

УДК 008 : 316.7

Ivanova K., Balabay Ya.

National University of Pharmacy

**CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS:
PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS**

Ivanova K., Balabay Ya. Cultural Transformations: Philosophical Analysis. The article is devoted to the ratio of internal and external mechanisms of cultural transformations. The synergetic-qualitative model of cultural changes that allows to consider the evolution of internal and external interactions of culture as an interconnected and a symmetrical process in which accidental aspects affecting the scope of cross-cultural interactions are interpreted as a source of chaos, shifting the balance of substrate and culture that leads to its internal evolution are proposed at the article. The consistency of the substrate is regarded as the necessary foundation of accidental changes.

Keywords: intercultural communication, internal evolution, cultural changes, qualitativism, synergetics.

Іванова К. А., Балабай Я. В. Культурні трансформації: філософський аналіз. Робота присвячена співвідношенню внутрішніх і зовнішніх механізмів культурних трансформацій. Пропонується синергетично-квалітативістська модель культурних змін, що дозволяє розглядати внутрішню еволюцію і зовнішні взаємодії культури як взаємозв'язаний і симетричний процес, в якому акцидентальні аспекти, що зачіпають сферу міжкультурних взаємодій, інтерпретуються як джерело хаосу, що зміщує рівновагу культурного субстрату і що приводить до його внутрішньої еволюції. А постійність субстрату розглядається як необхідна основа акцидентальних змін.

Ключові слова: міжкультурна комунікація, внутрішня еволюція, культурні зміни, квалітативізм, синергетика.

Иванова К. А., Балабай Я. В. Культурные трансформации: философский анализ. Работа посвящена соотношению внутренних и внешних механизмов культурных трансформаций. Предлагается синергетически-квалитативистская модель культурных изменений, позволяющая рассматривать внутреннюю эволюцию и внешние взаимодействия культуры как взаимосвязанный и симметричный процесс. Акцидентальные аспекты, затрагивающие сферу межкультурных взаимодействий, интерпретируются как источник хаоса, смещающий равновесие культурного субстрата и приводящий к его внутренней эволюции. Постоянство субстрата рассматривается как необходимая основа акцидентальных изменений.

Ключевые слова: межкультурная коммуникация, внутренняя эволюция, культурные изменения, квалитативизм, синергетика.

Relevance of the research is determined by the fact that the world in the 20th century has entered a period of the most intensive changes in scientific, technological, economic and socio-political branches. In the late 20th and early 21st century, these changes were particularly intense and predictable. These changes have both internal and external nature. Internal changes in Western culture were traditionally defined by the positive terms (STR, social liberation, the expansion of rights and freedoms). External changes were related to the "Third World" within the process of getting of European features. The situation has changed now since changes within Western culture got a negative reflection. At the same time there was a situation of non-Western influences on Western culture and such kind of effects increased.

The cross-cultural interaction transported to inside-culture context (for example, the problem of ethnical emigrant communities) and inside-culture interactions increasingly transformed into a cross-cultural kind (the typical example is the protection of national culture from the so-called mass culture in many European countries). There is a more general theoretical problem of differentiation of internal and external factors of cultural transformation.

A lot of literature is devoted to theoretical and practical problems of intercultural communication. Diffusionists (Ratzel, Frobenius, Schmidt, Wissler) and cultural-historical school (Boas, Grebner) considered cultural changes as a basis of spreading of cultural elements into limited cultural regions. Functionalism (Radcliffe-Brown, Malinovski) actually described the results of the contact situation. Smelser's concept shows the effects of Western technology on traditional culture as an evidence of diffusionism's ideas in sociology.

The fact of cultural "resistance" and the features of choice of other-culture elements are ignored in above mentioned trends. The concepts of socialization, acculturation and cultural shock are considered in a connection with intercultural cooperation.

Evolutionists (Taylor, Morgan) mean that a person is characterized by the inner tendency to progress which hasn't got a specific character. The internal mechanisms of progress weren't analyzed by the authors. Marxism and the representatives of the modern concepts (Markarian, Mezhujev, Davidovich, Zhdanov, Kagan) focus on the internal evolution as general progressive changes. An exception is not even done for the world revolution — its conditions had to be "mature".

Kroeber was the first among the anthropologists introduced the concept of cultural area and cultural pattern, developing the concept of internal change of culture and intercultural specific theory, considered in some dynamics. Expansion of possibilities inside the cultural patterns he considered as the foundation of evolution and decline of cultures. Moreover these patterns are interpreted as moving and unstable in their frames. So he insisted on culture can be changed by exchanging cultural elements and so culture can't fatally

change towards death according on Oswald Spengler whom argued with an American anthropologist.

Soviet orientalism and African Studies (Frolov, Levin, Primakov, Polonsky, Starostin) focuses on relationship and interaction of internal (social class) and external factors changes. However just narrow sociological and political aspects of the problem, focusing on the transformation of society in special sense had been analyzed.

Culture Studies concept is also relied on intercultural contact (Toynbee, Jaspers, Conrad) or insisted on an isolated internal evolution of culture (Danilevskiy, Spengler, Gumilev), completely ignoring the external factor as an interaction of transformations. Summing up this short review it can be argued that the problem of internal evolution ratio and intercultural communication in cultural transformation wasn't completely investigated.

The aim is to analyze the ratio of internal and external mechanisms of cultural transformations based on philosophical and culture study thoughts.

The investigation requires the following tasks:

- analysis of philosophical approaches to the sources of changes;
- consideration of theoretical aspects and intercultural internal culture evolution as a source of cultural change;
- to study the potential value of cross-cultural factors changes based on some "model" provisions of synergetics and traditional philosophical analysis of the problem.

Cultural changes are the part of the problem of changes studied in philosophy in the framework of the fundamental philosophical categories of becoming. This category expresses the inherent variability of things and phenomena, its continuous transition, converting of one to another one. Philosophy has always focused on the underlying fundamentals of transformations since the interaction in terms of philosophy is the option shares the process of internal change. In fact the philosophical tradition incorporated both approaches into the one.

Philosophical approaches to formation were based on dialectics. Heraclitus as a founder of dialectics is often called as the first author of a concept of formation [6: 361].

Idealist tradition in opposite paid its attention to the sources of change. For example Plato pointed to Eros as an all fascinating space of "desire". Moreover this desire is grounded in fact dialectically — dissected halves of androgens, sublime and vulgar Eros (the internal contradictory nature of Eros) — created the dialectical pattern of formation [9: 99–101, 111–113].

Aristotle created a coherent theory of change. Changing criterion is the presence of the opposition — that things which are opposed aren't preserved. Only the essence remains unchanged like a thing without an opposition. The opposition has something immutable — it is a substrate. In general contradictions and contrast set the whole horizon of possible changes that are focused [5: 230–231].

These contradictions at Aristotle's works are related with the major kind of changes — the qualitative one, which Plato refused at the end of his creative evolution [5: 259–260]. The result is the formation of one another, not the implementation of internal trends, development and movement towards total self-actualization. This "adventure" of things is its external determination [3: V, 30, 1025 25–30].

A negative connotation of qualitative change takes place when a thing becomes different of itself. This event has an essentially spontaneous character.

An important problem is the recurrence of qualitative changes that occurs simultaneously, unlike evolutionists' "high" kinetic movement. The presence of contradictions in the subject leads to its development, while the interaction leads to a qualitative change that has a negative sense. The dominance of the kinetics and the space over the time is typical for ancient philosophy which also treats as is happening across the entire length rather than spreading it over time. In fact, the ancient thinker always deals with a mechanical movement that is set externally, while a self-realization is not a real change.

Time appears with the advent of Christianity, both with the perception about tendentiousness of historical process and its temporary deployment of a cause to an effect. Time evolution is not only the foundation of the Christian philosophy of history, but the whole Christian world view centered on the realization of the divine plan and combination of this plan with the freedom of people responsible for sin. When investigating the external causes of changes the ancient thinkers didn't have the concept of time as a main instrument of knowledge of internal transformations. The concept of time became available for Christians since Augustine [1: 169–176]. Turning the external research processes and changes to the imagination (the nature of science during the period of major role of Christianity) it successfully addresses the problem of internal changes.

Changes are seen as a manifestation of ontological reality, hidden in transient events. External predetermination of events as a divine providence is faced with the internal determination by a human will. Arbitrary character of divine intervention to a personality being introduces an element of randomness to the process of change.

Change is the set of coincidences, as being for true Christians like for many ancient philosophers is associated with the motionless and equal God.

During the period of New Time a view at change as a result of intervention of a "higher" power became dominant. It had been analyzed in such way because an external power causing a movement considered as a source of mechanical movement.

Moving as a form of change dominates at the modern European philosophy till nowadays. A kinetic approach to change which involves external nature of its interpretation dominates now. This approach is positively evaluated by the ancient Greek authors and modern European philosophers. The ancient Greek au-

thors gave a positive evaluation because a thing can fully implement its potential. The modern European philosophers highly prized the approach because it was the only way to get a possible understanding of the objective existence of things in the world.

Turning to the theories of cultural transformations it is of great importance to take up a point that kinetic approaches to changes are correlated with trans-cultural diffusion in a wide sense and even in some aspects of the theory of evolution and functionalism. Changes leading to acculturation can be interpreted negatively by Aristotle because of losing its properties.

Moving is not limited as a relocation of cultural patterns is also unlimited, but a qualitative change is limited because it determined by the cultural area. The result of this change is a transformation of “lower” culture into a “higher” one with a “movement” as a main source. “Clean” kinetics deployed in Culture studies, doesn’t explain the reasons of changes because of focusing on their result as well as the movement accidents logics doesn’t explain changes in ancient philosophy. There is no true dynamics. Kinetics has a spatial and historical character. Changes in a single cultural field with the unified patterns are described as that who have already taken place and existed as unique elements of culture.

Kinetic approach to changes doesn’t correlate with metaphysics or dialectics. As it was described above the old dialectic and modern European science was “kinetic” in interpreting of the changes. At the same time, the medieval metaphysics focused on a different approach to a problem of change, which can be characterized as a qualitative (founded by Aristotle).

“Qualitativism” — a term, introduced by L. Robin is used without regard to its analysis at the works of Aristotle and implies qualitative changes which have an inner nature, not just “lead to internal changes” (they may be the result of external cooperation). Qualitative changes are connected with the changes, neither with the development, nor with the progress.

Qualitativism as a special approach to the problem of change doesn’t correspond directly to the traditional division of philosophy into the idealistic and the materialistic one. The idealism of Hegel hasn’t less anti-kinetic nature than the materialism of Marxism. Hegelianism in all its branches gave rise to the idea of continuity of self-motion. Contradictions as a stimulus for changes are described in Hegelian dialectics as a traditional history of philosophical thought. But the internal contradictions exclude the importance of external action and suggest changes in development. It is insufficient of “ant kinetic” methods to assess the approach as qualitative as there is always a need for entry metaphysical force or goal like a source of transformation. As ignoring of external factors of changes questioned the change at all because the internal and external are in complex dialectical relationship.

Turning to the theories of cultural change the dialectical approach can directly compare in this sense with evolutionary concepts. Evolutionism comes from the dominance of the internal mechanisms of

transformation and recognition of progressive character of changes. Evolutionism has a historic character. There are no jerks, but there is a gradual accumulation of positive changes that are associated with human tendency to improvements and progress. Mankind is moved by its needs. There is a place for reverse movements towards degradation. But “civilization eyes are directed forward” [11: 40–43, 63]. Internal evolution is dominated over the external one, but plays a subordinate role and is seen in a negative context.

Evolutionism stretches change into many discrete points. There is a “History” but the movement is present only in sense of opening and closing the provisions of “changes” in time as a change which hides the mechanism of transformation. Chaotic character of evolution leaves randomness (progressive opening) in a local point of space. Accidental and local character of discoveries generates a random exchange of the same nature.

However, this is only a coincidence grounding chronological gradual change. Marxist’s “jumps” doesn’t lead to fundamental changes.

Discrete evolution is complemented by discrete “breaks in continuity”, realizing the latent tendency [7: 34]. To paraphrase Taylor we can say that the “point of view” of evolutionary isn’t concentrated at the process of change but at its results.

With the trend of realization of internal potential we returned to the kinetic approach in interpreting the changes. Implementation of the potency is in fact the realization of immutability that has the potential in a thing, although there is a contradiction that “removed”. According on a logical point of view only the lack of trends means “real” change has its specific series of transformations. The same time the change is not possible unless the essence stored in the change that can be characterized as a trend.

This controversial problem of balance of internal and external aspects of the transformation process allows solving by using of synthetic methodology based on synergetics and Aristotelian metaphysics. This approach implies an accidental nature of qualitative changes affecting the essence of the thing itself and its substrate. The presence of this substrate ensures the emergence of order, while accidental changes all the time pushing the thing to chaos.

On the other hand, the presence of this substrate enables continuous changes and transformation of an opposite quality to another one. Chaos is an uncertainty in a sense of disorder, the loss of the initial state of things. But this chaos is associated with the substrate of the thing itself. To carry a change a substrate should “be” and “be changing”. A substrate should “be” for changes.

A change can be “a change” when a substrate can “change”. In other words, the substrate must be considered as an open “system”. It is not something independent, absolute and immutable — it is a product of accidental chaos as it is due to them.

The key definition of chaos, according to the synergetic paradigm is susceptible to small perturbations. If a non-equilibrium system given by the

openness of these systems, the systems are regarded as sensitive to fluctuations of its own elements [10: 60–61]. Applying for a more traditional philosophical studies language it can be argued that the factors responsible for susceptibility are accidental.

Accidental factors can be considered as the global evolution of the system to change or complete transformation, which means destruction (or appearance) of a new. It is about possible meanings which may acquire as a result of the temporary nature of the changes that have the character of fluctuations that go out both qualitative way of identity and remain within it.

The criterion for this is the availability of alternatives possible changes set structure quality of life. And it is not about the fact that the subject of fighting its quality and not the external contact (which even Aristotle only leads to a “simple transformation”), and that the substrate (contact with accidentals) can evolve in different ways and to varying degrees.

Synergetic qualitativism suggests the possibility of contact, leading to changes in the quality characteristics of objects. This contact is possible only inside physical reality and has a mutual character. This contact leads to interaction. Such contact is possible if the participants are of the same sort but aren't of the same kind.

The variable changes are possible for the first group and for the second one the characteristic feature is unpredictability. This approach to internal and external changes can be effectively applied to the analysis of cultural transformation.

The proposed approach allows us to turn to the internal context of changes to explain its character, not dogmatic accidents in cross-cultural contacts and internal quality characteristics units engaging in intercultural interaction. There is a possibility of cross-cultural interaction with a limited nature of this interaction, or its inability (in cases when the only one possibility is the destruction of one of the participants of interaction).

This approach allows avoiding concealment of functional approach of limited nature of possible transformations of culture in situations of contact with a foreign community. The changes aren't possible even under the most favorable conditions for contact and the “best” intentions of members of contact if there is no fundamental community involving the cultural stereotypes.

The changes don't occur because of the lack of contact. Cultural transformations are considered in terms of interaction between the substrate and accident.

Intercultural interaction involves only an accident sphere that can be described as manifestations of culture in individual subjects and the behavior of its representatives. The internal evolution of a substrate is connected with it. Accidents seem to be active and their fluctuations lead to a chaos and recombination of a cultural substrate.

Cultural substrate which can be described as a set of basic standards and values in the case of stress

(caused by interaction with foreign standards and values) comes to an unstable condition. It creates a chaos and the fluctuations turned back to accidental culture (for example, it expressed in the cultural syncretism and individualism). This chaos is changing by the appearance of stable, coherent and limited cultural settings which lead to a “dissipative structures”.

Conclusions and recommendations for further research: The ancient philosophical tradition was characterized by kinetic approach to the formation. The presence of contradictions in the subject leads to its development, while the (external) interaction goes a qualitative change that negatively understood. During the period of New Time the changes was analyzed as a result of external cooperation;

Within the frames of the proposed synergetic and qualitative approach accidental and substrate changes are analyzed as an equally possible. It allows to consider the accidental intercultural interaction and internal evolution as a recombination substrate (the most stable features of culture are seen as mutable);

Accidental interactions are in space of fluctuations and a chaos. It changed by the appearance of stable, coherent and limited cultural setting that lead to the emergence of “dissipative structures”;

Using of the proposed methodology can contribute to the development of the faithful interpretations of “unexplained” cultural transformation and cultural transformation to create models that take into account factors both internal evolution and cross-cultural interaction, considered as a factor of imbalance of cultural integrity.

References:

1. Августин Аврелий. Исповедь; пер. с латин. / Августин Аврелий. — М.: Республика, 1992. — 335 с.
2. Ансельм Кентенбрийский. Монологион / Ансельм Кентенбрийский // Сочинения / Перевод, послесловие и комментарии И. В. Купревой. — М.: Канон, 1995. — 400 с.
3. Аристотель. Метафизика // Аристотель // Сочинения: в 4 т.; АН СССР. Институт философии. — М.: Мысль, 1975–1983. — Т. 1 (Метафизика. О душе). — 1975. — 550 с.
4. Аристотель. Физика / Аристотель; пер. В. П. Карпова. — 2-е изд. — М.: Соцэкгиз, 1937. — 327 с.
5. Визгин В. П. Генезис и структура квалитативизма Аристотеля / В. П. Визгин. — М.: Наука, 1982. — 430 с.
6. Диоген Лаэртский. О жизни, учениях и изречениях знаменитых философов / Диоген Лаэртский. — М.: Мысль, 1979. — 620 с.
7. Ковалев А. М. Общество и законы его развития / А. М. Ковалев. — М.: МГУ, 1975. — 416 с.
8. Лейбниц Г. В. Сочинения: в 4 т. / Г. В. Лейбниц; [пер. с франц.]. — Т. 4. — М.: Мысль, 1989. — 554 с.
9. Платон. Пир / Платон // Платон Федон, Пир, Федр, Парменид. — М.: Мысль, 1999. — 528 с.
10. Пригожин И., Стенгерс И. Время. Хаос. Квант. К решению парадокса времени / И. Пригожин, И. Стенгерс. — М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. — 240 с.
11. Тайлор Э. Б. Первобытная культура / Э. Б. Тайлор. — М.: ИПЛ, 1989. — 573 с.
12. Чанышев А. Н. Итальянская философия / А. Н. Чанышев. — М.: МГУ, 1975. — 215 с.
13. Энгельс Ф. Возникновение семьи, частной собственности и государства: в связи с исследованиями Л. Моргана / Ф. Энгельс. — М.: ИПЛ, 1989. — 222 с.