

Interrelation between cultural studies and philosophical knowledge

Interrelación entre los estudios culturales y el conocimiento filosófico

Alexander P. TSILINKO ¹, Oksana S. LAVRENTJEVA, Irina S. KAZAKOVA, Nadezhda N. ILLARIONOVA, Oleg V. KOLNOSHENKO

Received: 09/03/2017 • Approved: 15/04/2017

Content

1. Introduction
 2. Methods
 3. Results
 4. Discussion
 5. Conclusion
- References

ABSTRACT:

Major stages of establishment of the philosophical thought about culture in the context of contemporary problems of the cultural development of societies and civilizations are examined. The current problems of philosophical studies of culture are highlighted. A critical analysis of the current trends in the philosophy of culture, which are destructive for cultural studies, is conducted. The role of the philosophical knowledge in understanding of cultural processes is analyzed. The history of the philosophy development as one of the resources of cultural studies is observed. An anthropological approach in examining the interrelation between philosophical and cultural studies is developed. Impact of studying the phenomenon of culture on the development of philosophical knowledge is also examined. The significant role of the modern world outlook in the development of cultural studies as an independent science is highlighted. The impact of the problem of combining religious and rational cognition of the world in the development of cultural problems is studied in particular. Future trends of the philosophical study of culture are outlined.

Key words: culture, philosophy, civilization, society,

RESUMEN:

Se examinan las principales etapas del establecimiento del pensamiento filosófico sobre la cultura en el contexto de los problemas contemporáneos del desarrollo cultural de las sociedades y las civilizaciones. Se resaltan los problemas actuales de los estudios filosóficos de la cultura. Se realiza un análisis crítico de las tendencias actuales de la filosofía de la cultura, que son destructivas para los estudios culturales. Se analiza el papel del conocimiento filosófico en la comprensión de los procesos culturales. Se observa la historia del desarrollo de la filosofía como uno de los recursos de los estudios culturales. Se desarrolla un enfoque antropológico al examinar la interrelación entre los estudios filosóficos y culturales. También se examina el impacto del estudio del fenómeno de la cultura en el desarrollo del conocimiento filosófico. Se destaca el papel significativo de la perspectiva del mundo moderno en el desarrollo de los estudios culturales como ciencia independiente. En particular, se estudia el impacto del problema de combinar la cognición religiosa y racional del mundo en el desarrollo de los problemas culturales. Se esbozan las tendencias futuras del estudio filosófico de la cultura.

1. Introduction

Contemporary researchers point out that cultural studies as a science are a result of the intercrossing of various sciences: "history, philosophy, pedagogy, ethics, sociology, ethnography, anthropology, social psychology, aesthetics, art studies, etc." (Cultural studies, 2012, p. 37).

Philosophy takes a special place among these branches of science and provides a general understanding of culture in its integrity and diversity. It is characteristic that American cultural studies scholars Alfred Kroeber and Clyde analyzed the definitions of culture from 1920 to 1950 and recorded 157 definitions of culture. At present, one may talk of hundreds of its definitions. An urgent need for a generalized vision of culture arose, which determined the increased interest of many cultural studies scholars in the philosophical approach to the study of culture. The actualization of interrelation between culture and philosophy led to the establishment of a special branch of science – the philosophy of culture. This allowed the researchers of culture to largely withdraw from descriptiveness in the study of cultural phenomena and move to a new level of generalization – the study of common problems of culture and the universal laws of its existence and development. In this regard, the philosophy of culture can be considered as a general methodological basis in the study of particular cultural phenomena.

Study of the culture of meanings of cultural processes and phenomena and understanding of the importance of culture for human existence, role of the latter in culture and ultimate goals of culture by the philosophy are no less important. It is important to note that the philosophical study of culture assumes not just a supertemporal, generalized view of culture, but also a study of the historical changes in the cultural processes and identification of general laws of the development of culture and its functions in society and community in them. Let's see how the philosophical understanding of culture has developed in the history of its study.

2. Methods

The initial understanding of the origin of the word "culture" (cultura) is known well – it has such meanings as "process," "cultivate," "breed," "dwell," "guard." It must be noted that these interpretations were originally used in regard to agricultural cultivation and farming. However, this "technologicalism" in the understanding of culture with its philosophical understanding was supplemented by a moral and philosophical interpretation, starting from Cicero. This notionalist suggested to consider cultivating not only the soil, but also the human soul. As such, the study of culture has received a moral dimension from the standpoint of philosophical ethics (Theory of culture, 2010).

Combination of technological and moral interpretations of culture in its philosophical understanding allowed to use the concept of "culture" in the most diverse areas of human practice and activity: in the education setting, in spiritual practice, in politics, production activities, etc. The philosophical understanding of the basic characteristics of the phenomenon of a human as "Homo sapiens" was concurrently realized in a new way, with a corresponding "eternal" anthropologically significant range of problems (problems of moral values in human life, symbolic forms of human activity, human freedom, humanism, etc.).

The first precondition for distinguishing culture as a special object of philosophical understanding was the works of Plato, who is known as a founder of idealistic philosophy. His teaching on "eidos", work with concepts as conditions of "proper" thinking, discovery of the phenomenon of "platonic" love combined with a religious view of the world later allowed to form the "ontology" of culture as a field for its independent exploration (Plato, 2009).

It is widely accepted that culture as an object of study was "factored out" of the religious

picture of the world with the advent of the Christian philosophy of the Middle Ages. In fact, the situation appeared not so unambiguous. In the works of A. Gurevich, an outstanding researcher of the Middle Ages, the influence of Christianity on the everyday way of life of the population in its cultural and symbolic forms (in rituals, in productive life, in leisure, etc.) was particularly studied, which refutes the widespread opinion about the predominant isolation of the Christian life in this historical period within the church and among its clergy. Moreover, the cultural codes of the Christian world view in the Middle Ages laid the foundation for the establishment of Western European culture and civilization (Gurevich, 2007).

For the most part, a view of culture as something "artificial", opposed to the world of "nature", has gradually established under the influence of the Christian philosophy of the Middle Ages. It is asserted in the philosophy of culture that such confrontation was dominant from the XVII century until late XIX century for philosophers of various directions and schools.

The opposition of "culture" to "nature" to a certain extent remains relevant even in our time, if the social nature of culture is explored, with its norms, patterns, regulations, as well as the role of a human as a subject and object of culture that exists in the world of "artificial", forming a new symbolic (semiosis of culture) and social reality.

The opposition of "culture-civilization" remains equally important for the philosophical understanding of culture. This opposition has been treated differently in the history of culture. In France, the culture was actually identified with civilization since the Enlightenment. The civilization was regarded as a system of legal, moral norms, as a development of science, production and the triumph of Reason (H. Mirabeau, D. Diderot, J.D. Alemnber).

In Germany, which overcame its feudal fragmentation, culture was assessed as an opportunity to form and integrate the German nation, expressing the "national spirit" and national identity (Hegel, 1977).

The opposition "culture-civilization" has been preserved in many studies of the XXth century. In the opinion of many researchers, culture confronts a soulless, technocratic civilization, being a space of spiritual freedom and ideal values (O. Spengler, L. Klages, H. von Keyserlingk).

At the same time, the positive role of civilization as a factor in preserving the unity of all mankind in the diversity of cultures ("unity in diversity") was also recognized. A triad "nature-culture-civilization", more productive for researching the culture, emerged instead of the former opposition "culture-nature".

3. Results

In accordance with this approach, major stages in the philosophical study of culture were identified. Actual full-fledged philosophical study of culture emerges at the end of the 19th century, and the entire 20th century was marked with intensive studies of culture by the representatives of a wide range of branches of science, which made the integrated philosophical understanding of culture especially popular (Shchedrovitsky, 1995, Shcherbakova, 2014; Anufrieva et al., 2015).

It must be noted that the phenomenon of culture also appeared very fruitful for philosophy as a way to integrate the humanities and social sciences, where culture was now viewed as perfect benchmarks and regulators for the combination of knowledge about society and man.

At the same time, the cultural context of philosophical papers also becomes central in the XXth century – the peculiarities of philosophical world view depend on the affiliation of a certain philosopher with the corresponding culture and cultural tradition. In its turn, culture also "learns" itself through its philosophical understanding.

The criticism of the emerging "Eurocentrism" in the culture studies in the XXth century led to actualization of the range of philosophical problems of studying cultures that are not part of the traditional range of culture of the European peoples. The dominant "European-centered" view of various cultures was recognized as unfounded as the refusal to use any single system of

evaluation and cognitive criteria while studying various cultures. This led to emergence of the philosophical problems of intercultural communication, which became one of the priorities in the study of culture (Gadamer, 1988).

A more universal opposition, "I" –"Other", emerges on this basis, which assumes going beyond the boundaries of "I" (and "my" culture, accordingly), though not through "dissolving" oneself into the "Other", but rather due to the complex diverse interrelations between members of this opposition as the foundation of the entire social life and cultural evolution of mankind (C. Lévi-Strauss, M. Merleau-Ponty). But since the interrelations between "one's" and "other's" culture are diverse, various philosophical concepts of culture emerge, which lock a certain nature of these interrelations.

It is common practice to single out the classical (late 19th century) and non-classical (20th century) stages of cultural research in philosophy. The classical stage of understanding and, accordingly, studying of culture is connected with the allocation of humanistic principles in it, based on the idea of good, beauty and truth, one way or another. In this case, culture confronts chaos, entropy and disharmony in human being and society.

Meanwhile, along with the search for cultural universals, a historical approach to culture is implemented in the above aspect, where various general humanistic principles, ideal norms and values develop with varying success. Historicism in the study of culture is based on the emerging philosophy of history that explores general laws in certain historical events and phenomena. A human in culture is regarded as a rational subject able to create his or her own destiny and life. Since culture itself is the product of rational human activity, philosophy seeks for the "ends" and "beginnings" of human existence in the area of culture.

At the same time, the classical period in the philosophy of culture is marked by the outlined internal split between cultural researchers and figures, which implies the gap between rationalism and religiosity resulting from the "overlapping" of the ancient and medieval philosophy in the history of culture.

An important result of this gap is the philosophical reinterpretation of the human, who is no longer regarded as an "apex of creation", but rather as a subject with real weaknesses, defects and imperfections (M. Montaigne). The "selfishness of an individual" is now locked, which needs adequate education and upbringing.

This view of a human becomes dominant in European culture since the Enlightenment, where the Modernity itself originates as a political philosophy and social practice. According to the enlighteners, "Progress" and "Reason" were to become the main drivers of the civilizational development of mankind.

Cultural researchers owe to the philosophy of the Enlightenment the attention to "details" and "artifacts" accessible to the observer and researcher of various cultures. Of course, there were some restrictions in this "grounding" (for example, the impossibility to get deeper into the understanding of the "spirit" of cultures and their mental layers in observations of the "visible" facts of culture), but the focus on "encyclopedism" was a precondition for attention to the civilizational component of cultures under study.

Some exception is the German Enlightenment, where special attention was paid to the study of the history of culture as a "history of the spirit", as Germany clearly lagged behind many other European countries in its civilizational development during this period (Hegel, 1977).

Historians and philosophers of culture point out that the word "culture" was first introduced into scientific circulation in this aspect by a German jurist S. Pufendorf as an alternative to the "natural", "unforced" state of a human. Culture in this sense is a result of the purposeful human activity.

The first detailed study of the idea of culture is the paper of the outstanding German educator J.G. Herder. In his studies of culture, the scientist judged from the idea of an organic unity of culture and nature based on reasonable grounds. In his opinion, this unity is provided by the

"divine mind", and the task of mankind is to follow this plan.

At the same time, the culture of the particular peoples can follow the path outlined by the God, but in accordance with their own logic of development. Thus, J.G. Herder anticipated the subsequent studies of cultures by romantic philosophers who paid attention to the need to study the distinctiveness of cultures, where folk culture and the achievements of folklore take a special place. According to J.G. Herder, the ultimate goal of the cultural development of mankind is to achieve the universal happiness and prosperity. As such, the philosophy and history of culture should explore the way to this goal.

In general, the European Enlightenment was focused on the rational perception of culture and proposed a strategy of the positivist approach to the study of cultural phenomena, where the deep study of "mental", spiritual structures that determine the very essence of a certain culture stayed on the sidelines despite the undoubted achievements in the study of the diversity of cultures in the "visible", objectively seen, "observable" forms and artifacts.

I. Kant was the first major philosopher who placed the problems of spiritual development of a human in the center of cultural study, regardless of his or her "natural", "unforced" needs. Moreover, I. Kant saw one of the main reasons for the lack of freedom of a human in independent development in these "natural" needs. According to I. Kant, the main purpose of a human is to acquire genuine freedom based on moral choice in favor of good and service to mankind. According to the philosopher, the level of moral consciousness determines its level of culture.

Ethics and morality of a person at the level of individual consciousness are recognized as a sense of duty. The main responsibility for acquiring a moral support in this way lies with the individual. In this case, he or she acquires genuine, not imaginary freedom by allowing for a universal principle, which distinguishes man from an animal. I. Kant calls this absolute origin "goodwill." It is pure will, without external pressure. A human needs reason to control this will. I. Kant believes that pure good will cannot exist without reason, as it does not contain anything empirical.

However, reason alone is not sufficient for the positive direction of this will. Volitional efforts, i.e. forced will, are also required, which I. Kant calls an imperative. The philosopher makes an important turn in his thought here, which leads him to one of the greatest discoveries for all mankind. He formulates his famous "categorical imperative". Essentially, the best actions of a person are committed without taking into account any consequences and a given goal, if they are based on "goodwill", i.e. voluntary and therefore absolutely unselfish. This is how people gain true freedom, which at the same time is a genuine humanistic choice in relation to others.

Accordingly, the task of culture largely lies in the formation of a person's abilities, drives, aspirations for voluntary service to the entire mankind, regardless of the imposed ideas about the "proper" and the "usefulness" of this service.

With all the idealization of person's possibilities in moral self-determination, I. Kant actually suggested a new understanding of culture as an opportunity for moral and ethical self-improvement and the corresponding spiritual development of people (Kant, 1999).

The next stage in the philosophical understanding of culture is the appearance of romanticism as a special philosophy in the first half of the 19th century. The largest thinkers of romanticism were the brothers A. and F. Schlegel, J. Fichte, F. Schelling, F. Schleiermacher, F. Schiller, partly J.W. Goethe, etc.

In some ways, the researchers regard romantic philosophy as a counter-enlightenment, which declared war on the deliberativeness and rationality of the philosophy of the enlighteners. The philosophy of romanticism centers on the aesthetic and artistic reality as a special way of understanding the world and the existence of culture. A person begins to feel full personal freedom and opportunity to create the world "under the laws of beauty", far from dull pragmatics and mercantilism, in aesthetic attitude to reality.

In this way, an aesthetic ideal was proposed to the development of culture, and the category of beauty was proclaimed the most important in assessing the consistency of certain cultures and social realities. The theory of romantic irony as some reflection on the existing gap between everyday reality and the aesthetic ideal, developed by romantics, may be of particular interest to cultural researchers in this regard. This irony was a certain artistic and research tool for expert assessments of the existing socio-cultural reality and the formation of alternatives in the cultural and civilizational development of societies in the direction of overcoming materialism, pragmatism and philistinism that destroy true spirituality and creativity.

The increased attention to the study of diverse cultures and the "spirit of peoples" as unmatched and unique in the creation of culture was an important achievement of the romantics. The latter could be not only individuals, but also whole nations and ethnic groups. The principle of historicism appears in the study of cultures and their follow-up consideration as the development of human spirituality and creativity on this basis.

The subjective and pragmatist origin in culture that Goethe reflected in his Faust was fixed and developed by the romantics, which became an important feature of the subsequent development of European culture, which received the name "Faustian".

A special attention of the romantics to the world of feelings as a reflection of cultural reality, fully represented in works of art, was also important for the subsequent development of cultural studies. The emerging "panestheticism" in the study of culture socialized the study of the arts as cultural artifacts, as well as the emotional development of cultural achievements, supplementing the usual rational schemes and concepts, in terms of cultural studies.

The increased attention of the romantics to the study and interpretation of various cultural "texts" is characteristic in this regard, which led to the appearance of a new research method in the study of culture – hermeneutics. This significantly expanded the field of studies of culture, which gave fresh impetus to the development and establishment of cultural studies.

G.W. Hegel developed an extremely rationalized concept in accordance with the philosophy of objective idealism as a kind of an alternative to the romantic concept of culture. Development of the "absolute idea" in this philosophy was a demonstration of the unique possibilities of "pure thinking", able to create a spiritual reality regardless of any empirical experience. According to G.W. Hegel, the basic "unit" of mental activity is the concept, through which the world is understood. Accordingly, culture is primarily principles of thinking considered as ideal samples for the thinking individual, according to Hegel.

Contrary to the so far widespread belief that Hegel's philosophical constructions differ with reality, it can be argued that the laws of thought, which were discovered by the philosopher and called the dialectical logic, are still extremely heuristic in nature. At the same time, it cannot be denied that Hegel's achievements in the field of philosophy and logic have not yet been mastered in humanitarian studies (Hegel, 1977).

At the same time, the content-richness of cultural research would have significantly improved if it relied more on the laws of dialectical logic and the dialectical picture of the world in the study of the pace of culture, cultural processes, evolutionary interpretations of culture, etc.

The Hegel's discoveries in the field of formation of a culture of the civil society, which mediated between ordinary, everyday reality and state institutions, must be particularly noted. In this way, a promising phenomenology of citizenship for further cultural studies of the civil society was proposed.

At the same time, Hegel's extremely abstract idealism that claimed universality in the understanding of reality could not satisfy the researchers, who considered the empirical fact as the basis of scientific cognition. The positivism that arose on this basis also emerged in the study of culture (A. Comte, J. Bentham, J.S. Mill, H. Spencer et al). Studies of culture shifted towards the observable phenomena and artifacts. At the same time, these phenomena and artifacts obtained the cultural status in accordance with the core principle of positivism – their usefulness for real social practice. The significance of culture for particular individuals was

largely determined by its importance for real adaptation of a person in society. Everything that is useful for the real human life was declared cultural norms and values, in accordance with the positivist attitude.

Despite the present "grounding" of the concept of culture, the positivism expanded the field of studies of culture by assimilating many methods and procedures from natural and science research. This allowed for a more rigorous treatment of many cultural phenomena, as well as the use of discoveries in the natural sciences in the studies of culture. At the same time, a real danger of excluding the moral reality from the field of view of cultural researchers arose as incompatible with direct observation and direct use for utilitarian purposes. As such, the positivism placed a "bomb" under the very existence of culture as a special "ideal" object of study, which would "explode" later, at the end of the XXth century, drawing the very possibility of an "objective" study of culture under question.

Philosophy of F. Nietzsche is considered the turning point from classical philosophy to its postclassical state. The pervasive denial of contemporary culture and civilization from the standpoint of the culture itself is probably the most paradoxical in the works of this notionalist. Nihilism of F. Nietzsche, notorious in this regard, is treated as the desire to establish a new ideal for the cultural development of mankind without the presence of rationalism and religiosity in it, which the philosopher considered major obstacles to the real improvement of human nature. In F. Nietzsche's opinion, rationality, as well as religiousness, ultimately makes mankind unviable, deprives it of the "will to live" and the required creativity.

The notionalist proposed the ideal of an "overhuman" who will be able to overcome philistine rationality and religious spiritual slavery and become the master of his or her own destiny, as an alternative to this existence. In his consistent denial of the values of modern civilization, F. Nietzsche came to complete immoralism in the name of observation of the free creative development of a human, who is a true "aristocrat" having achieved real freedom and the "will to live."

4. Discussion

After F. Nietzsche, culture was considered as a possibility of creativity that was not limited by any social and moral limitations and shaped the surrounding reality on the analogy of free artistic creativity, which realized the sensually-emotional nature of a human, his or her passions and basic natural drives ("Dionysianism").

As such, since F. Nietzsche we have had the immoral and irreligious aspiration of the creators of culture as a dominant in the formation of European culture and civilization with all subsequent cultural crises and deadlocks in the existence of the European civilization of the XX and XXI centuries already. At the same time, it is recognized that F. Nietzsche was the one who set up the acute problem of the image of the "perfect human being" as a focus of the development of culture, regardless of the political situation, limitations of church dogmatics and certain rationalistic concepts of the individual and society. There can be two ways from such a formulation of the problem of a human being: a further search for cultural universals that are important for any society and civilization and common guidelines for civilizational development, or "downgrading" to the ethical and cultural relativism backed up by the "freedom" of creativity and personality. Both ways of development of the sciences about culture were presented in its further study.

The XXth century in the philosophical understanding of culture opens with the increased focus on the axiological aspects of culture. This switch was made not only due to the spread of Nietzscheanism in intellectual circles in both Europe and Russia, but also due to the need to understand the possible interrelations between rapidly developing natural and scientific research and a system of values that are organic for the further existence of the human civilization.

A number of researchers (primarily the Neo-Kantians) began to search for common value

grounds for both the "science of nature" and the "science of culture" in culture. In result, the philosophy of culture emerged as an independent branch of science claiming to have general methodological status for any scientific research.

The world of values was now considered as an objective reality and as an alternative to their subjective and psychological foundation. This reality was now explored in two directions: in the search of common axiological foundations for all cultures and in the study of the cultural diversity of various societies, ethnic groups and civilizations that contribute to the axiological experience of mankind.

The study of values is mainly considered in the area of spiritual reality, which can be studied as an objective reality, no less significant than the physical and natural reality. Accordingly, the common scientific methods in the study of cultural values and phenomena of nature are sought, which was a new stage in the establishment of cultural science.

Rapidly developing civilizational and cultural processes in the XXth century became one of the reasons for the emergence of the category of time in the philosophical study of culture. Culture was now studied in real time, as a process with its own internal laws and trends of development. Two major philosophical concepts of the development of cultural processes have emerged within this approach to the study of culture: 1) cyclical and 2) evolutionary (which later turned into non-evolutionary).

Cyclic (or typological) models of culture were largely borrowed from biology, mainly from the morphological study of nature. However, evolutionary models were also largely based on studying the processes of biological evolution, which were extrapolated to the phenomenon of culture.

At the same time, evolutionary and cyclic models have been recently used as complementary and interrelated in the study of cultural processes, "grasping" various laws of conservation and development of cultures. It is possible neither to identify typological characteristics of culture without taking into account the pace of their development, nor to study evolutionary cultural processes without the analysis of the structure of culture (morphology of culture).

It is characteristic that to a certain extent, the traditional accusation of evolutionism in eurocentrism can be presented to the cyclic (typological) models of culture. For example, for A. Toynbee, the benchmark of research is Western European culture, while for N. Danilevsky it is Russian culture against the same European culture. Accordingly, the combination of typological and evolutionary approaches in the cultural studies is a condition for overcoming subjectivism, which essentially distorts the rigor of scientific research of culture.

While the evolutionary models of culture mainly appeal to the future, the typological, cyclic models appeal to the past. Obviously, both these approaches are important for the philosophical understanding of culture.

This attempt was made in the emerging scientific movement, which was called social and cultural anthropology. Various cultures were now studied in their interrelation with each other and in the pace of their development (Sociocultural anthropology, 2012).

Scientists single out several stages in the formation and development of social and cultural anthropology as a new philosophy of culture.

The first stage is evolutionism of cultures, regarded as the development of a corresponding mentality, cultural knowledge and ideas that ensure cultural progress.

The second stage is an appeal to historical methods of studying culture, which allowed to identify the unique features of various cultures with sufficient blurring of the common criteria for their comparison.

Researchers associate the third stage with the methodology of functionalism (B. Malinovsky, E. Sapir, R. Linton), where the study centers on the possibilities of culture as a process of adapting a person to the society.

The fourth stage lies with the development of comparative and structural methods for studying various cultures for the development of a "universal cultural model" (G. Murdock et al.).

The fifth stage is represented by Neo-Evolutionism (L. White), where the procedures for studying the mental field of culture and its changes as the main "territory" for the existence of culture come to the fore (White, 2004).

The sixth stage lies with the structural anthropology (C. Lévi-Strauss), where cultures are studied as a symbolic system explored in the process of its transformation.

The seventh stage is the emergence of an interpretative concept of culture (C. Geertz, D. Schneider), in accordance with which special attention is paid to the study of culture as a "network of meanings", within which man and society exist (Gadamer, 1988; Kamenets, 2015).

5. Conclusion

It is important to note that distancing from the rigid conditioning of cultural processes by economic realities became a dominant trend in the study of culture through the means of social and cultural anthropology, which played a positive role in preserving the specificity of cultural knowledge in comparison with other sciences.

Emergence of postmodernism as "new philosophy" marked a qualitatively new stage in the philosophical understanding of culture. The latter was now considered in the context of the development of "creativity" and "combinatorics," which gives free scope to creativity, innovation and experiments with cultural meanings and forms. Paradoxical as it may seem, postmodernism has its internal humanistic pathos, which lies in abandoning the real change of the society and social projects directly influenced by a certain idea, political construction, doctrine (lessons from the sad experience of the Second World War). The cultural activity becomes a game of intellectuals and creators who do not interfere with real life. Cultural studies in their postmodern interpretation are seen as a "glass bead game", which ensures the preservation of cultural elites.

Postmodern ideology does not lay claim to total transformation of society, but pretends to contribute to the creative development of individuals and small sociocultural groups, spaces, their independence from bureaucratic institutional structures (Deleuze, 2009; Deleuze, 2001; Postmodernism, 1991).

Accordingly, the scientists compile the following comparison of cultural fields of modernism and postmodernism:

Modernism	Postmodernism
Form (conjunctive, closed)	Antiform (disjunctive, open)
Goal, intention	Game
Plan	Accident
Mastery, logos	Exhaustion, silence
Hierarchy	Anarchy
Work of art, completed work	Process, performance, happening
Distance	Participation

Creation, generation of integrity	Destruction, deconstruction
Presence	Absence of
Centering	Dispersion
Genre, boundaries	Text, intertext
Semantics	Rhetoric
Paradigm	Syntagma
Metaphor	Metonymy
Selection	Combination
Roots, depth	Rhizome, surface
Interpretation, reading through	Against interpretation, incorrect reading
Designated	Designating (subject)
Readable	Writable
Narrative, a long story	Narrative, a short story
Mastery code	Individual features (idiolect)
Symptom	Wish
Type	Mutation
Genitality, phallicity	Polymorphism, androgyny
Paranoia	Schizophrenia
Generation, cause	Difference, trace
God the Father	Holy Spirit
Metaphysics	Irony
Certainty	Uncertainty
Transcendence	Immanence

E.A. Orlova notes that "the above table is based on data from many areas of knowledge: rhetoric, linguistics, literature theory, philosophy, anthropology, political science, theology, and many authors – European and American – who belong to various movements and groups"

(Orlova, 2002, p. 182).

The term "rhizome", presented in the table and still not widely used, requires a special explanation. It is noted that this term is in fact a metaphoric expression used by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari and borrowed from botanics. "Rhizome" here means a certain method of the plant root growth, which is neither a single nor a kidney-shaped side branch from a single stem, but rather a fragmented set of heterogeneous formations that support the development of the plant. Rhizome in poststructuralism is an irregular emergence of multiplicity, a movement that has no prevailing direction but spreads without regularity that would allow to predict the next movement... The proponents of postmodernism do not seek to oppose the new organizational principles to this state of uncertainty, disorientation and chaos. Ideas of collage and polystylistics emerge, in accordance with which all historical styles, paradigms of cognition and elements of artistic culture are equal. Accordingly, the very concept of "style" as applied to the current state of culture loses its classical meaning. The structural and functional models, the systemic view of sociocultural life and its pace were replaced by the pluralism of the original principles of the organization of experience ("program eclecticism"), lack of any universal system for correlating the truth or falsity of statements, plurality of equivalent interpretations of the same event. These features are found in art, social sciences and mass culture. In the plural, formless, "rhizome" space of postmodern culture, the identification of the structure and boundaries of society in its entirety loses its meaning" (Orlova, 2002, p.184-185).

Postmodern culture in the civilizational context replaces modernism as a rationalized cultural space that does not cover the diversity of social experience at the level of small groups, the "culture of everyday life", marginalized social groups, as well as creators of culture prone to independent creative experiments and innovations that have not yet received public recognition.

Summarizing the preliminary brief review of the history of the philosophical study of culture, it can be concluded that the influence of philosophy on the study of culture was expressed in the creation of the methodological foundation of cultural studies as a science, mainly in the vein of philosophical idealism. On the other hand, this influence contributed to the establishment of a special branch of science – the philosophy of culture, which can be regarded as one of the branches of cultural studies focused on building the "ideal reality" of the functioning of society and ideal images of a person as "Homo Sapiens" in the form of the universal anthropological norm, whose achievement patterns are the subject of the philosophy of culture. Let's proceed to this section of cultural studies.

Along with postmodern ideas about culture, mythological foundations of the philosophy of culture are formed within its framework.

Myths experts single out the following types of them: 1) theogonical (birth of the gods); 2) cosmogonical (creation of the world); 3) cosmological (structure of the world); 4) anthropological (creation of a human); 5) etiological (origin of natural objects and things); 6) soteriological (salvation of a human); and 7) eschatological (end of the world) (Voevodina, 2002).

Mythologicality in cultural processes is especially popular in situations of crisis, adjusting value standards and world outlooks. Generating the "semantic cut of culture", the myth fulfills the following functions in regard to society: 1) socially integrative; 2) regulatory; 3) sacral; 4) of the means and ways of communication; 5) collective memory; 6) significative-modeling, designating the construction of a sign system and models of the surrounding natural and social world; 7) axiological; 8) teleological; 9) theological (belief in the past and future of the nation); 10) cognitive; 11) compensatory. There are also the following basic functions of a myth: 1) energetical; 2) creation of teams; 3) formation of identity; 4) reproduction of the collective identity; 5) formation and structuring of space.

The well-known cultural studies scholar V.M. Rozin considers the myth as a complex combination of various realities. He states the following when analyzing the reality of the myth:

"speaking of reality, we mean two different concepts – the world of events that a person experiences and lives through in the reality of art, dreams, play, communication, etc. and the world the person lives in. On the one hand, this world is unaffected by the person (the latter is a kind of thrown into the world); on the other hand, it is understood by the person" (Rozin, 2005, p.164).

The axiological foundations of the study of cultural processes and artifacts are some of the most important in the philosophical study of culture. The category "value" is one of the least studied in the humanities. In spite of the fact that a special branch of science investigating the phenomenon of value – "axiology" – has been established, the interpretation of this phenomenon often lacks the preciseness and unambiguity of definitions. This is largely due to the fact that assigning a particular object or phenomenon to "value" always contains a subjective-psychological component, one way or another, which makes it difficult to single out objective, universal characteristics.

Nevertheless, the search for the essential attributes and characteristics of values as cultural universals that allow to evaluate certain cultures, their achievements, the facts of anticulture, etc. continues in the philosophy of culture.

Any kinds of attempts to offer an understanding of value through purely economic criteria (something that has market value, for example) cannot be considered satisfactory, since it devalues the importance of the very expression "cultural value", while certain criteria for classifying cultural achievements remain significant for humanity, society and civilization.

The philosophy of culture offers a promising strategy for studying the axiological foundations of culture in this situation through the construction of "axiological pictures of the world." Using this construct, cultural sciences can interact productively with philosophical knowledge, which constantly reproduces various ideas and world view landmarks in the exploration of the world.

On the other hand, culture experts who study various ethnic groups, societies and civilizations "supply" a vast variety of experiences of world views, world outlooks and values to the philosophy that allow for proper philosophical generalizations in the world of "values." The latter are represented in various artifacts and social facts that are important for the existence and preservation of culture (in traditions, customs, system of social relationships, in morality, etc.) in one way or another.

Culture is the space for the birth, preservation and development of values in the modern world. It's no coincidence that researchers of culture quite often single out the axiological function of culture as the main one.

In the meantime, the issue of possible distinguishing between essential characteristics of the axiological foundations of culture, which can be recognized as significant for the entire human civilization, certainly remains relevant. This issue is especially important in the situation of the increased diversity of cultural communications between nations, countries, ethnic groups and the collapse of "multiculturalism" in Western European civilization. The success of the search for axiological universals largely determines overcoming of the extra-axiological approach to the culture that destroys the latter, especially on the paths of modern postmodernism.

The functional approach to culture, developed in philosophical knowledge, largely confronts the previous approach, because it proceeds not from "axiology" but from "praxeology" of culture, i.e. its actual importance and usefulness. The founders of the functional approach to culture (B. Malinovsky and his followers) chose biological human needs as the initial unit of analysis of cultural processes. The culture is respectively explored by the functionalists as an opportunity to satisfy the demands of people and society which contribute to the survival and self-preservation of the latter.

At the same time, it was found (especially at the beginning of the XXIst century) that an attempt to link culture directly to the tasks of biological existence leads to an even greater degradation of society, with the prospect of its self-destruction. In this regard, the philosophical understanding of the functionality of culture turned out to be extremely in demand, as

philosophy appeals to the need to preserve the "rationality" of social systems and societies that go far beyond the boundaries of biological pragmatics (Zenkovsky, 2011, Birth of cultural sciences, 2011).

It was found out that the functionality of culture largely lies in the production of "life meanings" and the world view landmarks rather than in the search for the best opportunities for biological survival (Selezneva, Kamenets, 2013). At the same time, the life-purpose aspirations of people and societies become more reliable factors of survival than the pursuit of momentary material goods. Respectively, the philosophical culture-oriented thinking puts the question of the very concept of "life" differently – no longer as a biological category but rather in the context of the spiritual immortality of mankind, ensured by the priority of the "ideal" world in comparison with the "material" world, dominated by human egoism, acquisitiveness and consumerism, which deprive humanity of the natural resources that it already possesses.

References

- Anufrieva, N., E. Anufriev, I. Korsakova, I. Slutskaya and A. Shcherbakova, 2015. Personal Aesthetic Values Development as the Basis for a Modern Musician's Spiritual Formation. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (5S1), 569-574
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2009). *Chto takoye filosofiya?* [What is Philosophy?]. Moscow: Academic Project, pp: 261.
- Deleuze, G. (2001). *Empirizm i subyektivnost: opyt o chelovecheskoy prirode po Yumu. Kriticheskaya filosofiya Kanta: ucheniye o sposobnostyakh. Bergsonizm. Spinoza.* [Empiricism and Subjectivity: An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature. Kant's Critical Philosophy: The Doctrine of the Faculties. Bergsonism. Spinoza]. Moscow: PER SE, pp: 480.
- Gadamer, H.G. (1988). *Istina i metod* [Truth and Method]. Moscow: Progress, pp: 704.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1977). *Filosofiya dukha* [Philosophy of Spirit]. In Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences, (Volume 3). Moscow: Thought, pp: 471.
- Gurevich, A.Ya. (2007). *Izbrannyye trudy. Kultura srednevekovoy Yevropy* [Selected Works. Culture of Medieval Europe]. Saint Petersburg: Publishing House of the St. Petersburg University, pp: 544.
- Kamenets, A.V. (2015). *Vvedeniye v teoriyu sotsialnogo vzaimodeystviya* [Introduction to the Theory of Social Interaction]. Moscow: RGSU, pp: 464.
- Kant, I. (1999). *Osnovy metafiziki nravstvennosti* [Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals]. Moscow: Publishing House "Thought", pp: 1472.
- Kulturologiya* [Cultural Studies], (2012). In Solonin, Yu.N. and M.S. Kagan (Eds.). Moscow: Publishing House Uright, pp: 566.
- Orlova, E.A. (2002). *Vvedeniye v sotsialnuyu i kulturnuyu antropologiyu* [Introduction to the Social and Cultural Anthropology]. Moscow: Academic Avenue
- Plato, (2009). *Dialogi* [Dialogues]. Moscow: Eksmo, pp: 640.
- Postmodernizm i kultura* [Postmodernism and Culture], (1991). In Shapinskaya, E.N. (Eds.). Moscow: IFAS, pp: 138.
- Rozhdeniye kulturologii v Rossii* [Inception of Cultural Studies in Russia], (2011). Collection of Scientific Works. Ivanovo, Shuya: Center for Crisis Research "ShSPU", pp: 592.
- Rozin, V.M. (2005). *Teoriya kultury* [Theory of Culture]. Moscow: NOTA BENE Media Trade Company, pp: 416.
- Shchedrovitsky, G.P., (1995). *Selected Works*. Moscow: School of Cultural Politics, pp: 800.
- Shcherbakova, A.I. (2014). The Advance Reflection Phenomenon of the Birth and Self-affirmation of the New Artistic-aesthetic and Axiological Paradigms in Culture. *Life Scientific Journal*, 11(12): 320-324.

Selezneva, E.N. and Kamenets, A.V. (2013). *Kulturologiya Russkogo mira: dukhovnyye osnovy natsionalnogo mentaliteta* [Culturology of the Russian World: Moral Foundations of the National Mentality]. Moscow: Publishing House "RHYTHM", pp: 432.

Sotsiokulturnaya antropologiya: Istoriya, teoriya i metodologiya [Sociocultural Anthropology: History, Theory and Methods], (2012). Moscow: Academic Project, pp: 1000.

Teoriya kultury [Theory of Culture], (2010). In Ikonnikova, S.N. and Bolshakov, V.P. (Eds.). Saint Petersburg: Peter, pp: 592.

Voevodina, L.N. (2002). *Mifologiya i kultura* [Mythology and Culture]. Moscow: Institute of General Humanitarian Research, pp: 384.

White, L. (2004). *Izbrannoye: Nauka o kulture* [Selected: The Science of Culture]. Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN), pp: 960.

Zenkovsky, V. (2011). *Istoriya russkoy filosofii* [History of Russian philosophy]. Moscow: Academic Project, pp: 880.

1. Russian State Social University, Russia, 129226, Moscow, Email: korsak.rgsu@mail.ru

Revista ESPACIOS. ISSN 0798 1015
Vol. 38 (Nº 25) Año 2017

[Índice]

[En caso de encontrar algún error en este website favor enviar email a webmaster]

©2017. revistaESPACIOS.com • Derechos Reservados