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Abstract

The purpose of the article is to review and analyze research strategies and approaches proposed in world historical science within the framework of global history as an emerging methodological approach in modern historical science. The article uses a number of special historical methods (historical-genetic, historical-typological, historical-comparative, historical-system, synchronous and diachronic analysis, historical modeling method, descriptive-narrative method). Review and analysis of research approaches currently tested in the study of global history shows that the heuristic potential in the global history has the use of a comparative approach, reference to transnational history, world-systems analysis, postcolonial studies and the theory of multiple upgrades. At the same time, we should also rely on the principle of complementarity of paradigms, which allows us to synthesize the cognitive results obtained in the framework of various research strategies. The history of Russia can also be better understood in the context of global history.
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Introduction

In the modern world, the process of globalization is actively developing. Accordingly, the world historical science is searching for a conceptual apparatus and methodological approaches that would allow a deeper understanding of the modern, increasingly interconnected world. The expansion and complexity of the research field in modern historical science requires a more diverse methodological tools, and this is realized by an increasing number of researchers. The purpose of the article is to review and analyze research strategies and approaches proposed in modern world historical science within the framework of global history as an emerging methodological approach in modern historical science. Such approach would be cognitively productive for considering the realities of the modern world and for studying those trends of the past, the action of which created the modern globalized world.

Methods

The article uses a number of special historical methods (historical-genetic, historical-typological, historical-comparative, historical-system, synchronous and diachronic analysis, historical modeling method, descriptive-narrative method).

Results

Review and analysis of research approaches currently tested in the study of global history shows that the heuristic potential in the global history has the use of a comparative approach, reference to transnational history, world-systems analysis, postcolonial studies and the theory of multiple upgrades. At the same time, we should also rely on the principle of complementarity of paradigms,
which allows us to synthesize the cognitive results obtained in the framework of various research strategies. Research strategies that have been tested in the study of global history issues complement each other, and make it possible to understand the course of world history in all its diversity and depth.

**Discussion**

Historical science did not accept the globalization trends immediately. The historiographical canon that developed during the 19th century assumed the development of historiography within the framework of national history with the recognition of the paradigm of progress and the linear concept of understanding the course of time. National states were the main actors in the historical process. This national frame of historical description did not allow us to properly see the factors that in a broader context were the driving forces of social development. It did not give us a proper understanding of the reasons for the strengthening or weakening of certain states, mutual influences in the economic, political, institutional, cultural and ideological spheres of public life (Iggers, 2012).

Global factors have long been visible in the development of world history. They are especially clearly distinguishable starting from the modern period, but some researchers in the framework of world-system analysis find the first evidence of the influence of global factors in the life of human society since the appearance of the first state-organized societies in human history about five thousand years ago. Global history provides a wide-format panorama of processes, some of which were simply inaccessible to academic knowledge for a long time or, at least, were considered irrelevant for it, including materials from environmental history to explain historical events. So, it is established that in February 1600 in Spanish Peru, the volcano Wainaputina erupted, throwing so much ash into the atmosphere that it led to long rains, early frosts, which were observed even in Europe, and on the territory of Russia in 1601-1603. Following sources on Russian history it is known that on August 15, 1601 the Moscow river froze, by October 10, 1601, according to contemporaries, the ice on the Dnieper in the Ukrainian lands was, as in winter, the Black Sea froze on the coast. These natural disasters led to a number of events known in the history of Russia as the time of Troubles, but only within the framework of global history was it possible to understand the time of Troubles in a broader context (Witze, 2008).

The motivation for the formation of global history as a special methodological direction was the more active development of contacts in the modern globalizing world. The institutionalization of global history as a methodological direction in world historical science began to occur at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. In the United States and other English-speaking countries, it has been the fastest-growing field of all historical disciplines for several decades. The trend towards expanding the influence of global history is also becoming more noticeable in Europe and East Asia. Since March 2006, a specialized journal on global history "Journal of Global History" has been published (Conrad, 2018).

The rise of global history as a paradigm initially occurred in countries that actively participated in the process of globalization and benefited from it. Global history can be defined as a form of historical analysis in which phenomena, events, and processes are viewed in global contexts. The development of Europe and the West and other regions of the world cannot be explained ab intra as an autonomous process. Works on global history are relational, based on the study of relationships, based on the fact that the historical unit (civilization, country, family) does not develop in isolation, but can only be understood through its relationship with other units. As a direct consequence of this view, synchronicity in the interpretation of historical events is brought to the foreground. The closer we get to the modernity, the more synchronous constellations of mutually influencing events and factors and external forces act as important drivers of social change as age-old prehistories and traditions. Within the framework of global history, comparisons are made, relationships are
investigated, and causality is identified, which is discussed on a global scale. Research within the framework of global history does not necessarily cover the entire globe: the main thing is that phenomena are studied taking into account global connections and general structural conditions. However, within the framework of global history, the origin of national States is understood as a product of global processes and the development of the world economy. The most interesting processes and questions often arise at the intersection of global phenomena with their local implementations (Manning, 2003; Sachsenmaier, 2011; Berger, 2007).

A cross-cutting idea that runs through such works is the belief that no society, nation, or civilization exists in isolation and that from the earliest times human life has been characterized by mobility and interaction on the planet. Global history differs from the civilizational approach in that, although it recognizes the diversity of civilizations, it focuses not on differences between civilizations, but on the phenomena and processes of interaction and mutual influence among civilizations, including the way some countries can use the opportunity to penetrate the economic life of other regions for their own benefit. Instead of emphasizing relationships and interactions, civilizational discourse focuses on a clear awareness of boundaries and cultural uniqueness. Within the framework of a global approach, the possibility of turning these cultural differences into a commodity is also significant: after all, tourism in the modern world will not have such a motivation in its development if everything becomes the same everywhere.

One of the most striking examples of the implementation of research approaches to global history is the work of Kenneth Pomeranz on external factors in the development of the modern British economy. After discussing the internal factors that explain the British rise (in particular, drawing attention to the fact that the relatively high cost of labor in the British Isles in the XVIII century encouraged entrepreneurs to support and implement technical improvements), the historian concludes that great prospects for Great Britain were opened, first of all, the country's colonial Imperial possessions, and access to North American markets was also significant. Whole cities in England, like Liverpool, grew rich in the organization of the slave trade, even to the deployment of metal products in the form of collars, chains for the needs of the Atlantic slave trade. The economic development of England, concludes Pomeranz, can only be understood in a global context. According to him, "forces outside the market and conditions outside Europe should be put in the first place to explain why the territory of Western Europe, which is not exceptional in terms of development, gained unique achievements and eventually became the center where the new economy of the XIX century mainly developed" (Pomeranz, 2000).

The world is very important for the development of methodological approaches to global history world-systematic approach and the works of one of the largest representatives of historical sociology of our time, I. Wallerstein (1930-2019). A number of his works have been published in Russian, including the most important work, the 4-volumes "The modern world-system", published in 2015-2016 (Wallerstein, 2015, 2016). According to his approach, until modern times, there were a number of "world-economies" in the world as more or less autonomous entities that could meet most of their material needs at the expense of the internal market. Further, in 1450-1650, there was a "great divergence" between the ways of development of Western Europe and the rest of the world, when the economic center of Europe began to move to the North-West, on the shores of the Atlantic. Thus, in modern times, the core, semi-periphery and periphery of the world economy have developed. Within the framework of the world-system analysis, it is impossible to say that social development is a linear process. On the one hand, the most developed countries appear, and on the other hand, states and territories that have not yet reached the level of the most developed countries, but they are not closed to the path leading them to the leading positions in the world economy. From the sixteenth century to the present, there is a situation in our world in which there are no, so to speak, leading and weak, but there is a core, a semi-periphery and a periphery, various orbits around a rich and influential core. This is the perspective from which the main content of world
history unfolds. Individual regions can now become something in the world economy to the extent that the core allows them to do something. The final victory in the struggle for hegemony is achieved by military means: the level of development of weapons and equipment of the army is also critical. The inter-class conflict characteristic of capitalism has also become an inter-state confrontation. Local self-governing direct producers cannot change the balance of power in the world and actually pay tribute to the core, although subjectively they can understand this as buying real estate in Miami, teaching children at an English or American University, etc. In the arguments of Wallerstein the ideological charge has power, laid down by the movements of the "new left" of the late 1960s. In planning human activities, he warns against traditional social sciences, which, in his opinion, distort the idea of social reality. But, in the end, I. Wallerstein considered the decline of the capitalist world-system irreversible, and its collapse as a foregone conclusion. His views and the theory of world-system analysis I. Wallerstein assigns the role of ideological loosening of the capitalist world-system and its approaching collapse.

Global historians are particularly interested in how individuals and communities interact with others, and to a lesser extent in endogenous changes. The history of globalization is an integral part of the global history, but it does not coincide with it. In global history, spatial metaphors such as "territoriality", "geopolitics", "conversion", "networks" replace the previous temporal vocabulary: "development", "delaying", "backwardness". This also implies a rejection of the teleology inherent in the theory of modernization. The global history questions the idea that societies change exclusively "from within" and that the direction of these social changes – for example, from traditional to modern society – is predetermined. In this regard, for example, the uprisings of the "Arab spring" in 2011 are a clear example of how synchronous constellations, combinations and external forces act as important incentives for social change, as well as age-old prehistories and traditions (Conrad, 2018).

Writing history in the twenty-first century does not mean the same thing as it used to mean. Under the influence of approaches to global history, a full-fledged historical analysis is no longer possible without considering phenomena, events and processes in global contexts. However, there is no consensus among researchers on how best to achieve this result. In the framework of global history, there are five main approaches that remain especially relevant today: 1) comparative studies (global connection and comparison) (Gagne, 2019), 2) transnational history (transnational history pays particular attention to such concepts as mobility, the circulation of ideas, technologies, goods, borrowing; transnational studies are more interested in the question of how a society permeated by external forces and organized by them; examines non-profit organizations (NGOs), private companies, transnational public sphere that are not limited to state actors and are not bound by national borders; examines how the country entered into the global context and vice versa, as the context influences the individual and society) (Bender, 2006), 3) world-system theory (Wallerstein, 2015, 2016), 4) postcolonial studies (postcolonial historians see the theme of "the global" as a discourse of imperialist domination, as the invasion of imperialism in the local "life worlds"; country and civilization are not considered here as something naturally existing, on the contrary, researchers are interested in how such formations as "India" or "Europe" was created in the context of the global circulation of ideas; as a result, the emphasis is on the relativity of the structure of the modern world; in fact, the integration of the markets was influenced by all perfectly visible fist of imperialism, depended on forced or bonded labor contracts, from pumping out raw resources from the forcible "opening" of markets (like in Latin America and East Asia), from the imperialist financial management; the fact that in many studies described as spontaneous "globalization", was actually imposed by colonialism) (Young, 2016) and 5) the concept of multiple modernization (the path of modernization is not the same for different societies) (Duchesne, 2011). The concept of Histoire Croisee also appeared. It means twisted story, cross history, developing a comparative perspective, transfers, borrowing, interaction in different spheres of social life (Repina, 2014).
The theory of structuration by A. Giddens it is also important for global history. This is because global structures are as much shaped by human activity as they are shaped by global structures; they are the result of structuration processes. As such, global structures create the conditions in which a person acts, but they do not completely determine the choice of individuals or entire communities. The originality and creativity of human decisions and actions also have a causal influence. According to the synergetic approach, the crisis states of the capitalist system at bifurcation points also open up opportunities for realizing the potential impact of human activity on the choice of further scenarios of social development. In such transitional periods, the further development of the social system can be influenced, literally, by anything, and anyone in the most difficult to predict way (Giddens, 2005).

The study of global history is dominated by English-speaking researchers, to the extent that it is often directly considered as an American-British project, which, of course, is not entirely true. Another trend is the growing influence of East Asian historians. Global history has received an additional motivation to development due to the rise of China, because of the need to understand the changing geopolitical situation. The rise of the Chinese economy, more than all the methodological disputes and intellectual flows within the academic world, has contributed to a rethinking of global hierarchies, as well as possible ways to develop economic and political systems. It is significant that in Japan, Korea, China, and Singapore, historians have become engaged in global issues, and institutional support for these studies is gaining strength there. The Asian Association of world historians, founded in 2008, is becoming increasingly important in world historical science (Conrad, 2018).

As in all scientific knowledge as a whole, when conducting a research the observer's position is irremovable within the framework of global history. Historians can write about the entire planet, but they are in a certain place, and their narratives will always be at least partially colored by what happened and is happening there. It is also very difficult for a historian to distance himself from belonging to his society, to his culture, in his conclusions and assessments. The world is very different when viewed from Moscow, Washington, Tokyo, and to say nothing of views from somewhere in Libya, Iraq, or some African country. The difficulty of writing global history from the point of view of different national historiographies is clearly visible. In fact, global history can only be written as historiography - as a description not only of different conceptualizations of the world, but also of different ways of understanding the past.

The history of Russia can also be better understood only in the context of global history. The development of the North-East of the Eurasian continent from the very beginning of this process should be considered in the context of global history. The Russian state was encouraged to move East in the XVII century by the situation in international relations of that time, the need to find resources in the fight against Europe. The pressure of this global factor led to the fact that the Russians appeared, including the coast of the Okhotsk sea. On the other hand, the peoples of the North-East of Russia, who lived in noticeable isolation, few in number, provided in this region with food products in the traditional nature of economic activities, did not feel an urgent need to go somewhere for long distances and travel in reindeer sledges around the Moscow region in the XVII century. After all, need is the great engine of all historical processes.

The modernization shoot and the industrialization of the Soviet period in Russian history must also be understood as the result of a noticeable action of global factors, the beginning of confrontation between the capitalist and socialist systems. Mining and the search for new resources had to increase under the influence of difficulties and threats in the international environment. Otherwise, the Soviet state could not have existed.

In post-Soviet Russia, the country's involvement in the network of global exchanges also directly determines the situation in the Russian economy. The new opportunities for capital flows allow, on
the one hand, the inflow of investment, which to some extent occurs, but first of all, we are witnessing a huge capital outflow from Russia over the past years. We have been observing this phenomenon for years. Thus, the net outflow of private sector capital from Russia over the past 2018 increased 2.7 times and amounted to $67.5 billion. In the modern world, there are many countries whose observations cast doubts that globalization is a beneficial process (Vedomosti, 2019). In the modern world-system, the core, like a vacuum cleaner, drains the rest of the world of financial capital, human capital, centers and develops commodity and information flows, and effective ways to change this situation are not even seriously seen.

The North-East of Russia remains a peripheral region, while possessing significant natural resources and development potential. In modern conditions, in the development of the North-East of Russia, it is important where capital will come from, and where, to what extent, funds from the region's economy development will go. World capitalism has been living for centuries by trying to uncork and open up regions that have not yet been developed by world capital, primarily in its own interests, and this must be borne in mind. Such attempts to open up to global capital expanses of Russia were the events of the 1917 revolution, the civil war of 1918-1922, and setting the Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union by Western States in the late 1930-ies, and deployment of Gorbachev's "perestroika", of "new thinking", the collapse of the Soviet Union at the turn of 1980-90-ies. Therefore, in the development of the North-East of Russia, it is impossible to do without the coordinating role of the state power, without the Russian state performing not only its economic and social functions, but also its foreign policy function. All these processes will continue to unfold in the context of global history in the twentieth century. There is no way back. To exist in a global society, one will have to continue adaptation, but, at the same time, putting national interests at the center, without mindlessly introducing into your country what the globalizers impose. Even in the global world, the national-oriented political and economic elite, which primarily cares about the interests of their country, is still at a high price.

**Conclusion**

As you can see, the dynamics of world history from the earliest periods in the history of mankind unfolded under the influence of increased contacts between different countries and peoples, and as we approach the present, such contacts have acquired a global scope and content. In modern world historical science, global history is becoming one of the main methodological tools for analysis and understanding the situation in the modern world, explaining how trends originating from the past shape the present. By now, there are grounds to assert that the isolated existence of separate cultures, peoples and states has ended in the world. The influence of global factors in origin can be traced in almost all spheres of social life of modern societies, giving dynamics and content to the world's events. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, the understanding and real content of universal history has changed significantly, to the extent that its research field is being rethought and redefined as a field of research within the framework of global history. In fact, modern world history should be studied as global history.
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