




EXPO 2017
Future Energy
Astana Kazakhstan

Хабаршы



KazNU Science - Қауу Ғылымы - наука КазНУ

ХАБАРШЫ

ВЕСТНИК

2017

¹Myamesheva G.Kh., ²Mussalin A., ³Kindikbayeva K.K.

¹Associate Professor, Candidate of Philosophy, Kazakh National University al-Farabi, Kazakhstan, Almaty

²Master University of International Business, Kazakhstan, Almaty

³PhD, Kazakh National University al-Farabi, Kazakhstan, Almaty

Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: honey.koni@bk.ru

HISTORY IN FOCUS OF POST-CLASSIC

In the article the story is seen through the prism of a different view and the gaze of the Other. Reveals the history of the concept, look on the other. We give the concept of monumental, antiquarian and critical history of Friedrich Nietzsche. Man is an active and seeking creature, so he needs a monumental history. Human being as a protected and honored creature is in need of antique history, but as the suffering and hungry for freedom – in a critical history. Revealed the classical and post-classical concepts of the Other, the theory of kulotsentrizma Western rationalism. The classical interpretation of the Other as the another of my «I» stems from Hegel's philosophy of identity while the post-classical approach is based on the principle of distinction. The other is seen as a kind of independent structure not attached to «I» variation of the classic approach, there are several: as each other consciousness H. Ortega and Gasset, J.-P. Sartre, Husserl; Another neighbor as M. Buber, another as a condition of possibility I dialogue with other Bakhtin, S. Frank; The other as a member of the living world and Communications Jürgen Habermas. Post-classical approach constructs the Other as structure, as a look at the world through a friend Michel Foucault, Žilakana, G. Deleuze, E. Levinas.

Through these theories and concepts of the story is positioned Barren, a new chronology, the principles of social theorist. Another view of the problem affects the reliable /unreliable in history, the history / literature, external / internal. Looking the Other – a dialogue of the new / traditional chronology, the historian / philosopher, logic / sensing.

Key words: History, apprehension, other, kulocentrism, simulacrum, post-classic, type of information metabolism (TIM), the effect of reality.

¹Мямешева Г.Х., ²Муссалин А., ³Киндикбаева К.К.

доцент, филос.ғ.к., Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

²магистрант, Халқаралық бизнес университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

³докторант PhD, Қазақстан, Алматы қ. e-mail: honey.koni@bk.ru

Постклассика тұрғысындағы тарих

Мақалада тарих өзгеше көзқарас пен өзгенің көзқарасы призмасы түрінде қаралады. Тарих, көзқарас және басқа түсініктерінің мағынасы ашылады. Ф. Ницшенің монументалды, антикварлық және сын концепциялары талданады. Адам – белсенді және болашаққа ұмтылушы тіршілік иесі, сондықтан ол монументалды тарихқа мұқтаж. Қорғаушы және құрметке ие тіршілік иесі ретінде адамға антикалық тарих қажет, ал қиын кезеңде азап шеккенде немесе бостандыққа ұмтылғанда сын тарих қажет. Сонымен қатар, мақалада классикалық және постклассикалық Өзгенің түсініктемесі, батыс рационализмнің омиктоцентризм теориясы беріледі. Өзгенің өзгеше өзімнің Мені деп түсіну Гегельдің сәйкестік философиясынан бастау алады. Сол кезеңде постклассикалық көзқарас айырмашылық қағидасына негізделген болатын. Өзгелерді дербес және Менге бағынышты емес құрылым ретінде қарастырады. Классикалық көзқарастың бірнеше нұсқасы бар: Х. Ортега – Гассеттің, Ж.-П. Сартрдің, Гуссерлдің өзге ол – өзге сана; М. Бубердің Өзге жақын адам ретінде; Өзге ол мүмкіндік, жағдай, Мен, басқамен сұқбат М.М. Бахтин, С.А. Франк; Өзге ол – өмірлік әлем мен коммуникацияға қатысушы ретінде Ю. Хабермас. Постклассикалық философияда М. Фуко, Ж. Лакан, Ж. Делүзе, Э. Левинас Өзгелер басқалар арқылы әлемге деген көзқарас, құрылым ретінде қарастырады. Осы теория мен тұжырымдамалар арқылы дала тарихы, жаңа хронология, әлеуметтік теорияның принциптері түсініктері қалыптасады. Өзгеше

қозқарас тарихындағы нақты немесе нақты емес, әдебиеттегі ішкі және сыртқы мәселелерді қамтиды. Өзгенің қозқарасы бұл – жаңа/дәстүрлі хронологияның, философияның, тарихшының, логиктің, сенсориктің сүқбаты.

Түйін сөздер: тарих, өзге қозқарас, окулоцентризм, симулакрум, постклассикалық, ақпараттық метоболизм түрі, шындықтың өсері.

¹Мямешева Г.Х., ²Муссалин А., ³Қиндикбаева К.К.

¹доцент, к.филос.н., Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

²магистрант Университета международного бизнеса, Казахстан, г. Алматы

³докторант PhD, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби,

Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: honey.koni@bk.ru

История в фокусе постклассики

В статье история рассматривается через призму Другого взгляда и взгляда Другого. Раскрываются понятия «история», «взгляд», «другой». Даются концепции монументальной, антикварной и критической истории Ф. Ницше. Человек является деятельным и стремящимся существом, поэтому ему нужна монументальная история. Как охраняющее и почитающее существо человек нуждается в антикварной истории, а как страждущее и жаждущее свободы – в критической истории. Выявляются классические и постклассические концепты Другого, теория околоцентризма западного рационализма. Классическая трактовка Другого как Иного моего Я проистекает из Легелевской философии тождества. В то время как постклассический подход базируется на принципе различия, Другой рассматривается как некая самостоятельная структура, не привязанная к Я. Вариаций классического подхода существует несколько: Другой как другое сознание Х.Ортега-и-Гассета, Ж.-П. Сартра, Гуссерля; Другой как ближний М. Бубера, Другой как условие, возможность Я, диалог с Другим М.М. Бахтина, С.Л. Франка; Другой как участник жизненного мира и коммуникаций Ю. Хабермаса. Постклассический подход конструирует Другого как структуру, как взгляд на мир через Другого М. Фуко, Ж. Лакана, Ж. Делеза, Э. Левинаса. Посредством этих теорий и понятий позиционируется история Степи, новая хронология, принципы социального теоретика. Другой взгляд затрагивает проблему достоверного/недостоверного в истории, истории/ литературы, внешнего/внутреннего. Взгляд Другого – это диалог новой/традиционной хронологии, историка/философа, логика/ сенсорика.

Ключевые слова: История, взгляд, Другой, окулоцентризм, симулякр, постклассика, тип информационного метоболизма (ТИМ), эффект реальности.

Introduction

We live in a situation where the idea of globalization with the values of pluralism and communication, multi-polarity and multiculturalism, equality of rights of minorities, with high hopes on the ability of the Internet to organize society is in crisis. Separating power of national histories and historical experience as geological faults cut through the European soil. New abstract form of political solidarity between the «other» as an attempt to form a European identity today is complemented by the concept of «multi-speed».

The common European identity is not created from the top, administrative decisions [Habermas, 2008, 70-76]. «End of History» in connection with the failure of socialism, the search for alternatives to totalitarian systems also requires a rethinking of what is happening and changes of mind.

Multi-vector nature of the relationship of the international community to the events in Ukraine and Russia, an attempt to rewrite certain political characters and myth-makers pseudo scientists

history of the Second World War, by removing from the world of the Great Patriotic War and the Great Victory of the Soviet people (and now the peoples of the CIS countries) raise questions over the fate of their country and many of the world.

Growth of the authority of our country in the world in connection with the peace initiatives and steps are also great responsibility. In the context of post-globalization actualizes questions: «Can a man live without history? What is the history as a science and as a reality?»

Methods

Research methods are a means of formal and dialectical logic, intellectual intuition, hermeneutic interpretation, thought experiment, comparative philosophy, sociological analysis (sociological analysis). Formal logic allows us to correctly represent the content of our respectable knowledge. Dialectical logic with its central principle of ascent from the abstract to the concrete retains flexibility, breadth and depth of our thinking. Intellectual

intuition gives us an extraordinary vision of the usual things. Hermeneutic interpretation orients us to understand the objects, processes and phenomena through the prism of value and meaning of priorities. Thought experiment as a way to work with ideal objects, leads us to the conclusions about the real objects. Comparative philosophy through analogies and parallels, dialogue and polylogue considers the types of thinking and mentality, rational and irrational in textual, functional, valuable sections. Sociological analysis is based on the Model U and Model A when using reynins signs and reynins groups through rational and irrational methods of logical and ethical and intuitive-sensory approach.

Do we need a history in the modern era, when humanity inevitably goes to the «global cheloveynik» (A. Zinovev), is there taken place internationalization of the world? Do young people need a history which live here and now, by other value scenarios?

Is historical memory necessary to it? What is the history? Science about life and development of society or the science studying the past of human society? Science about the past or science about the future? [Methodology of History, 1996, 26-60] What are born by history: good or evil, advantage or harm? Before understanding the matters, we will consider the concepts of History, Other, The Look.

1. History. The brilliant expert on classics and its traditions and one of her first critics great to F. Nitsshe considered, that yes, unconditionally, the history is necessary to life, but in certain proportions, without surpluses because the last do irreparable harm. It is necessary as A.K. Sekatsky spoke to observe a dosage of the truth [Sekatskii, 2000].

Just as memory is one of the integral characteristics of the reasonable person, so and historical memory also is the characteristic of person in society, in personality and in the social person.

F. Nitsshe said that the person is an active and aspiring essence therefore the monumental history is necessary to it.

As the protecting and esteeming essence human needs antiquarian history, and as suffering and thirsting freedom – critical history. Samples, teachers, comforters are necessary for the figure. Purpose of life of the figure: happiness of others or his. The Great, monumental has to become eternal, and all another is minor. All monumental iconic is true. The spirit penetrating the figure, acts the strong confidence that if great appeared once, so its repetition is possible also. This full validity appears at the expense of rapprochement, generalization and an identification of diverse elements by means of

identity collecting absolutisation «effects in itself», «effective events» and ignoring the distinctions of motives. Thus the freakish texture of causes and effects [Nietzsche, 1990, 159-167]. It very much reminds a situation which R. Bart called «effect of reality»: we trust not to the facts, but to plausible pictures, successful and effective presentations of time [Bart, 1994]. The figure lives by the principle: «Look, great is already exists! « And, if he wishes to create something great, he addresses to the past, as to monumental history.

If the person lives in limits habitual and consecrated with the legend, he needs the history as antiques. However, here the status of eternal values finds not great (samples, models, heroes), but small, limited, obsolete. Conservatism, piety, awe, psychology «we» dominates over psychology «I». This is truly historical feeling- feeling of roots. Things, the house, the city – are inherent values. There is an identification last and old that can lead to degeneration because thirst of novelty and inquisitiveness are forced out by curiosity to old and to omniscience. The antiquarian history is capable to keep only life, but not to generate it, paralyze strengths of the figure, rushes with an old times fragment (custom of fathers, the political privilege, religion) as something immortal [Nietzsche, 1990]. Such different evidence was «Arab spring 2011», different versions of one scenario – fighting between new with old became a various configurations and shades in connection with «the known soil and known climate».

The critical history is intended to serve life therefore she judges the past, interrogates and pronounces a sentence, tries to cure life of a historical illness – a history surplus. According to F. Nietzsche, the past has to be as a healthy food. He offers 2 drugs for a historical illness, 2 natural antidotes from a life damping to the historical: unhistorical and overhistorical. Unhistorical is an art to forget in the limited horizon, and overhistorical is an art and religion – forces giving to life character of eternal and invariable, distracting attention from process of formation. As life is a highest, dominating force, the doctrine about hygiene of life approves this truth. Having recovered from a historical illness, people become again people, instead of humanoid units, will begin to live, instead of dissimulate in life scenery, will correctly use 3 approaches to history and there will be no unnecessary criticism, a piety before the antiques, incapable to great the expert great [Nietzsche, 1990, 210-230]. All these approaches were harmoniously united in the definition of history by the known French historian.

the representative of school of the Annals Marc Bloch, having called it «science about people in time» [Block, 1986, 29]

2. Another. Classical treatment of Another as Other mine «I» results from Hegel's philosophy of identity. While post-classical approach is based on the principle of distinction. Another is considered as the certain independent structure which hasn't been attached to «I». Variation of classical approach exists a little: Another as other consciousness H. Ortega and Gasset, Z.-P. Sartre, Cassirer; Another as near to M. Buber, Another as a condition, opportunity of «I», dialogue with Other M.M. Bakhtin, S.L. Franks; Another as participant of the vital world and U. Khabermas's communications. Post-classical approach designs Another as structure, as a view of the world through Other M. Foucault, Z. Lakan, Z. Delez, E. Levinas. The concept of the «Other» – is fundamental notion of postmodern philosophy, which is used for the conceptual strategy of «the resurrection of the subject.» [Majboroda, 2007, 157-251] Michel Foucault declares a person's death, the death of the subject, but the figure of another is explicated by his discursive practices that reproduce the objects of which they speak.

Discourse is what was made / produced a set of possible characters, i.e. statements. Discourse is the principle of scattering statements. Jacques Lakan, as a follower of Freud, converts it to a triad «I» – «I» – Superego in real (biological) – Imaginary fantastic way, illusory «I» like a response, protection is the violation of the unity of reality (the body of the Mother)) – Symbolic (order of culture, it is a language and is an unconscious).

There are other symbolic. It's necessary to harmonize real, imaginary and symbolic relations in speech with other speech of «Another» for liberate from the illusions and distortions of imaginary membership.

In G. Deleuze «Another» plays difference and repetition theme.

The difference is a not an identity of concepts and thinking subject., it is not a similarity, is not negative (not opposition and obedience), is no analogy in judgment. Other is a complete positive existence. The main principle of teachers – the G. Deleuze was: «Do with me, but do not do as I do!» A special place subject of «others» are taken in E. Levinas.

The relationship of «I – am another» is seen not in binary oppositions, not in the paradigm of domination and subordination, but in the paradigm of asymmetric dialogue. Another dialogue of «I» is

not meaningful information, but ethical character, which related to the generation of meanings and different status to other discourses. «Another» is irreversible not owing to the nature and physical appearance, but owing to the being to different Otherness for Levinas. E. is a weakness, humiliation and insult, poverty as a status as one as opposed to the wealth and power of others. This determines the asymmetry of the inter-subjective space, the asymmetry of communication. [Vorobyeva, 2007, 87-89] My responsibility exists by virtue of being the «Other». Another – is a metaphysical desire. The phenomenon of the Other's desire is way out of loneliness and suffering from aggression to itself. Desires of Other reveals new talents in me. The other does not have a culture, not a given. The other, according to E. Levinas is this sense, the primary source. Human freedom is liable to the other. «exiled from himself driven into responsibility» [Vorobyeva, 2007, 107] In our research for us will be necessary both classical, and post-classical approaches.

3. Look. As the known domestic thinker B.G. Nurzhanov, all western culture, since Ancient Greece and notes up to now, is defined as visual culture – «okulotsentrism». Paradigm of sight, visibility – the most important characteristic of a modern era. Z. Bodriyar, for example, considers that modern (post-modern) culture is hyperreal, simulative and pornographic. A dominating look totally abolishes a distance between the viewer and object, which liquidates scenic space and protected objects from a eyeing, naked vision, making the world available to visual perception, baring and opening the most hidden and intimate things. The modern culture is culture of a superiority of visual forms – cinema, television, video, the computer. It is necessary to consider also that the optical metaphor, terms of sight are closely connected with thinking philosophy. The philosophy initially declares priority vision, than hearing. This tradition originates at Platon [Nurzhanov, 2011, 103-104].

Making a start from identity philosophy, we will consider Another as other consciousness, as Other look in a historical and «geophilosophical» key. It is known that till the XVIII century there was a uniform historical and philological science. At that time there were no methodologies of natural-science and socio-humanistic knowledge therefore G.F. Mayer, H. Volf, A. Bek, F. Ast offered understanding as a private method of interpretation of texts of history and philology. Besides that, until the end of the XVIII century there was no scientific historiography, existed only an antique

and theological historiography. The century focused on reason, sees history in a future mode, between the past and the present there are no continuity threads, the future depends not on history, and on truth of reason [Kimel, 1995, 14-15]. Existence of objective historical experience – idea of people of the past of the world [Ankersmit, 2007, 367] didn't interest anyone, therefore certificates of real participants of events could be subjected to falsification and correction. So, after «cleaning» and «revision» the writer of the XVIII century, beforefreudian Giacomo Casanov turns in the theatrical character, a ridiculous puppet and the fool, and his original text «Stories of my life» is published only in 1960 [Sollers, 2007]. So with emergence of a scientific historiography of tradition of falsification and the mystifications of history going from Renaissance, don't disappear, they find other forms. How «cleaning» and «revision» of texts in the XIX century differ from creation of «effects of reality» the writers reproducing in the works a historical era? There the rate becomes on antiques – an ancient, characteristic thing as the «live» certificate of that era. How rewriting differs from the literary creativity using the correct tracks, figures, etc.? The same field berry the forged history of philosophy.

Why such «historical» documents as «Protocols of sion wise men» which not only aren't written by these wise men, but also widely of the mark are necessary? It is far not the historical document containing materials of meetings of Zionists in Basel in 1897, the representing plan of the Jewish world supremacy on ruins of a Christian civilization. Forgery of the document was established in 1912 by the English journalist F. Greyvz, who has seen in it close relationship with satire of Maurice Zholy on Napoleon III: «Dialogue in a hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu» (1864). The Russian historian V. Burtsev proved that «Protocols» are a fake which the imperial security made on the basis of Zholy's satire, the short story «Biarritz» of the German writer Herman Gedsh (1868) and other sources. And only in 1935 the court in Bern declared «Protocols» a forgery [Block, 1986, 53; 236] [Lepetukhin, 2007, 13]. For what mix reality with the plausible?

After all from antiquity the reality belonged to the history sphere, it was opposed to it opposite – credibility: internal order of a narration – imitation and poetry. Credibility is connected with opinion of crowd, this pronunciation and the thing description, instead of things in itself. This is general, instead of private (than the history is engaged) is an implicit initiative where opposite elements don't exclude

each other that not suffered by real history. The reality turns into the general category, meant here isn't present, it is expelled. Realistic becomes meaning (the concrete detail), all text dazzles with such details, giving rise to referential illusions, effect of reality – the hidden credibility. So how the new realism, new literature [Bart, 1994, 398-400] is being under construction.

And it occurs not only in literature, but also in all visual reality: in cinema, video, television, computers. Art as an illusion gives movement illusion, effect of movement, creating the new type of the letter conducting to death and literature, and painting, absorbing and making them senseless. As movement is reflection of live life, credibility of life is created by means of movement illusion. So the reality of cinema – illusory reality turns into big reality, than reality, bringing up, acquainting the person to values, stereotypes of classes, races, the nations being at a wheel of film production [Kimel, 1995, 288-309].

The interesting idea that geography at school carries out the same informative and general function, as the philosophy in higher education institution, sounds in one tonality with Z. Delez's «geophilosophical» paradigm. Really, if the knowledge of the world is carried out by means of real, external, extensive travel, the knowledge of the person occurs through internal travel to itself. However in any case any knowledge, any travel requires the Mirror, Another is necessary as other you, other of your world. According to A. Nazaretyan's concept, emergence of human society is closely connected with the protomorphs birth, caused by opposition «We» and Strangers. We are own view of ourselves, consciousness. Strangers are a view of us from outside which can be not only benevolent, but hostile and dangerous. For example, if in mentality of many European countries the fear of a malefice is put by an evil eye, in the Arab countries such fear exists before blue eyes as it is considered a sign of the wicked man, an insidiousness and deception sign. In a format of a paradigm, culture of violence, this moment: strangers enemies well I «worked» in a camp anti-advisers and the anticommunists who were carefully studying the enemy to know his weaknesses. However, as it was noted earlier, except this line always there was also other line connected with informative needs of the person, wishing to learn the world and people, to satisfy the curiosity and to broaden horizons, the knowledge horizons.

The original idea to learn a steppe civilization from the outside found own eyes and eyes the live

embodiment in the books written independently or collectively under the direction of known Kazakhstan thinker A.H. Kasymzhanova «Portraits: Strokes in Steppe history» and «Portraits: Steppe eyes from the outside. From Herodotus to Humboldt». In that books the history of the Steppe is given in the spirit of M. Blok: history «about people in time». A.K. Kasymzhanov tries to revive a simple voice of truthfulness, honesty without ideological and moral reflections, without pseudo-patriotism, without self-opinions and self-abasement. Through the personality, her motives, ideals without luster and a retouch, without denigration and concealment it is possible to see live human history – history in persons [Kasymzhanov, 1995, 3-6]. The view of the Steppe eyes of strangers, a look is from outside valuable not to give in to arrogance or self-abasement that not «to be seduced with others gifts», values, norms to avoid monkey imitation the «western», simple loan of «someone else's clothes» [Portraits, 2000, 3-5]. If other look resulted from an identity paradigm, the look of Another is implanted by Distinction. Through this prism we will look at history eyes of Another.

Another can be at our look in different appearances. It can be a meeting of supporters and opponents of new/alternative and traditional chronology, dialogue of historians and philosophers, different TIM'S approaches. If consider different TIM'S positions, for example, the logician and visionary, we will see the following picture. The outstanding German philosopher – rationalist G.V.F. Hegel (1770-1831), the logic-intuitive introvert (IIF) builds a ladder of victorious procession of a world history as progress of world spirit, reason. Not everything are involved in development of spirit, only the historical people. The world history, according to Hegel, begins with the East, Asia, first of all in China, India, Persia, Egypt. Further the historical initiative passes to Greece and Rome, and in the XVIII century – to Germany for «implementation of absolute truth as infinite self-determination of freedom» [Sergeichik, 2002, 181-186]. Positively painted picture of history, but made in own way and originally, Hegel's colleague on matters of Romantics presented to the world, the brilliant master of the historical novel, the known Russian writer And Duma (father), the touch and ethical introvert (ISFP) [Rumyantseva, 2002, 212] for sees history as a romance novel with various variations in which the history of war or peace of France and England is solved suspension brackets of Anna Austrian and courage of the noble four musketeers.

Image of musketeers as gallant knights and gentlemen, graceful duellists, French noblemen light on the feet with the swords, which main weapon there was an honor, instead of a musket or a sword, the created A.Dyuma, forces out those real musketeers who lived and protected the country at that time. Actually musketeers were heavy to infantrymen with muskets (a small gun), a bipod, a subbag for spheres bullets, a bag with gunpowder for charging and many other necessary ammunition that for a sword and a place free didn't remain.

And if remember model we are strangers, there becomes clear, why in the opinion of French British at all knights, unlike of the first. It not-knights British burned 19 summer Frenchwoman Jeanne D'Ark who with a sword in hands saved France from English occupation, but gallant compatriots sold it to monsters to British for a gold bag. The facts are serious things. And they say that during ship-wrecks not ardent and gallant French, and cold British and dry Germans rescue women and children, perishing together with the ships while the first throw by the sinking ships of children and women, rescuing itself [Nyuhtilin, 2006, 5-10]. Though for the socionic analysis surprising here isn't present anything, the behavior is predicted in advance. Logicians British (Stierlitz, the logic-touch extrovert) and Germans (Maxims, the logic-touch introvert) act in the same way, observing ethical standards and installations which are developed by culture. Besides, in an extreme, stressful situation «include»: who structural (British) who business (Germans) to logic also think not of themselves, and of the solution of a task.

Dialogue of historians and philosophers can be presented as communication of concrete and scientific and methodological (philosophical) knowledge. By means of M. Blok's works we can understand, the western Middle Ages and why exactly at that time there were first universities. Studying works to F. Nitsche, we comprehend another: to whom and why the history is necessary? He helps us to understand that behind backwardness of the countries which the Arab spring 2011 year captured, stand monumental and antiquarian history. The monumental history (pyramids) «feeds» Egypt, and the antiquarian history (Islam) allows to keep the people in obedience.

The particular interest is represented by new alternative chronology which is opposed to traditional, skaligerovsky, developed by scientists – mathematicians of the Moscow State University of M. Lomonosova of Fomenko A.T. and Nosovsky G.V. Prodolzhaia of I. Nyuton's idea, academician

N.A. Morozov, using a mathematical method of studying of history, they came to a conclusion that the traditional, standard, skaligerovsky chronology of history of the Antiquity and the Middle Ages, accepted in the XVI-XVII centuries, is wrong. It was based on the Roman chronology which in turn leaned on «Almagest» Ptolemaeus.

The method of the mathematical analysis of texts chronicles was carried out by means of a technique of recognition of the texts describing the same events, techniques of dating, a technique of recognition of dynasties, a technique of detection of duplicates and ordering of events, a technique of questionnaires codes [Khodakovsky, 2000, 177-178], [Fomenko, 2007]. So is found altogether another history. According to Fomenko A.T. and Nosovsky G.V., the history of Ancient Egypt, Rome, Greece, Syria, Israel is a history of one medieval civilization. The ancient civilization arose in X an eyelid AD in the Mediterranean (in the uniform center). Our history is SHORTENED for 50 CENTURIES. In the XI century there is J. Khristos (his life and a crucifixion) and Christianity. The Buddhism arises in the XV century as one of options of primary Christianity, and also arises a Judaism. In the XIV century there is Russia the =Ordynsky Great empire. It called the Mongolian empire. That is the mongolo-tatar yoke wasn't in the history. Megalion (with greek) = the great. Foreigners called Russia by Mongolia, as the translation of the Russian word «Great». Mongolian Empire=Russian = the Horde is a Medieval Russia. Her founder Rostov prince George Danilovich=Ryurik=Yuriy Dolgoruky = Mstislav Udaloy = George Vsevolodovich. The history of Russia is forged till 1613, before of Romanovs coming to power. The first reporters of history appeared in Europe not earlier than the V-VII centuries.

Philosophy also didn't avoid different falsifications. Even at the beginning of the XV century the name of philosopher Platon wasn't known. The first transfer of dialogues made Bruni in 1421, but originals are not found yet. In 1482 the Florentine philosopher Marcello Fichino gave the Latin manuscript of «Dialogues» as the translation of the Greek manuscript. There were roughnesses, descriptions not peculiar to an ancient era. They were eliminated in 3 in the edition. Platon Fichino's Greek manuscript didn't show, it disappeared. Only in 1512 Mark Azur submitted the Greek text of compositions of Platon. Alexandriysky philosopher Plotinus, and in Renaissance in Europe – Greek-Byzantine Pleton was one of Platon's followers. PLATON, DAMS, PLETON. Whether this persons

are instead of one face? Fomenko A.T. considers that the Egyptian pyramids – the dead city, an imperial cemetery of the whole world, a uniform cemetery for the huge Great (Mongolian) Russian empire where buried her great people. Pharaohs called not the live lords of Egypt, and regal dead men of the empire. That is why philosophy of Egypt – is a cult dead [Khodakovsky, 2000].

The incontestable proof of that «Ancient» Egypt appeared not earlier than the Medieval civilization, an artifact of «Ancient» Egypt are huge (more than 140 meters) pyramids (Cheops, the Aunt), sarcophagi, the statues executed not from a natural stone, and an artificial stone – geopolymeric concrete which was invented medieval alchemists not earlier than the XIV century. Recently the invention of medieval alchemists was newly open by the French scientists – the chemist, professor of the Bern university Joseph (Joseph) Davidovich who has based in 1972 in France in private research company CORDI, and in 1979 institute of geopolymers, it also possesses opening of new branch of applied chemistry geopolymerization. As a result of geopolymerization created a concrete which is almost indistinguishable from some stone breeds. Concrete is the artificial stone received from crushed and specially prepared rock. It can be soft as sandstone of which pyramids are constructed, it is possible to pick open it easily a penknife, and can be firm, as granite or a diorite (it is thus almost indistinguishable from them).

Professor D. Davidovich claims that he managed to find in hieroglyphs on one of steles of an era of Pharaoh Dzhoser the recipe of preparation of ancient concrete. If it was possible to establish structure of pyramids of Cheops and the Tety to D. Davidovich, to the head of the Big Sphinx in 1984 it wasn't allowed by the Egyptian management of antiquities, referring to that its concept is his personal point of view [Nosovskii, Fomenko, 2007, 503-516]. Without ideology, of course, there were not.

But, as all know, ideological, loaded socio-humanistic, instead of the natural-science knowledge initially is valuable. Why address history to mathematics and chemists? They aren't ideological workers, and advocates of truth. What practical benefit Fomenko A.T. and Nosovsky G.V. mathematics can have having established that all dates on Egyptian zodiacs are medieval? And what the knowledge of New chronology, a look of Another gives us? For scientists is an appeal to be true to truth, the scientific principles, instead of ideological designs. And for this purpose it is necessary to adhere to the principles of the social theorist. Somehow to resist to «arbitrariness» of ideology of V.V. Ilyin

... suggests to construct «a protective belt» theories means of regulative- principles of tolerance, convention, political apathy, anti-activism and humanity. The tolerance assumes ethical tolerance and healthy pluralism, a susceptibility to arguments and dissent.

The convention promotes to understanding of a relativity of own position and confidence of possibility of more adequate and correct decisions. Political apathy means autonomy and self-sufficiency, a non-use of ideologems, mythemes, prejudices of mass, utopian, and any loaded consciousness. Anti-activism demands from the theorist of explanations, instead of world changes. Role of the theorist and the practitioner are various, it isn't necessary to confuse roles. The humanity reminds that the person is initially and society is secondary. At all inexhaustibility of human reserves it is impossible to stake on a feat and heroism. It is impossible to do an existence situation (feat) by norm. The norm is a median way according to the wise remark of east philosophers [Ilyin, 1994]. For other people the knowledge

of Other look and a look of Another will allow to develop critical thinking, to study at history lessons, and, knowing possibilities of falsification as past, and present, not to become any object of manipulations, puppets in hands of puppeteers, gun meat of politicians. Especially it is worth remembering that we live in visual culture and in the world of communicative technologies, and mass media is already long ago the fourth estate. As makers of history acts communicators which «do» (design, create) news and today's history together with it. In such situation vigilance will prevent nobody.

Conclusion

Post-classical science with transversal values, significance not only global, but local and individual identity, «Context» gives an opportunity of a real, not declared, peaceful coexistence and meaningful dialogue and polylogue multicultural world through trends syncretism, teleonomy, new rationality of humanitarian anthropomorphism.

References

1. Habermas Yu. Split West. – M., 2008. – P.192.
2. Methodology of History. – Minsk, 1996. – P. 240.
3. Sekatskii A.K. The fables ontology. – SPb., 2000. – P. 120.
4. Nietzsche, F. The Use and Abuse of History // Nietzsche F. Writings in 2m. – M., 1990. – Vol. 1. – Pp. 158-230.
5. Bart R. Effect of reality // Bart R.I The elect work. Semiotics. Poetics. – M., 1994. – Pp. 392-400.
6. Block M. Apology stories or craft of the historian. – M.: Nauka, 1986. – P. 256.
7. Majboroda DM Another // Newest Philosophical Dictionary. Post-modernism. – Minsk: Modern writer, 2007. – Pp.157-251.
8. Vorobyeva S.V. Time and Another//Newest Philosophical Dictionary. Postmodernizm. – Minsk: Modern I writer, 2007.
9. Vorobyeva S.V. Humanism of Another//Newest Philosophical Dictionary. Postmodernizm. – Minsk: Modern writer. – 2007. – Pp. 4-107.
10. Nurzhanov BG Okulocentrizm of western culture and philosophy // Bulletin of the KNU. Philosophy series. A series of studies. Series politologiya. – 2011. – № 2. – Pp. 103-106.
11. Kamel YA Philosophy of history. System-historical essay // Philosophy of History: An Anthology. – M.: Aspect-Press, 1995.
12. Ankersmit F.R. The exalted historical experience. – M.: Europe, 2007. – P. 612.
13. Sollers F. Casanova. Great. – M.: CoLiBri, 2007. – P. 232.
14. Lepetukhin N.V. The war conscience // Koonz C. The nazi conscience. – M.: Ladomir, 2007. – Pp. 5-20.
15. Nurzhanov BG, Yerzhanova AM Cultural Studies in a new way. – A., 2011. – Pp. 372.
16. Kasymdzhanov A.H. Portraits: Strokes to the history of the steppes. Vol. 1. – A., 1995. – P. 123.
17. Portraits. Steppe eyes from the outside. From Herodotus to Humboldt / Ed. A.H.Kasymzhanova. – A., 2000. – P. 148.
18. Sergeichik EM Philosophy of history. – SPb., 2002. – P. 608.
19. Romyantseva EA On the way to understanding: socionics – teachers and roditelyam. – M., 2002. – P. 256.
20. Nyuhilin B. Melchizedek. Book I. The world. – SPb., 2006. – P. 288.
21. Khodakovsky The time spiral, or a future that has already happened. – M., 2000. – P. 315.
22. Fomenko 400 years of deception. Mathematics provides a glimpse into the past. – M., 2007. – P. 350.
23. Nosovskii GV, Fomenko A. A. New Chronology of Egypt. – M., 2007. – P. 558.
24. Ilyin VV The theory of knowledge. Epistemology. – M., 1994. – P. 136.