

SCTCMG 2018
**International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural
Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»**

**THE INVOLVEMENT OF RUSSIA IN THE ACTIVITY AGAINST
AMERICAN-STYLE GLOBALIZATION**

N.A. Kubanev (a) *, L.N. Nabilkina, (b)

*Corresponding author

(a) National Research Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod (Arzamas filial branch) Arzamas, Russia.

(b) National Research Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod (Arzamas filial branch) Arzamas, Russia.

Abstract

The article is devoted to extremely relevant modern issue: does globalization always have a positive impact on the geopolitical picture of the world? The authors of the article consider the US attempts to introduce the American way of life not only in English-speaking territory, but throughout the whole world. The authors note that at the end of the 20th century, Russia followed the American course, despite the fact that the Muslim world and Western Europe was in opposition to the US, having introduced the euro into the world economy. However, with the coming of the current president to power, Russia clearly stated its national identification. Such fields as religion and imagology occupy an important place in the solution of this problem. The authors refer to the studies of the Russian cultural expert G. Gachev. It is the imagological approach that allowed him to create “national images of the world”, in particular, Russia and America. Analyzing the problem of globalization, it is necessary to address to the issue of multiculturalism. The problem of multiculturalism is becoming particularly relevant in a multi-ethnic state. Russia is a convincing example of religious and cultural symbiosis. This is the guarantee of the stability of nations that make up a multi-ethnic and multilingual state and society.

As a result, it is concluded that globalization occupies an important place in the global geopolitical process. Nevertheless it is impossible to bring to a single denominator the uniqueness of mentalities, cultures, differences in lifestyles.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Globalization, American way of life, national identity, strategic partnership, imagology, geopolitical process.



1. Introduction

The process of globalization, which began after the collapse of the Soviet Union and held under the auspices of the United States, suggested a transition to a unipolar world, in which all countries would adopt the “American way of life”. After the USSR was eliminated from the global stage, the USA believed that the whole world would follow them. And so it happened. Then the process of American-style globalization slowed down, and in some cases went backwards. The Muslim world, China and, finally, Western Europe stood in opposition to the United States having introduced the euro into the world economy. At the beginning, Russia went after America (Conway, 2011; Driscoll & Grealy, 2018). But the leaders of the United States did not want to see a fully realized equal partner represented by Russia. They only pretended that our country would stand in the number of equals. After all, they believed that Russia had lost the “cold war”, and therefore there is no need to reckon with it as the losing side (Robin & Acuto, 2018; Berg & Vits, 2018). But Russia remained a nuclear power empire, and therefore the leaders of the United States maintained the illusion of equal alliance in the new liberal leadership of the country. But with the coming of V. Putin to power, everything has changed. Russia has clearly stated its interests, including national identification.

2. Problem Statement

The article poses the problem of countering of Russia and the rest of the world to the attempts of the United States to impose on them the “American way of life”, to subjugate all the leading tendencies in the world, including economy.

As far back as 1997, Z. Brzezinski, a former US presidential adviser on national security issues, published the book under the title “The Great Chessboard”, in which he gave a broad assessment of the situation in the world. He paid considerable attention to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the position and prospects of Russia (Delokarov, 2015).

He expressively declared that Russia is too weak to reckon upon a “mature strategic partnership”, and all the hopes of “pro-Westerners” in the leadership of Russia to consider it equal with the United States are illusory. So, Russia should be content with the role of the regional power and leave all intentions to unite the countries of the “near abroad” around itself. The idea expressed by “pro-Westerners” that Russia is a part of the West and should go in line with its course was deceptively supported by the West. Although in fact the West never considered Russia as its part. “It was flattering for new leaders to be on a short-distance with top officials forming the policy of the single global superpower, and they easily fell into the misconception that they were also superpower leaders”, Z. Brzezinski wrote with an obvious mockery (Brzezinski, 2006). Then he continues: “Although the concept of a “mature strategic partnership” caresses the eyes and ears, it is deceptive. America was never intended to share power on the globe with Russia (Brzezinski, 2006).

3. Research Questions

Religion has recently become not so much a manifestation of their religious affiliation, but rather a marker of their ethnic identity. So, Russian means Orthodox. Muslim – confessing Islam. In tsarist Russia,

there was no column on nationality at all; it was replaced by the “religion” column (Kanefe, 2018; Nikonorova, 2016).

Imagology plays a significant role in the understanding of national identity. Despite the fact that the term “imagology” began to be used only in the mid-90s of the twentieth century, the Russian literary critic and culturologist G.D. Gachev worked in the imagologic framework for many years. It is the imagological approach that allowed the scientist to create “national images of the world”, in particular America and Russia. Gachev presented our countries as certain systems that unite the character of the people, their national characteristics and mentality into a single nature, calling this unity a psycho-cosmo-logos. The peculiarity of the imagological approach, in which the specificity of national vision of the surrounding reality appears, was already manifested in the title of the first book of Gachev, “The American Image of the World, or America, through the eyes of a person who did not see it ... and finally has seen it”. It is the national view that is typical for the overwhelming number of books in which images of “foreign” countries and peoples are represented. This intellectual journey through America, mostly imaginary, acted “as a tool to convict our life in the situation of the thickest stagnation” (Gachev, 1996).

The Russian cultural expert determines the difference between the perception of the motherland by the Russians and the Americans. In Russia at all times, according to Gachev, there was a strong feeling, determined by the Russian mode of being and mythology, that “it is impossible to live somewhere else like in the Motherland”, there is no life. He differentiates the worldview of the state and an individual, opposing the infinite space, inspiring Russia as a whole (Russia is a triple) —the state, the community, the world — and an individual for whom the expanse is the “chamber of Death”. The American sees in the vastness of his country a source of inspiration for his own individuality, activity and “self-development”. Unlike the Russian, for whom the bearer of freedom, power and the Russian “self” is an autocracy, the American sees “the holder of freedom (his own and global) - his own personality (Milacic & Vukovic, 2017; Rieget & Pettersson, 2011).

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the work is to draw attention to the issue of globalization and the study of the main processes of globalization and its correlation with the processes of national identity.

There is no doubt that globalization occupies an important place in the global geopolitical process. Nevertheless American-style globalization is unacceptable for most sovereign countries. It is impossible to bring to a single denominator the uniqueness of mentalities, cultures, differences in lifestyle. The attempts to integrate Asian and African refugees collapsed in Europe. The attempts to introduce multiculturalism into society have also failed. They faced powerful opposition from national cultures, a desire to defend their “self”, and even, in some cases, resulted in facts of aggression of small nations. The beginning of the XXI century made the world community confront many problems and challenges, some of which are rooted in the past. Multiculturalism has become one of these challenges. The problem of multiculturalism is not as straightforward as it seems at first glance. It would seem that the thesis of cultural equality is not in doubt. However, the equality of cultures is not identical to their equivalence in the history of the state and the formation of its culture. The problem of multiculturalism is becoming particularly relevant in a multi-ethnic

state, although in the new century it has become quite acute in mono-national states. Moreover, the problem of multiculturalism gradually, but steadily, develops into a problem of national security (Karkov, 2014).

For the first time this problem arose in the United States. For a long time, it was considered indisputable that the basis of American culture is Anglo-Saxon culture and, more broadly, British culture. But as self-awareness grew, including the awareness of the national identity of the ethnic groups that make up the American people, the comparison of America with the “melting pot” became less and less popular. Another comparison has become increasingly common - the “dish with salad”. In this “dish” the representatives of each ethnic group felt their national roots, their own national “self”, not dissolving into the American social community. Again, it is difficult to see something negative in this phenomenon. But the trouble is that the “private” begins to prevail over the “general”. Fewer amounts of US citizens begin to feel like Americans, and more like Chinese, Spanish, Puerto Ricans, and Filipinos, people from Latin America or Southeast Asia and Black Africa.

It is not difficult to notice that it was the “colored” ethnic groups that began to declare their national and cultural dignity and isolate themselves from the “white” population. This problem became apparent in the USA in the first decades of the 20th century, and it became particularly acute at the end of the last century and the beginning of this century. Traditionally dominant representatives of the social-ethnic community WASP – “white Anglo-Saxon Protestant” - in modern American society have lost their positions and begin to feel their vulnerable position. Hypertrophied multiculturalism is especially dangerous in a multi-ethnic state. Therefore, all ethnic groups and their cultures should unite around the titular nation. In the United States, such a nation is the descendants of Pilgrim Fathers with Anglo-Saxon roots. The carrier of British culture is English language, which serves as the unifying link of representatives of different nations. In Russia, the titular nation is Russian, and the carriers of Russian culture are Russian language and Orthodox Russian culture. Russia is a convincing example of religious and cultural symbiosis. Our country has developed a unique experience of the community of Russians and Tatars, which is largely facilitated by the activities of the presidents of Russia and Tatarstan, conducting a balanced national-cultural policy. At the same time, any depreciation of the role of the titular nation under the most plausible slogans can serve as a serious threat to national security. There is no need to be afraid of the words “Russian culture”, “Russian people”, and “Orthodox culture”. These concepts do not violate the identity of other ethnic cultures. Nevertheless in any polyethnic society, the principle of dominance of the culture and language of the state-forming nation should act. This is the guarantee of stability, prosperity and power of all nations that make a state and society multi-ethnic and multilingual.

5. Research Methods

During the course of the research such methods that are adequate to the purpose of the study were used: the method of linguistic observation, description, linguo-cultural analysis. These methods allowed coming to reliable conclusions.

6. Findings

The process of globalization has given rise to deep directions of national identity, sometimes exaggerated. Globalization not only leads to the consolidation of global community, the equivalence of

cultural and national attitudes and moral standards, but also often leads to the destruction of society and state.

7. Conclusion

The American-style globalization has led to the growth of national identification, awareness of its national identity. The creation of a unipolar world is impossible; it leads to a split between nations and states. This process threatens the United States itself as the initiator of globalization.

The efforts of the United States on the way to universal globalization, on the cultivation of the “American way of life” worldwide and on the road to a unipolar world have brought certain results. Gradually, whole Europe accepted the conditions of the United States. In fact, only Russia is opposed to America on the path to world domination. Therefore, all US forces are aimed only at weakening of Russia. Thus, globalization has not given anything positive either to the Russian people or to the world as a whole.

From the very beginning of the independence of the US, Russia and the United States have always had the friendliest relations and have always acted together as allies before “arrogant” Europe. During the war of the North American colonies for independence Catherine the Great sent a small squadron to the shores of North America to provide political support to the colonists.

During the war of the North and the South, Russia resolutely took the side of the US government, although, by their habits and customs, the Southerners were much closer to the Russian landowners. During the Crimean War, the United States maintained “benevolent neutrality” and did not join the aggression against Russia. The United States did not support the boycott of Russia in connection with the suppression of the Polish uprising in 1863. Russia did not sell Alaska to England or France, which pretended to its territory, Russia sold it to friendly United States. Even the landing of the American forces in Vladivostok during the Civil War can be viewed not as an act of aggression, but as an attempt to counter the large-scale take-over of the Soviet Far East on the part of Japan. The authors do not focus on the events when our countries were allies in the bloodiest war of the 20th century.

The French political scientists M. Chevalier and A. Tokvil, the great American poet William Whitman and the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy paid attention to the similarity of our states. Each state has its own vital interests and adjacent territories, to which these states pay special attention. This, as A.S. Pushkin wrote in the poem “To the slanderers of Russia”, is a “home, old dispute”.

References

- Berg, E., Vits, K. (2018). Quest for Survival and recognition: Insights into the Foreign Policy. *Ethnopolitics*, 17, 390-407.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2006). *Great chessboard*. Moscow: International Relations.
- Conway, K. (2011). Cultural translation, global television studies and the circulation of telenovelas in the USA. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12, 26-37.
- Delokarov, K.Kh. (2015). Modeling intercultural dialogue in the context of globalization. *Culture Observatory*, 5, 84-95.
- Driscoll, C., Greal, L. (2018). In the name of the nation: media classification, globalization and exceptionalism. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 6, 16-22.
- Gachev, G.D. (1996). *National images of the world. America in comparison with Russia and the Slavic people*. Moscow: Rarity.

- Kanefe, N. (2018). Beyond multiculturalism: interculturalism, diversity and urban governance. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2, 102-110.
- Karkov, N.P. (2014). From humanism to posthumanism and back: reflections on the geopolitics of knowledge. *Personality, culture, society*. 1-2, 58-64.
- Milacic, F., Vukovic, I. (2017). The rise of the politics of National Identity: New Evidence from Western Europe. *Ethnopolitics*, 5, 35-41.
- Nikonorova, E.V. (2016). Culture and sustainable development: the foundations of mutual influence and the contours of integration. *Culture Observatory*, 13, 6, 6-12.
- Rieget, K., Pettersson, L. (2011). European Media discourse of the USA from Reagan to Obama. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 4, 11-19.
- Robin, E., Acuto, M. (2018). Global urban policy and the geopolitics of urban data. *Political geography*, 7, 63-71.