

## **GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURAL IDENTITY**

Aliya K. Abisheva, Al-Farabi KazNU,  
Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science

In the modern globalized world integration processes are resisted by cultural diversity that can be considered as dialectic contradiction with united universal roots. In modern conditions of globalization the danger of loss of the spiritual and creative bases of the human being is increasing, lying in its basis of pluralism of value meanings more and more amplifies. It is connected with a tendency of globalization to lead all cultural diversity to the uniform basis with the unified rational control system based on absolutized rational science and technology, absorbing and replacing within itself all spheres of human activity, even purely spiritual, such as art, religion, creative areas of the application of human imagination. Science and technology acting as tools of globalization mainly have common usable utilize character with a tendency to become the primary value and self-purpose as a reflection to ambitions related to the circles focused on domination, being on existing expression and implementation of values of power and superiority. It can lead to their absolutization when means will justify purposes. Technology, becoming self-purpose, isn't limited only to the production sphere, and starts to substitute by itself purely spiritual and creative areas of human activity, leading all wealth and uniqueness of cultural diversity, its initial character to formal logically monotony. As result the technocracy of all structures of society may act as a certain special version of totalitarianism. Such process contradicts the freedom of creativity as the intrinsic basis of the individual and to deep intrinsic unity of mankind that can become a deadlock course.

There is a double version in comprehension of a phenomenon of globalization: some explain a globalization phenomenon from the linear-progress point of view as natural-historical process to which the mankind comes necessarily during historical development. From positions of nonlinear approach to understanding of

history, globalization is apprehended as one of multiple of possible tendencies of development, the reason, character and backgrounds of which need to be studied, to reveal its spiritual and valuable origin, genetic roots. Adhering the second approach, can be claimed that the phenomenon of globalization is represented as manifestation, being expression of certain values of the person or civilizations providing it such character. On the basis of their freedom, individuals, people, nations make history, instead of be its products. Therefore, they also create a tendency to absolutization of certain values including the globalization contradicting democratic pluralism, blocking openness to new opportunities of development, their choice. From a position of such understanding the dilemma makes sense: globalization or cultural identity? In our opinion, nevertheless, in the presence of a tendency to absolutization of globalization, its transformation into self-purpose, pluralism of cultures, even at the price of their transformation, reappraisal of values in everyone, is ineradicable, because in the basis of the person, nation, people, any cultural-historical subject lies its ontological freedom, its deep-rooted essence, openness to creativity of the new meanings, choice of which defines particular specificity of each subject.

Initial principle of a problem raised by us is the understanding of that the general basis of the person as subject of own being is freedom. Ontological freedom assumes that a certain way of thinking and being isn't set to the person. The main purpose of human cognition is creativity of variety of spiritual meanings and a choice of sense of own being that makes uniqueness of each human being as the cultural and historical subject. Such vital sense we designate as value sense being the particular and general basis of the subject, following from his freedom. These spiritual meanings, senses of being are chosen by individuals and nations, can be both, true and false, humane or anti-humane according to the contents. Nevertheless, being, even false, they are presented to them true since perceived as the worthiest of their human mission. Their false sense can reveal only later, with being outlines, providing disharmony in the relations with the world, other people, and finally, to cataclysms in nature and society.

Though it sounds paradoxical, the sense of freedom includes possibility of refusal of the person from a choice of his/her behavior, under the flow of circumstances. The possible reason is that individuals often perceive themselves as a consequence of more objective necessary forces. In the history of philosophy it was presented by concepts in doctrines of G.Hegel, K.Marx [1] and others. In their doctrines the history was treated in linear progress way where the general law of development doesn't allow retrograde movement, possibility of regress. From initial freedom's point of view such regress, fundamental change and change of strategic development of cultures, people, individuals are possible, because freedom is, first of all, a reflection over own spiritual and valuable content of subject, preservation of the relation with it, instead of merge, disappearance in it. Thus, human "Ego", or culture, identified with a certain value sense, manifest itself as an activity for implementation of this sense as its functioning and only in this sense of "Ego", the culture can preserve itself and act as a certain integrity. Thus, freedom is the general principle only from what it is possible to explain variety of the cultures which aren't coinciding in the cultural values, intentions, and, often, even opposite on the orientations, purposes and motives that can lead to collision of civilizations as S.Huntington considers it [2]. Famous German philosopher I.Kant, proceeding from a premise that subjectivity of the person acts as its initial self-determination, considered that peaceful co-existence of the states and the nations with preservation of their cultural identity is possible only in the conditions of the legal foundation on the international scene [3]. He metaphysically substantiated the contractual theory of the state and the interstate relations, proceeding from essence of the person as freedom, a priori given in his reason as inalienable basis of the right. Only on the basis of recognition of freedom of each individual and each cultural-historical subject (the people, the state) the legal condition is possible, equality both in the state, and between the people, the states. Freedom is considered by I.Kant as the general law on the basis of which there are all relations of people, nations, states having various, and sometimes opposite values on directions, orientations of sense of life, motives and the purposes. However,

despite these distinctions, individuals unite on the basis of the cultural values general to them by the contract, in a certain voluntary association – the people, the nation, the state, making a single will - the sovereign. According to I.Kant, the original contract initially had already a democratic form, and other forms have historically arisen later, as deviations from it or even contradicting the initial essence. Kant, having developed bases of human rights and international law, had substantiated an idea of identity of a democratic form of a state system, especially its republican form to concept of the state in general [4]. He considered, the single world state is impossible, since the states are already founded on the social contract on the basis of the certain values, which have spiritually united people, and values of different peoples can't coincide, but the world community, which has taken the form of the world civil organization on the basis of international law, is possible. It is their voluntary union, the federation, operated by the principle of the constant congress, arranged by analogy to the democratic civil system close to republican and called to elaborate the bill of the peace [5].

Globalization process is accompanied by spiritual crisis, revaluation of the former values, generated a set of transit societies with the unstable installations, in a condition of search of the cultural self-determination, observed, for example, in CIS countries, in particular, in Kazakhstan, and recently in the countries of the Arab East and other countries of modern Asia. Revaluation of the values means also revision of their meanings from positions of modern development, includes the difficult question, what values can slow down nation development and what can promote, what values are worth refusing and what are to accept. The problem of their verity or falsehood is also relevant. The problem is in whether the traditional values that develop identity to the nation can promote its harmonious development in the system of global processes. Each culture is presented by the hierarchy of values at the head of which there is a leading value of this culture defining, directing, setting logic and sense to all subordinate structures, which, in turn, act as a certain means of implementation of the Supreme value, approaching it in different degree to being forms of expression and implementation. Thus

cultures can make an exchange means, not Supreme values. Cultures with special values, which aren't coinciding on sense, can have coinciding secondary values or, more precisely, means of their achievement though these can have various meanings, directions and the status for them. For example, in some cultures, especially in the western civilization, the science and technique became means of achievement of domination of the person over the nature by mastering its laws. In other cultures they can carry out function of means of achievement of other values, instead of dominations in all of its meanings. For example, modern Japan and such countries of Asia as Thailand, South Korea, developed in the technological relation, keep the national values. Traditional societies were identified by Popper with closed societies without democratic openness, tolerance, self-criticism [6]. Such conclusion seems quite pertinent from the position, that connects, firstly, development, progress in general with scientific and technical revolution, and, secondly, identifying democracy with cultural identity. However, scientific and technical progress can receive one of those meanings, a place and scope, depending on a world outlook paradigm of this or that culture, in each of which the own system of spiritual and material needs develops and, therefore, it can have various degree of importance in valuable hierarchies at different civilizations. In the modern world scientific and technical progress became one of the most important means of achievement of cultural, socio-political, economic targets of the nations pursuing purely own interests, deep values.

In the conditions of globalization the democracy becomes the most promoting of stability factors, transparency and at the same time openness for new opportunities of development; in this sense it acts as the general social basis providing free manifestation of cultural values, including traditional and not always can contradict them. The phenomena of globalization, occurring in integration processes and pluralism of cultures, in our opinion, can coexist and has to be a process of mutually developing character in case of observance by the nations and the states of democratic principles of international law, development and the strengthening of the principles of the republicanism and civil status in the international community.

Globalization has to be a development tool of individuals, civilizations, but as mean can serve for different values both positive, and negative according to the contents. Globalization can and has to act as a developmental tool of cultural diversity, free creativity, instead of turning into the absolute unified total value, in that case it finds anti-humane character.

#### References

1. Marks, K. K kritike politicheskoi ekonomii. Predislovie. \ \ Marks, K., Engels F. Soch. T. 23. – M.: Politizdat, 1974
2. Hantington S. Stolknovenie tsivilizatsiy. – M.: ACT Moskva, 2007-571p.
3. Kant, I. K vechnomu miru. Soch. V 6 T. T.6. - M.: Mysl, 1966 p. 257-311.
4. Kant, I. Metafizika npravov v dvukh chastyah. Soch. V 6 T. T.4 (2). - M.: Mysl, 1965 p. 107-454.
5. Kant, I. Ideya vseobshchei istorii vo vsemirno-grazhdanskom plane. Soch. V 6 T. T.6. - M.: Mysl, 1966 p. 5-25.
6. Popper, K. Otkrytoe obshchestvo I ego vrugi. T.1. Chari Platona/ T.2. Vremya lzheprorokov: Hegel, Marks I drugie orakuly. – M.: Feniks, Mezhd. Fond “Kulturnaya initsiativa” 1992.