

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Globalizing culture in transboundary space

To cite this article: M N Fomina and O A Borisenko 2019 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **274** 012143

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Globalizing culture in transboundary space

M N Fomina¹ and O A Borisenko^{1*}

¹ Transbaikal State University, 30 Aleksandro-Zavodskaya str., Chita 672039 Russia

E-mail: olenka_rabota@mail.ru

Abstract. This article is a philosophical reflection on the problem of transculturally, which in recent years has been raised in scientific publications in connection with the understanding of the role of culture, the dialogue of cultures in the emerging globalization space. The authors note that the comprehension of globalization processes increasingly raises the problem of transculturally, which they consider as a consequence of the development of the system “intercultural interaction – the dialogue of cultures – a political dialogue.” Dialogue contributed to the fact that transculturally, towering above state borders, forms its new space. But what is this space? The article analyzes the phenomenon of transcultural space, which, according to the authors, is formed in the context of globalization. The phenomenon of transculturally, differing from intercultural interaction and dialogue of cultures, in the context of cultural globalization is realized through such universals as: transcultural, transculturation, transcultural process; transcultural interaction; transcultural space. If the transcultural process is a phenomenon of globalization, transculturation promotes cultural identification; the transcultural process assures the perception of value regulators of global culture. In turn, authors argue that the transcultural space is an ambivalent formation in which the dialogue of cultures develops into a political dialogue; it is also an ambivalent phenomenon that indicates the intersection of intro- and extra-culture, because culture already acts as a transcultural phenomenon. The realization of transcultural in the context of transcultural space is represented as the sphere of existence of three types of cultures: intra-culture, extra-culture, and bilingual culture. If intra-culture and extra-culture reveal themselves in the context of cultural dialogue, then, as the authors suggest, bilingual culture is a reflection of political, economic, cultural, social processes and phenomena. Thus, the transcultural space, emerging from the present, forms new realities for reflection in the future. This is especially important when analyzing the globalization and regionalization of social processes (including economic trade, agricultural and food markets, transfer of technologies, etc.).

1. Introduction

In the context of globalization, each (local) culture becomes a part of the system of relations “intercultural interaction – dialogue of cultures – political dialogue”, generating a “transcultural” phenomenon. If an intercultural interaction (as a process) is accessible to all cultures, if a dialogue of cultures becomes a condition for understanding and accepting the Other Culture [16], and political dialogue acts as a consolidation of mutual (state) interests [3, p. 352], the trans-culture provides the condition for the formation of a new culture. It not only “stands” over existing cultures at a given time and in a given space, but also “absorbs” their elements. Yu. M. Reznik identified this type as “transcultural reality (going beyond culture)” [11, p. 22]. Is there a problem with transculture? One can say, there is a traditional problem, since new conditions give rise to a new process and new



phenomena. But we propose to look at this question from the other side. The problem of transculturality is that, differing from intercultural interaction and dialogue of cultures, it creates a new unique space that has its own visual parameters: one can determine the specific place and time of concentration of cultures of migration flows of specific ethnic groups on the territory of the traditional residence of another/other ethnic groups.

Globalization continued, updated, complicated (and other) the process of movement of cultures and civilizations towards each other, which was caused by the active interchange of spiritual and material values, the formation of a global culture. From the set of ideas (reflections) on the process of globalization of culture, it is possible to isolate its main indicators, taking into account the degree of their objectivity. These are the integration of ethnic cultures; information communications; the exit of economic, political, social processes and phenomena beyond national borders into the sphere of transnationality; the birth of a global culture.

2. Key Approaches

Peter Berger, an American sociologist, identified four processes of cultural globalization in 1997 [12]: the “Davos Culture” (the culture of the world business elite), which he repeated after S. Huntington; the “Faculty Club Culture” or the “international professors’ club” (community of intellectuals); the “McWorld culture,” i.e. the mass culture “McMir” (based on one standard of taste); “Evangelical Protestantism” – “Protestant Protestantism” (the spread of North American values outside the Protestant world). Later, he talks about this in the book “Multi-faceted Globalization,” which was jointly written with S. Huntington. Naturally, this is not an axiom, but P. Berger was able to systematize various emerging, developing or predictable factors and express them through these four types of cultural globalization model. This characteristic is not an alternative to the traditional understanding of culture and cultural space, since this is a new stage of perception and understanding of the process of cultural development in the context of globalization. But it is worth noting that each of the four processes has a peculiarity. They are not interconnected and not opposed to each other. Each type is independent, closed to others, develops only within itself. N. Vysotskaya [5, p. 10] thinks of them as certain channels of cultural globalization, which are developing in parallel and simultaneously. If we analyze their nature, we can distinguish what unites them. These are, as P. Berger observes, the Western (American) origin and the presence of English as the language of global communication; their internationalism and autonomy.

To this characteristic of cultural globalization, we supplement the following: the “blurring” of local and regional features – they are multifunctional; the lack of national or ethnic predestination – they are multi-ethnic; erasing individual traditional values – they are based on universal human values. In general, one can say after S. Huntington and P. Berger, they are a product of cultural globalization. But the question arises – are they only?

3. The Variety of Cultures

The difficulty is with such cultural characteristics as mentality and identification. It can be assumed that each type of global culture implies a system of relations built on the principles: “I and You are one whole”, or “I and You create We”, or “We and They”, etc. Mentality and identification do not lose their importance here, but it is they who will discover the essence of the emerging culture, which we think of as trans-culture – a culture that stands “above”, “through”, “beyond.” In various explanatory dictionaries, the concept “trans-” is interpreted as “through space” or as “located outside of something.”

We noted that globalization processes give rise to a new phenomenon – the so-called “transculture.” So, for example, E. M. Butenina [4] treats it as communication outside cultures, as a universal phenomenon. But, in our opinion, it should be borne in mind that transculture has its

derivatives: transculture, transcultural process, transcultural interaction, transcultural space, and (as introduced by Jean Poirier in the 70s) de-culture, acculturation.

As S.V. Akopov notes, [1, p. 342] the concept of “transculture” was introduced by M.N. Epstein, a professor at Emory University (Atlanta). In a number of his works, he interprets transculture as a sphere of cultural development beyond the borders of established national, racial, gender, and professional cultures; as a symbolic habitat at the borders and intersections of different cultures, which implies the diffusion of initial cultural identities as individuals cross the borders of different cultures and assimilate into them [19, 20]. At the same time, he constantly emphasizes that transculture cannot be identified with a global culture that forms the same (American) model. We do not identify these concepts, but we hold the opinion that transculture is a phenomenon of globalization.

Before analyzing this concept in the context of our research, we consider it necessary to turn to the concept of “inculturation”, not only because they are consonant. Quite often it is found in many works, which are more pedagogical and psychological ones, “in conjunction” with the concept of “socialization,” which is, of course, explained by their nature. If inculturation (as communion, accretion, entry, etc.) is the rooting of a person in a culture (specifically given), the formation and formation of a “person of culture”, then transculturation already implies rooting in cultures. Perhaps it is from here that the countdown begins for such notions as “man of the world”, “citizen of the world”.

Even F. Ortiz, as the founder of the theory of transculturation, notes that this is a process of loss and acquisition (de-culture and non-culture) of cultures [10]. V. N. Badmaev (after M. V. Tlostanova) notes that being at the intersection of cultures, a person belonging to all cultures does not belong to more than one [2]. Perhaps the most systematic study of transculture is presented today in the works of M. V. Tlostanova, which forms its model [13, pp. 8-3, 51], analyzes it as a process and as a new vision of the world [14, 7], explains as a special type of borderline thinking and consciousness [13, pp. 12-4, 147]. But how accidental is the fact that cultural memory is “lost” in this system? Is it possible to take into account its “presence” when it comes to borderline consciousness or that one culture is lost (you cannot lose what you don’t have)? Does it not provide cultural identification when a person is on the verge of accepting / rejecting cultures?

Appealing to the comprehension of the transcultural process allows to consider it through the prism of the formation of a global culture, which makes it possible to comprehend it as a logical transition from traditional cultures to transculture and as the possibility of transcultural interaction, which provides a person with the ability to simultaneously be in different cultures. In turn, transcultural interaction contributes to the fact that, as noted by V.M. Mezhuyev, “in the course of cultural globalization, national symbols become an element of free communication of people on a transnational scale” [9, p. 71]. But this is possible, as we assume, under one condition – the presence of a transcultural space.

Some researchers perceive the transcultural space as a single space in the context of globalization [17, p. 26]. We comprehend it in view of the fact that it has its dominant characteristics. This is the space of interethnic interaction, in which traditional and everyday cultures of different ethnic groups intersect [8, p. 108]; this is the space where the culture of one or several ethnic groups is the “receiving party” for others. This space is a consequence of the influence of both positive and negative external economic, political, social factors.

In the context of the above, there is a need to dwell on the study of A.S. Kim, dedicated to the problems of transnational diasporas [7]. The following positions of the author attracted our attention: “... having arisen as a result of migration, diaspora, developing and strengthening, they are transformed into active subjects of socio-economic and political relations, trying to form their own social space” [7, pp. 99-100]. “Diasporas are not only the product of changes in national-territorial spaces, but also one of its factors” [7, p. 105]. “Diaspora transnationality includes ... transculturality (being in different cultural communities at the same time; intercultural communication)” [7, p. 106]. Positions A. S. Kim and the authors of this article are consonant in one thing: a globalizing culture creates an entirely new precedent, the study of which in the present will determine its future development.

4. Conclusions

Thus, we consider it, first of all, as an ambivalent education, in which the dialogue of cultures (the dialogue between “own” and “alien”) is the historical “ground” for political dialogue, providing conditions for the simultaneous coexistence of polycultures second, as an ambivalent phenomenon, indicating that the extraculture, intersecting (as “their own” and “alien”) form a bifurcation point, since culture, as a system forms a new order transforming into a transculture, the signs of which is bilingualism. Considering that in the modern world, according to A. A. Guseynov, it is already difficult to talk about a “pure” culture, then it can be assumed that this is where the billing culture originates. If this is only an assumption, what grounds can there be for this? Does this statement disagree with the opinion of A.A. Guseynov, according to which the dialogue of cultures is not a universal synthesis, since cultures do not add up and are not subtracted, being equal to themselves. In this situation, in our opinion, this is not about a merger, but about the formation on the basis of intra- and extracultures of a new culture – transculture, which combines their elements (values, ethical and aesthetic attitudes, cultural orientations, etc.). And here, perhaps, is the factor that A. N. Chumakov noted, that people are in different cultural and civilizational systems [18, pp. 36-37]. And if to continue this thought, one can see that it is the transcultural space that allows not only to preserve, but to “sharpen” the self-sufficiency of both cultural and civilizational identity. If we accept this thought, then M. Tlostanova’s multiple identity will become clear. Then it is worth noting that in the transcultural space, there is the mechanism of dialogue provides intra- and extracultures with their openness and accessibility, since there are no borders between them.

The emerging transcultural space (as a space of global integration), in our opinion, is a sphere of simultaneous coexistence of three types of cultures in the context of globalization: intraculture adapts to new conditions (as a culture of “receiving” cultural space); extraculture is a factor in the emergence of a new culture (in the sphere of the cultural space of intra-culture, preserving or transforming its traditional values, forming or transforming “introduced” values); the nascent (which we risk to name) is a bilingual culture, as it appears not so much at the junction of several languages, but as cultures. Bilingual culture is neither intercultural nor extraculture. This is the culture of the polylogue, which reflects political, economic, social, cultural (and so on) issues in the relationship of ethnic groups in a particular transcultural space, the design process of which takes a fairly long period of time. How does this process end? One can only speculate about this, since the reality has not yet “presented” to us a “visual” sample. Here you cannot agree with this opinion, as there are historical examples, not to mention the “melting pot” – the United States or the Russian settlements in northeastern China. But this is also a debatable example.

References

- [1] Akopov S V 2012 Constructing Russian Identity: Principles of Transculturality and Critical Universality *Scientific Yearbook of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences* **12**
- [2] Badmaev V N 2012 The spiritual culture of the Kalmyk ethnos: to the methodology of the issue *Bulletin of the Maikop State Technological University* **2**
- [3] Borisenko O A 2010 SCO - a new model of political dialogue *In the World of Scientific Discoveries* **6-9**
- [4] Butenina E M 2010 Transcultural search for roots in Mexican-American and Native American literature *Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice* **1-1**
- [5] Vysotskaya N 2004 Transculture or culture in a trance? *Questions of Literature* **2**
- [6] Guseinov A A 2005 How is the dialogue of cultures possible? In *Dialogue of Civilizations. Agenda* Ed V I Tolstykh (Moscow, Russia:) pp 47-66
- [7] Kim A S 2006 Transnational diasporas: interdisciplinary analysis *Spatial Economics* **1**

- [8] Koshelev M I and Fomina M N 2012 Spatial and Temporal Characteristics of the Nature of the Dialogue of Regional Cultures *Bulletin of Trans-Baikal State University* **4**(83)
- [9] Mezhuiev V M 2011 Dialogue as a way of intercultural communication in the modern world *Questions of Philosophy* **9**
- [10] Ortiz F 1995 *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Durham and London (http://www.personal.psu.edu/users/s/a/sam50/readings521/ORTIZ_Counter-Engl.pdf)
- [11] Reznik Yu M 2012 The border of the human (epistemological perspective) *Questions of Social Theory* **6**
- [12] Berger Peter L *Four Faces of Global Culture* (<http://courses.arch.vt.edu/courses/wdunaway/gia5524/berger97.pdf>)
- [13] Tlostanova M V 2010 Multiple Identity in the Context of Transculturation *Personality. Culture Society* **12**(4) pp 142-156
- [14] Tlostanova M V 2012 Transcultural studies. Demarcation of the new disciplinary field and the future of humanities (p 95) *Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Philosophy* **1** pp 91-102
- [15] Fomina M N and Borisenko O A 2016 Globalizing culture as the essence and the phenomenon of globalization *The collection includes the 5th The International Conference «Social Science and Humanity» by in London, 23-29 September 2016 Social Science and Humanity* **3** (London, UK: SCIEURO) pp 294-304
- [16] Fomina M N 2003 Towards a multi-ethnic space: vectors of the dialogue of cultures *Personality. Culture Society* **5**(1-2)
- [17] Khlysheva E A 2009 The phenomenon of globalization in the transcultural space of the modern world *News of the Volgograd State University* **8**
- [18] Chumakov A N 2013 Cultural and civilizational dialogue as a way to solve problems in the modern world *Questions of Philosophy* **1** pp 35-42
- [19] Epstein M N 2007 Transculture and transcendence Only unique globally: Personality and Control *Culture and Education* (SPb, Russia)
- [20] Epstein M N *Transculture: between globalism and multiculturalism* Projective Dictionary of Philosophy New concepts and terms number 24 (<http://www.topos.ru/article/2976>)
- [21] Epstein M N 2002 *Transculture* Projective Philosophical Dictionary International Department (UNESCO) on philosophy and ethics (<http://terme.ru/dictionary/951>)