



MATERIÁLY

XI MEZINÁRODNÍ VĚDECKO-PRAKTICKÁ KONFERENCE

DNY VĚDY - 2015

27.03.15 - 05.04. 2015



Díl 7

**Historie
Politické vědy
Filosofie**



Praha
Publishing House
«Education and Science» s.r.o.

Vydáno Publishing House «Education and Science»,
Frýdlanská 15/1314, Praha 8
Spolu s DSP SHID, Berdianskaja 61 Б, Dnepropetrovsk

**Materiály XI mezinárodní vědecko - praktická konference
«Dny vědy – 2015».** - Díl 7. Historie.Politické vědy.Filosofie.:
Praha. Publishing House «Education and Science» s.r.o -
104 stran

Šéfredaktor: Prof. JUDr. Zdeněk Černák

Náměstek hlavního redaktor: Mgr. Alena Pelicánová

Zodpovědný za vydání: Mgr. Jana Štefko

Manažer: Mgr. Helena Žákovská

Technický pracovník: Bc. Kateřina Zahradníčková

XI sběrné nádobě obsahují materiály mezinárodní vědecko - praktická konference «Dny vědy» (27 březen - 05 dubna 2015 roku) po sekcích Historie.Politické vědy.Filosofie.

Pro studentů, aspirantů a vědeckých pracovníků

Cena 270 Kč

ISBN 978-966-8736-05-6

© Kolektiv autorů, 2015

© Publishing house «Education and Science» s.r.o.

Резюме. Актуальную проблематику «Я» и «Другого» можно рассматривать в разных срезах и плоскостях. Коммуникации, диалог между Я и Другим должны происходить в плоскости понимания; В современном обществе диалог важен, ибо важно не конфликтное разрешение проблем, а еще лучше не доведение проблем до состояния конфликта. Одним из важных условий всего этого является понимание между Я и Другим, которое более всего осуществимо в сообществах, где имеются традиции компромисса и традиции в семейном воспитании.

Resume. Actual problems of «I» and «Other» can be viewed in different sections and planes. Communication, dialogue between I and others should take place in the plane of understanding; dialogue is important in modern society, because it is important not to bring problems to the conflict. One of the important conditions for all this is the understanding between the self and the other, which is most feasible in communities where there is a tradition of compromise and the tradition of family education.

Литература

1. Тулмин Ст. Человеческое понимание. М., 1984
2. Корчак А. С.. Философия другого Я: История и современность. – М.: ЛЕНАНД, 2006. 152с.
3. CECILIA F. ESSAU, SATOKO SASAGAWA, JUNMEN CHEN, YUJI SAKANO.: «Taijin Kyofusho and Social Phobia Symptoms in Young Adults in England and in Japan», *Journal of Cross cultural psychology*, 2012, v. 43; 2, pp. 220 – 236.
4. Скворцова Е.Л. «О русских антагонизмах и японском компромиссе» // Вопросы философии. № 1, 2014.
5. Хабермас Ю. Философский дискурс о модерне. Пер. с нем. – М.: Изд. «Весь мир», 2003.

Kasymseitova Sandugash Alihanovna

Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy Kostanai State University the name of Baitursinov. Sity Kostanai. Republic of Kazakhstan

THE CONCEPT OF CULTURAL ECOLOGY IN VARIOUS SCIENCES

Cultural ecology is the study of human adaptations to social and physical environments. Human adaptation refers to both biological and cultural processes that enable a population to survive and reproduce within a given or changing environment. This may be carried out diachronically (examining entities that existed in different epochs), or synchronically (examining a present system and its components). The central argument is that the natural environment, in small scale or subsistence societies dependent

in part upon it, is a major contributor to social organization and other human institutions. In the academic realm, when combined with study of political economy, the study of economies as polities, it becomes political ecology, another academic subfield. It also helps interrogate historical events like the Easter Island Syndrome.

Coining the term

Anthropologist Julian Steward (1902-1972) coined the term, envisioning cultural ecology as a methodology for understanding how humans adapt to such a wide variety of environments. In his *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (1955), cultural ecology represents the «ways in which culture change is induced by adaptation to the environment.» A key point is that any particular human adaptation is in part historically inherited and involves the technologies, practices, and knowledge that allow people to live in an environment. This means that while the environment influences the character of human adaptation, it does not determine it. In this way, Steward wisely separated the vagaries of the environment from the inner workings of a culture that occupied a given environment. Viewed over the long term, this means that environment and culture are on more or less separate evolutionary tracks and that the ability of one to influence the other is dependent on how each is structured. It is this assertion – that the physical and biological environment affects culture – that has proved controversial, because it implies an element of environmental determinism over human actions, which some social scientists find problematic, particularly those writing from a Marxist perspective. Cultural ecology recognizes that ecological locale plays a significant role in shaping the cultures of a region.

Steward's method was to:

1. document the technologies & methods used to exploit the environment – to get a living from it. s
2. look at patterns of human behavior/culture associated with using the environment.
3. assess how much these patterns of behavior influenced other aspects of culture (e.g., how, in a drought-prone region, great concern over rainfall patterns meant this became central to everyday life, and led to the development of a religious belief system in which rainfall and water figured very strongly. This belief system may not appear in a society where good rainfall for crops can be taken for granted, or where irrigation was practiced).

Steward's concept of cultural ecology became widespread among anthropologists and archaeologists of the mid-20th century, though they would later be critiqued for their environmental determinism. Cultural ecology was one of the central tenets and driving factors in the development of processual archaeology in the 1960s, as archaeologists understood cultural change through the framework of technology and its effects on environmental adaptation.

Cultural ecology in anthropology

Cultural ecology as developed by Steward is a major subdiscipline of anthropology. It derives from the work of Franz Boas and has branched out to cover a number of aspects of human society, in particular the distribution of wealth and power in a society, and how

that affects such behaviour as hoarding or gifting (e.g. the tradition of the potlatch on the Northeast North American coast).

Cultural ecology as a transdisciplinary project

One recent conception of cultural ecology is as a general theory that regards ecology as a paradigm not only for the natural and human sciences, but for cultural studies as well. In his *Die Ökologie des Wissens* (The Ecology of Knowledge), Peter Finke explains that this theory brings together the various cultures of knowledge that have evolved in history, and that have been separated into more and more specialized disciplines and subdisciplines in the evolution of modern science (Finke 2005). In this view, cultural ecology considers the sphere of human culture not as separate from but as interdependent with and transfused by ecological processes and natural energy cycles. At the same time, it recognizes the relative independence and self-reflexive dynamics of cultural processes. As the dependency of culture on nature, and the ineradicable presence of nature in culture, are gaining interdisciplinary attention, the difference between cultural evolution and natural evolution is increasingly acknowledged by cultural ecologists. Rather than genetic laws, information and communication have become major driving forces of cultural evolution (see Finke 2005, 2006). Thus, causal deterministic laws do not apply to culture in a strict sense, but there are nevertheless productive analogies that can be drawn between ecological and cultural processes.

Gregory Bateson was the first to draw such analogies in his project of an Ecology of Mind (Bateson 1973), which was based on general principles of complex dynamic life processes, e.g. the concept of feedback loops, which he saw as operating both between the mind and the world and within the mind itself. Bateson thinks of the mind neither as an autonomous metaphysical force nor as a mere neurological function of the brain, but as a «dehierarchized concept of a mutual dependency between the (human) organism and its (natural) environment, subject and object, culture and nature», and thus as «a synonym for a cybernetic system of information circuits that are relevant for the survival of the species.» (Gersdorf/ Mayer 2005: 9).

Finke fuses these ideas with concepts from systems theory. He describes the various sections and subsystems of society as 'cultural ecosystems' with their own processes of production, consumption, and reduction of energy (physical as well as psychic energy). This also applies to the cultural ecosystems of art and of literature, which follow their own internal forces of selection and self-renewal, but also have an important function within the cultural system as a whole (see next section).

Cultural ecology in literary studies

The vital interrelatedness between culture and nature has been a special focus of literary culture from its archaic beginnings in myth, ritual, and oral story-telling, in legends and fairy tales, in the genres of pastoral literature, nature poetry. Important texts in this tradition include the stories of mutual transformations between human and nonhuman life, most famously collected in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which became a highly influential text throughout literary history and across different cultures. This attention to culture-nature interaction became especially prominent in the era

of romanticism, but continues to be characteristic of literary stagings of human experience up to the present. The mutual opening and symbolic reconnection of culture and nature, mind and body, human and nonhuman life in a holistic and yet radically pluralistic way seems to be one significant mode in which literature functions and in which literary knowledge is produced.

From this perspective, literature can itself be described as the symbolic medium of a particularly powerful form of «cultural ecology» (Zapf 2002). Literary texts have staged and explored, in ever new scenarios, the complex feedback relationship of prevailing cultural systems with the needs and manifestations of human and nonhuman «nature.» From this paradoxical act of creative regression they have derived their specific power of innovation and cultural self-renewal.

German ecocritic Hubert Zapf argues that literature draws its cognitive and creative potential from a threefold dynamics in its relationship to the larger cultural system: as a «cultural-critical metadiscourse,» an «imaginative counterdiscourse,» and a «reintegrative interdiscourse» (Zapf 2001, 2002). It is a textual form which breaks up ossified social structures and ideologies, symbolically empowers the marginalized, and re-connects what is culturally separated. In that way, literature counteracts economic, political or pragmatic forms of interpreting and instrumentalizing human life, and breaks up one-dimensional views of the world and the self, opening them up towards their repressed or excluded other. Literature is thus, on the one hand, a sensorium for what goes wrong in a society, for the biophobic, life-paralyzing implications of one-sided forms of consciousness and civilizational uniformity, and it is, on the other hand, a medium of constant cultural self-renewal, in which the neglected biophilic energies can find a symbolic space of expression and of (re-)integration into the larger ecology of cultural discourses. This approach has been applied and widened in a recent volume of essays by scholars from over the world (Zapf 2008).

Cultural ecology in geography

In geography, cultural ecology developed in response to the «landscape morphology» approach of Carl O. Sauer. Sauer's school was criticized for being unscientific and later for holding a «reified» or «superorganic» conception of culture. Cultural ecology applied ideas from ecology and systems theory to understand the adaptation of humans to their environment. These cultural ecologists focused on flows of energy and materials, examining how beliefs and institutions in a culture regulated its interchanges with the natural ecology that surrounded it. In this perspective humans were as much a part of the ecology as any other organism. Important practitioners of this form of cultural ecology include Karl Butzer and David Stoddard.

The second form of cultural ecology introduced decision theory from agricultural economics, particularly inspired by the works of Alexander Chayanov and Ester Boserup. These cultural ecologists were concerned with how human groups made decisions about how they use their natural environment. They were particularly concerned with the question of agricultural intensification, refining the competing models of Thomas Malthus and Boserup. Notable cultural ecologists in this second tradition include Harold Brookfield and Billie Lee Turner II.

Starting in the 1980s, cultural ecology came under criticism from political ecology. Political ecologists charged that cultural ecology ignored the connections between the local-scale systems they studied and the global political economy. Today few geographers