

# СВІТЛОВА КУЛЬТУРА І МІЖНАРОДНІ ЗВ'ЯЗКИ

УДК 130.2

## THE INTEGRATIVE FOUNDATIONS OF THE CONTEMPORARY MULTICULTURAL SOCIAL PRACTICES

### **Valentyna Sudakova**

Doctor of Philosophy, Head of the Department, Institute of Culturology, National Academy of Arts of Ukraine

### **Судакова**

#### **Валентина Миколаївна**

доктор філософських наук, завідувач відділу Інституту культурології Національної академії мистецтв України

### **Судакова**

#### **Валентина Николаевна**

доктор философских наук, заведующая отделом Института культурологии Национальной академии искусств Украины

### **Volodymyr Sudakov**

Doctor of Sociology, Professor, Head of Department, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

### **Судаков**

#### **Володимир Іванович**

доктор соціологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка

### **Судаков**

#### **Владимир Иванович**

доктор социологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой КНУ имени Тараса Шевченко

**Summary.** The article presents innovative scientific investigation that creates an opportunity to determine the principles of the conceptual approach to the study of the integrative foundations of social solidarity and the intercultural communications as an ontological basis of the multicultural individual and collective social practices. The fact is that the process of cultural globalization stimulates the emergence of the new types of social solidarity in the contemporary multicultural societies. The theoretical base of the contemporary policy of multiculturalism and the technological aspects of the liberal and the pragmatic models of multiculturalism are analyzed in the article.

**Keywords:** multiculturalism, cultural space, cultural globalization, cultural unity, intercultural communication, social integration, social solidarity, types of solidarity, models of multiculturalism.

**Introduction.** It is known that intensification of globalization processes constitutes the new different communicative forms between national cultures. The current innovative technological changes are also the important factors that transform traditional models of intercultural interactions. However, in the contemporary globalized sociocultural space, the activities of transnational and national men of politics constantly reproduce different intercultural conflicts. These conflicts reflect the emergence of the new forms of social violence and social tensions in the contemporary multicultural societies. We agree with scholars (A. Assman, Z. Baumann, U. Beck, A. Giddens, J. Habermas, D. North) who underline that the risks of “unintentional social consequences of individual and collective activity” form the new research field which stimulates the need to elaborate innovative conceptual approaches to the further studies of integrative foundations of the multicultural social practices.

These studies obviously reflect the practical need to establish and to promote the new sociocultural values of social solidarity, cultural unity, cultural diversity which are also the values of a peaceful, non-violent globalized social order.

**The main purpose** of this article, considering the presented position, is to determine the principles of the conceptual approach to the study of the integrative foundations of social solidarity and the intercultural communications as an ontological basis of the multicultural individual and collective social practices.

First of all, we want to underline that in the contemporary cultural studies scholars [1; 2; 3] who investigate the process of cultural globalization introduce into the scientific discourse and analysis the concepts of “cultural space” and “space of culture”. These concepts, according to A. Assman, reflect the peculiarities of the “spacial turn” in the contemporary cultural development [1, 149–166]. As we believe, the analytical distinction and more detailed consideration of the cognitive specifics of the concepts of “cultural space” and “space of culture” can reveal the new specific directions in cultural studies.

Obviously, any sociocultural system of human communications can be called as “space” if it exists as structured and a stable reproduction of interactions of individual and collective subjects. In a structural dimension, the *cultural space* consists of different groups and communities that differ in terms of language, faith, traditions, values, and so on. The peculiarity of cultural features in such groups is reflected by the concepts of “youth culture”, “professional culture”, “mass culture”, “religious culture”, and so on. Yet, ontological dimensions of the *space of culture* incorporate the complexity of the cultural globalization and its controversial social consequences.

These social consequences, as we consider, reflect different types and forms of globalized cultural contradictions and social tensions. According to our point of view, the existing system of social tensions is the important ontological base for identification of the new pre-conflict and conflict realities of the globalized multicultural communications. The essential characteristics of the “social tension” concept, as Western scholars believe, reflect the certain system of the typical causal ontological factors as sources of actualization: 1) violence, 2) social exclusion, 3) social inequalities, 4) protest behavior, 5) social conflicts, 6) global and local risk situations as the specific ontological modifications of the individual and collective activities [4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9]. These scholars have proposed the new scientific conceptualizations of the theme of social tension under the context of certain innovative ideas. In this connection, it is reasonable to underline the content of the three such important ideas.

First, it is the idea of the epistemological development of the contemporary social sciences “beyond societies” [6; 7]. The conceptual expression of this idea lies in the argumentation of the research position that under the influence of the globalization process all

contemporary societies as nation-states lose their “organic” nature and the features of functional autonomy and self-sufficiency. That is why the sociological analysis, which is limited to the study of separate societies, is becoming obsolete. It is easy to understand that according to this research position, *social tensions are the attributive consequences of the contemporary globalization process and of the “new mobilities”*.

Secondly, it is the idea of “reassembling the social” (B. Latour [8]). This idea reflects the need for a radical rethinking of the ontological characteristics of sociality under the context of the intensive development of social networks, which form the new interactive models of social interactions and intercultural communications. In this connection, it is also important to take into account the fact that the processes of virtualization of public life positively stimulate the potential of the agency of individual and collective men of politics and expand the possibilities of their involvement (inclusion) into the existing field of global, regional and local social practices. However, such involvement is often simulative and really transforms into the forms of social alienation and social exclusion. So, the desire and actions of the migrant or refugee, who are aimed at achieving the goal of becoming a member of an advanced society are really faced with the mechanisms of social exclusion as a functional system of economic, political, legal, and sociocultural constraints. The controversial combination of these desires and actions and functional mechanisms of social exclusion, as we consider, are the important source of social tensions. From the standpoint of such conceptual understanding, *social tension is an ontological manifestation of contradictions between inclusive and exclusive types of identity of individual and collective actors*.

Thirdly, it is also important to point out the conceptual significance of the idea of radical strengthening of the tendency of individualization of social life. The concept of “individualized society” which has been proposed by Z. Bauman, expresses the essential characteristics of this idea [9, 2–14]. This concept targets the scientific search: 1) to the study of the dominant influence of personal (individualized) social practices in the processes of organizing the social order in the contemporary societies and 2) to the research the establishment of the meritocratic profile of social structure as the results of individual choices which are based on accumulation of the cultural capital and its “life meanings”. It is important to take into account

that the increase of the influence of personified social practices actually leads to the violation and destruction of the existing traditional modes of social integration due to the formation of the new individualized channels of social mobility. Obviously, a certain system of such “violations and destructions” is also a specific source of social tensions, which can turn into different latent forms of social conflicts and protest behavior. Thus, *social tension is the specific consequence of the radical strengthening of the tendency of individualization of social life.*

Contemporary globalized *space of culture* reproduces itself by different social tensions. Therefore, the contemporary process of the global cultural integration is not the process of the global cultural unity. In spite of that the concept of “global cultural unity” is widely used in the global studies. It does not have the cognitive status of a scientific category. It should be noted that in sociology the concept of “global cultural unity” very often is used as the specific conceptual analogue of the category of “social solidarity”, which reflects the realities of the certain social unity of individuals and social groups as the integral result of the human peaceful coexistence based on common needs, interests, ideals, and values.

Of course, the descriptions and qualifications of the social solidarity of the various communities in the contemporary multicultural societies now are widely presented through the principles of liberal ideology that proposed to understand solidarity as the basic social value and desirable goal of social progress. Therefore, in different democratic political programs of the organization of the peaceful and non-violent social order the concept of solidarity one often uses for emphasizing the general integrative foundation of social life.

Now in the contemporary scientific researches, the different definitions of the term “solidarity” are given. G. Crow in his works [10, 11] analyzes different semantic meanings of this term, which have historically formed according to the scientific or ideological positions of scientists. He underlines that A. Comte and his follower E. Durkheim believed that solidarity is a “natural” state of society based on the division of social labor when people objectively need each other. The Marxist position offered to understand “solidarity” as the unity of a particular social community, which arises on the basis of objectively existing interest and becomes a mobilization force of collective action. Marx used the notion of “solidarity” to determine the state of collective

unity, the unity of the proletariat. In modern theories of rational choice, the concept of “solidarity” refers to the phenomenon of group consciousness and group action, based on the identification of individuals with “own” group/community, when the individual deliberately delegates part of his rights in exchange for the collective defense of their interests [10, 4–29; 11, 52].

Obviously, in the public consciousness, solidarity has a morally positive connotation as a sign of mutual understanding among members of society, as a factor in ensuring non-conflict coexistence, as an indicator of the common need of people to live together. We agree with O. Widegren who investigates solidarity as the specific strategy of the social exchange. So, solidarity in its basic ontological dimensions is, firstly, a feeling of interconnection and the specific exchange with other members of the group, a feeling of “we”, that is, a sense of unity; and secondly, solidarity is the state of people's consent to certain joint actions for the sake of affirming their own interests. In general, solidarity is the unity of beliefs and actions, mutual assistance and support for members of a social group based on common interests and the need to achieve common group goals; joint responsibility, as well as active sympathy and support for any actions or thoughts [12, 775].

Considering the analyzed conceptual positions, we would like to emphasize that under conditions of the newest globalization changes the new two types of solidarity in the multicultural societies emerge.

We believe that the new “*neoliberal type of solidarity*” in its ontological manifestations is the specific form of social integration through the social tensions, protests, conflict behavior and, also, through the specific human struggle for the priorities of certain cultural values and ideals for belonging to a “higher”, more “qualitative” culture. Another — the “*innovative type of solidarity*” — is based on the positive effect of preserving a cultural diversity and an enrichment of existing cultures through innovative and creative activities of participants who produce unique technical, technological, artistic, and spiritual products.

These new two types of solidarity in a specific way create the stimulus for modernization of the two models of the multiculturalism policy: 1) *the liberal model of multiculturalism* and 2) *the pragmatic model of multiculturalism*.

The practical implementation of the liberal model of multiculturalism clearly indicates that this model has the specific normative foundations which one can rein-

interpret and use as the ideological strategy for achieving of the “global humanism” through the protection of individual human rights. However, we would like to underline that the implementation of the “liberal” model of the multiculturalism policy in the European Union demonstrates the inadequate pragmatic effectiveness in attempts to solve the two most important humanitarian issues: 1) the overcoming of gender equality and 2) the recognition of the equal status of cultural minorities (religious, confessional, ethnic). The abstract calls and demands for political correctness, which now acquires absurd forms, makes it difficult to admit that the cultural, economic and political confrontation between the “Islamic world” and the “Western world” in the developed European societies are the acutest and the most obvious. The Islamic world will never agree to give women the rights and freedoms that men have; they will not refuse their attitude to the “wrong”, from the traditions of a special attitude to hygiene, alcohol, birth control, and much more. Taking into account these circumstances, we can conclude that the optimistic approach to modernization of the liberal model of multiculturalism, in our opinion, needs to take into account the basic sociocultural determinants of the racial, ethnic, religious, socio-economic, and political inequalities in intercultural communications.

The practical implementation of the pragmatic model of multiculturalism is closely connected with the creation of the relevant information base which one can use as the cognitive instrument in order to elaborate the system of effective practical influence on intercultural communications by using resource possibilities of the progressive technological innovations. This model is strongly human oriented and has the specific intellectual support from the ideology of “welfare state”. The pragmatic model of multiculturalism is adapted to the tendencies of the global social mobility and is based on the new integrative principle of intercultural relations in the contemporary multicultural societies - “*assimilation without coercion*”. This principle we can regard as the important stimulus for the further institutional development of the public sphere. In monograph research “The Divided West” [13] J. Habermas writes

that in the public sphere people through the social mechanisms of self-organization have real chance to establish appropriate system of collective human rights as the basic regulative legal norms of the intercultural communications and non-violent social order. He considers that the public sphere in multicultural societies is the specific sociocultural space of the intercultural communications which constantly reproduces itself by different forms of civil activity, mass collective actions and public discussions [13, 186–194]. We support this point of view and believe that the further institutionalization of the public sphere creates an opportunity for democratic and legal regulations of the processes of social inclusion and social exclusion in the contemporary multicultural societies.

**Conclusions.** 1. The process of cultural globalization determines the need to elaborate the innovative conceptual approaches aimed at the scientific studies of the integrative foundations of social solidarity and the intercultural communications. 2. The cultural globalization stimulates the emergence of the new types of social solidarity in the contemporary multicultural societies. The *neoliberal type of solidarity* is the specific form of social integration through the social tensions, protests, conflict behavior and through the specific human struggle for the priorities of certain cultural values and ideals for belonging to a “higher”, more “qualitative” culture. The *innovative type of solidarity* is based on the positive effect of preserving cultural diversity and enrichment of existing cultures through innovative and creative activities of participants who produce unique technical, technological, artistic and spiritual products. 3. The new types of solidarity create the stimulus for modernization of the two models of the multiculturalism policy: 1) the liberal model of multiculturalism and 2) the pragmatic model of multiculturalism. The real policy of implementation the liberal model of multiculturalism has revealed the lack of practical effectiveness of this model. That is why the model of “pragmatic” multiculturalism is the most promising. Its scientific development should be based on theoretical and empirical data of specialized sociological and cultural studies.

## References:

1. Assman A. Introduction to cultural studies. Topic, Concepts, Issues / Aleida Assman. — Berlin: Erich Smidt Verlag, 2012. — 248p.
2. Sorrels K. Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice / Katryn Sorrels. — Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publ., 2013. — 290p.
3. Theorizing of intercultural communication / W. Gudykunst (ed). — Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publ., 2005. — 480p.
4. Bouget D. Social Tension: some general elements / Denis Bouget. — Oslo: The Peace Institute, 2008. — 35p.
5. North D. Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. North, J. Wallis, B. Waingast. — N.-Y.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013. — 320 p.
6. Urry J. Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century / John Urry. — London: Routledge, 2000. — 266 p.
7. Beck U. World at Risk / Ulrich Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226p.
8. Latour B. Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory / Bruno Latour. — N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005. — 303p.
9. Bauman Z. Individulized Society / Zygmunt Bauman. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008. — 272p.
10. Crow Gr. Social solidarities; theories, identities, and social change / Graham Crow. — Buckingham: Open Univ. Press, 2002. — 152p.
11. Crow Gr. Social solidarities / Graham Crow. // Sociological Compass. — 2010. — vol. 4 (1). — P. 52–60.
12. Widegren O. Social Solidarity and Social Exchange / Orjan Widegren // Sociology. — 1997. — Vol. 31, issue 4. — London: SAGE Publ. — P. 755-771.
13. Habermas J. The Divided West / Jurgen Habermas. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. — 248p.

**Судакова Валентина Миколаївна, Судаков Володимир Іванович**  
**Інтегративні засади сучасних мультикультурних соціальних практик**

*Анотація.* У статті представлено інноваційне наукове дослідження, яке спрямоване на визначення принципів концептуального підходу до вивчення інтегративних засад соціальної солідарності та міжкультурних комунікацій як онтологічного базису мультикультурних індивідуальних та колективних соціальних практик.

Доведено, що процес культурної глобалізації зумовлює необхідність розвитку наукових досліджень новітніх процесів інтеграції та диференціації соціокультурного простору, оскільки соціальні практики транснаціональних та національних суб'єктів суспільного життя призводять до виникнення та поширення появи нових форм соціального насильства й соціальної напруженості в сучасних полікультурних суспільствах.

Встановлено, що важливим соціальним наслідком культурної глобалізації є поява двох нових типів соціальної солідарності, які визначаються авторами як “неоліберальний тип солідарності” та “прагматичний тип солідарності”. У статті проаналізовані теоретичні засади політики мультикультуралізму, а також з'ясована технологічна специфіка ліберальної та прагматичної моделей мультикультуралізму.

**Ключові слова:** мультикультуралізм, культурний простір, культурна глобалізація, культурна єдність, міжкультурна комунікація, соціальна інтеграція, соціальна солідарність, типи солідарності, моделі мультикультуралізму.

**Судакова Валентина Николаевна, Судаков Владимир Иванович**  
**Интегративные основы современных мультикультурных социальных практик**

*Аннотация.* В статье представлено инновационное научное исследование, направленное на определение принципов концептуального подхода к изучению интегративных основ социальной солидарности как онтологического базиса мультикультурных индивидуальных и коллективных социальных практик. Доказано, что процесс культурной глобализации обуславливает возникновение новых типов социальной солидарности в современных поликультурных обществах. В статье проанализированы теоретические основы политики мультикультурализма, а также выяснена технологическая специфика либеральной и прагматичной моделей мультикультурализма.

**Ключевые слова:** мультикультурализм, культурное пространство, культурная глобализация, культурное единство, межкультурная коммуникация, социальная интеграция, социальная солидарность, типы солидарности модели мультикультурализма.