

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Recenzované studie

Working Papers
Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů

18/2008

**Systems Approach:
Theoretical and Methodological
Principles Focus on Globalization**

Zuzana Lehmannová

**Faculty of International Relations
Working Papers**

18/2008

**Systems Approach:
Theoretical and Methodological
Principles Focus on Globalization**

Zuzana Lehmannová

Volume II



Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Working Papers Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů
Výzkumný záměr MSM6138439909

Tato studie byla vypracována v rámci Výzkumného záměru Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů Vysoké školy ekonomické v Praze MSM6138439909 „Governance v kontextu globalizované ekonomiky a společnosti“. Studie procházejí recenzním řízením.

Název: Working Papers Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů
Četnost vydávání: Vychází minimálně desetkrát ročně
Vydavatel: Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Nakladatelství Oeconomica
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Praha 3, IČO: 61 38 43 99
Evidenční číslo MK ČR: E 17794
ISSN tištěné verze: 1802-6591
ISSN on-line verze: 1802-6583
ISBN tištěné verze:
Vedoucí projektu: Prof. Ing. Eva Cihelková, CSc.
Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze, Fakulta mezinárodních vztahů
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Praha 3
+420 224 095 270, +420 224 095 248, +420 224 095 230
<http://vz.fmv.vse.cz/>

VÝKONNÁ RADA

Eva Cihelková (předsedkyně)

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Vladimíra Dvořáková

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Olga Hasprová

Technická univerzita v Liberci

Zuzana Lehmannová

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Marcela Palíšková

Nakladatelství C. H. Beck, Praha

Judita Štouračová

Vysoká škola mezinárodních
a veřejných vztahů, Praha

Dana Zadražilová

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

REDAKČNÍ RADA

Regina Axelrod

Adelphi university, New York, USA

Peter Bugge

Aarhus University, Aarhus, Dánsko

Petr Cimler

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Peter Čajka

Univerzita Mateja Bela,
Bánská Bystrica, Slovensko

Zbyněk Dubský

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Bernd Hallier

EHI Retail Institute, Köln,
Německo

Jaroslav Jakš

Metropolitní univerzita Praha

Vladimír Jeníček

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Eva Karpová

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Jaroslav Kundera

Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Wrocław,
Polsko

Lubor Lacina

Mendelova zemědělská a lesnická
univerzita, Brno

Václava Pánková

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Lenka Pražská

emeritní profesor

Mikuláš Sabo

Ekonomická Univerzita
v Bratislave, Slovensko

Margarita Shivergueva

Nov b'lgarski universitet, Sofie,
Bulharsko

Leonid Strowskij

Ural'skij gosudarstvennyj
techničeskij universitet,
Jekatěrinburg, Rusko

Peter Terem

Univerzita Mateja Bela,
Bánská Bystrica, Slovensko

Milan Vošta

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

ŠÉFREDAKTOR

Jakub Krč

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

Systems Approach:**Theoretical and Methodological Principles Focus on Globalization**

Zuzana Lehmannová (lehmann@vse.cz)

Summary:

Working paper deals with the systems approach and its possibilities of application in the study of globalization. First the development of systems approach is analyzed in the context of natural and social sciences in the 19th and the 20th century. Then concept of the approach, its application in social sciences, its main theoretical and methodological principles (contextual and epistemic in particular) are characterized. The possibilities of sociology and cultural anthropology concepts to be integrated into the approach are emphasized. At the close the process of globalization is characterized from the systems approach perspective. It is defined as a complex historical process the result of which is the deep transformation of worldwide socio-cultural structures.

Keywords: globalization, socio-cultural wholes, systems approach.

Systémový přístup:**Teoretické a metodologické principy aplikace na globalizaci**

Zuzana Lehmannová (lehmann@vse.cz)

Abstrakt:

Working paper se zabývá systémovým přístupem a možnostmi jeho aplikace při studiu globalizace. Nejprve je analyzován vývoj systémového přístupu v kontextu přírodních a společenských věd v 19. a 20. století. V další části je charakterizováno jeho pojetí v kontextu soudobé vědy, jeho aplikace v oblasti společenských věd, jsou vydefinovány jeho základní principy, zejména kontextuální a epistemický princip, jsou zdůrazněny možnosti integrace sociologických a kulturně antropologických konceptů do jeho rámce. V závěru je z hlediska systémového přístupu charakterizován proces globalizace jako komplexní historický proces, jehož důsledkem je hluboká transformace socio-kulturních struktur současného světa.

Klíčová slova: globalizace, socio-kulturní celky, systémový přístup.

JEL: G3, H83, O19.

Content

Introduction	7
1. Statement of the Problem	7
2. Historical Context of the Systems Approach	8
2.1 Historical Preconditions.....	9
2.2 Underlying Theoretical context	10
2.3 Classical Theories	13
2.4 New Inputs.....	15
3. Principles of Analysis	15
Conclusion	17
References	19

Introduction

Globalization as a research topic has become one of basic subjects of social sciences over the last 20 years. Research of concrete dimensions of globalization has advanced highly in various disciplines, especially then in the area of economic ones. Subsequently the globalization has become a subject of multidisciplinary studies. Nowadays new challenge rises to the foreground: elaboration of bases for cross-disciplinary reflection of this historical process.

Globalization as a deep historical transformation of human reality is a very complex socio-cultural process. It requires cooperation of many sciences and elaboration of new methodological tools of reflection to understand such complex socio-cultural phenomenon. It requires consequently to elaborate highly general approach that could be the platform for interdisciplinary integration of many different fields of science.

One of the required theoretical preconditions is the critical examination of methodological approaches that were developed in individual sciences. This study deals with one of the most general approaches – the systems one. The main purpose of the study is to examine possibilities of this approach, its theoretical and methodological potential for cross-disciplinary (interdisciplinary) reflection of the complex socio-cultural phenomenon and globalization process especially.

1. Statement of the problem

Globalization is generally understood as a very complex historical process the reflection of which overrun all individual disciplines. But separate reflection prevails in research practice. The research is focused on concrete problems, partial dimensions and aspects, individual disciplines concentrate on their specific topics resulting in lack of general categories reflecting in contexture the individual processes in concrete spheres of the social life. It is however the main precondition to understand the broader context of concrete analyses. The main consequence of such situation is ambiguous determination of the process as a historical one, its origin and its basic periods.

In connection with that there is an absence of categorial apparatus of general interdisciplinary reflection, the notion “*globalization*” is not determined exactly and it is not elaborated as a theoretical system. The development of the notion has gone up to now from metaphors (in the 1960s and the 1970s) to more sophisticated reflection in individuals disciplines in the 1980s and then to multidisciplinary reflection (e.g. linkage between science-technology dimension and economic one, economic and political ones, political and security ones etc.)

But also such definitions have descriptive and partial character (Bisley 2007; Scholte 2005; Robertson; White 2003; Held 2000).

We start from general comprehension of globalization as a complex process that involves all areas of social reality, has planet-wide character (nature) and entails qualitative conversion of orderliness of human (socio-cultural) reality. We reflect globalization as a process in the course of which the shaping of global structures in individual areas of social life and among those areas is in the progress.

Such approach requires to integrate partial standpoints and approaches of individual different disciplines, elaboration and application of highly general theoretic and methodological basis and the system of highly general categories. We presume, that such highly general approach, that could create basis for developing of cross-disciplinary reflection of globalization process as inwards very complicated and many-dimensional one was developed in the history of science. It is an approach that is traditionally (no however quite exactly on contemporary level of knowledge) referred to as systems or holistic one.

We are convinced that the systems (holistic) approach is useful to create basis for interdisciplinary approach on globalization. It is one of the most general ones that have been advanced in the science and that's why it could be useful analytic tool of very complex phenomenon. It requires to reflect phenomenon under study from following points of view: connections and context, inner and outer interrelations, dissipative structures as an mechanism of the system evolution. We presume that such approach enables to reflect globalization interdisciplinary as a complex and structured historical process in unity of its many dimensions. On our opinion it enables 1) to understand interrelations between many dimensions of globalization as a whole, 2) to give into the context individual spheres of the process separated up to now, 3) to answer the questions as : what is the level, stage of global integration, measure of its complexity and also of its inner imbalance, what structures developed in the process are more stable, where the process tends and is it possible to identify the alternatives of further development and their probability measure, is it possible to identify the fault points (bifurcations) etc. These answers can help to understand deeply the problems and effects of contemporary phase of globalization and its implications for international life.

2. The Historical Context of the Approach

As it was mentioned above, the notion “*systems approach*” is usually used (Capra 1998) to specify such approach but there are many misunderstandings in discussions especially in social sciences. That is why it is necessary to explain the content of the notion before applying the approach into reflection of globalization. Systems approach is usually identified with theoretical and

methodological principles of mechanic systems theory elaborated in the 1940s. But it has to be understood at contemporary level of science development. as a broad and highly general approach. To understand it one has to briefly go through the history of the approach.

2.1 Historical preconditions

It concerns the approach, that has been developing during the whole history of European science started from Ancient period and that has been changing in connection with development of science as a whole in individual stages of the science history. In Ancient philosophy¹ the approach had its roots in endeavor to understand things in the context of broad whole and understanding of this whole. So holistic principle of reflection is a theoretical precondition of the future systems approach. The linkages between the whole and its components are mainly studied in both, Ancient and classical phase of European Modern period.

In the context of mechanic natural sciences (at the beginning of the Modern period) general wholes (as Nature, Society, Men, etc.) were understood as mechanisms. In this context the mechanic concept of the whole and its structure has been defined. The main interest was given to the enquiry into foundation stones (basic elements) of the wholes that were reduced on physical (or late physical-chemical) principles and quantitative characteristics. In this period the wholes were split into pieces according to Descartes principles of analysis (Descartes 1947) as a rudimental scientific method. The explanation of the whole results from the qualities of these segments. These basic components were recognised in details and quantified. Mechanic wholes were understood as mechanisms composed of elements that have only quantitative features and pass thru only quantitative changes. They were studied as *closed wholes* that are strictly deterministic and have the stable structure. The qualitative changes are not considered. Such methodological standpoint is generalised in philosophy in the concept of “*Natural whole*” and “*Men*” as its part. This mechanic Cosmos is determined by natural laws, the primary dynamic impetus of which is given by God (Westfall 1971).

In this philosophical context the concept of men and society is defined (Bacon, Spinoza, Hobbes, Smith, French and German Enlightenment). Society was understood as a relatively stable whole, its functioning was interpreted through “*mechanism*” metaphor. The activities of all social “components” had to tend to stability, unity and balance which enabled to implement the common goals especially general value ones (the role of mankind in the context of “*esse*”). The

¹ The approach was named according to the meaning of the notion *Synhistanai* (Greek – to unite altogether).

mathematics and physics (mechanics) were the paradigmatic sciences in this period and the basic methodological principle was to explain man (J. de La Mettrie) and society under the principles of these sciences.

2.2 Underlying theoretical context

The development of the systems approach itself started in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century in the connection with the development of biology especially.

In this period biology became the paradigmatic discipline and had brought row of significant discoveries. The study of organisms implied the change of scientific picture of the universe. Understanding of life evolution had downed in the context of geology and biology and culminated in Darwin's scientific works. Many new concepts were formulated in biology and new lines of research were developed: cell-theory, development of physiology, research of metabolism and evolution theory. These concepts created theoretical context within the frame of which the fundamentals of the systems approach had formed. In organistic concept in biology study of organism as an integrated complex was developed, evolution theory stimulated the study of development of such integrated wholes onto higher level of complexity. "*Organism*" became the dominant metaphor that changed the "*mechanism*" one. The notion "organic system"² specified the organisms and also the human societies. Biology stimulated the study of qualitative characteristics of wholes that spring from the interrelations between the segments. (Liliendfield 1978) Such new aspect of holistic approach was then implemented not only in the studies of organisms, but it became the general theoretical and methodological principle in science and especially in rising social sciences – sociology and cultural anthropology (H. Spencer; A. Comte).

At the turn of the 19th and the early 20th century the systems approach was developing under the thumb of biology (the organictic research, microbiology on one hand and ecology a biosphere disciplines on the other hand) and also other disciplines as physics, chemistry but also psychology (gestalt psychology). The "*system*" is understood as a whole that is in connection (retroaction) with its relevant environment. It is the *whole* the segments of which are in functional interrelations. Such concept is the presumption for the definition of the concept "*dynamic system*" (open system).

The approach involving and connecting the holistic, structural and functional principles had influenced not only the development of the science but it had also the implications in the international practice. As for science the conception

² The notion system in the sense of integrated wholes the substantial qualities of which result from the relations between parts was firstly used for organisms by biochemist L. Henderson.

of biosphere is defined (Vernadski 1986) as an integrated planetary system of the life, lastly also the concept of integrated planetary system further advanced in conception “*Gaia*” in the 1960s (Lowelock 1979). In social sciences the mankind started to be perceived as an integrated whole formed by substructures – specific cultures and elements – concrete individuals. In international practice this approach manifested itself after the 1st WW in activities of Commission for Intellectual Cooperation. In this context the principle of mankind’s global responsibility was formulated.³ The concept of “*noosphere*” was discussed (Teilhard de Chardin 1959, Vernadski 1988). In cosmology and philosophy the idea of Cosmos as a deterministic mechanism was replaced by the idea of systemic organization of it (A. N. Whitehead). The theory of qualitative different levels was formulated as a general consequence of evolution theory. Organistic concepts in biology (R. Harrison), quantum mechanics (W. Heisenberg) focused the problem of “*interrelations*” in reflection of integrated wholes. Inner configuration of the relations within the wholes was emphasized. Thereby the concept of “*organization*” is focused as a cardinal systemic characteristic in reflection of alive beings (including socio-cultural ones). This was the base for future differentiation of the concepts “*organization*” (ordering, form), and “*construction*” (objectification) as tools of systemic reflection. In this context the forming of categorial apparatus of the approach started in this period.

The development of thermodynamics was very important stimulus for the advancement of the approach in the future. In the 19th century Clausius’s interpretation of the 2nd law of thermodynamics brought the notion of “*entropy*” and pointed out the problem of time in the sense of irreversible process. In the early 20th century Boltzmann’s probability (stochastic) interpretation represented “*crucial step in direction to physics of the processes*” (Prigogin; Stengers 1984: 238) Development of the thermodynamics also opened the discrepancy between physical and biological interpretation of the system development⁴ and inspired the research of qualitative changes that culminated in the 1970s in formulation of the dissipative structures theory.

In the early 20th century the development of quantum mechanics overruled the mechanistic idea of indivisibility of basic elements (classical atomism) and explained the elementary particles universe as a universe of context and interrelations. (Heisenberg 1971). In the 1920s and the 1930s science brought further ideas and theoretical concepts that contributed the development of the systems approach e.g. the concept of homeostases (W. Cannon) in biology.⁵ Philosophical and meta theoretical conceptions were formulated as the theory of

³ Commission was established by the resolution of League of Nations Assembly in 1921.

⁴ Mechanic systems direct into entropy, alive systems (organisms) into higher level of complexity and ordering (negentropy) over time.

⁵ Concept of homeostases explained the stability of inner environment of organisms on conditions dynamic interrelations with outer environment.

structures, organization (A. Bogdanov) and Whitehead's processes philosophy. In this period also the methodology developed new approaches. The epistemic understanding of the research started to be applied. Philosophy, psychology, physics (quantum mechanics and relativity theory) contributed to this approach by emphasis of the role of observer and his influence on surveyed processes and phenomenon. Phenomenology started to be developed and understanding of inner experience in cognitive processes was stressed.

In this scientific context the notion "*system*" was interpreted as an integrated whole substantial qualities of which rise from relationship between parts. Development of the living units (systems), inclusive socio-cultural ones, was understood as qualitative change in terms of rising inner complexity of the system. Every system was studied as an element of the higher system and at the same time as a met system of the lower order ones that it includes like its elements. Philosophy formulated the idea of systemic organization of the reality. Evolutionary aspect was presently formalized in terms of philosophical considerations about evolution levels (hierarchy of levels). Conception of emergent characteristics (C. D. Broad) was formalized i.e. characteristics belonging to higher evolutionary level that cannot be explained from levels of lower order. Development was perceived like general tendency towards higher complexity, qualitative changes were emphasized.

Systems thinking signified at this time to understand phenomenon in the context of wider whole, to determine character of their inner relations, to determine systemic features of the whole, understanding of its development and individual levels of complexity that originated in evolutionary process. Notion "*system*" wasn't meanwhile stable category rather metaphor "*organism*" predominates.

In social sciences metaphor "*organism*" (Spencer) was used within the interpretations of socio-cultural systems at this time. Concrete analyses and concepts however always had both mechanical and organic traits. Evolutionary principle was applied first on cultural development in cultural anthropology (cultural evolutionism) and on social development stages in sociology (Comte). In the early 20th century structures of social and cultural systems were studied (Ogburn 1922) in sociology a cultural anthropology. The concept of "social energetism" was developed under the thumb of physics (Ostwald 1907, 1909). Stimuli originated from natural sciences in the early 20th century however have had their consequences hereafter in social sciences.

2.3. Classical theories

In the period of 1940s and 1950s general system theory (L. von Bertalanffy) was formalized. This theory aspired to be an application of holistic principle like

basic methodological one for all of science disciplines that deal with "organized units". It was to be mathematical discipline (see analytical philosophy, Viennese ringlet) and integrative concept of the science. (Bertalanffy 1968). Author's main purpose was to overcome dominance of mechanical description of the world, to find new methodology for description of biological reality and to stress qualitative discrepancy between physical and biological systems. It was evident, that it is impossible to describe living systems in terms of classical thermodynamic, that classical thermodynamics isn't valid for description of systems, that are in steady state far from balance. In this respect Bertalanffy determined conception "*open system*".⁶ In terms of systems theory and in connection with researches on metabolism also presumption of "*self-regulation*" of the open systems was pronounced. New thermodynamics of open systems was elaborated as late as in the 1970s in connection with the theory of "*dissipative structures*" (Prigogin, Stengers 1984).⁷ Then the discrepancy between evolutionary theory and classical thermodynamics was solved.

In the 1940 also cybernetics (N. Wiener; C. Shannon) had significant importance for development of the systems approach in science. It brought many new stimuli even though it had marked mechanistic features.⁸

For further progress of theoretical thinking the idea of the mode of organization was very important. Contribution of cybernetics was determination of several general concepts as "*feedback*", "*self-regulation*", "*circular causality*" and in terms of hereof concept distinction between "*positive and negative feedback path*". Notions "*information*" and "*communication*" assumed key importance on the part of future development of both natural and social sciences. All these concepts were defined like theoretical tools to study general structures of organization and self-regulation of systems. The configuration of the interrelations that is specific for concrete system was core topic of cybernetics. To understand reality from the systemic point of view meant to understand the configuration of relations. The systemic qualities are understood as resulting from configuration of relations, system characteristics as the features of ordering. Concerning the systems approach it was of consequence that the concept "*open system*" was developed and completed by "*organizational enclosure*" principle (Ashby 1956) at this time.

⁶ Open system keeps up to fare from balance in steady state through continuous flow of energy, through continuous changes i.e. dynamic, "flowing" equilibrium (Bertalanffy).

⁷ The notion reflects the new structure of higher complexity and ordering that emerges in the situation of high disequilibrium.

⁸ Cybernetics has risen from practical needs to develop self-regulating machines. That is why it studied organization structures common to both living and machine systems. Its concepts were mechanistic because juxtaposition of machines and live organisms was focal point of he interest. Mechanical model of the brain like PCs ("Brain is logical circuit, whose elements are neurons") and information theory (Wiener, C. Shannon), were connected with technical progress – e.g. digital PCs (von Neumann).

Problem of “*self-organization*” was already inherent in cybernetic studies but meanwhile wasn't formalized. It was implemented as late as the 1970s. This question originated within the frame of research on “*ordering*” (“*configuration*”), which constituted system thinking in cybernetics. But cybernetics developed the focus on problems of negative feedback especially. The main attention was given to the problems of *auto-regulation* because as to machines self-development to higher state of “*orderliness*” wasn't meanwhile under investigation. Positive feedback wasn't under investigation (it was of marginal focus) and it was red as self – destruction process. Its significance to understanding of development mechanism towards higher level of system's complexity (thereby consequently to understanding of life development) was understood as late as the 1970s and the 1980s (I. Prigogine, F. Capra, H. Maturana, F. Varela).

In terms of endeavour to detect mechanisms that underlie mental phenomenon, to reflect the mind and functions of the brain by means of mathematics and formal logic (von Neumann) cybernetics was connected with formation of cognitive science. Its conception of knowledge like information processing i.e. like symbolic manipulation according to definite set of rules. It was a way out for the development of science discipline that deals with artificial intelligence.

Endeavour to apply the most general holistic perspective meant also application of the systems approach to the study of wide areas phenomenon including both live systems and socio-cultural ones (M. Meadova). Its implementation into social science research however became reality starting from the 1960s (M. Marujama, later N. Luhmann).

In social sciences strong empirical tendency predominated in the first half of the 20th century. Under the thumb of physics mechanistic and experiential orientation of the research as well as tendency towards specialization of social sciences were strong in this period. Classical systemic conceptions of society and culture were formulated in sociology and cultural anthropology. In terms of these conceptions both, mechanic and organic models were formulated (Malinowski 1944, Parsons 1951, Sorokin 1963, White 1975). General system theory (L. v. Bertalanffy) and cybernetics (N. Wiener) that were formulated at the same time as classical functionalism and structural-functionalism impacted the reflection of human reality further in 1970s and 1980s (E. Laszlo, A. Rapoport, R. W. Gerard, N. Luhmann, F. A. Hayek)

2.4. New inputs

Explosive development of research areas important for the further development of systems approach proceeded in the second half of the 20th century (in 1960s – 1980s). It was above all mathematics. It developed new principles that become useful tools to forward the systems reflection of reality (non-linearity, feedback

and principle of iteration, theory of chaos, fractal geometry, conception of attractor etc.) In natural sciences (physics, chemistry, neurology) the models of self-organization were formulated. The most important was Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures (Prigogin; Stengers 1984), principle of autopoiesis (Maturana; Varela 1980), systems life theory (Capra 1996) in biology, systems philosophy (Laszlo 1996).

In social sciences following topics were evolved in the context systems approach: *Order and configuration* of both socio-cultural reality as a whole and concrete socio-cultural systems, *autopoiesis* in socio-cultural reality, problem of evolutionary role of information and memory in socio-cultural reality. School of cultural ecology (M. Harris, R. Rappaport) inquired into socio-cultural reality on the part of adaptation function of culture and into orderliness and structures of cultural systems. (Lehmannová 1999: 48). Concept of "order" is emphasized in the study of socio-cultural reality in connection with the study of "orderliness" in natural and cognitive sciences and under the thumb of the evolutionary levels theory, nonlinear dynamics, theory of dissipative structures and. Notions "order" and "orderliness" are intended for basic tools of studies of complex phenomenon (Hayek 1973). Socio-cultural reality is understood as the most complex evolutionary level that our cognition is able to register on contemporary stage of knowledge. Under the thumb of information science, communication theory and cybernetics categories "information", "communication" and "memory" in general meaning conduct to the foreground and are understood as source of autopoiesis in socio-cultural systems (Luhmann 1990) (Král 1988).

3. Principles of analysis

We do not identify the systems approach with some of the theories that were analysed above. We understand it as highly general approach, general way how to inquire into the subject of research, the method how to cognize the reality.

On the basis of above analyzed development of the approach one can summarize its main principles on present stage of its theoretical development. It is an approach that reflects the subject of research from the point of view of following principles:

1. *Holistic principle*

Reflection of the subject as an integrated whole, in which the systems qualities, features are determinant, emergent features that any part has not in itself and that result from configuration of interrelations between parts and elements.

2. *Levels of complexity and emergent qualities*

In the integrated whole one can identify different systems levels as an different levels of complexity with their specific emergent qualities.

3. Context and relations

Character and qualities of individual parts of the whole one can understand only in the context of the system as well as the system itself and its dynamic one can understand in the context of met system and in relations with other systems. Relations are important for understanding of reflected subject and it is interpreted as part of the network of systemic relations.

4. Networks

The principles of systemic levels and that one of context are connected in levels of networks principle. This principle emphasizes the relations point of view, the wholes are studied as networks of the relations, levels of networks are identified.

5. Processes approach

Interrelations (inner and outer) are interpreted as processes, structures are understood as results, as objectifications of those processes.

6. Construction and organization

Two aspects are distinguished in theoretical reflection: Construction (objectified structures) and organization (ordering), typical configuration of the relations for concrete whole (system). The systemic qualities result from the configuration of relations, real structures are understood as objectifications of them.

7. Evolution principle

The wholes (systems) are studied in the process of evolution that is generally understood as a tendency to higher level of complexity.

8. Principle of dissipative structures

This principle explains the qualitative changes in direction to new structure of higher complexity and ordering that emerge in the situation of high disequilibrium. (Prigogin; Stengers 1984). The metaphor “*quantum shift*” is usually used (Lazslo 2008).

9. Principle of self-organization

This principle was formulated to reflect the mechanisms of the changes in configurations in living organisms and in socio-cultural reality. The notion “*autopoiesis*” (Maturana; Varela 1980), (Luhmann 1990) is used to reflect such mechanisms.

10. Communication and information, memory

The distinction of structures (construction) and configurations helps to understand the role of communication and information for living organisms and socio-cultural systems because for these systems inner and outer flows of information are the basic fundamental prerequisites. In social sciences the linkages between genetic and socio-cultural information and memory are studied (Luhmann 1990), (Kráľ 1998).

11. Epistemic concept of reflection

This principle means to include the role of observer and his influence on surveyed processes and phenomenon. Socio-cultural determinants of cognitive processes generally and in creation of concrete theory are integral part of reflection in social sciences especially. (Berger; Luckmann 1966), (Willard 1992). It also means to understand that the methods of reflection is integral part of the theory, theories are limited and any of them is not more fundamental then others.

To summarise above mentioned principles we can see that the content of the analysed approach has changed essentially and it has become more complex theoretically and methodologically during its development. That is why many authors try to use another notions to identify this approach e. g. evolution-genetic one, evolutionary memory one, evolution contextual one etc. On our opinion the last one mostly correspond to the content of the approach on the contemporary level of scientific knowledge. No matter to use whichever of terms it is substantial that it follows the classical systems approach but it is formulated on the basis of new development in sciences in the second half of the 20th century. On our opinion just this approach creates theoretical and methodological background for interdisciplinary reflection of complex socio-cultural processes especially. But it needs to integrate the spheres of research that study the aspects of emergent qualities of socio-cultural reality. To developed the phenomenology dimension of reflection. In this respect knowledge of cognitive psychology and symbolic and cognitive anthropology is extremely important in reflection of socio-cultural reality.

Conclusions

Systems approach as it was defined above enables to study globalization process in the broader context of human existence and history. It enables to understand globalization in the context of human history reflected as an implementation of the cultural adaptation strategy (i.e. creating ever more complex and structured socio-cultural (human made) reality).

From this point of view the globalization can be understood as a long term and complex historical process, as a consequence of the socio-cultural evolution. The concrete complexity level of socio-cultural structures in worldwide measure is an essential historical precondition of the rise of globalization.

Systems approach enables to study globalization as a process influencing and structurally rebuilding the human reality as a whole. From systems point of view globalization is the process that:

- relates to human reality as a whole, not only to some of its parts,

- has global (worldwide) shape not only as to space, but especially as to inner structure of it,
- concerns all organization levels of this reality, it is a process not only of horizontal but of vertical integration especially,
- changes structure of inner and outer relations of socio-cultural wholes and principles of their organization (ordering).

Systems approach studies the human history as a process in which human reality is continually forming itself in direction to higher complexity. From this point of view the emergent socio-cultural mechanism of human evolution can be identified. History can be studied as a process of self-organization of socio-cultural reality. Globalization then can be seen as:

- process of self-organization of human reality in direction to a new dissipative structure – global one,
- substantial change in the human history, transition from local socio-cultural structures into global socio-cultural structure.
- process of creating the global met system of human reality.

Distinction and elaboration of the categories *process*, *construction* and *ordering* enables to understand concrete socio-cultural wholes and their inner and outer structures of relations as objectified manifestation of the historical process. It enables to determine the level and concrete form of global integration and also the organizing principles and structures of its ordering in concrete moment of its development. This standpoint represents the fundamental theoretical and methodological principle for study of the global governance problems.

Globalization process itself is studied as complex and structured process from systemic point of view. It enables to reflect structure and dynamics in all branches of human socio-cultural activities and between them. It enables to study globalization as a process of many inner dimensions, as a process that proceeds unequally in each sphere of human activities, uneven process of inner imbalance at this stage of the history. It enables to identify the measure of its Inner imbalance and unequal level of global integration in individual parts of social life.

References

- ASHBY, R. (1956): *Introduction to Cybernetic*. New York: John Willey.
- BISLEY, N. (2007): *Rethinking Globalization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BERGER, P. L., LUCKMANN, T. (1966): *Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City NY: Doubleday.
- BERTALANFY, L. von (1968): *General system theory*. New York: Braziller.
- CAPRA, F. (1996): *The Web of Life. New Synthesis of Mind and Matter*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- DESCARTES, R. (1947): *Rozprava o metodě*. Praha: Jan Laichter.
- HAYEK, F. A. (1978): *Law, Legislation and Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HEISENBERG, W. (1971): *Physic and Beyond*. New York: Harper & Row.
- HELD, D. (2000): Regulating Globalization? The Reinvention of Politics. *International Sociology*, 15(2) pp. 394-408.
- KRÁL, M. (1994): *Změna paradigmatu vědy*. Praha: Filosofia.
- KRÁL, M. (1998): *Kam směřuje civilizace*. Praha: Filosofia.
- LASZLO, E. (1996): *The Systems View of the World*. New York: Hampton Press.
- LASZLO, E. (2008): *Quantum shift in the Global Brain*. Rochester: Inner Traditions.
- LEHMANNOVÁ, Z. (1999): *Kulturní dimenze mezinárodních vztahů*. Praha: VŠE.
- LEHMANNOVÁ, Z. (2003): Globalization and Culture. *Journal of International Relations and Development*. Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 240-251.
- LILIENFELD, R. (1978): *The Rise of Systems Theory*. New York: J Wiley.
- LOWELOCK, J. (1979): *Gaia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LUHMANN, N. (1990): *The Essays of Self-Reference*. New York: Columbia University Press.

MALINOWSKI, B. (1944): *Scientific Theory of Culture*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

MARUYAMA, M. (1963): The Second Cybernetics. *American Scientist*, Vol. 51, pp. 164-179.

MATURANA, H., VARELA, F. (1980): *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Dordrecht NL: D. Reidel.

OGBURN, W. F. (1922): *Social Change with respect to Culture and Origin Nature*. New York, Chicago: Huebsch.

OSTWALD, W. (1907): The Modern Theory of Energetics. *The Monist*, vol. 17, pp. 481-515.

OSTWALD, W. (1909): *Energetische Grundlagen der Kulturwissenschaft*. Leipzig: Dr. Werner Klinkhardt Verlag.

PARSONS, T.: (1964): The present Position and Prospects of Systematic Theory in Sociology. In: *Essays in Sociological Theory: Pure and Applied*. Revised edition. New York: Free Press.

PARSONS, T. (1951): *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL.: Free Press.

PRIGOGIN, I.; STENGERS, I. (1984): *Order out of Chaos*. New York: Bantam Books.

RICHARDSON, G. P. (1992): *Feedback. Thought in Social Science and Systems Theory*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

ROBERTSON, R.; WHITE, K. E. (2003): *Globalization: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London, New York : Tylor and Francis.

SCHOLTE, J. A. (2005): *Globalization, A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

SOROKIN, P. A. (1963): *Social and Cultural Dynamic*. New York: American Book Co.

STIGLITZ, J. (2002): *Globalization and its Discontents*. London: Penguin Books.

ŠMAJS, J. (1998): *The Threatened Culture*. Brno: Dobromysl and Slovacontact.

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, P. (1959): *The Phenomenon of Man*. London: Harper and Row.

VERNADSKI, V. I. (1988): *Filosofskie mysli naturalista*. Moskva: Nauka.

WESTFALL, R. S. (1971): *The Construction of Modern Science: Mechanism and Mechanics*. New York: John Willey and Sons.

WHITE, L. A. (1975): *The Concept of Cultural Systems: A Key to Understanding Tribes and Nations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

WHITEHEAD, A. N. (1929): *Process and Reality*. New York: Macmillan.

WHITEHEAD, A. N. (1967): *Science and the Modern world*. New York: The Free Press.

WIENER, N. (1950): *The Human use of Human Beings*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

WIENER, N. (1961): *Cybernetic*. New York: John Willey & Sons.

WILLARD, Ch. A. (1992): *Liberalism and the Social Grounds of Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WILSON, E. O. (1998): *Consilience. The Unity of Knowledge*. New York: Knopf.



University of Economics, Prague
Faculty of International Relations
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4
130 67 Prague 3
<http://vz.fmv.vse.cz/>



Vydavatel: Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Nakladatelství Oeconomica

Tisk: Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Nakladatelství Oeconomica

Tato publikace neprošla redakční ani jazykovou úpravou

ISSN 1802-6591