

Cultural Substrate as a Factor of the Dynamic Transformations Within the Polyethnic Conditions

Irina V. Komadorova and Evgeniya V. Kuznetsova

Naberezhnye Chelny Branch of University of Management “TISBI”,
Naberezhnye Chelny, Russian Federation

Abstract: The author’s target is to reveal cultural development peculiarities of polyethnic society in the article. Under modern conditions the conflict potential intensifies both within separate societies and between different nations, countries, cultures, confessions. As a cultural substrate within the polyethnic conditions, the author marks out not only a society or an ethnos on the whole, but also separate organizations (business culture) and professional associations (professional culture). The considering problem is complex and self-contradictory. Revealing cultural development peculiarities within the polyethnic conditions may assist with forecasting socio-cultural dynamic.

Key words: Ethnic • Nation • Polyethnic society • Business culture • State • Professional culture • Ethnicities

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary investigations devoted to problems of polyethnic there exists a situation being characterized by prevalence of impromptu and fragmentation, lack of any integral and consequential theories and ideologies. All this is explained by that global shifts being devoid of ideological basis are caused by mixture of a number of social, economic, cultural, technical and others factors various combinations of which are able to produce unexpected situations. Therefore, there is no wonder that a new forming order has a mass of hidden aspects fraught with unpredictable consequences. The consequences are put on the whole system of factors that are in altogether capable of intensifying conflict potential both within separate societies and between different nations, countries, cultures, confessions and etc. The postindustrial revolution, urbanization, informatisation, literacy rise have caused a specific culture and a mass of lumpens of physical and mental labour cut off origins and been able to support any myth promising all world welfare [1].

At the time, secularization dynamic has produced a new human type whose main moto and motive for action is to indulge his needs and wishes. This is a self-enamored person who, as S. Dannels mentions well,

is a product of liberty development non-adjusted by accountability [2]. He denies everything what limits his personality developments, rebels against institutions, processes of socialization, obligations, i.e. against everything that makes up the base of any society. He condemns the society, considering that it is responsible for mistakes, vise, soul poverty and etc. He does not admit neither discipline, nor father’s authority, family and conventions, nor self-limits. For him, the ideal is a hedonistic society, where everything serves to indulge needs, to content pleasure. By Shiller’s reasonable remark, “a lifestyle focusing only on pleasure represents truly a senile phenomenon both in an individual life and in a nation life”.

Considering the aim of the contemporary researches, from Marxists to existentialists according to which a person is a creature living in an irreversible historical time, simplified, M. Eliade insists that a person lives also beyond a historical time, exactly in his dreams, imagination and etc. In other words, a person, a society, a state and interstate relations correspondingly and a world community on the whole have world outlook measurement. Such measurement defines a content of the paradigm dominating in the certain historical period. F. Nietzsche anticipated that the XX century would become the century of struggles between various powers for

Corresponding Author: Komadorova, Naberezhnye Chelny Branch of University of Management “TISBI”,
Tatarstan Street, 10, Naberezhnye Chelny 423825, Russian Federation.

world domination realizing in the sake of philosophical principles. Nietzsche's anticipation turns out oracular with only one difference that diversity and complexity of the outlook inception were superseded by the ideological measurements, ideological principles were victorious over philosophical.

Contemporary ethics has the first time in its history faced the problems and the fait of the social and cultural structures depends on solving these problems lying on the basis of ethics. All the complex tasks facing contemporary ethics can be divided into two groups: ethics issues in narrow sense and issues associated with struggle and competitive of great traditions and ethic systems.

Solving the issues of the first type depends on a way that west ethics will conduct in dialogue with other ethnic systems. On the whole, the ethnic dialogue history can be divided into three periods: ethnocentric period, cultural relativity period and "moderate cultural universalism" period [3]. For cultural universalism, a statement that there is no sense to divide cultures into better and worse ones is characteristic, nevertheless there are definite moral norms that have to be compulsory for all people regardless of any cultural and religious conditionality. Hence, the cultural universalism is an ethnic universalism, moreover, it does not affirm that all people in all cultures admit certain general moral rules, but in turns, claim that such rules have to be admitted by everyone. The codification example of the universal moral rules is Human Rights Declaration, acknowledging that every person has his right to life, liberty and security from person's life itself.

At present, it is necessary to be aware of that from the ethnic point of view for a long time we have dealt with something what has globalization features on the local scale. The globalization of values, not of economics, as many hold, is clearly visible in ethics, where for a long period great ethic traditions have fought with each other, by the way, the fight have never gone smoothly; it has accepted in a sense open conflict form. Understanding the global processes taking place in the contemporary world is indispensable not so much for joining the processes rather than for defining you own horizons, perspectives and fears. Most of the authors, covering the issue, mean the processes occurring in the world economy, but the same can be said about the changes, taking place in morals.

What is a modern polyethnic region? The region where ethnics and cultures coexist in tolerance? This is an ideal statement. We should not forget the fact that the

modern polyethnic situation is featured more by presence of international business. Polyethnic is considerably expanding the boundaries. It is important to state the fact that the problems of various ethnics and cultures interaction, influencing the international business, are based on policy and ideology. Policy and ideology are closely associated. Ideology can be defined as some constructing project or a draft that is a base for power's structure and function construction in either society. All ideologies, independent of their content concern issues of authority, power, power relations and etc. Ideology focuses on direct political actual and actions, political process and is issued from the reasons for attracting as much support as possible. Therefore, it has naturally a clear expressed biased character.

Today, you have to state the fact that there exists no company having international contacts that has managed to avoid wrong judgments, illusions and mistakes by interacting with consumers and suppliers. Most part of publications on international management is rich in warnings about cultural differences and culture itself that are ferocious reasons for a corporation downfall. So, Hall claims, that "cultural differences are likely to lead partnership to tatters rather to be economically advantageous"[4]. The American experts in cross-cultural consulting ominously notice that cultural differences can even put an end to business relations [5].

In its turn, ethnic and cultural issues were interestingly and effectively concerned within cultural anthropology; one of the most outstanding representatives is Leslie A. White. From the American researcher's point of view, culture dynamic depends directly on ethnos behavior, character of their actions and the results are objectified in traditions [6].

The American thinker marks out that economical activity, character of social institutes, peculiarities of a spiritual life relate to the most essential "vectors" defining cultural realization of the ethnos. Thus, L. White stands logically against any ideological interpretations of an ethnos as a substance gifted with a "soul", "morality", "experience of life". In particular, he notes that moral inheres in any one person making up the society; only they possess ethics. Other "formations", according L.White, do not have morality. Any moral dominant are wrongly registered to nations. Mostly, their own nation is depicted as one with high moral standards and the opposing one is considered to be amoral. Ascription of an ethic behavior to a nation is based on three points: 1) transferring motives and values to a nation that peculiar to people; 2) imagining that a nation expresses

high-minded, noble and pure intentions of people. However, a person and nation are quite different systems, consisting of different elements and functioning differently. Nations are made up of cultural elements, institutions, ideologies, means and instruments of production, as L. White notes. Nations are rapacious and merciless; an international relations area is jungles where slyness, falsehood, deception and brute force reign. All talks about “moral” are used to cover true aims.

L. White particularly stresses that a stereotype of “moral” valuation of any ethnos is associated with an external symbolic representation: every nation has a belief about its nobleness, fairness, impeccability that they try imposing on other people and nations. By strong imposing of the believes on other nations, an “aggressive deformation” is observable. In this case, “their” is replaced by “alien”. An ethnos loses its cultural core; it distorts and fades away.

Therefore, capability for unity and strengthening the system on the whole, capability for mobilization of the recourses in particular situations of external cultural and civilization pressure is considered by L. White as one of the essential features of a nation as a cultural subsystem.

L. White particularly marks out that a nation is depicted as having low consolidation and awareness level in the range of various ethno-cultural systems being the subjects of cultural dynamic (tribe, clan, group, people, nation). Its behavior is characterized by mere reflexes and tropism. Moreover, the scientist stresses that it is wrong to employ both psychological terms (“clever”, “foolish”) and ethic ones (“good”, “bad”) towards the ethno-cultural system, as reasonable and unreasonable behavior is peculiar to biologicals only. However, for lack of developed cultural categories, we have to use terminology of other sciences.

It is clear why argues and discussions on the issue not only have not stopped, but also have got a new burst. It focus on such issues as What are nationalism and a national idea?, When did they appear? What role (positive or negative) did they play in the socio-historical process? What role doest play in modern and future world? What is primary: a nation or a state? How do they sort with each other? and etc.

In the series of articles about limits in business published in ten years ago in Harvard Business Review, one of the article was straight forwardly titled *Cross-cultural bog*. In other publication Frost compared cultural conflict with earthquakes. “As parts of the earth, being

separated, by no means influence each other, having collided, they cause earthquake; representatives of various cultural groups may work in harmony until there are clashes, notice that such clashes may reflect on working process” [7].

So passionate are the American authors as well (H.N. Seelye and A. Seelye-Lames, 1995). “Culture conditioned disagreements come out when representatives of different cultures get in touch with. Sometimes, misunderstanding appears before an attempt of introduction, when you have not said a word yet. Conflict on cultural grounds may cause universal tiredness and even shock or depression... What are symptoms of culture shock? How contagious is it? Is it mortal?” the opinion that “culture” is able to ruin international business is not new. Sudden and anxious are the American author’s statements such as those mentioned above, they write about cultural conflicts with such pathologic rage [8].

Nevertheless, there is a sense of truth in the warnings. The problem is that it is unacceptably overestimated. If you don’t work properly with cultural differences, it may lead to inappropriate problems in a society.

Bringing up a globalization issue of ethnos and cultural interaction in polyethnic conditions, we try to stress that the idea is not equal to an attempt to liken people to mechanism, machines, whose action is programmed beforehand by needs that do not depend on them and they did not choose them. “Prescriptions” of latter does not deprive people of peculiar “freedom will” that shows in the capability of “ranking” their needs according to an existing scale of value preferences. More ridiculous are searches of objective of a necessary hierarchy, where division into “principal” and “nonprincipal”, “primary” and “secondary”, “determinative” and “determinate” needs is given independently of people wishes and preferences. How can we talk about an objective hierarchy if every person is substantively free in opting for his life priorities and is able to build his live?

Nevertheless, such opinions do not abolish an idea of stable, objective dependence in the system of people needs. It is endorsed by the fact that the object of it application is not only individual, but also collective people behaviour. This circumstance let us deduce the objective bond between needs as some statistic rule and socio-cultural factors that are able to depict mass manifestations.

No one person's choice may be viewed asgnoseological true or false. It doesn't mean that such choice cannot be observed as worthwhile regarding to targets of keeping and developing society as organized forms people's combined activity.

It is necessary to observe the differences between understanding and a set order, a model, so that we reveal insight of global interconnection of ethic consciousness, of increasing importance of person's needs and their fundamental basis in formation of modern professionalism.

A model - is a god of any social system; it is the top of business, significant condition of successful work of any company, the ideal of every state official. A social mechanism has to work like a dream. If a model is perfect, understanding is superfluous not taking into account short-term mind efforts that are essential in extreme situations such as drought, flu epidemic. Working system itself is a product of mind. However, when an adequate pattern order is set, mind has nothing else to do, but work of the system is endorsed by totality of conditioned reflexes. A person is only expected to be susceptible of being educated in the situation. It is easy to understand that society life is based on a model. The society requires stability and stability- a product of a model [9].

The problem is that unstable development is characteristic for modern social systems; hence, we have to prepare a person for facing new conditions of his existence. It is impossible to prepare oneself for something you do not know. We need such understanding of modern conditions that would allow us to become familiar with the innovations that are able to influence certainly near future. However, in this case, we cannot be satisfied with a doctrine according to which the society lives by a model, dismissal of which will lead to pernicious consequences. We have to realize the reasons of the society's model existence, the reasons rooting in a person's nature and at the same time, we have to value every new thing that influences the results of a society's activity by way of contrast with a habitual order. Thus, we can foresee what will avoid changes in near future and what will not do.

The business spirit has to be strong enough to subdue a business part of the life to fixed models, but at the same time, to control the actions of the models and, when it is necessary, to recreate them, understand their inner structure and outward targets. The power secures any success. However, we cannot do without ethic

perception of the most difficult stream carrying all the variety people's societies; foe instant, the perception has to be related to variety needs including both serious targets and entertainments. It is extremely important to cultivate an understanding instinct of determining characteristics of current social events.

Thus, a cultural substrate in polyethnic conditions can be represented both by a society or an ethnos and particular organizations (business culture) and professional associations (professional culture) and etc. Such levels of culture do not deny a fact of succession of cultural values, though it updates them to some degree [10].

Depression cycles of production, shaking the world, serve as a warning that business relations, in some sense, are affected by shortsightedness. We should not make a mistake departing a business world from a human community in analysis. A business world is a main part of the society that has to be analyzed. Behaviour of the whole community is under certain influence of the business spirit. Great community is that one where businessmen understand the function of their activity. Mean behaviour follows mean thoughts; after a wave of permissiveness, mean behaviour leads to a downfall of living standards. Community's loftiness is the first condition of prosperity, viability and steady and prevailing loyalty.

REFERENCES

1. Kuznetsova, E.V., 2011. Mass culture as a phenomenon of modern communicative practice // Vestnik of Kostroma state university. 1: 46-52.
2. Gadzhiev, K.S., 1998. Introduction to geopolitics. - M.: Logos, pp: 415.
3. Slomskiy, V., 2006. Globalization as an etnic problem of philosophy. Riga: BMA, pp: 120.
4. Hall, W., 1995. Managing cultures; Making strategic relationships work. Chichester, UK; John Wiley and Sons, pp: 154.
5. Boas, F., 1930. Some Problems of Methodology in the Social Sciences. University of Chicago Press, pp: 65-198.
6. White, L.A., 1996. The Concept of Culture. N.Y. pp: 46-227.
7. Frost, A.R., 2000. Negotiating culture in a global environment. 2000. Journal of Management Communication, 4(4): 367-379.

8. Holden, Nigel, J., 2005. Cross-cultural management: a knowledge management perspective. M.: UNITI-DANA, pp: 17-148.
9. Komadorova, I.V., 2001. Culture as a social phenomenon in a symbolic anthropology of L. A. White- M.: Publishing House MSU, pp: 97-120.
10. Komadorova, I.V., 2005. American cultural anthropology about factors of social cultural dynamics. M.:«Academia», pp: 56-294.