

GLOBALIZATION PROCESSES AND FORMATION OF CULTURAL SPACE: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ASPECT

Vasyl Sheiko

Doctor of Historical Sciences,
Professor, Honored Artist
of Ukraine, Full Member of the
National Academy of Arts of Ukraine,
Rector of the Kharkiv State Academy
of Culture, Kharkiv
rector-2@ic.ac.kharkov.ua

Шейко

Василь Миколайович

доктор історичних наук, професор,
заслужений діяч мистецтв
України, академік Національної
академії мистецтв України, ректор
Харківської державної академії
культури, м. Харків
rector-2@ic.ac.kharkov.ua

Шейко

Василий Николаевич

доктор исторических наук,
профессор, заслуженный деятель
искусств Украины, академик
Национальной академии искусств
Украины, ректор Харьковской
государственной академии
культуры, г. Харьков
rector-2@ic.ac.kharkov.ua

Abstract. The paper highlights the urgent problems of the globalization processes of modern civilization and the formation of the cultural space. The analysis focuses on the consideration of scientific literature and resources authors of which to a greater or lesser extent investigate this problem and emphasize the possibilities of cultural methodology regarding the study of globalization transformations and the formation processes of the cultural space of the modern world community.

The investigation determines the existing crisis of scientific methodologies that stubbornly poses before researchers the urgent tasks of continuing the search for new methods and principles, the processes of globalization and the formation of cultural spaces in the era of civilizational globalization. A certain problem arises even more acutely for such a young scientific branch as cultural studies. In this regard, the author accentuates an extensive methodological possibility of cultural comparative studies, directly, its application to illuminate the issues of the origin and evolution of cultural space in the era of civilizational globalization. It is in the cultural space there are possibilities of functioning of different cultures, different eras, and the cultural space exists and acts as an operating system of the component of cultural activity united by common fundamental values.

An analysis of existing sources and literature on the problems of civilization processes in the course of the formation of cultural space shows that it is the methods and principles of comparative studies within the cultural creation of ethnic groups that make it possible to overcome the tendencies of isolationism between different peoples and their cultures and traditions. Culturological comparative study, its principles and methods, makes it possible to study the genesis and to show the evolution of the spatial field of culture, its content, to highlight the processes of dialogue between cultures, the formation of globalization culture within a specific cultural space.

The results of the research allow us to extrapolate the processes of globalization and the formation of cultural space on the materials of the development of Ukrainian culture. Simultaneously, the main attention is paid to the interaction of culture and economy in the last years of independent Ukraine development in the process of forming its cultural space.

Keywords: culture, globalization, cultural space, civilization, comparative studies, processes of globalization transformations, modern civilizational community, historiography.

The relevance of the studied topic is that the problems of transformational processes of modern globalization and the formation of cultural space are still poorly studied. If we also take into

account that these problems are studied mainly in the historiographical aspect, the topicality of this intelligence is doubled.

The methodology of this study is cultural studies principles and methods, in particular, the principles and methods of comparative studies, which allowed the author based on a historiographical outline to highlight the main globalization processes and show milestones in the formation of cultural space of modern civilization.

Results. Reviewing numerous sources and literature based on cultural studies methods and principles, the author identified the main processes of globalization transformations and showed their relationship with the basics of forming a cultural space of modern civilization.

The topicality of this scientific research is that the author applied new cultural studies methods and based on analysis of various sources and literature identified their relationship with the formation of the cultural space of modern civilization.

The practical significance of this study is that the author managed based on analysis of numerical sources and literature to achieve positive results in highlighting the processes of globalization and the formation of cultural space, which can be used in further scientific researches on this issue. Besides, the results of this scientific development can be used in the preparation of methodological materials for cultural studies courses.

Presentation of the main material. The materials for the study were fundamental works that dealt with certain aspects of the selected issues, but the author claims that it is necessary to consider the other articles, in which to some extent the authors deal with these issues. For example, Ivanova K.A. considers cultural changes that characterize modern globalization processes (Іванова, 2010), Kliukhina A. I. (Клюхина, 2010) and Shmelova T. V. (Шмельова, 2019) touch on the issues of culture and education in the era of globalization, Shtefan I. P. (Штефан, 2010) highlights some methodological aspects of global culture study. The question of the essence and consequences of cultural transformation in the era of globalization is studied by Pyliavets L.S. (Пилявець, 2013a; Пилявець, 2013b) and Korzhov O.Yu. (Коржов, 2014), and Domanska O. (Доманська, 2014) focused on the interpretation of the concept of national cultural space. For his part, Klochko V. P. (Клочко, 2015) tended to define the concept of cultural space and made

a circular attempt to determine the elements of the impact of globalization on its formation in Ukraine. In the article of Melnyk V. V. (Мельник, 2014) and Strutynskyi B. D. (Струтинський, 2019) the attention is focused on the evolution of cultural policy in the context of globalization. The articles of Fabrika A. A. (Фабрика, 2015), Fedotova N.V. (Федотова, 2013), Charkina T. (Чаркіна, 2016) talk about culture and globalization, and in the works of Kravchenko O.V. (Кравченко, 2014) and Luhutsenko T.V. (Лугуценко, 2014) issues of cultural space in particular in Ukraine are explained. Theoretical understanding of cultural space in the context of globalization is considered in the articles of Sudakov V. M. and Hrytsenko O. A. However, Sudakova V. M. is focused on determining the conditions and trends in the development of interaction between individual and collective subjects of public life in the modern cultural space, and Hrytsenko O. A. is focused on the formation of a model of the national space of Ukraine (Гриценко, 2019; Гриценко, 2017; Судакова, 2018). By the way, globalization processes in the field of culture of Ukraine are considered in the articles of Arefieva A.Yu. and Babkin V.O. (Ареф'єва, 2016; Ареф'єва, 2017; Бабкін, 2018). Finally, we should recall a small article by Kliueva E.O. (Клюева, 2015), in which an attempt was made to historiographical review of works dealing with issues of cultural space.

So, today there are many articles in which, mostly in the narrative aspect, attempts are made to deal with issues related to globalization and culture. However, to this day, the problems of globalization and their role in shaping the cultural space, in particular in Ukraine, remain unexplored and await their researcher.

It should also be noted that the author of this article has been having an interest in these issues for a long time. It is testified by a number of his scientific investigations (Шейко, 2001; Шейко, Богуцький, 2005).

It is believed that globalism as a branch of scientific researches originated due to the shift in the world that occurred at the turn of the '60s-'70s of the XX century. It aroused the interest of scientific thought in the problems of world integrity, which is increasingly studied through the prism of the ideas of interdependence and interconnectedness, which gave an impetus to the formation of ideas of the famous Club of Rome, which defined the subject of globalism — Mankind in the process of Universe evolution (universal evolution concept of Erich Jantsch (Янч, 1989)).

The topic of globalization, by the way, for the last 20-30 years has been developed not only in its generalized, superdisciplinary form but also simultaneously within the framework of separate disciplines. This, in particular, led to the search for a clearer definition of the subject of globalism, which is understood as some global "condition of human existence" with a special structure distinct from all partial types of social relations (works of Roland Robertson, etc.). This notion was based mainly on methodology of cultural studies and marked the exit of globalism from the "intrauterine" state (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001).

Globalization as a process and structure certainly does not exist outside the complex of knowledge about globalism. Globalism is a new interdisciplinary field of knowledge in the field of international relations and world policy. It considers cultural, political, social, economic and other problems of globalization, assuming that globalization is as it is reflected and created by globalism (Чешков, 2001).

The monodisciplinarity of our field of social and humanitarian knowledge can be judged by its two disciplines, the most advanced in the study of global issues: economic and cultural.

In economic disciplines, including the study of world finance, this topic is inextricably linked with the problems of post-industrialism and the formation of a new, information society, where economic relations base on a theoretical variety and require consideration through the prism of society, culture and human (Иноземцев, 2000; Кочетов, 2000).

Culturology, apparently, to the same extent as the economic sciences, has mastered the globalist issue, although both areas of theoretical development still need to be continued. Just as in economics, the concept of "global economy" is not demarcated from the concept of "world economy", in cultural studies the idea of some global culture is faced with the denial of this idea and its replacement by either the amount and "continuum of cultures" or the idea of dominant civilization. Basing on the more or less recognized thesis about the primacy of culture over other forms of modern social life, cultural studies go beyond its limits, acting as a provider of methodological tools for other disciplines that study global issues.

These mechanisms create close relations between the two monodisciplines: economic and cultural ones. Thus, the relationship between economic disciplines and cultural studies creates the conditions under

which a certain interdisciplinary form of knowledge is formed. The emergence of interdisciplinary forms of knowledge is symptoms of convergence of different branches of science within the framework of globalism. Meanwhile, there are such forms of cognition, which are practised in all disciplines (Эшби, 1996).

All these innovations go beyond the individual disciplines of globalism when it is already beginning to transform from a conglomeration of separate disciplines into an integral field of cultural, socio-humanitarian knowledge. This conclusion, which differs from the idea of the prevalence of disciplinary fragmentation, can be supported by a reference to the attraction of many disciplines, to philosophical and cultural knowledge and, first of all, to the problems of space and time. In this regard, as well as under the formation of a general scientific form of knowledge and the number of disciplinary forms, globalism faces the problem of distinguishing the number of meanings, concepts and categories (Бродель, 2007; Валлерстайн, 2001; Евстигнеев, 1997; Кочетов, 1999; Неклесса, 2004; Пригожин, 1989).

The formation of interdisciplinary and superdisciplinary forms of knowledge, their attraction to philosophy and cultural studies means that there are conditions that contribute to the transformation of globalism into a special branch of socio-humanitarian knowledge. The general contours of this field are outlined by the fact that almost all disciplines that are part of globalism, operate on the idea of the world as world integrity.

To master the paradigms of globalism more deeply, let us consider these dimensions on the materials of Ukraine. The nature of Ukraine's relations with the world is one of the most difficult development issues. During the thirty years of independence, the society practically, as it was already indicated, has not received an answer to the question about Ukraine's place in the world. After all, global challenges "format" the internal space of Ukraine. It should be noted that economics, culture, politics, ecology, religion, information, security and many other key areas of human activity are not raw national anymore for a long time. That is why it is necessary to achieve a strategic understanding of the modernization of theories of current and future challenges associated with globalization. This understanding will give the country the opportunity and need to use the potential of global challenges and contribute to more dynamic and modernizing development

of Ukraine in many areas and, first of all, in economic and cultural ones (Захарченко, 2002).

However, today there are no universal forms of legitimation of modernization. Rational-scientific legitimation of modernization was to perceive some patterns of development such as norms, models of development. It was possible to "catch up" only if the model of development, its norms were known. Modernization theories are theories of development based on identity change (Федотова, 2002). The task of changing identity in modernization theories is a requirement of self-identification within those new limits that would correspond or at least not contradict Western values and social attitudes, which assume that the Chinese and Russians in their assessments and actions should be guided by the same norms that Americans (Огородник, 1990).

It should be recalled that modernization theories were revived in the countries of the former Communist bloc, where the "catch up" model of modernization was proclaimed again. One of the main difficulties in its implementation was the ambiguity of what stage of development of the West is trying to reach a huge region in its "catch up" movement (Федотова, 1997).

From a cultural point of view, the relationship of the non-Western world to the Western one is one of the central problems of modernization, which exists regardless of whether specific modernization efforts are added by certain societies. Modernity in its turn acts as a problematization of detraditionalization, during which there may be the creation of new properties, settings and beginnings of life, and the destruction of all previous principles. This problem is faced by every society that is being modernized and the person who is going through individual modernization.

As we can see, Ukraine has no chance to enter the post-industrial phase in the future, nor it is possible to abandon the "catch up" but incapable to "catch up" modernization. However, today Ukrainian society is changing dynamically and systematically, it is characterized by the lack of stable stereotypes of responding to global challenges. Moreover, at the moment they can already be indicated, albeit in dotted lines, which, in turn, requires the super flexibility of social, cultural, economic, mental and other structures. Ukrainian society, which is characterized by an amorphous identity, needs both the construction of rigid and labile mental structures. As we know, Ukraine is involved in various integration projects looking for stability. However, this demand for stability is offset by the fact that the world

is entering a stage of "global anarchy" (Валлерстайн, 2001).

It should be noted that the need to move in the paradoxical environment of the global world with new force raises the question of maintaining the limited interaction between the Ukrainian elite and society. Here it makes sense to turn to the ideas of Arnold Toynbee (Jr.), who developed the concept of "challenge-response" (Тойнби, 1996).

As it was already mentioned, today Ukraine mainly continues to be outside the global economics and culture. It includes world development leaders who have been able to develop a technologically unique product based on informational, scientific and knowledge-based innovations. It is impossible to become a member of global economics through imitation, but it is possible to enter it by having at least one unique achievement in which the world is interested. Thus, even without being part of the post-industrial world, you can enter it, creating at least one unusual innovative product that is competitive in the global market.

Thus, the process of forming the paradigmatic foundations of globalism as a relatively new field of knowledge about the global processes of modern civilization in recent decades has passed a long way. Scientists are increasingly paying attention to these problems. Significantly, a detailed analysis of these works allows us to conclude that the study of these issues is possible mainly through the economic and cultural prism. It is culture and economy that have become the cornerstones of globalization. These problems have become especially relevant for Ukraine in determining the vector of its further development and existence. The global economic crisis that has gripped the world today, in particular Ukraine, can be overcome only if we study and take into account the opportunities and prospects of today's globalization challenges.

As it was already noted, the current crisis of research methodologies poses to scientists the task of finding principles and methods for analyzing the processes taking place in the age of civilizational globalization. This problem is even more acute in such a relatively young scientific field as cultural studies. It is the analysis of the methodological possibilities of comparative studies about the processes taking place in the field of culture and cultural studies that is of special scientific interest to the author.

Recently, the term *cultural space* occurs in a va-

riety of variants. Each author invests his perception in it, so the gap between reading and the original meaning is growing. *Space* is a self-evident concept, its scientific understanding has a long history. However, in the second half of the XIX century in the understanding of space, a tendency emerges to differentiate it, which is associated with the delimitation of activities: different types of human activities form their own spaces. Human activity forms the living world (space) as the basis of human existence. Thus, man gradually became the object and subject of physical and social space, as noted by E. Husserl (Гуссерль, 1994).

It should be noted that the second half of the XX century again actualizes spatial representations in philosophy. The search for a more complete spatio-temporal picture of the world, which could combine the physical space and consciousness, has intensified. In these studies, an important place was given to the concept of cultural space. It is perceived as directly related to human consciousness and activity. "The main difference between space and time is manifested in their relationship to man as a perceiving subject ..." (Эко, 1998). Spatial structures differ from temporal ones primarily by topological qualities. They are characterized by signs of reversibility, the ability to unfold in three dimensions.

This anthropological component in the understanding of space as a form of matter and culture is even more entrenched in the humanities of the XX century. The notions of space as a container and space as an order of things also remained unchanged. To these ideas were added figurative ones — space as a way of length (Шпенглер, 1993), space as a self-organizing system (Пригожин, 2002), space as a place of the rootedness of human existence (Хайдеггер, 1996), space as a distributive structure (Бодрийяр, 2000). And, first of all, these scientific investigations were related to the works of O. Spengler, I. Pryhozyn, M. Heidegger and J. Baudrillard. It is in the cultural space that the existence of past and present layers of culture is possible. The idea of space as a real element of culture is affirmed, and cultural space is perceived as a system of regulatory bases of human activity and its sign-symbolic content, embodied in various products of cultural practice. Each cultural space appears as an organic entity, where all components are united by common values.

As it is well known, in structuralism a human was excluded from the cultural landscape. From the

point of view of this direction, he must live and develop according to his laws. Derrida (Деррида, 1999) described the cultural landscape surrounding a person as "... something like the architecture of an abandoned (or uninhabited) city that people have abandoned. This city is still inhabited by some ghosts of culture, phantoms of meaning, which only deter it from the transition to the natural state". The refusal to recognize the leading role of structuralism in Western philosophy allowed us to reconsider the notion of the cultural landscape and cultural space. He began to correlate with some ideal body that forms the worldview of people (Гурко, 1999, с. 36).

One of the factors in the dialogue of different ethnic cultures in a multicultural space is language, which, not surprisingly, is closely linked to the problems of the cultural space. Trying to know a "foreign" world through language, a person learns another culture. Due to this, cultures interact, their self-identity is revealed. Linguistics forms the understanding of cultural space through linguistic and mental structures that are contained in the human mind and fixed in language. The subject of study here is often space in myth, heroic epic ballade, fairy tale, epic, author's work of art, art (*Orientalia et Classica. Аспекти компаративістики*, 2005).

Cultural space forms a variety of cultural texts. Each of them plays a specific role in human activities. The texts of the cultural space provide an opportunity to know the other side of the world. Such cognition occurs as what M. Heidegger (Хайдеггер, 1996), M. Merleau-Ponty (Мерло-Понти, 1996), J. Deleuze (Делез, 1998) called a fold. But it is impossible to completely correlate the cultural space with the text, it is only a part of the cultural space.

In Western European science, a special direction emerged that studies cultural spaces: proxemics. From their point of view, "... space speaks, is endowed with meanings that vary from culture to culture. To the three dimensions of the space, the proxemic adds the fourth one — cultural... within this space there are strong and weak codes" (Эко, 1998).

However, the most humanitarian, anthropological component in the understanding of space is brought by cultural studies. The specificity of space is that it, unlike the material objects in it, cannot be perceived by the senses, and therefore its image is combined with certain metaphors and conditioned by them. Among them, the main ones are visual images and motor sen-

sations that give an idea of space. Therefore, space together with time is one of the most important categories of culture that determine its unique image.

To date, within the framework of research in cultural studies, several approaches to the study of cultural space have been formed. Let us consider the main ones. Thus, the informational approach of A. Moles (Моль, 2008) explains the cultural space exclusively as a space of the communicative process, which provides the transfer of knowledge from the collective level to the individual, and, serves as a mediator. On the other hand, the semiotic approach of Lotman Yu. M. builds the analysis and consideration of cultural space based on the central-peripheral system. In the functioning of the system, some features are found in the areas of cultural contacts, these are: relay, dialogic and increase of the amount of cultural product produced by society compared to the amount of assimilated product (Лотман, 1996).

A completely different mythological approach was proposed by Kahan M.S. To his point of view, the problem of space, where man and the world exist, is rooted in mythology. The development of space has led humanity to create different concepts: material, philosophical, religious and artistic spaces, as well as — to understand the world, "top" and "bottom", the categories of "near / far" (Каган, 1995), and so on.

The axiological concept of Ikonnikova S.M. and Bolshakov V.P. is of great interest. Ikonnikova S.M., for example, considers "space as a culturally integrating principle of existence and development of peoples and as a value" (Иконникова, 1977, с. 39). Based on an in-depth retrospective analysis of different interpretations of cultural space, she discovered its complex architecture, as well as its important properties — multidimensionality and dynamism (Иконникова, 1995). Ikonnikova S.M. notes that the processes of globalization contribute to the spread of such cultural models, which are presented as universal ones within a single information and communication field and ensure the global integration of cultures.

In the concept of cultural space, which was presented in the publications of Bolshakov V.P. (Большаков, 2000), cultural space is considered not only as a "container" of cultural values, cultural artefacts, cultural processes. He claims that cultural space, is something "that is generated and changed by culture, that arises and develops", that "having arisen, actively influences the culture that gave rise to it" (Большаков,

2005). He also notes that territorial, political spaces do not always coincide with cultural spaces, which, in our opinion, clearly confirms the nature of mobility and transparency of cultural boundaries and the existence of border spaces characterized by the formation and development of border cultures there (Большаков, 2005).

Due to the globalization of the civilized world, different concepts of cultural space are emerging. The most powerful of them and that deserve our attention in this article are the theories of "global culture". The problem of considering the world as a whole — through the universalization of the format of culture and worldview and the localization of their content, for example, considered in the works of R. Robertson, who introduced the concept of "global culture" and was the first to put forward a theory of global culture (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001). This theory replaced the dominant notion in the science of globalization as a purely socio-economic process, socio-cultural westernization of the world, the construction of a single world of the global distribution of the capitalist system developed by I. Wallerstein (Валлерстайн, 1999). Interesting generalizations are contained in W. Rostow's works (Rostow, 2003). He differentiated the world space into centre, semi-periphery and periphery according to the degree of development of national economies. In the theory of "the world as a whole" Robertson believes that it is a culture that represents the interests, discontent, tendencies to preserve and reproduce socio-cultural diversity, is designed to play the role of "global context" (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001; Rostow, 2003).

Prospects for the development of global culture are linked in Robertson's theory with models of the possible ordering of transnational cultural space in terms of social interactions. These models, called by Robertson (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001) as "images of the world order", appeal to the dichotomy "community — society" introduced by the German philosopher and sociologist F. Tönnies (Теннис, 1998; Филиппов, 1997). Robertson offers four models — two versions of the world community, the "global village", and two versions of the world community, the "global city". Each of them acts as a type of socio-cultural organization of the transnational cultural space (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001).

The relationship between the private and the common, the problem of homogeneity and heteroge-

neity of global culture are revealed by Robertson with the help of his concept of "glocalization". The conceptual meaning of this concept indicates the growth in the process of the historical formation of the world as a whole, the tendency to universalize the format of culture and localize its content. Besides, Robertson's concept reveals the fact of relativization of different cultures in a global context, which provides a plurality of interpretations of the global context by participants of intercultural interactions (Робертсон, Хондкер, 2001).

The theory of global culture of the American anthropologist A. Appadurai (1996), which was formed in the mid-90s of the XX century, develops a new conceptual apparatus, focused on the consideration of modern globalization processes. The methodological dominant in his analytical constructions is the idea of "organized chaos" as a way of the existence of transnational cultural space.

The formation of a transnational cultural space is associated with the "organizational chaos" of cultural flows that stimulate the emergence of imaginary worlds. Imagination becomes, according to Appadurai (1996), the main social force through which people are constantly trying to make real and virtual interactions in the transnational cultural space, which contributes to the emergence of a new group and individual identities. The changing landscapes of global culture blur the space of national cultures and contribute to the formation of the culture of the postnational world.

"The basic characteristics of the transnational cultural space — global mobility and local rigidity" — change the image of the global world. J. Attali points to the danger of turning a man into an object of the market (Аттали, 1993). In this regard, he draws attention to the advent of the global cult of "industrial cannibalism" and the process of human cultural mutation. The main actors of the XXI century are nomads — nomadic rich and poor, privileged and disadvantaged. Albert Nalchajyan's (Налчаджян, 2004) publications state that nomadism is a frequent cause of a more general adaptive strategy of withdrawal or escape from frustration and stress caused by the devaluation of national values. Nomadism is one of the examples of complex ethnic regression when representatives of a certain ethnic group or the whole ethnic group as a whole have a desire to move to other lands and preserve the old system of values or build a new one (Аттали, 1993; Налчаджян, 2004).

Thus, scientists of cultural studies in the context of globalization face the need to identify the dynamics of the formation of transnational cultural space of the modern world, to determine the methodological approaches of their study and basic characteristics. This purpose is facilitated by determining the dynamics of global worldview, global macro ethics, global literature, languages of transnational communication, the role of the Internet as a new social reality and research tool, university, theatre, cinema, etc.

Conclusions. Thus, consideration of the problem of studying the cultural space in the context of globalization processes of civilization requires an appeal to two main approaches: interdisciplinary and comparative. The first approach demonstrates the complexity of the chosen object of study — the cultural space of ethnic and multiethnic culture.

Comparative studies within ethnic-cultural studies help to overcome the tendency of isolationism between different cultural traditions, as well as to lead to an understanding of other worldview traditions that have formed multiethnic cultures.

"Modern comparative studies struggle against prejudices about the insurmountability of differences between civilizations and universalist claims, moves to a methodology that recognizes the value of differences in cultural models, non-classical and universal forms of thinking" (Колесников, 2003).

Today it seems quite difficult to line up different ethnic cultures in a certain hierarchical line with a definitive place for it in one or another scale of values. In this sense, a special place in establishing a dialogue of cultures can be occupied by multiethnic, comparative cultural studies, which is one of the acceptable ways of this process. The wider the possibilities of comparison, the more convex the general things appear and the alien ones stand out (Яснєрс, 2000).

The history of the formation of national culture in the context of globalization cannot be considered as a history of the culture of all mankind and cover all the diversity of all cultural traditions. Thus, the ethnic principle in the study of cultural space allows to involve in the described history of culture bright cultures that have remained in the shadows to this day and due to historical reasons did not fall into the linear scheme of "progress of cultures of nations". The methodological ethnic principle allows synthesizing the positive

qualities of the logical-theoretical interpretation of the cultural space with the necessary substantiation of the cultural-historical reality.

Thus, the review of the relevant literature and analysis of the methodological possibilities of comparative studies shows that their application to issues of culture, cultural studies and cultural space in a globalization civilization allows solving many contradic-

tory and complex problems. Thus, with help of cultural comparative studies, its principles and methods, it is possible to highlight the genesis and formation of the spatial field of culture, to outline the content of the cultural field, globalization culture, to show the processes of interaction in the dialogue mode of cultures of different peoples, culturological processes of national self-identification.

References:

- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. (P. 37). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arefieva, A. Yu. (2017). Hlobalizatsiini protsesy v kulturi suchasnosti [Globalization processes in modern culture]. In *Hileia: naukovyi visnyk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. (Vyp. 116 (1), P. 185–189). Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo «Hileia». (In Ukrainian)
- Arefieva, A. Yu. (2016). Hlobalizatsiia kultury yak predmet filosofskoho analizu [Globalization of culture as a subject of philosophical analysis]. In *Hileia: naukovyi visnyk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. (Vyp. 107 (№ 4), P. 272–275). Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo «Hileia». (In Ukrainian)
- Ashby, W. R. (1996). Neskolko zamechaniy [Introductory Remarks at Panel Discussion]. In *Obshhaya teoriya sistem*. Moscow: Mir. P. 171–178. (In Russian)
- Attali, J. (1993). *Na poroge novogo tysjacheletija [Lignes d'horizon]*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. (In Russian)
- Babkin, V. O. (2018). Hlobalizatsiini kulturni protsesy ta yikh vplyv na funktsionalne pryznachennia natsionalnoi kultury [Globalization cultural processes and their influence on the functional purpose of national culture]. In *Mystetstvoznavchi zapysky: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. (Vyp. 33, 55–62). Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Baudrillard, J. (2000). *V teni molchalivogo bolshinstva, ili Konec socialnogo [A L'ombre des majorites silencieuses, ou la fin du social]*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo Uralskogo universiteta. (In Russian)
- Bolshakov, V. P. (2000). *Svoeobrazie kultury Novogo vremeni v ee razvitiy ot Renessansa do nashih dnei [The originality of the culture of the New Age in its development from the Renaissance to the present day]*. Velikij Novgorod: Novgorodskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. (In Russian)
- Bolshakov, V. P. (2005). Provincialnost kulturnykh prostranstv nyneshnej Rossii [Provinciality of the cultural spaces of today's Russia]. In *Kultura rossijskoj provincii: proshloe, nastojashhee, budushhee: materialy kruglogo stola*. (P. 7). Saint Petersburg. (In Russian)
- Braudel, F. (2007). Materialnaja civilizacija, jekonomika i kapitalizm [Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalism]. In *Vremja mira*. (Vol. 1). Moscow: Mir. (In Russian)
- Charkina, T. (2016). Hlobalizatsiia: sotsialno-kulturnyi aspekt [Globalization: socio-cultural aspect]. In *Versus*, 1, 36–41. (In Ukrainian)
- Cheshkov, M. (2001). Vzglyad na globalizaciju cherez prizmu globalistiki [A look at globalization through the prism of globalism]. In *Mirovaja jekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*, 2, 52–60. (In Russian)
- Deleuze, G. (1998). *Logika smysla [Logique du sens]*. Moscow: Raritet; Ekaterinburg: Delovaja kniga. (In Russian)
- Derrida, J. (1999). Che cos'è la poesia [Che cos'è la poesia]. In *Logos*, 6, 140–143. (In Russian)
- Domanska, O. (2014). Kontseptualne osmyslennia poniattia “natsionalnyi kulturnyi prostir” [Conceptual understanding of the concept of national cultural space]. In *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho universytetu. Filosofija*. (Issue 706/707, P. 113–117). (In Ukrainian)
- Evstigneev, V. R. (1997). *Valjutno-finansovaja integracija v ES i SNG: Sravnitelnyj semanticheskij analiz [Monetary and Financial Integration in the EU and the CIS: A Comparative Semantic Analysis]*. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian)
- Fabryka, A. A. (2015). Kulturna hlobalizatsiia na suchasnomu etapi: kliuchovi tendentsii [Cultural globalization at the present stage: key trends]. In *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatyinoho universytetu. Filosofija. Kulturolohiia*. (Issue № 2, P. 130–134). (In Ukrainian)

- Fedotova, N. V. (2013). Hlobalnyi svit — hlobalna kultura [The global world is a global culture]. In *Aktualni problemy istorii, teorii ta praktyky khudozhnoi kultury: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. (Issue 30, P. 46–51). Ministerstvo kultury i turizmu Ukrainy, Natsionalna akademiia kerivnykh kadrov kultury i mystetstv. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Fedotova, V. G. (1997). *Modernizacija «drugoj» Evropy [Modernization of the "other" Europe]*. Moscow: Institut filosofii Rossijskoj akademii nauk. (In Russian)
- Fedotova, V. G. (2002). Neklassicheskie modernizacii i alternativy modernizacionnoj teorii [Non-classical modernization and alternatives to modernization theory]. In *Voprosy filosofii*, 12, 3–21. (In Russian)
- Filippov, A. F. (1997). Tennis kak osnovopolozhnik nemeckoj sociologii [Tönnies as the founder of German sociology]. *Istorija teoreticheskoj sociologii*. (Vol. 1, P. 340–350). Moscow. (In Russian)
- Gurko, E. (1999). *Teksty de-konstrukcii. Zhak Derrida. Difference [De-construction texts. Jacques Derrida. Difference]*. Tomsk. (In Russian)
- Husserl, E. (1994). Fenomenologija vnutrennego soznaniia vremeni [The Phenomenology of the Internal Time-Consciousness] (Vol. 1). In *Sobranie sochinenij*. Moscow: Gnozis. (In Russian)
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Fenomenologija i transcendentnaja filosofija cennosti [Phenomenology and Transcendental Philosophy of Value]*. Kyiv: Cartel. (In Russian)
- Hrytsenko, O. A. (2017). Teoretychne osmyslennia kulturnoho prostoru: poperedni pidsumky ta prahmatychni vysnovky shchodo natsionalnoho kulturnoho prostoru Ukrainy [Theoretical understanding of the cultural space: preliminary results and pragmatic conclusions about the national cultural space of Ukraine]. In *The Culturology Ideas*. (№ 12, P. 30–55). Natsionalna akademiia mystetstv Ukrainy, Instytut kulturolohii. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Hrytsenko, O. A. (2019). Modeli kulturnoho prostoru ta problema identychnosti yoho elementiv [Models of cultural space and the problem of identity of its elements]. In *The Culturology Ideas*. (Issue № 15, P. 66–82). Natsionalna akademiia mystetstv Ukrainy, Instytut kulturolohii. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Ikonnikova, S. M. (1977). Arhitektonika kulturnogo prostranstva [The architectonics of the cultural space]. In *Filosofija kultury, Materialy 1-go Vserossijskogo filosofskogo kongressa*. (P. 38–42). Saint Petersburg. (In Russian)
- Ikonnikova, S. M. (1995). Kulturologija v sisteme gumanitarnykh nauk: mezhdisciplinarnye vzaimosvjazi [Cultural Studies in the Humanities: Interdisciplinary Relationships]. In *Gumanitarij*, 1, 73–83. Saint Petersburg. (In Russian)
- Inozemcev, V. L. (2000). Priblizhenie katastrofy [Approaching disaster]. In *Svobodnaja mysl — HHI*, 12, 78–88. (In Russian)
- Ivanova, K. A. (2010). Kulturni zminy v konteksti hlobalizatsii [Cultural change in the context of globalization]. In *Praktychna filosofija*, 4, 26–31. (In Ukrainian)
- Jantsch, E. (1989). *Prognozirovanie nauchno-tehnicheskogo progressa [Technological forecasting in perspective]*. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian)
- Jaspers, K. (2000). *Vsemirnaja istorija filosofii. Vvedenie [World History of Philosophy. Introduction]*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka. (In Russian)
- Eko, U. (1998). *Otsutstvujushhaja struktura. Vvedenie v semiologiju [La struttura assente. Introuzione alla ricerca semiologica]*. Saint Petersburg: Petropolis. (In Russian)
- Kahan, M. S. (1995). *Filosofija kultury. Stanovlenie i razvitie [Philosophy of culture. Formation and development]*. Saint Petersburg. (In Russian)
- Kliueva, E. A. (2015). Istoriografija kulturnogo prostranstva [Historiography of the cultural space]. In *Voprosy kulturologii*, 1, 35–39. (In Russian)
- Kliuhina, A. I. (2010). Kultura i obrazovanie v jepohu globalizacii [Culture and education in the era of globalization]. In *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kultury i iskusstv*, 4, 40–44. (In Russian)
- Klochko, V. P. (2015). Hlobalizatsiia yak faktor formuvannia suchasnoho kulturnoho prostoru v Ukraini [Globalization as a factor in the formation of modern cultural space in Ukraine]. *Kultura i suchasnist*, 2, 23–29. (In Ukrainian)
- Kochetov, E. G. (1999). *Geojekonomika (Osvoenie mirovogo jekonomicheskogo prostranstva) [Geoeconomics (Development of the world economic space)]*. Moscow: Mir. (In Russian)
- Kochetov, E. G. (2000). Globalnyj mir: problemy ego postizhenija i vyhoda na novuju model [The global world: problems of comprehending it and entering a new model]. In *Obshhestvo i jekonomika*, 11/12, 19–30. (In Russian)
- Kolesnikov, A. S. (2003). Logika i metodologija filosofskoj komparativistiki [Logic and methodology of philosophical comparative studies]. L. A. Verbickaja, V. V. Vasileva, V. V. Kozlovskij, & N. G. Skvorcov (Eds.). In *Rabochie tetradi po komparativistike*. Issue 8: Sravnitelnye issledovanija v politicheskikh i socialnykh naukah. (P. 16). Saint Petersburg: Sociologicheskoe obshhestvo imeni M. M. Kovalevskogo. (In Russian)
- Korzhev, O. Yu. (2014). Transformatsiia kultury v epokhu hlobalizatsii [Transformation of culture in the era of globalization]. In *Kultura Ukrainy: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. (Issue 44, P. 51–59). Ministerstvo kultury Ukrainy, Kharkivska derzhavna akademiia kultury. Kharkiv. (In Ukrainian)

- Kravchenko, O. V. (2014). Kontseptualni modeli identyfikatsii natsionalnoho kulturnoho prostoru Ukrainy v suchasnomu publichnomu intelektualnomu dyskursi [Conceptual models of identification of the national cultural space of Ukraine in modern public intellectual discourse]. In *Kultura Ukrainy*, 47, 13–25. (In Ukrainian)
- Lotman, Yu. M. (1996). *Vnutri mysljashhiv mirov: Chelovek — tekst — semiosfera — istorija* [Inside the thinking worlds: Man — text — semiosphere — history]. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury. (In Russian)
- Luhutsenko, T. V. (2014). Kulturnyi prostir i prostir kultur u suchasnoi informatsiinoi tsyvilizatsii [Cultural space and the space of cultures in modern information civilization]. In *Hileia: naukovyi visnyk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats.* (Issue 82, P. 273–279). Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Melnyk, V. V. (2014). Stanovlennia i rozvytok kulturnoi polityky v umovakh hlobalizatsii [Formation and development of cultural policy in the context of globalization]. In *Humanitarnyi visnyk Zaporizkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii*, 58, 148–156. (In Ukrainian)
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1996). *V zashchitu filosofii* [Éloge de la philosophie]. Moscow. (In Russian)
- Moles, A. (2008). *Sociodinamika kultury* [Sociodynamique de la culture]. Moscow: URSS, LKI. (In Russian)
- Nalchajyan, A. (2004). *Jetnogenez i assimiljacija. Psihologicheskie aspekty* [Ethnogenesis and assimilation. Psychological aspects]. Moscow: Kogito-Centr. (In Russian)
- Neklessa, A. (2004). Globalnaja transformacija: sushhnost, genezis, prognoz [Global transformation: essence, genesis, forecast]. In *Mirovaja jekonomika i mezhduнародnye otnoshenija*, 1, 116–123. (In Russian)
- Ogorodnik, S. Ja. (Ed.). (1990). *Finansovo-kreditnye metody povyshenija jeffektivnosti promyshlennogo proizvodstva* [Financial and credit methods of increasing the efficiency of industrial production]. Kyiv: Tehnika. (In Russian)
- Orientalia et Classica. Aspekty komparativistiki: Trudy Instituta vostochnykh kultur i antichnosti (Issue 6)* [Orientalia et Classica. Aspects of comparative studies (Issue 6)]. (2005). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta. (In Russian)
- Pryhozhyn, I. (1989). Pereotkrytie vremeni [Rediscovery of time]. In *Voprosy filosofii*, 8, 4–19. (In Russian)
- Pryhozhyn, I. R. (2002). Kost eshhe ne broshena. Poslanie budushhim pokolenijam [The die has not been rolled yet. Message to future generations]. In *Nauka i zhizn*, 11, 4–9. (In Russian)
- Pyliavets, L. S. (2013a). Kultura v rakursi hlobalizatsii: aktualnist doslidzhennia [Culture in the perspective of globalization: the relevance of the study]. In *Aktualni problemy istorii, teorii ta praktyky khudozhnoi kultury: zbirnyk naukovykh prats.* (Issue 31, P. 182–186). Ministerstvo kultury i turyzmu Ukrainy, Natsionalna akademiia kerivnykh kadriv kultury i mystetstv. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Pyliavets, L. S. (2013b). Sutnist i naslidky hlobalizatsii: kontury kulturolohichnoho pidkhodu [The essence and consequences of globalization: the contours of the culturological approach]. In *Kultura i suchasnist*, 2, 203–208. (In Ukrainian)
- Robertson, R., & Khondker, H. (2001). Diskursy globalizatsii: predvaritelnye razmyshlenija [Discourses of Globalization: Preliminary Considerations]. In *Rossija i sovremennyj mir*, 1(30), 215–218. (In Russian)
- Rostow, W. W. (2003). *Concept and Controversy: Sixty Years of Taking Ideas to Market*. Ostin: University of Texas Press.
- Sheiko, V. M. (2001). *Kultura. Tsyvilizatsiia. Hlobalizatsiia (kinets XX–pochatok XXI st.)* [Culture. Civilization. Globalization (end of the XIX — beginning of the XXI century)]: monohrafiia (in 2 vol.). Kharkiv: Osnova. (In Ukrainian)
- Sheiko, V. M., & Bohutskyi, Yu. P. (2005). *Formuvannia osnov kulturolohii v dobu tsyvilizatsiinoi hlobalizatsii (druha polovyna XX — pochatok XXI st.)* [Formation of the foundations of culturology in the age of civilizational globalization (the second half of the XIX — beginning of the XXI century)]: monohrafiia. Kyiv: Heneza. (In Ukrainian)
- Shmelova, T. V. (2019). Vplyv hlobalizatsii na kulturu ta osvitu [The impact of globalization on culture and education]. In *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Seriia: Pedahohika. Sotsialna robota.* (Issue 1, P. 209–213). Uzhhorod. (In Ukrainian)
- Spengler, O. (1993). Gestalt i dejstvitel'nost [Gestalt und Wirklichkeit]. (Vol. 1). In *Zakat Evropy. Ocherki morfologii mirovoj istorii*. Moscow: Mysl. (In Russian)
- Shtefan, I. P. (2010). Teoretyko-metodolohichni problemy doslidzhennia hlobalnoi kultury [Theoretical and methodological problems of global culture research]. In *Visnyk Derzhavnoi akademii kerivnykh kadriv kultury i mystetstv*, 3, 46–51. (In Ukrainian)
- Strutynskyi, B. D. (2019). Informatsiino-kulturna hlobalizatsiia yak fenomen suchasnoho stanu tsyvilizatsiinykh transformatsii [Information and cultural globalization as a phenomenon of the current state of civilizational transformations]. In *Mystetstvovznachchi zapysky: zbirnyk naukovykh prats.* (Issue 35, P. 66–71). Ministerstvo kultury Ukrainy, Natsionalna akademiia kerivnykh kadriv kultury i mystetstv. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/181534>
- Sudakova, V. M. (2018). Kulturnyi prostir ta osoblyvosti yoho vidtvorennia v umovakh hlobalizatsii [Cultural space and

- features of its reproduction in the conditions of globalization]. In *The Culturology Ideas*, 13, 184–193. (In Ukrainian)
- Tönnies, F. (1998). Obshhnost i obshhestvo [Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft]. In *Sociologicheskij zhurnal*, 3/4, 207–215. (In Russian)
- Toynbee, A. J. (1996). *Civilizacija pered sudom istorii: sbornik [A study of history. Civilization on trial. The world and the West]*. Moscow: Izdatelskaja grupa «Progress» — «Kultura»; Saint Petersburg: Juventa. (In Russian)
- Wallerstein, I. (1999). *Globalizacija kak perehodnaja jepoha? Vzgljad na dolgosrochnoe razvitie mir-sistemy [Globalization or the Age of Transition?: A Long-Term View of the Trajectory of the World-System]*. (P. 127). Moscow: Krasnye holmy. (In Russian)
- Wallerstein, I. (2001). *Analiz mirovyh sistem i situacija v sovremenном mire [Analysis of world systems and the situation in the modern world]*. (P. 208–226). Saint Petersburg: Universitetskaja kniga. (In Russian)
- Zakharchenko, V. (2002). Suspilno-ekonomichni transformatsii i «Osovyi chas» promyslovoho rozvytku [Socio-economic transformations and "Axial time" of industrial development]. In *Visnyk NAN Ukrainy*, 11, 17–28. (In Ukrainian)

Література:

- Ареф'єва, А. Ю. (2016). Глобалізація культури як предмет філософського аналізу. *Гілея: науковий вісник: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 107 (№4), с. 272–275). Київ: Видавництво «Гілея».
- Ареф'єва, А. Ю. (2017). Глобалізаційні процеси в культурі сучасності. *Гілея: науковий вісник: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 116 (1), с. 185–189). Київ: Видавництво «Гілея».
- Аттали, Ж. (1993). *На пороге нового тысячелетия*. Москва: Международные отношения.
- Бабкін, В. О. (2018). Глобалізаційні культурні процеси та їх вплив на функціональне призначення національної культури. *Мистецтвознавчі записки: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 33, 55–62). Київ.
- Бодрийяр, Ж. (2000). *В тени молчаливого большинства, или Конец социального*. Екатеринбург: Издательство Уральского университета.
- Большаков, В. П. (2000). *Своеобразие культуры Нового времени в ее развитии от Ренессанса до наших дней*. Великий Новгород: Новгородский государственный университет.
- Большаков, В. П. (2005). Провинциальность культурных пространств нынешней России. *Культура российской провинции: прошлое, настоящее, будущее: материалы круглого стола*. (С. 7). Санкт-Петербург.
- Бродель, Ф. (2007). Материальная цивилизация, экономика и капитализм. *Время мира*. (Т. 1). Москва: Мир.
- Валлерстайн, И. (1999). *Глобализация как переходная эпоха? Взгляд на долгосрочное развитие мир-системы*. (С. 127). Москва: Красные холмы.
- Валлерстайн, И. (2001). *Анализ мировых систем и ситуация в современном мире*. (С. 208–226). Санкт-Петербург: Университетская книга.
- Гриценко, О. А. (2017). Теоретичне осмислення культурного простору: попередні підсумки та прагматичні висновки щодо національного культурного простору України. *Культурологічна думка: щорічник наукових праць*. (№ 12, С. 30–55). Національна академія мистецтв України, Інститут культурології. Київ.
- Гриценко, О. А. (2019). Моделі культурного простору та проблема ідентичності його елементів. *Культурологічна думка: збірник наукових праць*. (Випуск № 15, С. 66–82). Національна академія мистецтв України, Інститут культурології. Київ.
- Гурко, Е. (1999). *Тексты de-конструкции. Жак Деррида. Difference*. Томск.
- Гуссерль, Э. (1994). Феноменология внутреннего сознания времени (Т. 1). *Собрание сочинений*. Москва: Гнозис.
- Делез, Ж. (1998). *Логика смысла*. Москва: Раритет; Екатеринбург: Деловая книга.
- Деррида, Ж. (1999). *Che cos'è la poesia. Логос*, 6, 140–143.
- Доманська, О. (2014). Концептуальне осмислення поняття «національний культурний простір». *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету. Філософія*. (Вип. 706/707, С. 113–117).
- Евстигнеев, В. Р. (1997). *Валютно-финансовая интеграция в ЕС и СНГ: Сравнительный семантический анализ*. Москва: Наука.
- Захарченко, В. (2002). Суспільно-економічні трансформації і «Осьовий час» промислового розвитку. *Вісник НАН України*, 11, 17–28.

- Иконникова, С. Н. (1977). Архитектоника культурного пространства. *Философия культуры*, Материалы 1-го Всероссийского философского конгресса. (С. 38–42). Санкт-Петербург.
- Иконникова, С. Н. (1995). Культурология в системе гуманитарных наук: междисциплинарные взаимосвязи. *Гуманитарий*, 1, 73–83. Санкт-Петербург.
- Иноземцев, В. Л. (2000). Приближение катастрофы. *Свободная мысль* — XXI, 12, 78–88.
- Иванова, К. А. (2010). Культурні зміни в контексті глобалізації. *Практична філософія*, 4, 26–31.
- Каган, М. С. (1995). *Философия культуры. Становление и развитие*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Клочко, В. П. (2015). Глобалізація як фактор формування сучасного культурного простору в Україні. *Культура і сучасність*, 2, 23–29.
- Клюева, Е. А. (2015). Историография культурного пространства. *Вопросы культурологии*, 1, 35–39.
- Клюхина, А. И. (2010). Культура и образование в эпоху глобализации. *Вестник Московского государственного университета культуры и искусств*, 4, 40–44.
- Колесников, А. С. (2003). Логика и методология философской компаративистики. Л. А. Вербицкая, В. В. Васильева, В. В. Козловский, & Н. Г. Скворцов (Ред.). *Рабочие тетради по компаративистике*. Вып. 8: Сравнительные исследования в политических и социальных науках. (С. 16). Санкт-Петербург: Социологическое общество имени М. М. Ковалевского.
- Коржов, О. Ю. (2014). Трансформація культури в епоху глобалізації. *Культура України: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 44, С. 51–59). Міністерство культури України, Харківська державна академія культури. Харків.
- Кочетов, Э. Г. (1999). *Геоэкономика (Освоение мирового экономического пространства)*. Москва: Мир.
- Кочетов, Э. Г. (2000). Глобальный мир: проблемы его постижения и выхода на новую модель. *Общество и экономика*, 11/12, 19–30.
- Кравченко, О. В. (2014). Концептуальні моделі ідентифікації національного культурного простору України в сучасному публічному інтелектуальному дискурсі. *Культура України*, 47, 13–25.
- Лотман, Ю. М. (1996). *Внутри мыслящих миров: Человек — текст — семиосфера — история*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
- Луценко, Т. В. (2014). Культурний простір і простір культур у сучасній інформаційній цивілізації. *Гілея: науковий вісник: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 82, С. 273–279). Київ.
- Мельник, В. В. (2014). Становлення і розвиток культурної політики в умовах глобалізації. *Гуманітарний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії*, 58, 148–156.
- Мерло-Понти, М. (1996). *В защиту философии*. Москва.
- Моль, А. (2008). *Социодинамика культуры*. Москва: URSS, ЛКИ.
- Налчаджян, А. (2004). *Этногенез и ассимиляция. Психологические аспекты*. Москва: Когито-Центр.
- Некlessа, А. (2004). Глобальная трансформация: сущность, генезис, прогноз. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*, 1, 116–123.
- Огородник, С. Я. (Ред.). (1990). *Финансово-кредитные методы повышения эффективности промышленного производства*. Киев: Техника.
- Пилявець, Л. С. (2013а). Культура в ракурсі глобалізації: актуальність дослідження. *Актуальні проблеми історії, теорії та практики художньої культури: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 31, С. 182–186). Міністерство культури і туризму України, Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв. Київ.
- Пилявець, Л. С. (2013b). Сутність і наслідки глобалізації: контури культурологічного підходу. *Культура і сучасність*, 2, 203–208.
- Пригожин, И. (1989). Переоткрытие времени. *Вопросы философии*, 8, 4–19.
- Пригожин, И. Р. (2002). Кость еще не брошена. Послание будущим поколениям. *Наука и жизнь*, 11, 4–9.
- Робертсон, Р., & Хондкер, Х. (2001). Дискурсы глобализации: предварительные размышления. *Россия и современный мир*, 1 (30), 215–218.
- Струтинський, Б. Д. (2019). Інформаційно-культурна глобалізація як феномен сучасного стану цивілізаційних трансформацій. *Мистецтвознавчі записки: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 35, С. 66–71). Міністерство культури України, Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв. Київ. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/181534>
- Судакова, В. М. (2018). Культурний простір та особливості його відтворення в умовах глобалізації. *Культурологічна думка*, 13, 184–193.
- Теннис, Ф. (1998). Общность и общество. *Социологический журнал*, 3/4, 207–215.
- Тойнби, А. Дж. (1996). *Цивилизация перед судом истории: Сборник*. Москва: Издательская группа «Прогресс» — «Культура»; Санкт-Петербург: Ювента.
- Фабрика, А. А. (2015). Культурна глобалізація на сучасному етапі: ключові тенденції. *Вісник Національного*

- авіаційного університету. *Філософія. Культурологія*. (Випуск № 2, С. 130–134).
- Федотова, В. Г. (1997). *Модернізація «другої» Європи*. Москва: Інститут філософії Російської академії наук.
- Федотова, В. Г. (2002). Некласическіє модернізації і альтернативи модернізаційної теорії. *Вопросы философии*, 12, 3–21.
- Федотова, Н. В. (2013). Глобальний світ — глобальна культура. *Актуальні проблеми історії, теорії та практики художньої культури: збірник наукових праць*. (Вип. 30, С. 46–51). Міністерство культури і туризму України, Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв. Київ.
- Филиппов, А. Ф. (1997). Теннис как основоположник немецкой социологии. *История теоретической социологии*. (Т. 1, С. 340–350). Москва.
- Хайдеггер, М. (1996). *Феноменология и трансцендентальная философия ценности*. Киев: Cartel.
- Чаркіна, Т. (2016). Глобалізація: соціально-культурний аспект. *Versus*, 1, 36–41.
- Чешков, М. (2001). Взгляд на глобализацию через призму глобалистики. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*, 2, 52–60.
- Шейко, В. М. (2001). *Культура. Цивілізація. Глобалізація (кінець XIX -початок XXI ст.): монографія (в 2 т.)*. Харків: Основа.
- Шейко, В. М., & Богущкий, Ю. П. (2005). *Формування основ культурології в добу цивілізаційної глобалізації (друга половина XIX -початок XXI ст.)*. Монографія. Київ: Генеза.
- Шмельова, Т. В. (2019). Вплив глобалізації на культуру та освіту. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Педагогіка. Соціальна робота*. (Вип. 1, С. 209–213). Ужгород.
- Шпенглер, О. (1993). Гештальт и действительность. (Т. 1). *Закат Европы. Очерки морфологии мировой истории*. Москва: Мысль.
- Штефан, І. П. (2010). Теоретико-методологічні проблеми дослідження глобальної культури. *Вісник Державної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв*, 3, 46–51.
- Эко, У. (1998). *Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию*. Санкт-Петербург: Петрополис.
- Эшби, У. (1966). Несколько замечаний. *Общая теория систем*. Москва: Мир. С.171–178.
- Янч, Э. (1989). *Прогнозирование научно-технического прогресса*. Москва: Наука.
- Ясперс, К. (2000). *Всемирная история философии. Введение*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. (P. 37). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Orientalia et Classica: Аспекти компаративістики: Труды Института восточных культур и античности*. (2005). (Вып. 6). Москва: Издательство Российского государственного гуманитарного университета.
- Rostow, W. W. (2003). *Concept and Controversy: Sixty Years of Taking Ideas to Market*. Ostin: University of Texas Press.

Шейко Василь Миколайович

Процеси глобалізації та формування культурного простору: історіографічний аспект

Анотація. Аналізуються нагальні проблеми глобалізаційних процесів сучасної цивілізації та формування культурного простору як такого. Водночас основна увага приділяється огляду літератури та джерел, автори яких, так чи інакше, торкаються вказаної тематики, та висвітленню можливостей культурологічної методології щодо дослідження глобалізаційних трансформацій і процесів творення культурного простору сьогоденної світової спільноти.

Визначається, що наявна криза наукових методологій наполегливо ставить перед дослідниками актуальне завдання продовження пошуків нових методів і принципів вивчення процесів глобалізації та формування культурного простору в добу цивілізаційної глобалізації. Означена проблема постає ще з більшою гостротою перед такою порівняно молодого науковою галуззю, якою є культурологія. У зв'язку з цим автор приділяє значну увагу методологічним можливостям культурологічної компаративістики, зокрема — застосуванню її для висвітлення процесів зародження та еволюції культурного простору в добу цивілізаційної глобалізації. Адже саме в культурному просторі маються

наявні можливості функціонування різних культур різних епох, а культурний простір існує і проявляється як діюча система складових людської культуротворчої діяльності, поєднаної спільними фундаментальними цінностями.

Аналіз наявних джерел і літератури з проблем глобалізаційних процесів у перебігу формування культурного простору як такого свідчить, що саме методи й принципи компаративістики в межах культуротворчості етносів дає змогу подолати тенденції ізоляціонізму між різними народами та їхніми культурами, традиціями. За допомогою культурологічної компаративістики, її принципів та методів з'являється можливість вивчити генезу й показати еволюцію просторового поля культури, його змістовну складову, висвітлити процеси діалогу різних культур, формування глобалізаційної культури в межах певного культурного простору.

І, насамкінець, у статті зроблено спробу екстраполяції процесів глобалізації та формування культурного простору на матеріали розвитку культури України. Водночас основна увага приділяється взаємодії культури й економіки в останні роки розвитку незалежної України в процесі формування її культурного простору.

Ключові слова: культура, глобалізація, культурний простір, цивілізація, компаративістика, процеси глобалізаційних трансформацій, сучасна цивілізаційна спільнота, історіографія.

Шейко Василь Николаевич

Процессы глобализации и формирование культурного пространства: историографический аспект

Аннотация. Анализируются насущные проблемы глобализационных процессов современной цивилизации и формирования культурного пространства как такового. При этом основное внимание уделяется рассмотрению литературы и научных источников, авторы которых, в той или иной степени, затрагивают данную тематику, и освещению возможностей культурологической методологии исследования глобализационных трансформаций и процессов образования культурного пространства сегодняшнего мирового сообщества.

Определяется, что существующий кризис научных методологий настойчиво ставит перед исследователями актуальные задачи продолжения поиска новых методов и принципов изучения процессов глобализации и формирования культурного пространства в эпоху цивилизационной глобализации. Очерченная проблема набирает остроту для такой относительно молодой научной отрасли как культурология. В связи с этим автор уделяет значительное внимание методологическим возможностям культурологической компаративистики, непосредственно — применению ее для освещения вопросов зарождения и эволюции культурного пространства в эпоху цивилизационной глобализации. Потому что именно в культурном пространстве есть в наличии возможности функционирования разных культур разных эпох, а культурное пространство существует и проявляется как действующая система составляющих человеческой культуротворческой деятельности, соединенной совместными фундаментальными ценностями.

Анализ существующих источников и литературы по проблемам цивилизационных процессов по ходу формирования культурного пространства как такового свидетельствует, что именно методы и принципы компаративистики в пределах культуротворчества этносов дают возможность преодолеть тенденции изоляционизма между разными народами и их культурами, традициями. При помощи культурологической компаративистики, ее принципов и методов появляется возможность изучить генезис и показать эволюцию пространственного поля культуры, его содержательную составляющую, осветить процессы диалога культур, формирования глобализационной культуры в пределах конкретного культурного пространства.

И, наконец, в статье сделана попытка экстраполяции процессов глобализации и формирования культурного пространства на материалы развития культуры Украины. При этом основное внимание уделяется взаимодействию культуры и экономики в последние годы развития независимой Украины в процессе формирования ее культурного пространства.

Ключевые слова: культура, глобализация, культурное пространство, цивилизация, компаративистика, процессы глобализационных трансформаций, современное цивилизационное сообщество, историография.