Deterritorialisation and Development of National Cultures

Gulnaz K. Gizatova, Olga G. Ivanova, Alexander S. Safonov

Abstract: *The term "deterritorialization" has become widely used in various fields of social theory to describe a wide variety of social processes. For example, they started to use the concept of "deterritorialization" to describe, first of all, cultural processes, while the gap between social and geographical is emphasized. However, as many researchers rightly point out, where deterritorialization takes place, the reterritorialization will also appear necessarily. And here the thing is, first of all, about the correlation of global and local, universal and particular. But in the modern world this ratio is characterized by apparent asymmetry. Hence the researchers' particular attention to such concepts as homogenization, macdolandization, Americanization, glocalization, etc. Of course, there is a clear idea that it is Western culture that is becoming a kind of model that has a decisive influence on other, non-Western cultures. A characteristic feature of modern social studies is that their focus shifts from rationality to the emphasis of differences, hence the keen interest in history, the search for roots that are lost, also as the result of deterritorialization. The relativization of knowledge in general and historical knowledge in particular has led to the fact that the latter, and in particular, historiography begin to be regarded as a synonym for mythology, and traditions and the past of a particular nation - as artificially created constructs.*

Keywords: deterritorialization, national cultures, reterritorialization, culture universals.

I. INTRODUCTION

The processes that many social theorists describe as "deterritorialization" are accompanied by serious changes, not only such as homogenization, macdonaldization, etc., and, consequently, the loss of their national identity, but also the transformation of the very ways of national-cultural existence. The term "deterritorialization", first used by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, originally meant the relationship between thought and territorial distribution, between imprisonment and exile; it correlated with such concepts as nomadic thought, hybridity, and the diaspora [See: 1]. The term has become widely used in various fields of social theory to describe a wide variety of social processes. For example, the concept of "territorialization" begins to be used to describe, first of all, cultural processes, while they start to focus on the gap

between social and geographical, which marks a new era of non-spatial human interaction in relation to regional and national identity ... [See: 2]. Deterritorialization begins to be associated with the decontextualization of cultural forms, which leads, ultimately, to the loss of cultural codes and, accordingly, to the loss of culture essential features, its identity. The result is the gap between place, history and memory. John Tomlison, the director of the British Institute for Cultural Analysis, whose research on cultural diversity formed the basis of UNESCO's recommendations on intercultural interaction, emphasizes that new media technologies are one of the most important factors contributing to deterritorialization, which contributes to the loss of cultural certainty and, most importantly, the loss of existential comfort. He considers the weakening or breakdown of the connection between everyday culture and territorial location as the main defining characteristic of deterritorialization. At the same time, it is felt not just as cultural loss or alienation, but as a complex and indefinite combination of proximity and distinction, the expansion of cultural boundaries and a growing sense of vulnerability, access to the world of something out there, accompanied by penetration into our own inner worlds, new opportunities and new risks [See: 3, p. 116, 128].

Ultimately, we are talking about the gap that arises between the past and the present, old and new, and leads to the loss of communication between the place and historical memory. However, as many researchers rightly point out, where deterritorialization takes place, reterritorialization also arises necessarily. And here we are talking, first of all, about the correlation of global and local, universal and particular. But in the modern world this ratio is characterized by apparent asymmetry. Hence the researchers' particular attention to concepts, homogenization, macdonaldization, Americanization, glocalization, etc. Of course, a clear idea can be traced here that Western culture is becoming a kind of model that has a decisive influence on other, non-Western cultures.

II. METHODS

Cultural problems are among those philosophical problems, the understanding of which with the development of history requires taking into account an increasing number of factors affecting its existence, transformation and role both in the life of society as a whole and in the life of an individual person. It is no coincidence that all modern social researchers during the analysis of various social phenomena touch on cultural issues in one way or another. This trend intensified with the spread of the postmodern paradigm, which placed culture at the epicenter of any social research. According to the apt expression of the

German philosopher R. Berking: "where society was, culture appeared."

Max Weber formulated his famous question: "How to explain the fact that "only" Western culture has "universal meaning and value?" His answer was the following: culture was rational only in the West: with rational science, theology, art and music, with rational concepts. But he left unclear the following questions: why it was rational or how it was determined.

However, analyzing contemporary post-non-classical rationality, it seems that it would be advisable to refer to George Ritzer's well-known work "Macdonaldization of society" for its study, the work that has already become significant in assessing the role of rationality in modern culture. Considering macdonaldization as an integral part of the rationalization process characteristic of the modern world, he shows that rationalization is invariably accompanied by an individuation process, i.e. the process of isolation, the result of which is the separation of people in modern society by invisible barriers of customs and cultures. He characterizes these negative consequences of the McDonaldization process as the irrationality of the rational and connects it primarily with the fact that consistent adherence to the functional principles of rationalization leads to the opposite results: inefficiency, uncountability, unpredictability, loss of control and, most importantly, dehumanization of human labor. The ideas of J. Ritzer and his other followers, in our opinion, could be fruitfully used for a holistic understanding of such a complex phenomenon as modern culture.

Returning to M. Weber's thesis that "only" Western culture has "universal significance and value", we would like to dwell in more detail on the idea of universality of values. This idea has always aroused deep interest of philosophers-anthropologists, in particular, such as D. Merdock, K. Levy-Strauss, etc. Thus, the authors of the collective monograph "Culture and Communications: Global and Local Dimensions" give the following interpretation of the essence and basic functions of cultural universals. "The universals of culture," they note, "perform three interrelated functions. First, they provide quantification and sorting of diverse, historically changing experiences. Secondly, they act as the basic structure of human consciousness in each specific historical era. Thirdly, the interconnection of universals forms a generalized picture of the human world, what is commonly called the worldview of the era. This picture, expressing general ideas about a person and the world, introduces a certain scale of values accepted in this type of culture, and therefore determines not only understanding, but also the emotional experience of the world by a person" [4, p. 26].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thus, there are certain markers in each particular culture that express something common, stable, inherent in each culture. Such universals include the presence of language, myths and rituals, belonging to any social group or community, etc. However, it is obvious that each culture reproduces these universals in the form that is determined by its national characteristics, i.e. cultural universals inevitably vary depending on the characteristics of their representation, where, in particular, the factor of ethnicity plays a decisive role. And the term "ethnicity" emphasizes, first of all, the role of history, language and culture in the reconstruction of

subjectivity, as well as the fact that all discourses are positioned contextually [See: 5, p. 63].

A characteristic feature of modern social studies is that their focus shifts from rationality to emphasis of differences, hence the keen interest in history, the search for roots that are lost, also as the result of deterritorialization. The relativization of knowledge in general and historical knowledge in particular has led to the fact that the latter, and in particular, historiography begin to be regarded as a synonym for mythology, and traditions and the past of a particular nation - as artificially created constructs. Thus, the British philosopher and sociologist of culture S. Hall, discussing national identity, notes that the latter arises in the dialogue between the meanings and definitions that are represented to us by the discourses of culture, and our desire (consciously or unconsciously) to respond to the requirements of these meanings [See: 6, p. 219].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The self-awareness of a nation in recent social studies is no longer regarded as a fixed phenomenon. And the point here is not that they ignore historicity, the variability of this phenomenon. The point is that self-awareness more often appears as a description now. An attempt to fix the deep, essential foundations of self-awareness is discursively regarded somehow as an ideological interpretation carried out for specific political purposes. So, M. Foucault means a certain plurality of statements by discourse. These statements are the elements of a certain "discursive formation." Thus, discourse is "the linguistic expression of a particular social practice, which is streamlined and systematized by special use of the language, determined by a certain mentality, which is ideologically rooted and historically determined" [7, p. 48]. Ideology as a form of power appears as a discourse that gives or provides meaning to any social phenomena, and social practices. In this sense, national identity is primarily determined by symbolic and discursive dimensions and, using narratives, creates the idea of the roots, origins of the nation, the idea of continuity and traditions. Therefore, nations are not only political entities, but also - above all - the systems of cultural representations, therefore, national identity is constantly reproduced through discursive actions [See: 5, p. 65].

F. Jameson, exploring the concept of "ontology of the present", notes that the latter should combine not only the reconstruction of the past, but also the extraction of Utopian impulses from the present. The present is fluid; it is in continuous change. Hence, its (present) ontology is the analysis of narratives changing in history and requires the archeology of the future [See: 8, p. 215]. Addressing the future, also in the form of utopia, serves as a "buffer", designed to remove the most stressful features of the modern state, which is characterized by instability, crisis, uncertainty, etc. When the criticism of social processes is aimed at clarifying of modern problem foundations the need for philosophical and historical concept appears, which is the most important task of modern critical philosophy of history. P. Ricoeur's position in this context is no coincidence, who writes the following: "Transfer to another present, which is accepted as a type of historical objectivity, is the work of imagination, temporal

imagination ... Undoubtedly, this imagination indicates the entry into the game of subjectivity ...” [9, p. 43]. This idea is the concretization of the theory of “narrative identity” he developed. The philosopher believes that the narrative, in accordance with this concept, "provides practical means" by which people "are able to realize themselves as living in time, people with the past, present and future, united by a narrative plot beginning, middle and end" [See: 10, p.125].

Modern narratology assumes that the human self is best understood when viewed as a narrative self. Narrative philosophy as a whole assumes that the objective meaning of each human action individually and the meaning of human life as a whole are understood most deeply if we consider them as a narrative. This implies that the subject defines himself and describes his personality and his actions to other people as his personal narrative. At the same time, the researchers of national narratives note that there are differences between national narratives and individual or poetic narratives. This difference appears in at least two main aspects. The first aspect concerns the communication scheme related to national narratives, which consists of the collective actors of the narration and the collective audience for which this narrative is intended. Secondly, if poetic narratives tend to strive for originality and uniqueness, then national narratives tend to plurality and repeatability. In other words, the main task of national narratives is that they should be produced and play back. These two elements, of course, are closely related, mutually complemented and reinforce each other [11,14,15].

According to N. Papastergiadis, the director of the Research Department of Cultures at the University of Melbourne, “the concept of deterritorialization can be used to understand language gaps and cultural identity” [12,16]. We are also talking about the fact that the process of deterritorialization is accompanied by the destruction of traditions, and the development of national cultures is no longer determined by a narrative sequence (S. Lash). These processes are not vectorly unidirectional, and most social theorists emphasize the ambivalence and inconsistency of what is happening, referring also to retarritorialization, as the possibility of constructing new sustainable phenomena, such as national narratives, national self-awareness, etc., although, it should be emphasized, they can no longer be characterized by former stability and solidity. As F. Guattari noted: “The more capitalism follows its characteristic tendency to “deciphering” and “deterritorialization”, the more it seeks to awaken or awaken artificial territoriality and residual codes, thereby confronting itself” [13,17].

Thus, the modern world is characterized by simultaneous processes of deterritorialization, on the one hand, and the desire of national cultures to preserve and develop their identity. In these processes, these opposing trends undergo profound transformations. The study of these transformations can become a conceptual basis for studying the traditional in national cultures, their adaptive mechanisms, as well as new phenomena that arise in the national sphere of the modern world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. G. Deleuze, F. Guattari A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia. Ttransl. by B. Massumi.L.: Athlone, 1988; Deleuze G., Guattari F. What is philosophy? Transl. by H. Tomlinson and G. Burchill.L.: Verso, 1994
2. C.H. Williams Nationalism in a democratic context // A companion to political geography. Eds. J. Agnew, K. Mitchell and G. Toal. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. pp. 356-377.
3. J.Tomlison. Globalization and Culture. – Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1999. – 238p.
4. “Culture and Communications: Global and Local Dimensions” - Tomsk: NTL Publishing House. - 2004. - 400 p.
5. C. Barker. TV, Globalization and Cultural Identities. - Philadelphia. Publication. – 1999.
6. S. Hall. The Centrality of Culture: Notes on the Cultural Revolutions of Our Time //Media and Cultural Regulation. – London: Sage. – 1998.
7. M. Foucault. Archeology of knowledge. K.: Nika-Center, 1996. - 208 p.
8. F. Jameson. Singular modernity / Fredric Jameson. – L.; N.-Y.: Verso Books, 2002 – 250 p.
9. P. Ricoeur. Memory, history, oblivion / Transl. from French by I.I. Blauberg, I.S. Vdovina, O.I. Machulskaya, G.M. Tavrizyan. - M.: Publishing house of humanitarian literature, 2004. - 728 p.
10. J. Elliott. Using narrative in social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. London, England: Sage. - 2005.
11. Shaul R. Shenhav. The Discursive Effect of National Narratives: A Theoretical Framework. - The Hebrew University of Jerusalem// https://ecpr.eu/filestore/paperproposal/5b9329d4-4c4e-4a06-a756-b945222a57f6.pdf
12. Cit.: S. Elden. Missing the point: globalization, deterritorialization and the space of the world, Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, № 30, pp. 8-19, 2005.
13. Cit.: S. McQuire. "Media City" //https://postnauka.ru/longreads/31899.
14. Sazesh, A., & Siadat, S. A. (2018). The Relationship between Quantum Management and Organizational Agility in Ministry of Roads and Urban Development of Golestan Province, Iran. Dutch Journal of Finance and Management, 2(2), 51. https://doi.org/10.29333/djfm/5827
15. Tereso, A., Ribeiro, P., & Cardoso, M. (2018). An Automated Framework for the Integration between EVM and Risk Management. Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management, 3(1), 03.
16. Lee, M. Y. (2019). A Case Study Examining Links between Fractional Knowledge and Linear Equation Writing of Seventh-Grade Students and Whether to Introduce Linear Equations in an Earlier Grade. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 14(1), 109-122. https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/3980
17. Issaliyeva, A., Ospanova, A. N., & Alibekul, A. (2018). Kazakhstan and GCC: Islamic component in joint collaboration. Opción, 34(85-2), 205-220.

Retrieval Number: A9223119119/2019©BEIESP
DOI: 10.35940/ijitee.A9223.119119

5171

Published By:
Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering
& Sciences Publication