritual tradition is empirically a small community, and hence it is not yet a global phenomenon. But there exist some next, larger links too.

The further translation of the experience of spiritual practices into wider spheres may happen in two ways. First of all, a spiritual tradition exercises some influence in surrounding socio-cultural environment. To some extent, such influence is always present, but in some periods the tradition takes special efforts to spread and enhance it. As a rule, such periods correspond to golden ages of the tradition, peaks of its development, when it becomes aware of universal value of its experience, and strives to go out of its closed world in order to open its treasures to the surrounding and introduce surrounding people to its values. It is important that this going-out is conceived and realized not by means of propaganda or even sermon, and tries to inculcate in people neither ideology nor rites, but only a definite anthropological experience: personal attitudes, personality structures, and way of existence. A perfect

illustration is the Russian starchestvo (eldership) of the XIX century, which became famous due to the Optina pustyn' monastery and "The Karamazov brothers" by Dostoevsky. It demonstrates vividly, how effective and deep-reaching this peculiar radiation may be, that emanates from the spiritual tradition and turns the vast layers of the surrounding society into a kind of adjoining area of the tradition, its personal environment, imbued with its influence and involved in its anthropology. The main and most valuable side of this social phenomenon lies in its retaining of anthropological nature: it is a process of "anthropological translation", which follows the paradigm of inter-personal communication, and is realized in uninstitutionalizable and unformalizable personal connections and not by means of any social institutions.

Contacts between different spiritual traditions can be realized in the same way, as processes of "anthropological translation", transferring and exchanging anthropological experience. In this way, genuine dialogue of spiritual traditions becomes possible; and further, via such dialogue, a larger phenomenon of dialogue of religions (to which the corresponding traditions belong) can also be realized. But we should stress immediately that inter-traditional and inter-religious contacts may also develop in a completely different way. As said above, each spiritual tradition is a community that performs the reproduction and translation of the experience of a certain meta-anthropological strategy (the experience of spiritual practice). One of the most important peculiarities of such strategies is the demand for strict and precise following of their rules, their organon. All arbitrary variations, all deviations from the organon of the tradition in question lead usually to distortions of the strategy, to the loss of the right orientation, and to phenomena of false, illusory experience, that are wrongly taken for real signs of spiritual advancement (the Eastern Church calls them "seductions" - prelest' in Russian, plani in Greek -which means spiritual delusion). These requirements of the purity of experience, and strict following to a very definite organon imply that different traditions can hardly be combined or mixed with each other in their experience. Each spiritual tradition is a closed world, trying to keep itself pure of any distorting admixtures, of anything alien. Thus relations between such worlds are, in principle, those of incompatibility and mutual exclusion. Therefore the very possibility for different spiritual traditions to have profound contacts with positive fruits is doubtful. The very idea of a dialogue of spiritual traditions or religions is problematic. These theoretical arguments can be richly illustrated by long history of inter-religious enmity, antagonism, and intolerance.

But inter-religious relations have always been one of the most important factors in civilization dynamics, and the need to canalize them away from conflict and enmity is too great. For this reason, attempts of contact and dialogue, attempts to build up some strategy or model of harmonious relations between spiritual traditions and religions have never ceased. Since the middle of the XIX century they attained some regularity and considerable size. The initiative and main efforts belonged usually to the American Protestants. As a kind of symbolic prologue to these initiatives, their participants used to remember sometimes the talks of representatives of all religions of Hindustan, including Christians, at the court of the Emperor Akbar of Great Mughals in the 1574-1578 years. Many large multilateral meetings and contacts take place in the end of the XIX - in the beginning of the XX century. Among the most important of them we must name the World Congress of Religions (also called Parliament of Religions), held in Chicago in September 1893 simultaneously with the World Exhibition. At that time, all meetings of such kind, including this Congress, tried to attract and embrace clergy and believers of all existing religions, faiths, cults and sects, and the ultimate, though distant goal of all the movement was conceived as unification of all religious life of the mankind into a Universal World Religion. At the Congress, even some projects of the name and world center for this "religion of the future" were discussed. Osip Mandelstam called the XIX century "Golden Age"; and these boundless projects are extremely

characteristic for that atmosphere of superficial humanism and progressism which dominated in the West in the decades preceding the First World War. With the first volleys of the war, this atmosphere vanished immediately - and forever.

But the efforts in organizing and managing inter-religious contacts survived the war and were renewed, mainly in the same protestant circles. At a new historical stage they have taken a new form, however. In the main part, it was the form of Ecumenical movement which restricted its sphere to that of Christianity. The basic views and principles of the initiators, their ideas on the organization and mechanisms of the contacts and dialogue remained nearly the same, but with the narrowing of its sphere, the movement became more realistic. Some effective working institutions have been created (the main of which was the World Council of Churches), procedures of regular meetings at various levels and mechanisms of making decisions have been worked out. During several decades in the middle of the past century Ecumenical movement remained an important factor in the inter-confessional relations. Today its activity continues, but inner tensions and contradictions which have been accumulated in it (some of them touch upon the very principles and essence of the inter-religious communications) have lead it to a crisis. Its prospects are now vague: it is not clear whether it will be able to retain its importance in inter-religious relations.

Meanwhile, the new architecture of the global community that is forming up now has approached the next stage. Due to the complex character of the globalization processes, the trend will surely develop that will try to integrate and absorb inter-religious contacts as well as organizations and institutions administering these contacts, into scenarios and mechanisms of globalization: to turn all the religious sphere into the "religious dimension" of globalization. So these contacts will have to be coordinated with the leading dimensions, i.e. economical and political, and will get inevitably subordinated to them, in some form and to some extent. That means, among other things, that, due to the needs of globalization, the main course of inter-religious dialogue in the near future will again cross the boundaries of the Christian world, and will include all of the main world religions. Both of these trends, the integration into the web of globalization mechanisms and giving more importance to inter-religious, instead of inter-confessional, contacts can be seen in the religious processes in unified Europe. The inter-religious contacts, "meetings of religious leaders", corresponding agreements become a link in the chain, a part of the complex of measures, designed to initiate the next set of global projects and processes or solve some or other global problems. This auxiliary role of the religious dimension within the framework of fully secular machine of globalization, will surely affect the essence of contacts, depriving them of genuine religious depth, value and meaning.

In all of the described stages of history of inter-religious dialogue, its attempts were following roughly the same model of strategy. Its main principle may be quite adequately expressed by an arithmetical notion: the ground or space for contacts and dialogue is chosen to be the *sui generis* "biggest common divisor" of all the participants, i.e. the sum of everything that is common to all of them, of principles which they all share. Obviously, this model is universal and may be applied to contacts of any kind; in our case, we mean religious principles, attitudes, elements of religious doctrines. The role of initiators of such a dialogue is here that of moderators, in modern terms, whose task is to help the participants to discover in themselves all the possible contents, all the elements of their position, which they have in common with other participants, and which, so to speak, are part of "the biggest common divisor". As for the task of all the dialogical process, it consists in activating the common contents, bringing them to the forefront, discussing them comprehensively and deriving the maximal volume of consequences. The first and the main outcome of this process is expected to be the reaching of an agreement, according to which mutual relations of the participants

should be determined by the common elements, the biggest common divisor. This should secure (hopefully) the harmonious character of those relations.

To estimate the virtues and chances of this model, we must see the other side of the principle described. It obviously means, that all the mismatches of the participants' positions, all that distinguishes one position from another is a priori excluded from the dialogue space. Eo ipso, this space is organized according to the principles of narrowing and minimalization. The participants lose their individual traits, acting as averaged, formalized subjects. Clearly, such a dialogue brings forth the danger of reduction and primitivization of the topic discussed as well as all the sphere of religious life. This danger has been always felt by Eastern Orthodox believers, when they were confronted with the model in question. In the sphere of inter-confessional contacts of Christians, the principle of this model had the name "interconfessionalism". Having first become acquainted with it at the first congress of the Russian Student Christian Movement in 1923 (the well-known Psharov congress in Chekhoslovakia), Nicolay Berdyaev criticized it sharply. As reported by a memoirist, Berdyaev "has very simply and clearly showed in his talk that when Christian contacts are based on the interconfessionalism, they follow the line of minimalism, which means the reduction of our ecclesiastic consciousness to a minimum". Avoiding to explore the depth of spiritual experience in its specific character and concrete reality, on the ground that all this is considered as a barrier between the participants, this type of dialogue risks to remain superficial, trivial, or even trite; for example, discussions of the projects of Universal religion often sounded like a parody. There is also another danger of practical character: extreme narrowing of the dialogue space, restriction of its contents to a set of most general theses or even platitudes, impoverishes its resources and diminishes its possible results. Such a dialogue can hardly generate stable rapprochement between the participants, or lead to important and/or constructive conclusions. Changing little, and hardly binding the participants to a noticeable extent, it cannot have profound influence on the situation (but still it can moderate the worst tendencies of the mutual intolerance and aggression, arousing doubts about these extremist tendencies and reducing their popularity).

The summary assessment of this model and its perspectives depends on whether there exist any alternatives to it. In what follows we shall describe briefly one of possible alternative models of inter-religious dialogue, which is based on spiritual experience of Eastern Christianity. The main feature of this model of dialogue is that it corresponds to the paradigm of personal communication, obeying its specific laws. It is obvious that the model, discussed above, does not fit this paradigm. It represented the dialogue participants by their positions, and the positions were, in their turn, characterized by lists of the statements defended, so that the dialogue turns out to be basically the process of comparing these lists: which is, using the computer terminology, the "communication of protocols". Such a formal process has some convenient and positive sides, but it is strikingly different from face-to-face communication of living persons, possessors of personal and spiritual experience. There are many differences, but we shall mention only those that are necessary for our discussion.

The main thing for the problem of communication and dialogue is the following one: in the "communication of protocols", in the impersonal and formalizable contact, any distinction amounts to division, it is considered as a dividing factor. This is exactly the reason why the old model removed all the distinctions, differences from the dialogue space. However, in the case of personal communication this is surely not true. There is no general law determining, what exact role is played by this or that difference of the dialogue sides, but, in any case, personal communication and rapprochement are not based on coinciding or similar features only. Though differences may, undoubtedly, arouse estrangement and enmity, but in personal communication they are perfectly able to produce the opposite effect too, arousing mutual interest, regard or even active attraction. Next, one of the most fundamental

traits of personal being consists in its specific identity structures. The very constitution of personal identity makes it radically different from the identity of an object: the identity of a person is constituted by its distinctions from all others, and these distinctions taken together endows the person with originality and uniqueness. This peculiarity tells directly on communication: it implies that any contact, which ignores, excludes from its space concrete distinctions of a person, is of impersonal character and the person in question is radically reduced in it, being not able to realize in it its identity, its specific personal nature.

Now we can return to the problem of the inter-religious dialogue, which has been formulated by us as the problem of the dialogue of spiritual traditions. Spiritual traditions have been characterized by us as a personal and anthropological phenomenon, whence it is clear that fruitful dialogue between them can not be achieved on the base of the model of formalized contacts developed by protestants. (This is in accordance with our definition of a spiritual tradition as a community, translating the experience of spiritual practice: Protestantism rejects the monasticism, which plays the major role in the creation and all the life of spiritual practices, and hence it distances itself from all the field of spiritual practices and traditions). On the contrary, the paradigm of personal communication is obviously an adequate base for such a dialogue. It doesn't mean, however, that the dialogue sets up quite easily within the framework of this paradigm: as shown above, our concept of the spiritual tradition implies that their dialogue meets its own specific difficulties, because of the necessity for the tradition to keep the purity of its experience. But the presence of some inner obstacles is almost a rule in the matters of interpersonal communication: such communication is a delicate and unformalizable process that cannot have any guarantees of success. There are, nevertheless, some premises and conditions which are necessary for the dialogical process and contribute to its advancement; the paradigm of the personal dialogical communication, as it is developed by the modern philosophy , articulates and includes them. The most important of them is usually called the principle of "participativeness" (Bakhtin's term), or acceptive participation. Roughly speaking, we may characterize it as mutual openness of the participants of a dialogue, as their willingness to enter the perspective of Other's experience and share this experience: however, not the whole of it, but just some part, some elements of it, which are unpredictable in their concreteness, but, taken together, turn out to be sufficient to set up a certain effect, some emotion of comprehension (rather than intellectual comprehension as such) and sympathy. Christian attitude of kenotic, self-sacrificial love, which was realized in the Russian starchestvo and ensured its effectiveness, can be considered as an ultimate form of participativeness.

The second specific trait of personal dialogical communication, as well as the dialogue of spiritual traditions, is connected with some features of the communication space. This space must be such that a person in the process of communication had the possibility "to fulfill one's own self", "to be one's own self", i. e. to display and realize fully his/her identity. As said above, the personal identity is constituted by unique, unrepeatable traits and features of a person, and such traits and features that are rooted in depths of contacting personal worlds are exactly what can arouse mutual interest, evoke the feeling of contact and affinity, became a ground for mutual understanding and rapprochement. Hence the important conclusion must be drawn: the space of personal dialogue must be full and wide to the limit. It must be built up not by the principle of exclusion, which admits only coinciding elements, but by the principle of expansion, which includes all the personal unique features. In contrast to the model of impersonal and formalized contacts, it must be maximal, not minimal. Contacts of impersonal institutions or positions happen on the surface of commonplaces, but a meeting of personalities is a meeting in depths.

Historical examples can be found which show that this model of communication has really been implemented not only in individual contacts, but also in contacts between spiritual

traditions. Such examples are not very exceptional, but little known, since the life of spiritual traditions avoids publicity and external watching (though such traditions are not esoteric communities, and they consider their experience to be of universal value, such secluded life is commanded to them by the delicate character of their anthropological and spiritual work). One good example is provided by the relations between Sufism and Hesychasm. During several centuries, they were developing in the neighborhood on vast spaces of the Byzantine Commonwealth and adjacent Islamic states, and this has lead to their similarity in a number of points. Such points include even some elements in the key parts of both practices: the techniques of breathing, some details of the prayer discipline, the elaboration of a generalized pneumosomatic concept of heart. But it is extremely hard to trace exactly this fruitful process of exchanging so specific experience. It is often difficult to discover even the direction of the translation, from which and to which of the traditions it took place. It looks, as if the law "the more important, the more concealed" is in power here. And it is quite evident that these processes correspond exactly to the model of personal communication, to "the meeting in the depths".

This example is also valuable in one more respect: it demonstrates clearly the difference between the phenomena of spiritual tradition and religious tradition (historical religion). The last kind is of a more broad and heterogeneous nature, and includes also various institutions relating the religious sphere with the state and society: hence, in no way can one ascribe to it the personal and anthropological nature. In the Medieval civilization inter-religious relations were inseparably connected with the state, political, military relations. In the same centuries when the Christian and Islamic spiritual traditions were "meeting in the depths", on the historical scene bloody wars of Christians and Muslims - i.e. of religious traditions - took place. But, in spite of all the differences between processes on these two levels, spiritual tradition is the core, quintessence of the anthropological and spiritual contents of religious tradition, and, as a rule, it retains strong and steady (though often hidden) influence upon the religious tradition. This relationship between the two types of traditions must be taken into consideration in all contemporary attempts to set up the inter-religious dialogue: a clue to the fruitful dialogue of religions lies in success of the dialogue of the corresponding spiritual traditions. After a certain period when the influence of spiritual traditions upon the religious life (as well as cultural and social life, of course) was failing, this influence now starts to grow again, both in Christianity and in the religions of the East.

Drawing a distinction between the notions of religious and spiritual tradition helps us also to clarify the relationship between the two models of contact, discussed in this section. As we have shown, the constitutive principles of these models are of opposite nature, but it does not mean that the models exclude each other completely. Religious tradition is a complex and heterogeneous phenomenon, and among its various aspects, various processes that form its life, there are many such ones, in which the role of its core, the spiritual tradition, is not so important. Hence such aspects and processes can, in principle, be managed in contacts that follow the formalized "protestant" model. What is more, their circle includes most of those religious phenomena, which take part in the broad civilization processes on the macro-levels of global reality. Thus the diversity of problems and processes of the modern global situation is such that each of the two models, the Protestant model of functional contacts and the Eastern Orthodox model of personalistic dialogue, may find its own sphere of application. They are able to co-exist, being the useful complements to each other, in the contemporary strategies of building up the new global architecture.

3.

In conclusion we must return to the new anthropological phenomena described in the Section 1. Although these crisis phenomena have been characterized by us as the most

essential features of the contemporary situation, which tell upon the global level and are the evidence of some principal changes of man and some new anthropological dynamics, we did not discuss them in the Section 2. Our idea was to analyze first the possibilities of the "anthropologization of globalistics", i.e. introducing the anthropological aspects and dimensions into the global discourse, and then to come back to these phenomena on a new basis, in order to conceptualize them and formulate an adequate strategy with respect to them. To solve the first of these problems, we have described the concepts of spiritual practice and spiritual tradition, and displayed the possibilities of translating the constitutive personalistic and anthropological principles of these phenomena onto broader levels of the global reality. Having discovered that the translating in question is achieved, in the first place, in the phenomena of contact and dialogue of spiritual traditions and religions, we have singled out and analyzed two models of inter-religious dialogue.

One can agree that these results bring us closer to at least partial solution of the problem of the "anthropologization of globalistics", supplementing the global discourse with the full-fledged anthropological dimension. But do they bring us closer to the solution of the stated problems concerning the new anthropological phenomena?

Genetic and gender experiments, transgression practices (including the phenomenon of suicidal terrorism), extremal psycho-practices, "acid" and virtual practices: all this spectrum of phenomena reflects some changes occurring to man. Of what kind are these changes, how can one characterize them? To start with, we notice one common trait in all the phenomena listed. May be, not all of them are exactly of crisis or catastrophic nature, but surely all of them are of limiting or extreme character: they all are such phenomena or practices, in which human person strives to the limits of his possibilities, to the border of the horizon of his existence - i.e., to that area of human manifestations, in which fundamental predicates of man's mode of being start changing, and which we call the anthropological border. Next, we should pay attention to the unprecedented diversity and broadness of the spectrum of these extreme manifestations. It shows that the extreme character as such (absorbing in extreme practices and strategies, actions, forms of behavior) becomes the principal value and goal of a man. Man strives to put into practice and actually experience all the extreme manifestations that are possible or thinkable. We can consider this peculiarity as the principal feature of the anthropological dynamics that lies behind the whole complex of new phenomena characterizing the present-day anthropological situation.

Discussing these phenomena in the Section 1, we noticed at once that they are of global importance, and hence must cause some global effects. How do they exactly tell upon the global level? The study of all their global aspects and implications is a big problem, which we, of course, cannot solve here. Some of the main implications are immediately obvious, however. The new anthropological phenomena attain the global scale and significance, first of all, if they are catastrophic and/or threatening and, in addition, sufficiently wide-spread. Exactly such character is inherent in the most of them and, in particular, in all those discussed in Section 1. As we stressed, the new anthropological dynamics is not yet reconstructed even in its principal laws, but both the scientific and mass consciousness perceive it as the dynamics, in which catastrophic trends dominate and the most dangerous risks are hidden. Thus we conclude that the whole sphere of the new anthropological phenomena must be interpreted as a sphere of anthropological risks with the global scale.

This conclusion determines the character of global problems caused by this sphere and hence the character of the proper reaction to the phenomena under consideration. One should know how to block up, parry and overcome the rising threats, crisis and catastrophic trends, and the global strategies and scenarios, which are worked out now, must include such anthropological know-how. One can tell at once that the way of external prohibitions, purely disciplinary and forcible measures won't do. The obvious constructive way consists in putting

forward appropriate alternatives. It means that one should to point out or create different anthropological possibilities and perspectives: different, but capable to satisfy those needs and strivings of man, which he now tries to satisfy by means of extreme and pernicious strategies. What exactly does he expect to get in them? The answer which our brief analysis suggests is as follows. As always, man is striving for the full self-realization and complete actualization of his identity: but the principal new feature of the present-day situation is that he now sees the main criterion of the full self-realization in the extreme character of his experience. As a result, the experience looked for, satisfying and satiating, is now any experience which leads to the anthropological border.

Hence contours of a possible alternative can be guessed. To be acceptable, an alternative anthropological strategy or paradigm must give a human personality sufficient space for self-realization and actualization of his/her complete and unreduced identity. It is easy to see that many of the destructive impulses and features of the new anthropological phenomena originate in the natural human protest and rebellion against the contemporary social and global architecture, which deprives man of such a space, reducing him and treating him as an impersonal being. Therefore a sound alternative must follow the personalistic paradigm, which is followed by the phenomena of spiritual tradition and dialogue between such traditions. Next, there is one more necessary feature of the desired alternative that also turns us to spiritual traditions: this alternative must give some place to extreme anthropological manifestations, but, certainly, not to those of destructive or catastrophic character. As we have seen, spiritual practice and spiritual tradition, by virtue of their meta-anthropological nature, provide manifestations of exactly such kind.

Thus the alternative should be built up in the sphere of personalistic and extreme, but not destructive, experience. These properties are inherent in the experience of spiritual practices and spiritual traditions. It is crucial, however, that they are also retained by all those anthropological practices and strategies, which do not belong to the class of spiritual practices or traditions, but realize the above-mentioned attitude of participativeness with respect to a certain tradition from this class. Due to this, such practices and strategies share the experience of spiritual practice in some of its parts and elements. They are called adjoining practices or strategies (with respect to a given spiritual practice and tradition) and they form quite a large and diversified category. As a result, due to the adjoining phenomena, the properties of full-fledged alternative are present in practices and strategies from the large sphere of anthropological experience, which is not by far exhausted by spiritual practices *stricto sensu* (obviously, such practices can never be practiced by large masses). This allows us to expect that practices and strategies, adjoining to various spiritual traditions, will become more and more wide-spread in contemporary world. Attraction to spiritual traditions will grow, since, turning to them, one finds a way to overcome the catastrophic tendencies in the anthropological situation. At the same time, they provide a way, via the mechanisms described, to achieve a kind of "anthropological correction" of the globalization, supplementing it with appropriate anthropological and personalistic dimensions.

It is worth mentioning, in conclusion, that the anthropological (and global) alternative, provided by the phenomena of spiritual practice and tradition, means not the suppression or cutting-off of the dangerous trends and phenomena, but rather their therapy: inner transformation and conversion into different paradigm. This is stipulated by the fact that the fundamental predicate of "extremeness" of these trends and phenomena is preserved, and just given a different way for its realization. Such an anthropological principle of "not rejecting, but conversing" was well known already in the ancient Christian asceticism and was used actively in one of the main ascetic works, the "invisible battle" with man's passions. To some extent, it is akin to the famous attitude of "changing one's mind", metanoia; and many sophisticated descriptions and discussions of it may be found in the ascetical classics, like,

e.g., works by st. Maximus the Confessor (VII century). Taking account of this, one can consider our ideas - at least, in their core - as a *sui generis* modern transcription of the ascetic discourse. Then the final conclusion will be that the old paradigms of the ascetic anthropology - such as spiritual practice and spiritual tradition, metanoia, invisible battle... - can obtain today a new value in the general anthropological context, helping to solve many problems of contemporary man.