

Noohumanism as a New Worldview Paradigm of the 21st century

Raushan Shindaulova

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences,
Associate Professor, Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory (Almaty, Kazakhstan)
E-mail: sharabana1@mail.ru

Shindaulova, Raushan (2022) Noohumanism as a New Worldview Paradigm of the 21st century. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 28, 107-117. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/28/9>

The article discloses the prerequisites of the Noohumanism, which incorporates the noospheric-environmental as well as the humanistic components. Studied is the role of the principle of harmony as a basic cornerstone element of the Noohumanism. The metaprinciple, being projected through each level of the “human-society-nature” system, generates the axiological array of the noohumanism and plays the regulatory role in forming the noohumanistic senses and values.

The aim hereof is to provide a rationale for the author’s development of the worldview potential of the noohumanism as the homonymous worldview concept based on the synthesis of the noospheric-environmental and humanistic worldview matrices. The noohumanistic worldview focused on the harmonization of the socio-natural systems shall be formed applying adequate approach, in this particular case, the noohumanistic approach, which plays the methodological role within the scope of the handled problem.

The noohumanistic approach, as elaborated by the author, is the complex research method that helps to argue and approves the conceptual bases lying under the formation of the noohumanistic worldview and to structurize the framework of the determinant noohumanistic categories and concepts. The noohumanistic approach incorporates: (a) the mixed-level analysis and the subset of approaches (axiological, interdisciplinary, regional, psycho-didactic, musicological et al.), exposing the philosophical-anthropological, culturological, psychological-pedagogical and other requisites that predetermine the socio-cultural, worldview-wise and moral significance of the noohumanism; (b) the noohumanistic ideas tracing their origins back to the philosophic, naturalistic, interdisciplinary areas of knowledge. The noohumanistic approach reflects the relevancy of the introduced worldview system as a social demand of the present.

The scientific finding that resulted from the noohumanistic approach is the developed theoretical-methodological and methodical framework of the noohumanistic worldview within the scope of the philosophy of education to provide blueprint principles for the incipient noohumanistic pedagogy – one of the most prospective areas of contemporary education.

The practical implication hereof is that the study materials may be put into scholarly circulation and used in developing the strategies of the educational modernization, the youth policy and within the teaching and learning activities.

Keywords: noohumanism, metaprinciple of harmony, axiology of noohumanism

Received: 12 June 2021 / Accepted: 18 September 2021 / Published: 27 January 2022

© Shindaulova, Raushan, 2022

The current world situation reveals all sorts of multiple global threats, e.g., military-terroristic, political, social-economical, environmental, denominational-extremist, etc. The socio-economical, physical and psycho-emotional health of people all over the world has worsened even more because of the recent outbreak of the Covid pandemic, which confronted humanity to find a newer policy of global collaboration between the countries in solving existing threats and the related crisis events within multiple strata of economy and society. The worldwide community is concerned about the aftereffects of the pandemic, which might lead to the total impoverishment of the masses and the global economic crisis. Economic stagnation, closed borders, unemployment, and restrictions over the producers might become the factors that could trigger the “hunger crisis.”

In such conditions, one shall have along with the clear mind and strong nerves, the positive-constructive world outlook – the worldview focused on the harmonization of the socio-natural systems, on the productive cooperation of people, which will rely upon the humanistic guiding (orienting) points, and seek for consensus, as well as the development of the planetary intelligence. In this regard, a very viable direction is the noohumanization of the society, i.e., by introducing humanity to the noohumanistic values.

The worldview foundations are laid and shaped not only by the family, educational institutions, or by the scientific-technological and cultural progress, yet they already stem out of the exquisite, subtle spirit of the society. Developing inside the public energy and information space, these worldview germs steadily propagate into the collective consciousness. Certainly, as we have noted, those processes are conditioned by the complexity of the factors listed above.

The scholarly objective shall be capturing and studying any newborn worldview trends ever so manifested in society, assessing their overall efficiency and productivity, and specifically for the youth as far as they are the conductors of those ideas-trends into their future professional daily activities.

In our view, one of the promising departments of the contemporary philosophy of education is the *Noohumanism* as a worldview construct that reflects the most critical aspects – i.e., environmental, humanistic, spiritual-moral aspects of social development.

This paper attempts to disclose author’s vision of fundamental grounds of the noohumanism in terms of the worldview paradigm – the triunity of components of the “human-society-nature” system based on the socio-natural homeostasis or harmonization of the socio-natural systems.

We pose as prospective – especially, in the context of the philosophy of education – the accumulation of humanistic, noospheric, environmental worldview reference (orientation) points under the general noohumanistic matrix, which is intended to form in an individual of the: intelligent and careful attitude toward the nature; communicative skills and empathy toward a neighbour; and to master and exploit the health-saving technologies to maintain one’s own psycho-physical balance.

The concept of “the noohumanism” consists of two components: the humanistic and the noospheric, essentially, it comprises the *noospheric humanism*.

It is known that humanism recognizes “the value of a human as a person, his or her right to free development and the manifestation of his or her capabilities, the postulation of the human welfare as a criterion for assessing social relations” and the humanity – as the ideal of humanism – is “the love, attention to a person, respect for a human person; a kind attitude to all living things” (Sarybekov & Sydyknazarov, 2007: 59).

The noospheric concept of the noohumanism is associated with the idea of the noosphere by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (2008) and Édouard Le Roy (1928), the doctrine of the noosphere

by Vladimir Vernadsky (1944), whereunder the main meaning of the noosphere “lies in the principle of co-evolution – the correlation of cosmo- and anthropogenesis” (Birich, 2010: 18). Indeed, in terms of the Universe evolution, the “geological force” is represented by the Man, since it is him, who is “the main instrument of the Universe awareness,” life and can see beyond the actual opportunities, create new forms of existence, evolve from nature imitation and adaptation thereto towards the creativeness and perfection of self spiritual dimension” (Birich, 2010: 18). Pioneers have diversely interpreted the definition of the “noosphere”: Vladimir Vernadsky, as a natural scientist, believed that mankind, “while mastering the laws of nature and developing technology, ever more transforms the nature up to its needs, and therefore the noosphere tends to continuously expand, which is facilitated by the Man’s spaceflight and penetration into the depths of the planet” (Philosophic Encyclopaedic Dictionary, 2005: 65).

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin viewed the noosphere in an abstract and esoteric way. In Teilhard de Chardin’s understanding, the noosphere is a qualitatively new state of the concentration of consciousness, which forms a specific envelope or a sphere of the spirit, a “thinking layer” covering the Earth. He defines the noosphere as the “harmonized collectivity of consciousnesses equivalent to a sort of super-consciousness” (Teilhard de Chardin, 2008: 247).

Instantly, shall we point out that the notion of “the noosphere” and, respectively, the doctrine of noosphere bear intricate character: they have both many proponents and opponents alike. For example, Vladimir Kaganov sharply criticized the said notion and the noospheric humanism in general, emphasizing their utopianism and inconsistency. He wrote: “Vladimir Vernadsky believes that Man faces “an issue of restructuring the biosphere for the benefit of free-thinking humanity.” One shall note that the biosphere has been restructuring since the domestication of plants and animals, which ensured a significantly better food supply of the Man. Since then, the restructuring has gone with varying success, producing not only benefits for the Man, but also affecting big and irreparable damage to the entire nature. Yet, there is no “free-thinking humanity” in the world, and nobody knows when it will appear. Likewise, nobody knows what would remain behind the biosphere by that time. Moreover, there are other forces out there in the world, uncontrollable by the Man, the forces of the nature itself. As for now, protection and salvation of the biosphere against Man’s vandal destruction stand as the essential task before humanity. In principle, nobody is going to restructurize it into the noosphere. That would be impossible. The biosphere will never become intellectual and thinking and will never transgress into the noosphere. Evolution creates a hierarchy of life forms, and the biosphere is lying in its basis. A reasonable symbiosis of Man and biosphere is needed, without which the very existence of the Man is impossible. It is not by coincidence that the problem of environmental safety and protection in our time has become the focus of attention of public organizations and international forums” (Kaganov, 2018).

The quote we cited to objectively display multipolarity of opinions about the issue under consideration does not only diminish, but rather emphasizes the potential of the noohumanism and the prospects of its research. It (the quote) expresses the author’s concern about the biosphere protection issues and the survival of *Homo sapiens* as a species, on the one hand, as well as highlights the ecological principle as an organic part of the noospheric whole, on the other. That is understandable since Man (society) – Nature, Cosmos are the links of a single chain and interaction of humans with socio-natural systems in terms of harmonization, more broadly – of their survival – is the top priority task that requires a relative consensus of the human community in solving modern global challenges of the era.

Clearly, the environmental part of the noospheric component could not fail to be impregnated with the ideas of sustainable development (Meadows et al., 1972; Kuznetsov et al., 2001). However, not only the ecological orientation of this problem brings it to the planetary level. The absence of inter-cultural dialogue and tolerance, inter-ethnic strifes, civil wars, terrorism, etc. – all this highlights the civilizational crisis, the need to switch to a qualitatively new level of consciousness and develop a concerted strategy of survival in this complicated world. If the intelligent human activity, at the time when Édouard Le Roy, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and Vladimir Vernadsky were building foundations of the noosphere doctrine (the first stage), did not pose any threat and was viewed positively in essence, then the present predatory attitude of people toward the bioresources, the expansion and technogenic load on nature push the biosphere to irreversible catastrophic consequences as a result of such consumer egoism. Therefore, in the modern reading of the noosphere concept, considering the threatening state of the biosphere, its semantic dominant has shifted towards the ideas of the sustainable development concept, i.e., intelligently managed sustainable evolution.

In other words, we are talking about the formation of *the harmonious noosphere* (the second stage) – a new human habitat, which, based on the systemic scientific knowledge, provides the possibility for harmonious coexistence of the biosphere, the technosphere, and the Man. The most important conditions for creating the harmonious noosphere are the education and maintenance of the desired level of culture, morality and human conscience, as well as the development of creative abilities.

The harmonious noosphere shall be understood as “such an interaction between Man and nature, which will promote resolution of the conflict between limited resources of the biosphere and growing needs of the society for energy and substances. The fight against environmental pollution, curing damages caused to nature by uncontrolled industrial activities, and the conscious management of evolutionary processes in biological systems are particularly important today. Therefore, formation of the harmonious noosphere is the main problem of the 21st century, the solution of which has already begun, as evidenced by the formulation and attempt to solve environmental problems” (Sarybekov & Sydyknazarov, 2007: 234).

Apropos the above critical assertions concerning the noosphere doctrine, it should be noted that the scientific community pays tribute to the academicism and productivity of the said doctrine. The modern scientific paradigm exhibits a steady trend to actualize the statements of the noospherism and sustainable development concepts, focused on the formation of a worldview model having co-evolutionary, humanistic, and eco-philic directionality. Considerable amount of research papers have been published in connection with the development of typological diversity of the worldviews: the noospheric (Kuznetsov, 2001; Ivanov & Voroshilova, 2010), environmental (Moiseev, 2001; Glazachev, 2005), environmentally-oriented (Ivaschenko et al., 2008), humanistic (Batalova, 2004, Kaznacheeva, 2000), ecohumanistic (Seliverstova, 2009; Zulkarnaeva & Vinokurova, 2016). To that effect, following the logic of progressive development, the conceptual foundations of the noohumanistic worldview shall undoubtedly be elaborated.

Substantially, the noospheric component of the noohumanism gained its reflection in Russian science. It is stated that the noospheric concept is represented in the noohumanism as a “humanized integral organism, which is to solve not only environmental, but entire global and universal problems. It calls to love not only one individual person but also the entire humanity regardless of race and nation, love nature as a habitat, all living on Earth (...) Imperative of the noohumanism is to humanize existence of the human being as a guarantee of its survival” (Drobzhev, 2013: 198). Besides, Igor Borzenko points out that,

“The noospheric humanists urge to account all the global trends of our time and realize that a dignified living of every person, peaceful existence, environmental safety, social and moral justice, the meaningfulness of existence, universal human solidarity in the process of humanization of life and the planet-wise transformation of inner and outer nature are the only imperatives for Man’s survival. The central theses of the noospheric humanism are as follows (Borzenko, 1999: 60):

- a) the interpretation of the Man as a biosocial cosmic being;
- b) acknowledgment of the universal science as far as it concerns “the unity of the Man, the life and the Universe as well as the global laws of their systemic-organizational structure, functioning and development”;
- c) the philosophic credo in that the human mind plays a decisive role in the cosmo-evolutionary process.

Alexander Subetto, tracing the origins of the noospheric humanism, refers to it along with “the new scientific directions such as the noospherology, the noospherism, the anthropocosmic ecology, the noospheric ethics, and all of them represent the noospheric scientific school – the school of paradigmatic typology, carrying the revolutionary changes in the system of scientific worldview, the ideology of the 21st century, and in the scientific picture of the world” (Subetto, 2012: 7).

Prominent scholar Oleg Bazaluk considers that the philosophy of education in the light of the new cosmological conception forms the “image” of the future human, thus, orienting and meaningfully enriching the pedagogy with the new knowledge, methods, modi, goals, which eventually by means of education will underlay the immanent system of views of a certain generation (Bazaluk, 2010: 9).

The noohumanism we are considering as a worldview concept is based on the idea of socio-natural homeostasis (Subetto, 2003), which originates in antiquity and is brilliantly developed by the modern scientific community. This idea is associated with the harmonization of the socio-environmental systems and is founded on the *principle of harmony* (Mukaeva, 2003), which corresponds to the *principle of harmonization* – the key principle of the noospheric education (Maslova, 1999), etc. Plotnikova Larisa notes that, “At the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro (1992), and later at the World Summit in Johannesburg (2002) it was recognized that the comprehensive harmonization of the socio-natural interaction is an urgent goal of our time, the prerequisite for the transition of mankind to a new phase of sustainable and safe development (...) Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, the common human idea of the noosphere can (should) become an ideal project of the future socio-natural harmony governed by the collective human mind” (Plotnikova, 2004).

So, what meaning do we put into the concept of noohumanism, why do we think that, in terms of the socio-natural homeostasis, it is legitimate of the idea of socio-natural consonance regulated by the metaprinciple of harmony to be substantial therefore?

The principle of harmony between Man and nature is the key principle in the noohumanism and has fundamental methodological significance. The principle of harmony is interpreted as generic in an array of correlates: “sustainable development,” “tolerance,” “the co-evolution,” and “homeostasis.” It denotes the whole’s unsteady (non-equilibrium) balance and has a universal meaning.

Indeed, the term “harmony” means “the accordance, the consonance” (Philosophic Encyclopaedic Dictionary, 2005: 87) and is associated with its generic temporal being.

What relates harmony to the concept of “sustainable development” is that people should live “in *harmony* with nature,” “recognize that the environmental protection shall become an integral component of the development process” (Sikorskaya, 1999: 3). Semantic similarity of “the harmony” and “the homeostasis” is obvious, because the latter within common scientific discourse is interpreted as “the dynamic equilibrium state of a system, maintained by its resilience against external and internal disbalancing factors” (Dictionary of Practical Psychologist, 1997: 107). The concept of the “tolerance” shares the same semantic space along with the listed meanings; it is defined as a value and social norm of the civil society and manifested in “the right of all individuals of the civil society to be different; the sustained harmony between various religious denominations, political, ethnic and other social groups (...) the willingness to understand and cooperate with people having different appearance, language, beliefs, customs and faiths.” Declaration of the Principles on Tolerance was adopted by the UNESCO resolution dated November 16, 1995” (Sarybekov & Sydyknazarov, 2007: 368).

As per the Noohumanism concept proposed hereinabove, the principle of the socio-natural harmonization regulated by the metaprinciple of harmony is viewed in the light of the “human-society-nature” system. Notably, projections of this principle are capable to generate the noohumanistic values and set the vectoriality of the *raison d’être*, the meaningful and purposeful foundations of an individual’s life, its motivation and activity.

However, from the synonymic chain of: “the socio-natural homeostasis,” “the socio-natural harmonization,” as based on the harmony metaprinciple, we derive the principle of the socio-natural consonance, since it means the unanimity and concordance of the views. It is for this reason that the “group agreement” (“the group consensus”) was coined as the psychology term, which expresses “the similarity of outlooks, positions, and attitudes” (Dictionary of Practical Psychologist, 1997: 620).

Moreover, the reason to count on the given term is that it reflects the human factor. Here the most important is an individual’s intention, his or her attitude, willingness to establish a dialogue, constructive and mutually beneficial cooperation. Therefore, within the category of socio-natural consonance, the harmonizing impetus is not exerted statically, but in the intention of its initiators, in the desire to strengthen and maintain the relative balance of the socio-natural systems.

Manifesting the idea of socio-natural harmony, the aforementioned metaprinciple of harmony plays a regulatory role and acts as a noohumanistic gradient, which projects the whole range of noohumanistic values within the “human-society-nature” system (in terms of variable combinations of its components). In other words, projections of the metaprinciple of harmony, at each level of the said system, generate the axiological array of the noohumanism.

So, let us investigate what noohumanistic scale of values is structured through the projection of the harmony metaprinciple at each level of the “human-society-nature” system.

On the personal level (the “human” level within the “human-society-nature” system), the harmony metaprinciple projects as an individual’s formation (self-upbringing) of the stable subconscious mental set, balanced composure, health, distress tolerance and commitment to positive relations with the society that prospers into congruity (Rogers, 1994), i.e., the higher cohesiveness of one’s internal world with the ambiance, on the one hand, and internal self-acceptance, on the other. An individual’s willingness to cultivate the internal psychological stability within the frame of the noohumanistic worldview paradigm corresponds to the principle of the potential intellectual safety of a child, of a teacher and is marked in the noospheric education as the health-preserving technology (Maslova, 1999). The individual’s

personal committedness to build harmonious relationships with the world, society, him or herself results in the development of self-awareness and self-knowledge (Rubinstein, 1989; Rogers, 1994). Realizing the objective reality and endowing it with personal noohumanistically-oriented meanings and values, one turns it, thereby, into the content of its own subjectivity, the resultant of which (ideally) is the formed desired noohumanistic worldview.

Oleg Bazaluk fairly notes that the “System of values forms part of the nucleus of personality and acts as the worldview basis of all vital spheres and aspects thereof. The main function of the educational system exactly is to form the said component, which reflects in the very term of *education* itself (Bazaluk, 2010: 330).

– Further, let us consider how the harmony metaprinciple is manifested at the society level within the “human-society-nature” system.

It has been found that the projection of the harmony metaprinciple on an interpersonal level is most prominently materialized, as demanded by the present-day realities, in such communicative quality as the tolerance, i.e., the patience towards the Other (Maikovskaya, 2009), the people’s capacity to establish intercultural, interpersonal dialogue and build mutual understanding on denominational, interethnic, interstate and other levels, as well as capacity to show mercy, humanity and kindness. As per the Declaration of the Principles on Tolerance adopted by the UNESCO in 1995 and recognized by 185 countries, the tolerance is the “harmony in difference.” Novelty of usage of this term arises out of its contextuality, i.e., in terms of the noohumanism, tolerance also stands as the noohumanistic value (attitudes, beliefs) – a spiritual and moral quality that is urgently needed by humanity nowadays. Moreover, tolerance initiates derivative meanings associated with empathy and sociologically – mastering communication skills, teamwork (Vorobyova, 2008; Andreeva, 2010), and conflict resistance (Tsoi, 2015; Khasan & Sergomanov, 2004) that regulates the conflict discrepancies.

Hence, implementation of the harmony metaprinciple at the “society” level within the “human-society-nature” system has great prospects. A tolerant person would judiciously build his or her relationships with the society and would try to comprehend the inner logic of Others, avoiding any aggression, thus, contributing to thwart any conflict. Alternatively, an individual, who has conceived and adopted the noohumanistic value of forging harmonious communicative skills in the society, would gain benefits for his or her professional activities and competencies of the noohumanistically-oriented personality;

– On the “nature” level of the “human-society-nature” system, i.e., the people-nature interaction, the harmony metaprinciple is exhibited through environmental component of the noohumanism – as the Man’s willingness to preserve the environment for the sake of future generations, as an individual’s cultivation (self-cultivation) of the responsible environmental attitude towards the biosphere, ecological culture, which contextually serve as the noohumanistic values.

Analyzing the current scientific content of the Ukrainian scholars on this topic, we would like to mention a relevant article by Tamara Kirik, the Candidate of Pedagogic Sciences of the Kyiv Medical University, called “On the Tendency of Introduction of New Terms in the Courses of Philosophy and Other Disciplines” (“Про тенденцію упровадження нових термінів у курси з філософії та інших дисциплін”), wherein the author figures some moments (Kirik, 2017). Kirik remarks the author upon that using the term – “the noohumanism”: “Shindaulova did not set herself a task to study in details the history of usage by other modern scientists of the scientific terms that would begin with ‘noo-’, in

particular, ‘the noohumanism,’ being satisfied with one single case – the doctoral dissertation of a Russian citizen Galina Sikorskaya, whom she considers the inventor of this term” (Kirik, 2017: 165).¹

Tamara Kirik rightfully remarked that we did not set ourself the specific task to study minutely who was the first to coin out the term – “noohumanism.” This absolutely was beyond the scope of our research study.

The primary objective was to investigate the applications of the noohumanism as widely as possible and impregnate this very concept with our own vision.

However, in the late 90s, at that time when we started the project of our dissertation study for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy, it was the doctoral dissertation of Galina Sikorskaya available in open media sources that was the most noteworthy and which provided the clearest definition of the noohumanism (Sikorskaya, 1999).

In none of our papers did we emphasized that it is Galina Sikorskaya and only she who is the original inventor of the term “noohumanism.”

Revisiting the above remark by Tamara Kirik that we have not set ourself the task to study in detail the history of usage by other modern scientists of the scientific terms that would begin with the “noo-” prefix, we would like to furnish two considerations to that effect.

Firstly. While creating an intellectual product, a scholar cannot sidestep the analysis of earlier accomplishments in the field of his or her interest. Objectively, what is meant here is the paradigm – “the achievements, which are acknowledged by all scientists and which provide the academic community with the problem statement and solution model for a specific historic period” (Concise Philosophic Dictionary, 2016: 279). No new strata of the knowledge could ever be discovered without “standing on the shoulders of giants.” This well-known metaphor that conveys the sense of the knowledge continuity is the ultimate and unconditioned reference standard for our study of the noohumanistic concepts. Based on the multidisciplinary approach that integrates the systems approach, the noospheric-environmental, the quantum, the musicological and other approaches, we have drawn into the orbit of our research not only the treatises by Sikorskaya, but also the works of other scholars, who have studied the scientific phenomena, concepts with the “noo-” particle such as: “the noospherism,” “the noogenesis,” “the noospherogenesis,” “the noosphere-oriented synthesis of sciences” (Moiseev, 2001; Subetto, 2003). For instance, Nikita Moiseev considered the formulation of the sustainable development strategy as a particular step toward the noosphere, in other words the step on the way toward the noospherogenesis” (Moiseev, 1997).

By and large, a scholar has to somehow find out approaches to elaborate such a fundamental research project as, in our case, – the development of a cosmo-planetary individual, a one who would think globally and person-wise would own profound moral principles, responsibility, leadership skills, etc. (Bazaluk, 2021). In this regard, it is notable that the academic ideas, concepts, dwelling in the surrounding info-space (in the noosphere), instantaneously resonate with the contemporary scholars, since “the noosphere” is the single organized whole, of which the all parts are harmoniously interconnected at various levels and act in concert with each other. A precondition for that must be a connection that is quick, reliable, covering long-distance range between those parts, as well as permanent material flow between them, the comprehensive information exchange” (Ivanov & Voroshilova, 2010).

¹ “Шиндаулова Р.Б. не ставила перед собою завдання детального вивчення історії використання іншими сучасними науковцями наукових термінів, які б розночилися с “ноо-,” зокрема, і поняття “ноогуманизм,” задовольнившись одним-єдинним випадком – докторською дисертацією громадянки з Росії Г.П. Сикорской, яку вона вважає вінахідником цього терміну”

Secondly. Meaning of the noohumanism is construed differently in our studies (Shindaulova, 2016) and in the papers by Galina Sikorskaya. If Sikorskaya in understanding the “noohumanism” concept accentuates its environmental component, then we define its meaning more widely.

That is, first of all, the idea of the homeostasis (the dynamic equilibrium) of the socio-natural systems, at each of three levels of the “Human-Society-Nature” system, and, accordingly, the formulated value-based orientations. In other words, achieving the harmony at all three levels of the said system – be it either the psycho-emotional balance, human resistance qualities (“the human” level) or the social skills, tolerant relations with people (“the society” level) or the prudent and careful human-and-environment interaction (“the nature” level) – in all cases means the requirement for the human being to keep within limits, to pay respect to oneself, to the surrounding people and to the nature. While the moral-ethical qualities (such as humanity, respect, responsibility, tolerance, love, etc.) as well as the imperatives (the moral, the environmental, the survivability imperatives), forming at that point, constitute the axiological basis of the noohumanism.

One shall note that the followers of diverse scholastic and academic traditions are enriching, in this case, the term “noohumanism” with various senses.

Thus, in addition to the above reviewed “environmentally-oriented” meaning of the “noohumanism” as for one is proposed by Galina Sikorskaya or to the extensive interpretation of the noohumanism in terms of the socio-natural homeostasis as suggested by Raushan Shindaulova, the exponents of the Ukrainian school of thought – Konstantin and Yuri Korsaks – in their nooglossary define the noohumanism as “the realisation of principle for the relation to the person as to the highest value in conditions of noosociety and adoption of the world convention ‘On Duties of the Person’” (Korsak & Korsak, 2014: 46).

As we see the multiple understandings of the meaning of “the noohumanism” take place. That is normal since scholarly knowledge can gradually grow because of the legitimate criticism of the hypotheses proposed for a problem’s solution. Here one may recall Sir Karl Popper, and his principle of falsification as one of the scientific criteria (Popper, 1935).

With all that said, the contemporary geopolitical situation and various civilization threats require well-reasoned and balanced approaches. Herein the proposed worldview concept of the noohumanism, which is to form the value orientations as per the central idea of the homeostasis (the metaprinciple of harmony) under the “human-society-nature” system, gains paradigmatic tendency within contemporary philosophy, philosophy of education, and while still undergoing its evolutionary development, offers tremendous prospects, creative productivity, and is capable of solving the topical issues of today.

References

- Andreeva, Galina (2010) *Social psychology*. Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Batalova, Anna (2004) *Formation of humanistic worldview in the students of educational institutions of culture and arts*. Author’s abstract of the dissertation of the candidate of pedagogical sciences. Moscow. Available online: https://static.freereferats.ru/_avtoreferats/01002625807.pdf
- Bazaluk, Oleg (2010) *The Philosophy of Education in the Light of the New Cosmological Concept*. Textbook. Kyiv: Kondor.
- Bazaluk, Oleg (2021) The Genesis of the Philosophical Tradition in Education. *Schole*, Vol. 15 (2), 911-925. <https://doi.org/10.25205/1995-4328-2021-15-2-911-925>

- Birich, Inna (2010) Relatedness of cosmic-, philo- and anthropogenesis at their structural triunity: “nesting doll” model. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Vol.9. Available online: <http://ispcjournal.org/journals/2010/2010-2.pdf>
- Borzenko, Igor (1999) Planetary Aspects of Humanistic Worldview. *Zdravyy smysl*, No. 3 (12).
- Concise Philosophic Dictionary (2016) Moscow: Original-maket.
- Dictionary of the Practical Psychologist* (1997) Golovin. Minsk: Harvest.
- Drobzhev, Mihail (2013) Vernadsky: Noosphere and Humanism Problems (To the 150th Anniversary of V.I. Vernadsky). *Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities. Philosophy, Sociology and Cultural Studies*, Issue 2 (117), 190-200. Available online: shorturl.at/jpHY6
- Glazachev, Stanislav (2005) Ecological Culture: Essence, contents, Technology of Formation. *Narodnaya Asveta*, No 2, 33-37.
- Ivanov, Sergej, and Voroshilova, Tatiana (2010) Modern Environmental Education: from Ecocentrism to Noospheric Outlook. *Education and Science*, No. 8 (76), 53-64. Available online: shorturl.at/krL03
- Ivaschenko, Alexander, Panov, Victor and Gagarin, Alexander (2008). *Ecologically-oriented Outlook of a Person*. Moscow: Publishing house of RUDN.
- Kaganov, Vladimir (2018) *On the noosphere and noospheric humanism*. Available online: <http://www.humanism.ru/discussions/840-kaganov2018.html>.
- Kaznacheeva, Natalia (2000) *Development of the Humanistic Worldview of High School Students By Means of Russian Classical Literature*. Dis. of. Cand. of Pedagogical Sciences. Moscow.
- Khasan, Boris, and Sergomanov, P. (2004) *Psychology of Conflict and Negotiations*. Moscow: Academy.
- Kirik, Tamara (2017) On the Tendency of Introducing New Terms Into Courses of Philosophy and Other Disciplines. *Philosophy of Science: Traditions and Innovations*, 1 (15), 159-168. Available online: shorturl.at/jqAET
- Korsak, Konstantin, and Korsak, Yurij (2014) Nooglosarium as a means of positivizing the Future and New Goals of Higher Education. *Higher Education of Ukraine*, No. 2., 42-48. Available online: shorturl.at/bntF7
- Kuznetsov, Michael (2001) *Philosophical foundations of the noospheric worldview*. Ph.D. thesis. Ekaterinburg.
- Kuznetsov, Oleg, Kuznetsov, Pobisk, and Bolshakov, Boris (2001) *System Nature-Society-Man. Sustainable development*. Moscow.
- Le Roy, Édouard (1928) *Les Origines humaines et revolution de l'intelligence*. Paris, France: Boivin.
- Maikovskaya, Larisa (2009) *The Phenomenon of Ethnocultural Tolerance in Music Education*. Author’s abstract. ...dis. of Dr. of Pedagogical Science. Moscow.
- Maslova, Natalia (1999) *Noosphere Education in the Formation of a New Person*. Moscow.
- Meadows, Donella H; Meadows, Dennis L; Randers, Jørgen; Behrens III, William W (1972) *The Limits to Growth; A Report for the Club of Rome’s Project on the Predicament of Mankind*. New York: Universe Books.
- Moiseev, Nikita (1997) Coevolution of Nature and Society. Ways of Noosferogenesis. *Ecology and Life*, (2-3). Available online: <http://www.ecolife.ru/jornal/echo/1997-2-1.shtml>.

- Moiseev, Nikita (2001) Environmental Outlook. *Philosophy of Environmental Education*. Ed. I.K. Liseeva. Moscow: Progress tradition. 21-30.
- Mukaeva, Bair (2003) *The Principle of Harmony in the Concept of Sustainable Nature Management: Philosophical and Methodological Analysis*. Dis. ... of cand. of philos. sciences. Moscow.
- Philosophic Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (2005) Moscow: INFRA-M.
- Plotnikova, Larisa (2004) *Doctrine of the Noosphere as an Ideal Project for the Harmonization of Socio-Natural Interaction*. Dis. Cand. Philos. Chita. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3vlg1qo>
- Popper, Karl (1935) *Logik der Forschung*. Springer-Verlag.
- Rogers, Charles (1994) *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Moscow: Progress.
- Rubinstein, Sergey (1989) *The Fundamentals of General Psychology: In 2 volumes*. Vol. II. Moscow: Pedagogy.
- Sarybekov, Mahmetgali, and Sydyknazarov, Muhit (2007) *Dictionary of Science*. Taraz: TarSPI.
- Seliverstova, Svetlana (2009) Formation of an Ecohumanistic Outlook of a Student as a Person of Culture in a Pedagogical University: Author's abstract. ... Dis. of Cand. of Pedagogical Sciences.
- Shindaulova, Raushan (2016) *Noohumanistic Worldview: From Philosophical Theory to Educational Practice*. Kyiv: Publishing house of NPU named after Michael Dragomanov.
- Sikorskaya, Galina (1999) *Noohumanistic model of ecological and pedagogical education and the practice of its implementation*. Dis. of the Dr. of Pedagogical Sciences. Ekaterinburg.
- Subetto, Aleksander (2003) *Noospherism. T. 1. Introduction to Noospherism*. SPb: Asterion.
- Subetto, Aleksandr (2012) *Noospheric Scientific School in Russia. Results and prospects*. Sankt-Peterburg: Asterion.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre (2008) *The Phenomenon of Man*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Tsoi, Lyubov (2015) Conflict Resistance as a Systemic Factor in Preserving the Integrity and Sustainable Development Of Man, Society and the State. *Materials of the XVII International Scientific and Practical Conference of the Academy of Management of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia*. Moscow, November 26, 2015, 133-140.
- Vernadsky, Vladimir (1944) A Few words about the noosphere. *The Successes of Biology*, 18 (2), 113-120.
- Vorobyova, Olga (2008) *Communication Technologies at School*. Moscow: Uchitel.
- Zulharnaeva, Anastasia, and Vinokurova, Natalia (2016) Pedagogical Technologies of Formation Ecohumanistic Worldview in the Course of School Geography. *Modern Science Intensive Technologies*. No2-3, 486-490.