

УДК 159:331

DOI 10.22213/2618-9763-2022-1-76-80

A. V. Pilyushenko, Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor
Kalashnikov Izhevsk State Technical University, Izhevsk, Russia

THE PHENOMENON OF MULTICULTURALISM AS THE IDEOLOGICAL VALUE OF THE GLOBAL WORLD

The problem of global world raises new questions in the field of socio-humanitarian research. The activity and scale of intercultural communication in the modern world leads to the formation of various concepts in the field of theory and practice of ethnic groups and interethnic relations, each of which has different ways to resolve the conflict of the national majority and minority. The article is devoted to the problem of multiculturalism as a social phenomenon of the new global world, which is based on the idea of the value of national identity and the principle that being special is good. Along with this, an overview of the melting pot concept aimed at the gradual elimination of cultural national differences is given. The considered concepts are studied through the plane of the evolutionary formation of the human thinking system, the historical nature of the formation of ethnic characteristics, including in the dialectic of the "friend - foe" relationship, formed during the relations of individual and group natural selection. The article also reveals the role of ethno-cultural features of behavior and thinking as a demarcation of "normality", which has a supra-conscious nature and has the main source of rejection of behavioral cultural differences: one behavioral ethno-cultural normality overlapping with another generates conflict and rejection. It is emphasized that in multiculturalism this problem is solved through the idea of the value not of the usual, but of the special.

Keywords: interethnic communication; ethnoses; global world; multiculturalism; melting pot theory.

Introduction

The modern world is global and extremely dynamic. This fact affects the fundamental ideological aspects of human being and the prism of his thinking. The worldview, as a complex multiproblematic unity of beliefs, ideals, interests, value orientations and moral orientations of a person, are the main source in the formation of spiritual qualities, as an individual and a social group in the whole society. The spiritual appearance of a modern human was formed historically as a process of long-term evolution of thinking, reacting to changes in its subject-practical activities and the external world. One of the key factors in the formation of the worldview is the cultural and historical type of thinking, ideological features of people, ethnoses, climatic and geographical features of their residence as a local social group historically living together, which is a set of norms, rules, beliefs characteristic of this ethnic social group, consciously and unconsciously acquired.

Speaking about the ethnoses, Yu. V. Bromley once said: "a Special place among the entire... extremely complex hierarchy of human associations is occupied by communities, referred to in the special scientific literature as "ethnoses". Ethnoses in the narrow sense of the word in the most general form can be defined as a historically established set of people with common relatively stable features of culture (including language) and the psyche, as well as the consciousness of its unity and difference from other such entities" [1, p. 34].

In this aspect, the main qualities of the ethnoses as a social community are formulated: relatively stable features of culture and psyche, the historical nature of their formation, as well as such an attribute as "to be" a criterion of internal unity and to differ from others. Each quality has an important regulatory function in the context of social relations, which have deep causes of formation in the commencement of the evolutionary path of a human and society. Let us consider each of them.

Stable features of culture and psyche

The instruments of culture as the main regulators of social relations are formed at the earliest stages of the emergence of human society. The "rules of the game" are essential for survival in the new social environment, and to preserve the social environment as a sustainable system, it was necessary to seek and shape human society on their own, putting them in a desired spiritual form of a man, who intended to regulate his behavior. In that case, if at the pre-social stage of the development human life and the "rules of the game" in the natural environment were given to a human by nature in the form of "ready-made recipes", through the mechanisms of instincts, needs and natural selection, the society had to look for them on its own at the public stage.

In fact, without such culturally created norms and rules of behavior, a human would be left disoriented in the search of the right kind of behavior out of a multitude of alternatives, moreover, human

society itself would disintegrate. The stability of such cultural regulators of social relations stems from their fundamental nature, the inclusion of these rules and regulations and their dissolution in the worldview of a particular ethnic group. The adoption of ethnic worldview positions by a person has a multidimensional character, purposeful education, subconscious acceptance, intuitive reading; this explains that ethnic cultural norms regulate not only the external aspects of human activities, moreover, his activities in the world, but also the internal of his thinking and psyche.

The historic character of formation

The life of a given group of people and ethnic groups are dynamic systems, where numerous circumstances of socio-historical nature contribute to the worldview formation. However, given the stability of ethnic features of culture, tradition and relative stability of its content and forms of its manifestation, certain features of the psyche are “genetically” transmitted in the form of “collective unconscious” at each historical stage of ethnic community development. The society does not build “from scratch”, it layers new worldview principles on the existing worldview of a particular ethnic group.

In this regard, specific ethnic culture is not the final outcome, but a process that goes a long way of its historical formation and development.

Ethnos as a criterion of internal unity and difference from others

It is this side of ethnos that turns into unpleasant social consequences in the form of ideology of racism, fascism, discrimination, oppression by the ethnic factor of the “minority” by the “majority” and others – all that forms the field of interethnic conflicts. Considering this feature, it seems expedient to turn to biosocial aspects of the development of society and man to consider the human psyche as a result of evolutionary changes in the process of anthropo-sociogenesis. To study the nature of the previously mentioned formation, firstly we need to study the social stages of human evolution.

Let us turn to the theory and idea of Edward Wilson about the formation of egoism and altruism in the structure of human personality as an outcome of multilevel natural selection, where each mental feature has the necessary reasons [2, p. 79]. The individual selection is based on cooperation and competition between members of one group; and the group selection, which occurs during the competition and cooperation between the

groups is emphasizing the details of human social behavior.

“The role of individual and group selection is clearly visible in the details of human social behavior. A particular person shows deep interest in small details of another individual’s behavior. Gossiping is the predominant topic of conversation, as it was in hunting camps and in Royal courts. Our mind is mark “ours” and “others” [3, p. 153]. With this method we emotionally assess each of our acquaintances with a certain amount of trust, love, hatred, suspicion, admiration, envy, and a tendency to communicate. We involuntarily tend to enter groups or create them if necessary. E. Wilson once published, approaching the explanation of the phenomenon of demarcation of people on the principle of “whom belongs to me and whom belongs to others” in our own consciousness, or rather subconscious ideas of patriotism and national unity, built into a cult.

The values of ethnic groups formed historically, describe the events of ethnic conflicts stimulating interethnic competition, expressed even in such “harmless” areas as sport, art, science and technology.

All these previously mentioned features are echoes of the evolutionarily formed type of thinking and worldview of social community belonging to groups, competition between groups, acts as a motivating force that determines the quality and content of interethnic and, in general, any intergroup relations.

In his concept “From natural law to natural rights” White R. S. stated: “Nothing unites the collective as a joint confrontation with other collectives. A multitude of external enemies is a prerequisite for the existence of totalitarian regimes and a reliable means of rallying” [4, p. 35].

It is unequivocal that the ideology of patriotism and policy of national unity solved important tasks and issues regarding certain stages of the historical development in society [5, p. 176], the state and interstate relations, when the intra-group unity and presence of single ideological foundation of the nation was an important resource to relieve social tension. However, the growth of international interactions in the sphere of economics and politics, strengthening of cross-cultural exchange in different planes of human life, the globalist tendencies of modern society necessitated the revision of the concept of inter-ethnic interaction and the absence of ideological speculation with unconscious demarcation of the human psyche in the aspect of the relationship of “whom belongs to me and whom belongs to others” (“ours” and “others”) in the ethnic context.

It should be noted that this way of thinking (“whom belongs to me and whom belongs to others” - “ours” and “others”) in the context of social relations are not able to overcome completely. This is an evolutionarily complex mindset, unconsciously projected by a human on his social reality. Basic social institutions exist only due to this property of the human psyche, resulting from the group level of natural selection. The institution of a family, a circle of friends, a professional community, fans of a football club is a basic tool of socialization and assimilation of rules of social life [6, p. 414]. On the other hand, it is the definition of criteria for such competitive games played by groups, it is an issue containing moral foundations of the worldview. And the development of ideological positions acceptable to the modern global world in the plane of interethnic interaction is a necessary social need that solves the problem of removing social tension [7, p. 171].

Conclusions

The phenomenon of multiculturalism is understood as the ideology of acceptance of ethnic differences as an absolute norm. It is not a factor in the opposition of man to man making intercultural communication but is the very ideological position that corresponds to the new “global” thinking. It is not interethnic tolerance expressed in tolerance for foreign cultures, where relations are built, as a rule, through the suppression of the cultural “minority” by the “majority”. It is not there the acceptance of any culture as a model, nor the evasion from acceptance of cultural qualities of other ethnic groups. Moreover, it is not the erasure of cultural differences between ethnic groups as an attempt to create an average person of the global world (the “melting pot” theory) [8]. Multiculturalism, in general, is an attempt to cut speculation on the evolutionarily formed supra-conscious projection of the principle of “whom belongs to me and whom belongs to others” on the quality and content of interethnic communication.

In fact, it is the conscious assimilation of ethnic differences not as a source of danger (alienness) (as it was in the conditions of intergroup competition at the pre-conscious and conscious stages of human evolution), but simply as differences, which the whole social reality is abundant with [9, p. 81]. Nowadays, the European world, as an example of multicultural and multiethnic social organism, offers examples for the empirical implementation of the formation of new principles of interethnic exchange [10, p. 446], which, in fact, in the conditions of such intensive professional, educational,

and political migration is a necessary measurement in smoothing the social tension of the modern European community.

If the mass culture of the global world was based before on the principles of Europeanization or Americanization of thinking, now the cultural and ethnic pluralism is more and more increasingly present.

As a result, different cultures are allowed, and sometimes they are even popularized in the public sphere [11, p. 178]. Art, literature, marketing, and mass media build a new cult of singularity together with non-banality, moving away from standardization and unification of man as a logical consequence of spiritual fatigue from the need to imitate the model. This is a glaring crisis of “imitation”, stereotypes, depersonalization of culture. From time to time this previously mentioned process is expressed in provocative and protest ideas of not following the pattern. This is another consequence of the failed attempt to erase ethnic differences or impose a “culture pattern” as desirable, foreign, absurd [12, p. 151].

In fact, the theory of “melting pot” in its inception had defects that can be characterized by the concept of social anemia introduced by E. Durkheim. The erasure of ethnic differences provokes the formation of cultural vacuum – “the past is dead, and the future is not yet going to appear”.

At the same time, as E. Durkheim rightly notes: “Dissimilarity, like similarity, can be the cause of mutual attraction. However, there are not enough differences in general to produce this effect... only a certain kind of differences tend to each other, these are those differences that do not oppose and exclude each other, but mutually complement each other” [13, p. 214]. In this sense, multiculturalism as an ideology of multiethnic complement is a sharp contrast to nationalism as an ideology of interethnic opposition.

Based on Durkheim’s quote, it is important to note cognitively significant differences that are designed to build a special norm of reality. That is a demarcation line in mental attitudes that distinguishes bad from good, good from bad. These differences are the main obstacles to positive interethnic communication. Norms in a human’s head do not have a conscious nature, we barely think about the content of these norms, especially rarely express them verbally. They have been stored in our subconscious for a long time. A rare Russian person is aware of the fact that loud speech and active gestures irritate them because they live in a social sphere where this is not

common. However, if they meet a person of another ethnic group for whom active gesticulation is the normal way of behavior, they will feel irritated because this goes beyond their ideas of normality. At the same time, active gesticulation is not bad and not good, it is an ethically neutral act, but the different content of national demarcation mental attitudes will give this effect of bad impression.

However, the modern world is becoming more global than national. And its task is to overcome these differences by creating a single global socio-cultural space.

Multiculturalism is a simultaneous opposition to the concept of nationalism, where the national characteristics of a separated ethnic group are endowed with positive qualities, and the theory of “melting pot”, where nation differences are simply destroyed and a person is represented without the cultural and historical background of his personality. Nevertheless, multiculturalism is not a new concept of natural tolerance, where the main emphasis is placed on tolerance as a neutral attitude to potentially annoying actions. On the contrary, the main idea here is to love the differences, not to tolerate them.

The real embodiment of the ideas of multiculturalism can be seen in the modern global mass culture. Aesthetics unfolds to different types of appearance, to different styles in art, appeal to aesthetic solution originating in the national color of different countries and ethnic groups. It is promoted and called beautiful. It is through the sphere of culture a person first reads the dominant values of the global world, and, in general, he will be able to notice the change in the ideological paradigm.

References

1. Bromlej Yu. V. Essays on the theory of ethnos. Moscow, Science Publ., 1983. (in Russ.).
2. Wilson E. O. The meaning of human existence. Translation from English. Moscow, Alpina non-fiction Publ., 2014, 216 p. (in Russ.).
3. Ibidem.
4. White R. S. From natural law to the natural rights. Natural rights and the birth of Romanticism in the 1790s, Palgrave Macmillan, London. 2005, pp. 1-40. DOI: 10.1057/9780230506145_1
5. Kymlicka W. Political theory and Australian multiculturalism. Journal of international migration and integration, 10, 2008. pp. 261-280. (in Russ.).
6. Mitchell G. Religion, theology and multiculturalism in universities. Higher education policy, 2005, no. 18, pp. 413-417. (in Russ.).
7. Kennedy K. J. Multiculturalism’s forgotten dream. Curriculum perspectives, 2017, no. 37, pp. 171-172. (in Russ.).
8. Kriesi H. Englishtened understanding, empowerment and leadership – three ways enhance multiculturalism. CMS, 2015, no. 3 (1). DOI: 10.1186/40878-015-0019-2. (in Engl.).
9. Eve Haque. Multiculturalism within a bilingual frame work language, race and belonging in Canada. Language policy, 2014, no. 13, pp. 79-81.
10. Thompson S. Multiculturalism without culture. Contemporary political theory, 2008, no. 7, pp. 446-449.
11. Kymlicka W. Solidarity in diverse societies: beyond neoliberal multiculturalism and welfare chauvinism. IMISCOE “Mobility in crisis”, 2015, pp. 164-185.
12. Shayo M. A model of social identity with an application to political economy: nation, class and redistribution. American political science review, 2009, no. 103 (2), pp. 147-170.
13. Durkheim E. Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. The Free Press: A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc., New York, 1973.

А. В. Пилюшенко, кандидат философских наук, доцент

Ижевский государственный технический университет имени М. Т. Калашникова, Ижевск, Россия

ФЕНОМЕН МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРАЛИЗМА КАК ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ЦЕННОСТИ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО МИРА

Проблема глобального мира поднимает новые вопросы в области социально-гуманитарных исследований. Активность и масштабы межкультурной коммуникации в современном мире приводят к формированию различных концепций в области теории и практики этнических групп и межэтнических отношений, каждая из которых имеет различные способы разрешения конфликта национального большинства и меньшинства. Статья посвящена проблеме мультикультурализма как социального феномена нового глобального мира, в основе которого лежит идея ценности национальной идентичности и принцип, согласно которому быть особенным – хорошо. Наряду с этим дается обзор концепции плавильного котла, направленной на постепенное устранение культурных национальных различий. Предложенные концепции рассматриваются через плоскость эволюционного формирования системы мышления человека, исторического характера формирования этнических характеристик, в том числе в диалектике отношений «свой – чужой», сформировавшихся в ходе отношений индивидуального и группового естественного отбора. Раскрывается роль этнокультурных особенностей поведения и мышления как демаркации «нормальности», которая имеет надсознательную природу

и является основным источником неприятия поведенческих культурных различий: одна поведенческая этнокультурная нормальность, накладываясь на другую, порождает конфликт и неприятие. Подчеркивается, что в мультикультурализме эта проблема решается через идею ценности не обычного, а особенного.

Ключевые слова: межнациональное общение; этнос; глобальный мир; мультикультурализм; теория плавающего котла.

Получено: 24.11.2021

For Citation

Pilyushenko A. V. [The Phenomenon of Multiculturalism as the Ideological Value of the Global World]. *Social'no-ekonomičeskoe upravlenie: teoriâ i praktika*, 2021, no. 4 (47), pp. 76-80 (in Russ.). DOI 10.22213/2618-9763-2022-1-76-80.