Betilmerzaeva M.M., Gadayev V. Y., Khaladov Khozh-Akhmed S.

Бетильмерзаева М.М., Гадаев В.Ю., Халадов Хож-Ахмед С.

HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE CONTEXT OF CIVIC IDENTITY FORMATION

Chechen state pedagogical university

Чеченского государственного педагогического университета

The terms *historical consciousness* and *civic identity* mirror the issues of cross-disciplinary nature. Analyzing these issues requires the consideration of their philosophic and historical foundations. Today's world has plenty of contrasts: on one hand, highly-developed countries transmitted to the post-industrial kind of society where postmodernism values are the rule; on the other hand, developing countries with poor industrial culture find themselves pushed by the information web into the vortex of global processes. Cultural, social, political, and economic diversity has existed for ages. And sometimes, as consequences of wars or social and economic cataclysms, great migration movements from the East to the West and vice versa took place, which determined the diversity of cultural shifts. These shifts found their reflection in language, mythological, basically cultural borrowings.

But now, the worldwide situation worldwide is worsened by high-speed communications – transport, mobile network, and the Internet, in the context of which the consciousness of an individual or a society representing this individual is incapable of processing the incoming information flow. This fact serves to highlight the crash between modern cultures. In order to preserve their ethnical and national peculiarities, people activate defense mechanisms like historical consciousness and historical memory that nourish and develop specific identity models of subjects.

The main goal of this research is to understand the role and place of historical consciousness in the context of civic identity development.

The goals of the research are also:

- to understand the essence of the concepts of historical consciousness and civic identity;

- to locate the connection between historical consciousness and other forms of social consciousness;

- to identify structural elements of historical consciousness;

- to determine the role of historical consciousness in the process of civic identity development.

Methodological and theoretical basis of the research

We based our research on such philosophic methodological principles as objectivity, historicism, interconnection, development and contradiction, and the systems approach. We also used the method of philosophical reflection in our work.

It is worth noticing that under the modern conditions of global changes in the cultural, social, political and economic reality, both in the context of a country and the world, a topical issue is the development of civic identity as a consolidation factor of the Russian society. Civic identity, alongside ethnic and national ones, is an integrant part of social identity which 'testifies the identity of individuals to themselves as citizens of a certain country' [1, 114].

Another way of saying this is that, while social identity is perceived as one's awareness of belonging to the society, the civic identity is a particular form of its expression when one experiences his or her belonging, not only within a specific group of people, but also within the community of citizens of the country in the political life of which this person takes an active part.

An individual's awareness of his or her social, ethnical or civic identity is determined by historical consciousness and historical memory. These are two of the interconnected components of one's self-awareness development. The process of historical consciousness evolution is a complex spiritual phenomenon associated to the history of a nation. Studying the phenomenon of historical consciousness increases our understanding of its role and place in the system of social consciousness in its connection to mental specifications, historical age and historical space. Russian historian V. O. Klyuchevsky wrote that the knowledge of one's past is not only the

need of a thinking mind, but also 'a significant condition for conscious and correct activity' [2, 62].

The analysis of the phenomenality of historical consciousness rises from a philosophical interpretation of history made by J. G. Herder, I. Kant, and G. Hegel. Later, a great contribution into this issue was made by W. Dilthey, E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, R. Aron, P. Bourdieu and many other scientists. History transformed into an interdisciplinary science in the works by the Annales School's representatives M. Bloch, F. Braudel, L. Febvre, and J. Le Goff.

Historical knowledge has always been the main factor determining social self-awareness. As A. J. Gurevich wrote, 'we can understand ourselves only by putting ourselves into a broad and deep historical perspective, comparing ourselves to other people – the people belonging to other civilizations and past times' [3,501].

In the context of Russian science, A. J. Gurevich [4], Yu. A. Levada [5], and I. S. Kon [6] nearly simultaneously started the discourse on the concept of historical consciousness. In his article *'Time as a Problem in the Cultural History'*, A. J. Gurevich notes, that 'in the society, there is always not a universal "monolithic" time, but a range of social rhythms determined by laws of various processes and nature of individual collectives of people' [4, 112-113]. Yu. A. Levada identified historical consciousness and memory, defining historical consciousness as an element of social 'memory'. He distinguished 'short social memory' that covers the proximate past and 'mediated, long-term social memory' that includes the whole diversity of conscious and unconscious, scientific and mythological variants of memorizing the past by the society into the structure of historical consciousnessawareness [5, 192-193]. I. S. Kon defined historical consciousness as 'a society's, class', or social group's awareness of its identity, location in time, and connection of its present with past and future' [6, 15].

The context of this issue that was created according to the Marxism–Leninism philosophy and reflected in the work by V. P. Tugarinov *'Philosophy of Mind'* [7] is of unconditional interest. V. P. Tugarinov considers consciousness in a general sense and consciousness in differentiated forms, 'in terms of social life, labour, and

communication', or social consciousness. In philosophical literature, social consciousness is usually seen as a reflection of social being or a set of collective representations which are characteristic of a specific era. V. P. Tugarinov notes that 'in our philosophical literature, the concept of forms of social consciousness usually refers to division of the latter according to the differences in individual aspects of the society's spiritual activity (political, legal, scientific, moral, philosophic, aesthetic, religious). Along with this division of social consciousness into forms,' [7, 115] distinguishing individual, collective, everyday consciousness, social psychology and ideology is part of the convention.

This differentiation is supported by the 'different depths of reflection of social phenomena in them' and 'particularities of consciousness of an individual, a particular social group, and the whole concrete historic society' that mirror 'the interconnection of the unique, special and common in the social consciousness' [7, 116]. Social consciousness is the completeness of spiritual wealth accumulated by the humanity during its historic development. Tugarinov points out that Hegel named this stage of consciousness *objective spirit* [7, 120], but it must be taken into consideration that Hegel's concept of objective spirit does not separate being and consciousness. Objective being and objective consciousness are identical to objective spirit. We must also pay attention to the resemblance of the term 'objective spirit' and Karl Popper's concept of 'world 3' by which Popper means 'the world of the products of the human mind' [8, 19], that is all that can serve as a fact of human creativity.

The content of the objective spirit, objective consciousness and objective being, or world 3 is objective to the extend it is independent from a particular subject in its 'materialized form'. The being of objects standing for the listed concepts is determined by their relation to human practice, as they are created by individuals.

After analyzing the proposed definitions, V. P. Tugarinov noticed that 'almost in all Soviet philosophical works concerning this issue, social consciousness is perceived as the consciousness of the society, sub-individual consciousness as opposed to individual one' [7, 119-120]. Finding this to be only partially true, the

author of 'Philosophy of Mind' underlines that society is not an autonomous creation, and although social consciousness is rather different from an individual one, the carrier of social consciousness is always a particular individual. Going against contrasting individual and social forms of consciousness as pair categories, Tugarinov distinguishes three characteristic features of social consciousness based on V. I. Lenin's works:

1. Social consciousness is the mirror of social relationships.

2. Social consciousness is developed by the society and many generations of people.

3. Social consciousness is the expression of understanding the essence of social relationships and man's role in these relationships.

According to Tugarinov, the definition of social consciousness offered by philosophical literature is incomplete, because it only reflects the first two features, but the third one, which he named as social awareness, is not taken into accountconsidered there [7, 127]. In his monograph, he suggests several fundamentals of forms of social consciousness:

1. Different aspects of the society's spiritual activity are expressed in political, moral, religious, philosophical, legal, scientific, and aesthetic consciousness.

2. A deep reflection of phenomena is represented in theoretical and everyday consciousness.

3. According to the subject of consciousness there are individual, collective, and social forms of consciousness.

Social psychology and ideology are identified as two important components of the structure of social consciousness. Social psychology is interpreted as a 'pair category' regarding any selected form. Ideology is a part of each form; however, according to the author, it manifests itself properly when it comes to knowledge. Tugarinov fixes on description of the knowledge-ideology pair. Knowledge features universality and theoreticity. Ideology also implies knowledge, but it is channelled to practical application. When analyzing various aspects of consciousness from the perspective of class approach, the author realizes that in social sciences 'where class

differences are of great significance,' still 'anyone will hardly assert that everything in these sciences is class-specific, and that there is nothing universally valid' [7, 142].

A. K. Uledov also perceives social consciousness as the result of spiritual activity of the whole society, as the consciousness of the society. He notes that 'in each given period of time, the consciousness of any society is permeated with certain ideas (political, philosophical, moral etc.), and therefore it has some kind of uniqueness' [9, 205].

The authors join an opinion that historical consciousness defines the quality of 'certain ideas' by permeating all forms of social consciousness, and thus it has a special place in the structure of social consciousness.

Explication of historical consciousness in relation with the phenomena of mentality shows the 'informative depth' of the subject of our discourse. The term *mentality* allowed representatives of the French historical school to express specific conditions that provide a structure to individual consciousness – culture, traditions, language, lifestyle, religiousness – within which mentality is developed as a part of historical consciousness. The evolution of the term 'mentality' [10] is present in many philosophical works of the 20th century. Its semantic content was formed earlier, when this word was still part of everyday language and ended up within the focus of ideological and political struggle. U. Raulff in his article 'Origin of the Concept' [11, 45-46] set the task to rebuild the spiritual climate of the time that gave rise to this concept based on the analysis of French journalism of 19-20th centuries. In Raulff's opinion, the fact that in the 20th century science revealed a 'heavy archaic stratum' in the human consciousness was the result of a sudden social manifestation of this archaism.

Mentality as a phenoumenal [12, 98] characteristic of the unity of the mental and physical defines informational interaction [13, 99]. Analysing mental characteristics of an individual or a group of people, we are able to build a scale of historic development of mentality considering the context of its interdependence with the unconscious, natural attitude, and everyday life, which find their formal expression in language and sustainable forms of thinking. The mental stratum of psyche of an

individual or a group of people in the perspective of historical consciousness defines a particular content of the latter.

Some researchers question the importance of introducing the concept of historical consciousness into academic discourse, believing that 'in those contexts where it is used, it means…a kind of everyday, practical consciousness woven into direct political activity in the form of convictions, beliefs, and social and psychological attitudes' [14, 32]. However, each form of social consciousnessawareness (political, moral, aesthetic, et al.) has its own 'historical' elements, those ideas of the past which this form is intended to clarify.

It is appropriate to provide a definition for the phenomenon of 'consciousness' to see its substantive content. Consciousness is explained as a potential feature of subject-object interaction, in which both the brain and heart are involved. The brain itself is only an instrument for cognition, which is proven by the latest experiments on creating artificial intellect. These experiments demonstrated the enormous potential of nano- and biotechnologies, but the carrier of artificial intellect, acting within a certain program, has no right to choose. If we determine consciousness as a property of the brain, we should assume that creating a functional analogue of the brain will allow us to speak about the availability of artificial consciousness. But nowadays, nobody speaks about artificial consciousness, because consciousness is not only a property of the brain. To ensure functioning of consciousness, the heart is necessary as a regulator of the brain work, as well as social environment as the stimulus of brain development. The initial human self-awareness, referring oneself to certain species, which is the result of identifying oneself in the space of the objective world, can be considered the foundation for further constitution of the subject [15].

Approaching the analysis of the phenomenon of consciousness from the perspective of combining the functionality of the brain, heart and environment in it, allows to differentiate both consciousness as such – a genuine metaphysical property for the process of the subject creation – and consciousness as a dialectic property of the same subject. In the latter case, the formation and development of consciousness

is defined by the historical era and evolution of subject-object and intersubjective interactions.

As demonstrated by the suggested analysis of historical consciousness, nowadays scientists take this phenomenon in consideration, in social and philosophical analysis as a separate issue. In science, historical consciousness is understood as the system of knowledge, the totality of mental representations, views, traditions, rites, customs, ideas, concepts, by means of which individuals, social groups, classes, ethnicities and nations form the notions of their origin, landmark events of their history and outstanding people of the past, as well as the relation between their history and the history of other communities or the entire human society.

Consequently, historical consciousness is an evaluation of the past with all its diversity typical and characteristic of the society as a whole and different social and demographic, occupational, and ethnic groups, as well as individuals. Thereby understanding their past, people communities (ethnic groups, nations) can reproduce it in time and space, in all the three states of it: past, future, and present, thus highlighting the connection between times and generations, as well as individuals' awareness of their belonging to certain communities (ethnic groups or nations).

Being a sociocultural phenomenon, historical consciousness is permeated with historicity of time and space. Fernand Braudel wrote that 'the dialectic of time spans is the core of the social reality, living, inner, constantly renewed tension between the present moment and the slow passage of time' [16, 117]. According to Braudel, social time, being a matter of the past and the structure of contemporary social life, has multiple forms. In his concept of three types of historical time – the time of long duration, medium duration, and short duration – the most extensive analysis is represented by the category of '*long duration*' which Braudel associates with the concept of *structure*. Scientists studying social phenomena perceive structure as 'an organization, order, system of sustainable relationships between the social reality and masses… It is an ensemble, architecture of social phenomena; but first of all, it is the

historical reality, stable and slowly changing with the course of time' [16, 124]. Some durable structures are stable during several generations, others are less.

Braudel's statement that 'people are prisoners of their time, climate, flora and fauna, culture, the balance with their environment that is being established for centuries, the balance that people cannot break without the risk of losing much' [16] corresponds to the famous Arabic proverb that 'people are more like their time than their parents'. M. Bloch wrote that 'it is naive to claim to understand men without knowing what sort of health they enjoyed' [17, 96]. Historically changing world determines changes in the subject's consciousness. Historical time as duration is fixed in a certain historical space.

Keeping in mind all the phenomena connected to historical consciousness (social consciousness, mentality, historical time, and historical space), the authors suggest the following structure of historical consciousness: 1) primitive consciousness (primitive thinking), reflected in mythos; 2) everyday consciousness, based on an individual's direct life experience and reflected in folklore; 3) historical memory determined by cultural and historic values of the past, the information about which is learned during directive education and instruction; 4) social consciousness (Hegel's objective spirit, K. Popper's world-3) understood as theoretical and practical consciousness of a community formed as part of the global cultural diversity of the past and present; 5) personal or individual consciousness.

Primitive consciousness is the consciousness of people at the initial stage of development of the society. Everyday consciousness is based on one's daily experience. In the modern academic discourse, everyday life is represented as a specific scope of reality [18], as a sphere of human experience with a particular way of seeing and experiencing the world. Being the sphere of experience, everyday life reflects the intersubjective lifeworld.

Historical memory represents not only history as past events, but a memory image imprinted in the consciousness of descendants. The word *memory* is used to represent common experience of people and in a broader meaning – historic experience borne in the minds of a community [19, 41]. Maurice Halbwachs,

introducing the notion of acts of memory in history, defines collective memory as a social phenomenon demanded by social practice. It is collective memory that guarantees a society's identity. According to M. Halbwachs, there are two types of memory: individual and collective, which allow the subject, on one hand, to stay within his or her private life and, on the other hand, to fit in the general group which he or she shares common memories with. Collective memory is based on the common history, traditions, customs mirrored in the chronology of events, facts and folklore.

Objective consciousness as a theoretical and idealistic sphere of a society living in a certain era or eras is represented by spiritual and material forms of culture. Mythos, religion, art, philosophy, science, politics and a moral system create a world of objective consciousness.

Individual consciousness is represented by a subjective image of objective reality in an individual's mind, which allows the individual to have a unique perception of reality determined by personal experience of understanding and perceiving the cultural environment.

Historical consciousness mirrors the evolution of the process of understanding history, encompassed by a higher-duration period. One of the main goals of this process is to create an appropriate identity image of the present while also appealing to the past and thereby to ensure spiritual safety. This is a system of conditions to preserve the 'basic spiritual and moral principles and values, that are formed in a person in accordance with traditional rules and norms of the given society' [20, 21] in the context of historical consciousness genesis.

References

1. Betilmerzayeva M. M. Limitation of a person's identity with cultural space // Prostranstvo obrazovaniya – prostranstvo kultury (Educational space is cultural space): Proceedings of the All-Russian Conference of February 25, 2011 / N. G. Samarina (Ed.). Issue 2. – Moscow: Moscow Municipal Humanitarian Pedagogical Institute, 2011. – p. 114.

2. Klyuchevsky V. O. Kurs russkoy istorii [A course in the history of Russia]. Part 1 1 // Writings in 9 volumes. – Moscow: Mysl, 1987. – V. 1. – p. 62.

3. Gurevich A. J. The Lessons of Lucien Febvre. – p. 501 // Fevr Lusien. Boi za istoriyu [Lucien Febvre: the battles for history]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

4. Gurevich A. J. Time as a Problem in the Cultural History // Voprosy filisofii. 1969. No. 3, pp. 105-116.

5. Levada Yu. A. Historical consciousness and scientific method // Filosofskie problemy istoricheskoy nauki [Philosophical issues in the historical science]. – Moscow, 1969. – pp. 168–220.

6. Kon I. S. The problem of history in the history of philosophy // Metodologicheskie i istoriograficheskie voprosy istoricheskoy nauki [Methodological and historiographical issues of the historical science]: collected articles. Issue. 4. Tomsk, 1966. pp. 14-55.

7. Tugarinov V. P. Filosofiya soznaniya: sovremennye voprosy [Philosophy of mind: contemporary issues]. – Moscow, 1971. – 199 p.

8. Popper K. R. Znanie i psikhofizicheskaya problema: V zashchitu vzaimodeystviya [Knowledge and the mind-body problem: In defence of interaction]. – Moscow: LKI, 2008. – p. 19.

9. Uledov A. K. Dukhovnaya zhizn obshchestva: Problema metodologii issledovaniya[Spiritual life of the society: The problem of research methodology]. – Moscow: Mysl, 1980. – p. 205.

10. Betilmerzayeva M. M. The origin and development of the phenomenon of "mentality" in West European academic discourse // Gumanitarnye, sotsialno-ekonomicheskie i obshchestvennye nauki (Humanities, social-economic and social sciences). – 2009. – No. 6 (49). – pp. 20–25.

11. Raulff U. Origin of the Concept. Speaking about mentality of the times of Dreyfus affair. pp. 45-46 // Istoriya mentalnosti, istoricheskaya antropoogiya. Zarubezhnye issledovaniya v obzorakh i referatakh [The history of mentality, historical anthropology. Foreign studies in reviews and summaries] – Moscow, 1996.

12. Mentality is realization of the link between perceived phenomena and intelligible essences, phenomena, and noumena, in other words, mentalty is a phenoumenon. In: Betilmerzayeva M. M. Mentalnost v kontekste kultury (filosofsko-kulturologichesky analiz) [Mentality in the context of culture (philosophical and culturological analysis)]. Rostov-on-Don: Northern Caucasus Higher School Scientific Center Southern Federal University, 2011.

13. Betilmerzayeva M. M. Mentalnost v kontekste kultury (filosofsko-kulturologichesky analiz) [Mentality in the context of culture (philosophical and culturological analysis)]. Rostov-on-Don: Northern Caucasus Higher School Scientific Center Southern Federal University, 2011.

14. Ivashchenko G. V., Naumenko T. V. About the historical conscious // Credo. 2000. No. 1 (19).

15. Betilmerzayeva M. M. Social reality as the factor determining the mind-body interaction. – pp. 6-13 // Vetnik psikhofiziologii. Saint Petersburg, No. 4, 2013.

16. Braudel F. History and the social sciences. The Longue Durée // Filosofiya i metodologiya istoriii [Philosophy and methodology of history] / (I. S. Kon, ed.) – Moscow, 1977. – p. 117.

17. Cited by: Gurevich A. J. Istorichesky sintez i shkola "Annalov" [Historical synthesis and the school of "Annals"]. – Moscow: «Indrik», 1993.

18. Schütz A. On multiple realities // Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 3. No. 2. 2003. pp. 3–34.

19. Pomanoskaya E. V. Morris Halbwachs: Cultural Contexts of Memory // Izvestiya of Saratov University. New Series. Series: Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy. – 2010. – Issue. 3. – pp. 39–44.

20. Gadayev V. Yu. The individual origins in the context of spiritual safety of a person. // Teriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya. (The theory and practice of social development). – 2014. – No. 6. – pp. 21–25.