

**SCTCMG 2019**  
**International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural  
Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»**

**ARCHAIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION: CULTURAL ASPECT**

Salavat Sagitov (a), Daniyar Abdrakhmanov (b)\*  
\*Corresponding author

(a) Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla, 3a, October revolution street, Ufa, Russia,  
salavatst@list.ru,

(b) Bolgar Islamic Academy, 1, Kul Gali street, Bolgar, Russia,  
daniyar25111980@gmail.com

***Abstract***

The article deals with the problem of relationship between two multidirectional processes – globalization and archaization. At the beginning of the 20th century, theories were formed that predicted the imminent death of the West and its creation. Among Western intellectuals there were even supporters of a return to the Middle Ages, the restoration of the traditional civilization of the West. Here they saw the salvation of civilization and the further possibility of its existence, rejecting the ideas of progress, pointing to the dark sides of Western modernization. The problem of transformation of cultural and spiritual values is that society is not able to simultaneously and collectively accept these changes. On the part of social groups, transformations do not make it possible to quickly determine the roles, functions, conditions and the need for interaction in the process of social development. Some social groups have time to accept them, are in the most frequent maelstrom of changes (there are not so many); others "float" in the river of transformations, perceiving and accepting changes after some time; others, having reached a certain level of self-development, put themselves some "watersheds" and do not consider their participation in further processes of transformation. And these processes are ongoing, because as soon as certain values, a certain culture reaches full development, begins to form the next, intended in a short or long struggle to replace the first. In such periods, as a rule, there is a contrast between tradition and archaic.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy [www.FutureAcademy.org.UK](http://www.FutureAcademy.org.UK)

**Keywords:** Archaization, globalization, transformation, culture, values.



## **1. Introduction**

The history of human development clearly demonstrates that with each of its further period, the next transformation of spiritual values needs less time, while increasing part of society are covered. Of course, society "does not exist and cannot exist in a constant state" (Sztompka, 1996, p. 35), but we, in this case, are talking about those transformations that ultimately affect all spheres of public life, leading to a change in the role and functions of social institutions. In modern Social Studies there are a lot of concepts regarding the dependence of social processes (transformation, change) from the past (Yadov, 2014). Some authors focus on the inactivity of social institutions; others emphasize the stabilizing function of national culture and mentality. At the same time, over the past 150 years, the issue of the essence of the crisis of man and humanity has been in the center of attention of representatives of various areas of social and humanitarian knowledge. This crisis primarily affects the civilizational aspect, based on its spiritual and moral component.

## **2. Problem Statement**

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, theories were formed that predicted the imminent death of the West and its creation - the modernist technotronic civilization (Spengler, 1918), the advent of the "revolt of the masses", "new barbarism". Among Western intellectuals there were even supporters of a return to the Middle Ages, the restoration of the traditional civilization of the West. Here they saw the salvation of civilization and the further possibility of its existence, rejecting the ideas of progress, pointing to the dark sides of Western modernization.

The very problem of transformation of cultural and spiritual values is that society is not able to simultaneously and collectively accept these changes. The reason is the nature of society. It is not homogeneous, which is why it's different groups, layers, classes transformation of the same values can be both accepted and rejected. This is influenced by the participants of social transformations themselves, who cannot at the same time realize their place in the system of new industrial relations. On the part of social groups, transformations do not make it possible to quickly determine the roles, functions, conditions and the need for interaction in the process of social development. Some social groups have time to accept them, are in the most frequent maelstrom of changes (there are not so many); others "float" in the river of transformations, perceiving and accepting changes after some time; others, having reached a certain level of self-development, put themselves some "watersheds" and do not consider their participation in further processes of transformation. And these processes are ongoing, because as soon as certain values, a certain culture "...reaches full development, begins to form the next, intended in a short or long struggle to replace the first" (Simmel, 1996, p. 55). In such periods, as a rule, there is a contrast between tradition and archaic.

## **3. Research Questions**

In contrast to tradition, archaic is not given explicitly and is not a consciously used behavioral regulation. In comparison, the tradition is more rational, more obvious and follows from value conventions and patterns of behavior which are set by culture, not by psyche. With the destruction of culture it replaces the archaic. In the development of culture, on the contrary, tradition supersedes archaic. The main feature

of the archaic is the inability to self-development, to constructive changes. As Soshnikov (2013) notes, "archaization is a form of regression in which life programs have a specific character of domination of those local worlds that do not know modernization as a cultural value" (p. 22). Paradoxical is the fact that this archaic itself can be a source of modernization and the destruction of tradition (Buranchin, Vakhitov, & Demichev, 2014). At the same time, the individual, social groups and society as a whole in the course of its development either builds the concept of socio-spiritual development, which often demonstrate their failure, inadequacy and lead to the destruction of man (for example, such a theory as "The City of the Sun"), or tries to turn to its origins. The second way

*...is the most fruitful, because here a person will be able to re-examine and understand himself from the original, to find the moment when he lost himself, his deep connection with the Universe, distorted the meaning of his existence. But at the same time, he should not just once again put forward the slogan "back to ...", but turn to the archaic, as his essential state, the moment of his birth, the foundation of a holistic world perception and worldview, a stage from which you can try to set and reassemble yourself. (Pershin, 2014, p. 59)*

After all, culture, like any sphere of public life, has its own logic and internal laws of development. Ignoring the internal self-realization of cultural life will have a negative impact on the development of society as a whole (Sagitov, 2016).

#### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The modern Russian society, which is in the conditions of deep social and political transformations, faces many destructive factors, counteraction to which becomes an important task and condition for the survival of the entire social system. Among the negative phenomena, can be distinguished the increase in the activity of extremist social and religious movements, the decrease in the level of ethnic tolerance, the increase in the use of psychoactive substances, suicides, the difficulty prediction of external migration's impact, anomie, archaization of social structures, etc. All this makes extremely urgent problem of development counteractions mechanisms to negative forms that occur in the process of modernization development. The growth of social entropy is needed to determine the extent and the development of effective technologies to streamline non-linear, sometimes chaotic processes.

The problems of the unstable state of modern Russian society are not limited to empirically fixed manifestations, they affect the fundamental layers of social life, specifically: the substantial problems of the relationship between the changing society and the individual, the processes of self-identification of the adapting individual consciousness, the problems of socialization of the individual in the conditions of the collapsing ethos, the forms and methods of overcoming abnormal alienation by the individual. These problems of society are complex, macro-social, due to a special, specific type of relationship between the individual and society in these conditions.

All this encourages the Russian society, or rather its significant part, with increasing frequency to turn to the tools of archaization. According to Fedotova (2013) archaic today is one of the most relevant topics of Russian Social Science. At the same time, the theme of archaization, literally engulfed our society,

did not find a worthy place in scientific discourse. It is obvious that a certain role was played by the fact that archaism and archaism were formed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, while the Sciences turned to the study of these innovations, without assuming the importance and possibility of archaization in the future (Fedotova, 2013). Moreover, "history shows that the revival of archaic in itself is not a destructive process. On the contrary, it is a resource-saving and ensuring the survival of the social mechanism, which through maximum simplification organizes socio-cultural life. It allows society, groups, individuals to maintain their identity and social order in crisis conditions" and "flexibility and consistency of social reform will not cause a painful reaction, "rebellion" of archaic, but its presence in the public mentality, the picture of the world and then – a gradual departure, "overcoming" (Lamazhaa, 2011).

## 5. Research Methods

The main approaches to solving the scientific problem and the implementation of the project as a whole: civilizational, institutional, systemic, socio-cultural.

The methodological part of the study is a combination of fundamental and socio-humanitarian approaches, basic working concepts and a set of private sociological methods.

## 6. Findings

According to Akhiezer (2001) archaic occurs at the moment when the society on "the worsening problems of the corresponding subject does not produce adequate creative potential" (p. 23), and instead of finding answers to the challenges of our time dramatically returns to their previous values. Usually archaic associated with ancient, primitive forms of culture and social life. But this does not mean that with the development and complexity of societies it disappears. In reality, it only retreats, becoming a reduced element of tradition. The clash of archaism and progress occurs, first of all, "between cultural values, forms of lifestyle, differing from each other by orientation to statics and dynamics". Archaization is the result of the subject's adherence to cultural programs that have historically developed in layers of culture formed in simpler conditions and do not meet the increasing complexity of the today's world, the nature and scale of the dangers. The only cardinal means against negative phenomena of this kind is the development of dialogization as a system of certain relations and the development of subcultures. The absence of development, stagnation subcultures are the main danger, which comes from these processes. For example, in the Russian society the former subcultures are already forgotten and "thrown out on a dump of history", and new, urged to feed and develop new, in this case the Russian culture, aren't formed. It is doubly dangerous if these processes cover the dominant culture, i.e. the type of culture in which cultural universals, traditions – norms, values inherent in the majority of a certain society are represented.

According to experts, tradition is ultimately the main factor that buries the archaic layers of consciousness. Writes Kostyuk (2006), the tradition is, above all, "the protection against chaos in the individual consciousness. It resists both the destructive pressure of the chaos of the subconscious and the pressure of modernization aimed at the constructive restructuring of the established layers of cultural consciousness" (para. 5).

In other words, in contrast to the tradition of the archaic is not given explicitly and is not consciously used behavioral regulation. In comparison, the tradition is more rational, more obvious and follows from value conventions and patterns of behavior which are set by culture, not by psyche. The destruction of culture it is replacing the archaic (Abdrakhmanov & Burenin, 2014).

The influence of archaism is particularly evident today in a certain "corrosion" of social institutions. Currently, social institutions designed to ensure the stable development of society, regulate public life, cannot effectively perform their functions. It happens, on the one hand, because of the different speed of changes occurring in different social institutions; on the other, because of the depth of these changes. While the contours of some social institutions are to some extent already defined, those of others are still in their infancy. This prevents social institutions from fully interacting with each other and from carrying out their inherent functions.

One of the three main cultural and semantic strategies identified by Sergeev (2010) – the invented archaic – is a certain strategy of response to the crisis, which uses the technology of "increasing the cultural roots and cultural achievements of its people" (Strogonova, 2001, p. 20).

The first type is the archaization of modernity – the process of revival of cultural phenomena, in which there is an appeal to the traditions of culture, their revival in new conditions, involves an appeal to cultural meanings that are already outdated, are not in the actual memory of the ethnos and its culture, it is on the periphery. At the same time, intellectual efforts are required to revive them, but in this case, they will remain understandable only for a part of society.

The modernisation of archaism, which can also be defined as a Renaissance process of cultural phenomena, represents a second strategy and has a fundamentally different nature. The process of modernization of the archaic is objectively positive, as it contributes to the integration of the old forms of existence of meaning in a new modern context, which can help the culture to reach a qualitatively new stage of development. This allows you to maintain continuity, supports the identity of the team at different levels (cultural, ethnic, national, group, regional, etc.), on the one hand, but it allows you to conduct an effective intracultural and intercultural dialogue of meanings – on the other hand. The thing is that the process of modernization of archaism is directed, in contrast to the archaization of modernity, to the other side of meaning, to the plan of its expression. Reborn shell, a form without its cultural meaning, which would still remain incomprehensible to contemporaries or would pull them in the archaic past, making it difficult to change and adapt to new transformed conditions. In turn, the revived shell is filled with a new living cultural meaning.

Finally, fundamentally different from these Renaissance processes is the invented archaic, which is the process of archaic Renaissance on the basis of the construction of its cultural and historical past. French scientist Guénon (1964) believed that in such cases, even resort to falsification: "not finding any genuine tradition on which to rely, reach the point that come up with pseudo-traditions that never existed..." (p. 14). The mechanism of generation of pseudo-history, which is designated as the invented archaic, consists in the statement of "the world by connection of intensional channels" that actualizes imaginary memory (Rudnev, 1996). This process is negative because it is used as an obstacle to any change. Thus, the meaning is autonomous in relation to values. But as soon as there is a collapse of the value system (which is equivalent to the death of culture or the transformation to a qualitatively new stage of its development), the

meaning is released and its all-consuming creative activation occurs, bordering on the absurd. For this reason, in times of crisis, turmoil, historical chaos associated with meaninglessness and absurdities of life, the carnivalisation the overturning of the value system; all changes their places, and the fact that yesterday was considered good, turns evil.

## 7. Conclusion

In the context of these arguments, it becomes clear why people are beginning to save the past, which is clear and convenient for them. Trying to escape from chaos, they turn to traditions, history, archaic as a means of overcoming frustration, a way out of the crisis. But, as we have shown, this treatment may be different. The revival of cultural meaning as an indication of old values, and, consequently, the restoration of the latter is similar to the restoration of the old mechanism that is not able to cope with the new socio-cultural situation.

Archaic features in culture can be found in various era: 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries in Europe, beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century in Russia (culture of the Silver age). New art reveals many of the traits that various theorists have described as "Second modern" (Mahnkopf, 2005) or "Reflexive modernism" (Beck, 2000). We can observe the trend of culture change from postmodern to post-postmodern and even to the formation of a new archaic.

Globalization in many countries is carried out through modernization, and not organic, but "catching up", and on this way there are phenomena that are clearly opposed to modernity. Thus, the network structure of post-industrial society, about which Castells (2006) wrote so convincingly, generates "its own other", whole system areas of pre-civilization thinking and action (here it is enough to give an example of world terrorism, which has a flexible and global network structure, widely using the Internet and, at the same time, reproducing the most archaic forms of Islamic fundamentalism) (Shtompel & Shtompel, 2010).

Again, archaization as a spontaneous reproduction of practices characteristic of the past should not be confused with traditionalism and neotraditionalism, which is a conscious search in the cultural heritage of elements interpreted as fruitful sources of vitality of society and its future development, as well as with fundamentalism, purposefully denying innovation. The processes of globalization themselves are one of the factors of the archaization of consciousness, religious in particular, because it is syncretic, and in this syncretism there is a place for myth, and mysticism, and magic.

If we compare the time of the beginning of industrial revolutions, it is easy to notice that the time of the first industrial revolution fell on the era of Enlightenment, the second – on the time of the development of fundamental and applied research, including social, the third – on the period of the heyday of mass culture. Each of these periods of cultural upsurge was preceded by a brief period of gradual cultural upsurge, and each of them was followed by a period of more or less profound cultural decline. If we consider the current situation in Europe, we can safely say that we are witnessing a certain decline of civilization and numerous financial and economic crises are proof of this. Let me remind you, the idea of the inevitability of the death of Western culture was justified by Spengler (1918) – "the fall of the Western world is no more or less as a problem of civilization" (para. 12). Today, in the period of globalization and computerization, it is time to start the development of a new post-industrial, digital culture.

The new technological era "can serve as a accelerator for a new cultural Renaissance that will allow us to feel part of a global civilization" (Schwab, 2018, p. 101). At the same time, it should be understood that new technologies, the upcoming next transformation of spiritual values can aggravate relations between different social groups, primarily because "as in all moments of major technological changes, people...feeling the depth of changes, cannot thoroughly understand them, and do not understand their consequences" (Castells, 2006, para. 9).

The alternative to this, in fact, disastrous path can only be the path of Enlightenment – both at the individual and at the global level, associated with the search for overcoming the dead ends of modern civilization. The complexity of it in relation to previous projects of Enlightenment is the need to overcome dependence on both globalization, blurring the line between human communities, to the same extent, the danger of archaization, destroying human and historical perspectives.

## References

- Abdrakhmanov, D. M., & Burenin A. M. (2014). Destructive aspects of social transformations: anomie, archaic, deviation. *Bulletin of Perm University. Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology*, 3(19), 94–101.
- Akhiezer, A. S. (2001). Archaization in Russian society as a methodological problem. *Social Sciences and modernity*, 2, 23.
- Beck, U. (2000). *Risk society. On the way to another modernity*. Moscow: Progress-Tradition.
- Buranchin, A. M., Vakhitov, R. R., & Demichev, I. V. (2014). *Socio-cultural aspects of modernization processes in the Republic of Bashkortostan*. Ufa: Design Press.
- Castells, M. (2006). *The Impact of the Internet on Society: A Global Perspective*. Retrieved from: <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/530566/the-impact-of-the-internet-on-society-a-global-perspective/>
- Fedotova, V. G. (2013). Crisis of modernization and archaization of society. *Knowlege. Understanding. Skill*, 1, 309–313.
- Guénon, R. (1964). *La crise du monde moderne*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Kostyuk, K. N. (2006). *Archaic and modernism in Russian culture*. Retrieved from: <http://www.rir.ru/socio/scipubl/sj/sj3-4-99.kost.html>
- Lamazhaa, Ch. K. (2011). *Archaization of society in the period of social transformations (socio-philosophical analysis of the Tuvan phenomenon)*. 43 p.
- Mahnkopf, C. -S. (2005). *Adornos musikalische Moderne*. Retrieved from: [http://wn.com/adornos\\_musikalische\\_moderne](http://wn.com/adornos_musikalische_moderne).
- Pershin, Yu. Yu. (2014). *Archaic consciousness: essence and principles*. Omsk.
- Rudnev, V. P. (1996). *What was "Winnie the Pooh" by A.A. Milne the House at bear corner*. Retrieved from: [http://www.winnieosho.narod.ru/rudnev\\_sem.html](http://www.winnieosho.narod.ru/rudnev_sem.html).
- Sagitov, S. T. (2016). On the principles of state cultural policy. *Bulletin of the Perm national research Polytechnic University. Social and economic Sciences*, 3, 24.
- Schwab, K. (2018). *the Fourth industrial revolution: translation from English*. Moscow: Publishing House "E".
- Sergeev, D. V. (2010). Correlation of meaning and value in the context of studies of "Renaissance" processes in the history of culture. *Bulletin of the Buryat state University*, 14, 261–265.
- Shtompel, O. M., & Shtompel, L. A. (2010). Archaism of modern culture: a necessity or coincidence?. *Values and meanings*, 4, 35–43.
- Simmel, G. (1996). *Conflict of modern culture. Western European sociology of XIX – early XX centuries*. Moscow: Publication of the international University of business and management.
- Soshnikov, A. A. (2013). The phenomenon of centrocampista: the archaization of culture in a postmodern society (Ukrainian version). *Theory and practice of social development*, 8, 22–23.
- Spengler, O. (1918). *The Decline of Europe: Essays on the morphology of world history*. Retrieved from: <https://vuzlit.ru/463509/shpengler>

Strogonova, E. A. (2001). *Buryat national and cultural revival (late 80's – mid 90's of XX century Republic of Buryatia)*. Moscow: Irkutsk, Natalis.

Sztompka, P. (1996). *Sociology of social change*.

Yadov, V. A. (2014). Transformation of post-Soviet societies: what is more significant – historically traditional or recent past. *Sociological studies*, 7, 47–50.