

УДК 316.3

Modern Globalization Processes as a Manifestation of the Western Culture

Maria V. Kozlova*

*Siberian Federal University,
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia¹*

Received 14.08.2009, received in revised form 21.08.2009, accepted 28.08.2009

In the given article we show, that modern global civilization defines itself not so much in the terms of culture, as in the terms of equipment. Determination of social and spiritual life, which earlier having been going from general notions of duty, honor and conscience, of ethic and esthetic regulators, is being progressively changed by technological determination. Being determined by culture, person turns into a human factor, which is ruled by equipment. It is fragmentary and dependent. Initiative and the final salvation of the questions of person's interaction with external environment and other people become the prerogative of equipment and technology. In the given article we underline, that the crucial difference of a socio-cultural personality from the human factor is included in the following: person is determined from the inside – from the side of assimilated cultural assets, which have become inner, while the human factor is determined from the outside – from the side of socio-technical systems. All these aspects acquire special meaning in the conditions of globalization.

Keywords: culture globalization; internationalization; westernization; culture homogeneity; socio-cultural phenomenon.

Point

In the modern conditions we can observe a global merging of the inner and the outer, of one's own and of foreign spheres, the merging being fraught with the total failure of human identity mechanisms. Principal distancing from whatever «grounds» (cultural, national, state) destroys the process of identification, based on the opposition of «we» and «they». Global person does not differentiate «we» and «they» and axiological-normative pieces of codex, connected with it, and puts out to the open sea of unregulated transnational contacts. But, while entering the interaction with other cultural environments' participants, carrying different meanings and

evaluating the same events and phenomena in a different way, the person, who does not have his own identity, easily transforms into a person, having no norms.

Example

The realities of the formation process of integral world-wide system of trans-individual social historical organisms, which took place in XVI century, corresponded to the notion of «internationalization». To the beginning of XX century this process had almost reached its completion. From the latter half of XX century we can observe how the system of social organisms, varying by their social-economical

* Corresponding author E-mail address: dovedudelodouma@mail.ru

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

order (slavery, feudalism and others), by this or that economical sphere prevailing (agricultural, industrial and others), by the form of government (monarchy, republic and others), by their political regimes (autocracy, democracy and others), by the dominating confessions (Christianity, Buddhism and others) and so on, turns into a single and integral social organization. Complex and contradictory processes of integration (of peoples, cultures, civilizations and so on) into one single and integral social organism with its typical political-legal organization and up-bringing-educational structures serve to show the tendencies of «globalization» [1].

Modern globalization processes, presented by the naturalistic process of the world's growing interdependency in the result of information technologies expansion, volume and services and goods nomenclature increase, expansion of financial flows between the countries – all these presuppose a special attitude to the past as well. They use and successfully spread those historical facts, within which bases there is their «consumptive value», i.e. their excuses for aggressive pretensions of the western civilization. Even the history textbooks are compiled according to the principle of globalism: they not only pay less attention to the eastern nations, than to any other western country, but wrench in advance the axiological scale, which has been historically formed in the concrete society. It is connected with the fact that according to N.M.Churinov's conception, «on the basis of the metaphysical method, they have formed axiological and value research approaches, methods of intuition, idealization and etc.; they have also shaped a notion of transcendental reality, which is formed by such free objects in the modern science as... «freedom of word», «freedom of conscious» and so on» [2, p. 43].

It is paradoxically, but it is a fact: world system globalization processes description speaks of the

fact that different authors differ in their choice of primary axiomatic theories. Hence, we may observe the variety of opinions and conceptions. There are a lot of competing notions of one and the same globalization process.

Sometimes, the consequences of these processes have lasted for centuries for humanity, civilization and culture and very often been huge and global. For example, E. N. Ustjugova represents those scientists, who are sure: «what we call globalization today is the episode of historical process, though qualitatively peculiar, as everything in history is» [3, p. 56-57].

To our mind, in comparison with internationalization, globalization presupposes not only systematic orderliness and the merge of industrial-economical structures of all the countries, but also almost complete atrophy of their political, socio-cultural and educational sovereignty. Globalization processes begin to capture also the sphere of spiritual production, what is right now and especially well seen in the sphere of education. Globalization creates a real threat to the very existence of the national systems of up-bringing and education in the result of increase of international initiatives in the «format» of the so called «Bologna process». Its targets coincide with the highest theological goals of globalization in industrial-economical and social-political spheres and presuppose unification and, in reality, a substitution of the existing variety of national systems of up-bringing and education, – by the Northern-American system, as the one, presenting pattern examples of development as «the market of educational services». On the whole, we may agree with the authors, who assert, that if we abstract away from the sophisticated argumentation of the ideological «screen's» propaganda campaign, argumentation being dictated by far-from-man-loving, selfish intensions, then «Bologna process» is presented in its true and a rather sleazy appearance of transnational corporation, which

strives to control the market of «goods» of spiritual industry [4, p. 242].

As we can observe, in the modern world, globalization processes bring to a number of social transformations, for example, individualism is being increased, which is so typical for the society of consumption, characterizing the western way of living and being imposed to the whole world by globalization tendencies. It confirms the conception of N. M. Churinov, who justly notices: «... agnosticism was the epistemological basis of the individualistic philosophy and, consequently, the theory of representation is a theory of cognition of the individualistic philosophy» [5, p. 48].

Recently, the notion of «cultural globalization», having been often mentioned in the American studies of globalization, has turned out to be un-adapted to the modern realities. Instead of the cultural globalization we should admit a complex and ambiguous process of the global cultures' formation, the cultures, which, as a rule, take their origin from national and regional roots.

Logical formal perfection of the western laws do not at all coincide with the principals of spiritual organization of the Being – with the truth, warm-heartedness, generations' reverse interrelation, the worshipping of the highest sacred things, but not of material power of money, luxury, and material wealth. In reality, the Apologists of panhuman culture preach implicitly or directly the supremacy of the Romanic-German (European) culture, and this way, in fact, they (cosmopolitans) appear to be chauvinists, imposing their national culture under the cover of panhuman culture and panhuman values considerations» [6, p. 156].

One of the peculiarities of living in culture, in comparison with the pragmatism of civilization, is the preservation and development of spiritual ideals. If ideals disappear, then it does not mean

that the infancy or juvenility of a man or a nation is over, but it means that their life in culture has come to an end.

For several centuries, the abandonment of the highest ideals has been camouflaged by the clothes of humanism, which, at the beginning, has been spontaneously preserving its strivings for the celestial, the highest, and the divine.

As the highest value, man has been and still stays to be the starting point for most extreme conceptions – beginning from educational and rationalistic to communistic and religious ones. Being abstractly expressed by itself, the principle of humanism is able to bring and has been bringing to such consequences, which could have never been forecast and thought about by its theoreticians and apologists...

A. V. Gulyga has found out that I. Kant disclosed the difference between the cultural and civilizational forms in quite an explicit form; actually, he defined this difference in its sense relation and called them both culture. The external, technical type of culture was called civilization. Obviously, being much occupied with clear forms of mind and formalisms of mathematical knowledge, Kant felt how much the strivings of formal and creative studies differed; though, in the science analysis, he himself had never broke his German deliberativeness and was ever sure that there was as much truth in a certain branch of science, as there was much mathematics. While analyzing pure forms of thinking and categories, he built a formal table of categories, which did not yet contained any thought-over principles of its integrity. But, while researching the proper culture and in comparison with his predecessors in esthetics, Kant proved that nature (organics) is not only opposite to culture, but has some interior cognition with it. Culture also lives, develops and also possesses the qualities of an organic system.

According to Kant, state preserves the culture of traditions, legislative norms and social orders,

teachers to overcome the contradictions between person and society; sometimes, state can be antagonistic towards person, but harmony cannot be achieved in any of organic systems. Nevertheless, the search of system's flourishing has always been and still is the condition of system's life, as far as intensification of antagonisms inside the system is dangerous for the very existence of state as a system. Egoism of persons' selfishness, illusion of individual being self-sufficiency poisons the state organism of common existence and anticipates the ruin of the latter.

Kant's foreknowledge of antinomy between culture and civilization was much more revealed in his opinion of nation as an organic system.

Society's massovization, national culture primitivization and attempts of mass conscious control for the purpose of its orientation to foreign primitive norm and values – all these is the main target of informational war. Substitution of cultural values with pseudo-ones and propaganda of behavior models, being based on them.

Moreover, the process of society's massovization has always had its undersurface, which turns the society, destructing its own culture, into an uncontrolled environment, devouring its creators. That is an involuntary result of any kind of manipulation, as a form of violence over the human conscious.

Values system destruction starts from revealing of weak points in the conceptual sphere of the opponent, searching for discordant facts, stereotypes and notions, which are later given some fundamental meaning with the help of MSM propagandistic campaigns. Moreover, the society is alternatively suggested a model of the world, being based on illusions and stereotypes of the given society, but which are not rooted in its historical memory, national traditions and inner psychological patterns and which are right opposite to the social-historical conditions of its existence.

Speaking about globalization in the sphere of culture, we cannot fail to appeal to the impact of mass technologies and means of communication on the vital functions of society and culture. At present time, we are to underline the fact that the act of communication prevails and is preferred to the content of the transferred matter – it is a phenomenon of «society's virtualization» [7].

Having been initiated by the forth informational revolution, the integration direction of culture genesis is being developed in two spheres: in real and in virtual. «There are enough bases to think that the latter influences on the methods of presentation and interpretation of true-life realias, thus giving birth to the phenomenon of «trans-culture» – the culture of cultures polylogue. «Trans-culture» is out of territorial, historic-cultural, and mental borders and it is realized as a polyphonic integrity of the multitude of «living cultures», having been virtualized in the process of communication» [8, p. 193].

«Trans- culturelization has been brought to life by the processes of mediatization of cultural spheres, by the ability of Diaspora cultures to assert themselves by means of Internet communication and to integrate themselves through the borders of national and state territories. In comparison with acculturation, trans- culturelization underlines the fact of cultural interaction «through» and «in spite of» state territories, regions and borders» [9, p. 105-110].

«Globalization (horizontal) processes have marked a temporal distance and mental distinctions in the bases of modern cultures. Large-scale involvement into culture- genetic process, which has been intensified by the informational revolution, has revealed that the common cultural sphere is heterogeneous. Having been caused by globalization, the changes have influenced not only the forms of cultures, but also the types of their perception

and interpretation. As a result, being perceived as a unification of material sphere of cultures, the global homogeneity has revealed the difference as in historical dynamics of values, so in their hierarchic structure and has caused the crisis of understanding as of its own, so of «other» cultures. «Migration in time» or predominance of pre-figural type of culture becomes to a greater degree an inner expression of the territorial migration. That is why the appeal to spiritual potential of the culture, as to the method of society's adequacy preservation, is «the answer» of the local culture to the global challenge. It testifies of the strengthening of the culture's role in the over- and trans-territorial communications and it also speaks of transformation of the previous cultural landscape and of formation of a new or some other one» [10, p. 185-186].

According to the scheme of single culture's domination, cultural homogeneity corresponds to expansionist politics of countries. In the given case, culture as a summation of values, world outlook attitudes, and behavioral patterns is a power, which destabilizes the socio-cultural spheres of countries-opponents and countries-recipients. Culture is a peculiar means of neutralization of opponents, is «a soft power, which is applied by the countries, leading at present time in the globalization process». As A. I. Utkin supposes: «Global culture will inevitably resemble the dominating cultures of the past.» [11, p. 175].

Amitai Etsioni is sure, that «... the world is able and should obtain important lessons from non-European countries as well – it concerns inner politics and economy, international relations, and also construction of a new global architecture. This is especially true in such questions, as respect to power, care for collective welfare and preservation of social relations – though, only in case, if such values and corresponding them institutes will be much modified [12, p. 21-22].

The question of cultural universals has acquired its true sharpness on the background of a disappointingly simple thesis – panhuman cultural integrity is a functional, but not a historical notion, as far as humanity «is not a cultural universal» [13, p. 247].

Cultures' existence in the vectors of «global» and «egoistic» can be as well explained in the other way. Occupation of one culture by another, dominating one can be an implicit or a vivid wish of the culture, which has subordinated to some other, foreign world picture, to feel historically more comfortable. Rome had Europe as its province, and its power swept away up to Britain. Japan culture has built itself on an explicit reversion of the main oppositions of the Chinese world picture, having become its expressive antithesis. Waves of assimilation and dissimilation change each other, but when the global process has started to gain a panhuman character in the economic sphere, the opponents of the process have begun to give their historical and cultural arguments.

Globalistic position sticks to the world life standardization, which creates a false-integral reality. It has not any historical perspective, and esthetic symmetry has it neither. But, there is another type of reality – the world of pause, interval and fragment. The fragmentary world has a perspective to combine and to build new integrative entities of different types. The standard one does not have it; it is a dead symmetric world [14, p. 41].

In the cultural sphere, we observe the tendencies of unification and becoming of the integral culture, which should bring to the mankind unanimity – this is to the mind of *mondialism* adepts. Though, the form of thinking and realization of this unanimity quite reasonably generate oppositions. Historical experience testifies of the fact that non-European types of culture are squeezed out of the world development

and trampled on as unadjusted to the modernity. In the global world, non-European cultures are denied their own self-valuable status– they are an expression of cultural exoticism, which is nothing else, but curious. Though, to our mind, different types of culture are understood not as forms of integral human race existence, but as a disclosure of heterogeneity of the mankind, consisting of different types of people, who are far from being equal according to the criteria of «the progress». Hence, we may come to a dangerous conclusion that there is a necessity of expansion of the only type of person, being often identified with the western «*Faust-like*» man. Actually, the terminal point of such a movement will be the condition, which can be characterized, as the blowing of the whole out of proportion at the expense of its parts development.

Resume

If we speak of the content of the common culture becoming, then the most precise way

to describe its essence will be in the terms of universal technologism. Social life has turned into a technologically regulated process, has become a kind of techno-system. It inevitably leads to mechanization of the real choice sphere and to an utmost standardization of social reactions. Now, the most undesirable qualities are imprudence, being un-programmed, spontaneity, unpredictability. And it is clear: these qualities revelation can damage a well coordinated work of the mechanism, being called economics, which serving is the main aim and sense of the society existence of nowadays. Blocking of all these qualities goes simultaneously on all the levels of the social practice and is being fixed psychologically. But, at the same time, with them disappears the context, within which frames the human ability to creation is being formed, as far as creativity presupposes a certain moment of chaotization of the social sphere and the inner world of person [15, p. 178].

References

1. Global Sciences. Encyclopedia / under the editorship of I. Mazur, A.Chumakova. – Moscow, 2003.
2. N. M. Churinov. Perfection and Freedom / N. M. Churinov. – Krasnoyarsk, 2001.
3. E.N.Ustjugova. Globalization and Culture: Historical Context/ E.N.Ustjugova // The Philosophical Sciences. – 2005. – №12.
4. Ch.S.Kirvel', V.I.Strel'chenko. Globalization of Education and Social Strategies of Modernity / Ch.S.Kirvel', V.I.Strel'chenko // The Dialogue of Generations and Cultures in the Context of Globalization: Materials of the International Conference «The Conflict of Generations in the Context of Informational Globalization». – St. Petersburg, Publishing House of the Polytechnic University, 2007.
5. N. M. Churinov. Collectivism and Individualism, and Speculations on the Theme in the Western Tradition / N. M. Churinov // The Theory and History. – 2004. – № 3.
6. A.A. Korol'kov. Spiritual Sense of the Russian Culture. – St. Petersburg: P.H. of RSPU named after A.I. Herzen, 2006.
7. D.V. Ivanov. Virtualization of Society. Version 2.0. – St. Petersburg: The St. Petersburg Oriental Studies. 2002.
8. V.A.Mamontova. Globalization in the Sphere of Culture: Vectors of Development/ V.A.Mamontova // Credo -2006 -№1.

9. Globalization and Multi-Culturalism. Executive editor: P.S.Karabaev. Moscow: P.H. of the Russian University of Nations Friendship, 2005.
10. V.A.Mamontova. Globalization in the Sphere of Culture: Vectors of Development/V.A.Mamontova // Credo -2006 -№1.
11. A.I. Utkin. Globalization: the Process and Understanding. – The Logos, 2001.
12. A. Etsioni. From Empire to Society: a New Approach to International Relations. Moscow: Ladomir, 2004.
13. Dm. Javorskij. World Outlooks Differentiation and Integration: Existential and Historical Experience. International Readings of the Theory, History and Philosophy of Culture. St. Petersburg, 2004. V. 20.
14. K.G. Isupov. Problems of Globalization on the Background of Russian Thought (preliminary considerations) // Globalization: pro et contra: Materials of the International Conference « Globalization Challenge to History on the Verge of Centuries: Priorities of the Russian Culture and Art». St. Petersburg: Asterion, 2006.
15. O.A. Romanov. Globalization as a Subjective Reality: the Ideology and Practice of its Formation // Globalization: pro et contra: Materials of the International Conference «Globalization Challenge to History on the Verge of Centuries: Priorities of the Russian Culture and Art». St. Petersburg: Asterion, 2006.