

Educational Establishment
Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts

Faculty of Cultural Studies and Sociocultural Activities
Department of Cultural Studies

APPROVED
Head of the Department
A. I. Smolik

12 03 2025.

APPROVED
Dean of the Faculty
N. E. Shelupenko

31 03 2025.

EDUCATIONAL AND METHODOLOGICAL COMPLEX
(ELECTRONIC EDUCATIONAL AND METHODOLOGICAL COMPLEX)
ON EDUCATIONAL DISCIPLINE

CULTURAL MODELS OF THE XX-XXI CENTURIES

*for the advanced higher education
(magistracy)*

7-06-0314-02 Culturology

Compiled by:

A.E. Salikau, Professor in the Youth Policy and Sociocultural Communication Department, State Educational Establishment "National Institute for Higher Education", Candidate in Cultural Studies, Associate Professor.

Krishtanosova E.A., Associate Professor in the Department of Culturology, Educational Establishment "Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts", Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor.

Smolik A.I., Head of the Department of Culturology, Educational Establishment "Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts", Doctor of Cultural Studies, Professor.

Reviewed and approved

at the meeting of the University Faculty 31 03 2025.

Protocol no. 4

CONTENTS

1. <u>EXPLANATORY NOTE</u>	3
2. THEORETICAL SECTION	5
2.1 Lecture notes	5
3. PRACTICAL SECTION	44
3.1 Educational-methodical card of the discipline (full-time).....	44
3.2 Educational-methodical card of the discipline (Extramural).....	44
3.3 List of seminar's topics	45
4. ASSESSMEN SECTION	52
4.1 Assignments for supervised work of students	52
4.2 List of exam's topics	53
5. AUXILIARY SECTION	54
5.1 List of primary sources	54
5.2 List of additional sources	54
6. GLOSSARY OF TERMS	56

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The modern world is determined by the growth of a number of problems inherent in the majority of modern multicultural states. These problems arise due to two modern tendencies: 1) the tendency of erasing cultural features a result of globalization processes; 2) the tendency of ethnocultural groups to segregate, as well as to isolate in order to protect their identity. These problems arose in the past: the first tendency was historically formed as a universal cultural model and the second one as particularism considered as a cultural model. Nowadays, these trends have become particularly relevant. Firstly, due to the growing interdependence of countries, and secondly, due to attempts to protect their identities. Today, these problems are accelerated in all states in the world, with the exception of 11 mono-ethnic and monocultural countries.

Therefore, it is very important to study the basic cultural models in the context of new trends. In this regard, the systematic study of the discipline "Cultural Models of the XX-XXI Century" by Master's students.

The curriculum based on humanities ("History of Belarus", "Fundamental Cultural Studies", "Theories and Cultural History", "Philosophy", "Political Science", "Pedagogy", "Contemporary Foreign Cultural Studies"), as well as knowledge of general features of culture and arts. The curriculum has an interdisciplinary connection in "History", "Ethnography", "Philosophy" and some other educational disciplines.

The program is dedicated to identifying flexible links between humanitarian and cultural issues. The program provides a systematic study of theoretical and practical issues. As a result of studying the discipline "Cultural models of the XX-XXI centuries" the students should obtain the competencies as follows:

Universal competency (UC)

UC -1. To be able to apply scientific methods (analysis, comparison, systematization, abstraction, modeling, data validation, decision making, etc.) in academic research, generate and implement innovative ideas.

UC-4. To apply the methodology of scientific knowledge, to be able to analyze and evaluate the content and level of philosophical and methodological problems in order to resolve issues of research and innovation.

UC-6. To be able to carry out professional activities in international settings.

Advanced Professional Competencies (APC)

APC-1. To have communicative knowledge, and skills for working in an interdisciplinary and international environment.

APC-3. To be able to develop and maintain values, norms and ideals of national culture.

APC-4. To be able to understand and apply the tools of the basic theories of domestic and foreign scientific schools in professional activities.

Social and Personal Competencies (SC)

SC -1. To be able to carry out research in the context of modern culturological theoretical and methodological concepts.

SC-2. To be able to prognosis the development of a national culture.

SC-4. To demonstrate the skills of collecting, analyzing and systematizing theoretical and factual knowledge on the problems of sociodynamics of culture.

SC-5. To be able to apply scientific, theoretical and methodological knowledge on the problems of sociodynamics of Belarusian culture.

SC-6. To apply skills of discursive analysis of cultural texts.

Aim of the discipline:

- to extend the system of knowledge in the theory of culture;
- to cognize the essence of culture and the mechanisms of its dynamics;
- to comprehend the unique experience of dialogue of cultures in the context of globalization.

Objectives of the discipline:

- to identify universal patterns of functioning of culture;
- to determine the place and role of culture as a whole and the main structural elements in its dynamics in the XX-XXI centuries;
- to understand the characteristics of various cultural models, the prospects for their development;
- to study the theory of world culture as a model.

The curriculum of the discipline "Cultural models of the XX-XXI centuries" is designed for 94 academic hours, of which 28 hours in a classroom. The approximate distribution of class hours: 8 hours - lectures, 20 hours - seminars, 4 hours - individual work. Academic success will be assessed at the end of the study in the form of an exam.

For correspondence students: 8 hours - lectures, 4 hours - seminars. Academic success will be assessed at the end of the study in the form of an exam.

2. THEORETICAL SECTION

2.1 Lecture notes

TOPIC 1: INTRODUCTION

Topics to be covered:

1. Culture as a system and phenomenon of society.
2. *The Most Important Characteristics of Culture*
3. *The Structure of Culture.*

1. Culture as a system and phenomenon of society.

The modern term "culture" is based on a term used by the ancient Roman orator Cicero in his *Tusculanae Disputationes*, where he wrote of a cultivation of the soul or "cultura animi," using an agricultural metaphor for the development of a philosophical soul, understood teleologically as the highest possible ideal for human development. Samuel Pufendorf took over this metaphor in a modern context, meaning something similar, but no longer assuming that philosophy was man's natural perfection. His use, and that of many writers after him, "refers to all the ways in which human beings overcome their original barbarism, and through artifice, become fully human.

There are literally hundreds of different definitions as writers have attempted to provide us. Culture plays a crucial role in human evolution, allowing human beings to adapt the environment to their own purposes rather than depend only on natural selection to achieve adaptive success. Every human society has its own particular culture, or sociocultural system. Culture can be defined as a way of life. No matter where people live, their behaviors and thoughts follow and are generally based on their own cultures. Culture establishes a context of cognitive and affective behavior for each person. It influences individual estimation and attitudes, and can also have an effect on practical aspects of life such as hobbies.

The word culture is a notoriously difficult term for definition. However, commonly term to define about culture which come from anthropologists and other behavioral scientists and it was used in the way that culture is the full range of learned human behavior patterns. The term was first used in this way by pioneer English. Anthropologists Edward B. Tylor in his book, *Primitive Culture*, published in 1871. Tylor's definition of culture is "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." Besides that culture is a learned set of ideas and rules about appropriate behavior shared by a group which passed on from one generation to the next not by the genes but which language. (Cameron M. Smith, Evan T. Davies) And our written languages, governments, buildings and other man-made things are merely the products of culture. Especially culture is a powerful human tools for survival, but it's fragile phenomenon which easily lost and changing because it exists only in our minds.

Although contents of each culture are different and each culture has specific way or idea in language, ethics, social rules, the supernatural, styles of bodily decoration, family structure and food preferences. (Cameron M. Smith, Evan T. Davies.) But cultural learning support children make sense of the world and understanding in human societies that cultures are complexes of learned behavior patterns and perceptions, societies are group of interacting organisms and human societies also generally perceive their society is distinct from other societies in terms of shared traditions and expectation. Although culture and societies are not the same thing but also they are the continuously evolving products of people interacting with each other and culture is created and transmitted to others in a society.

Nevertheless, there are layers or levels of culture that are part of your learned behavior patterns and perception which layers consists of culture is the body of culture traditions that distinguish your specific society such as when people speak of Thai or Western culture, they are referring to the shared language, traditions, and beliefs that set each of these people apart from others. Second layers of culture is a subculture or part of your identity which people is diverse societies who come from many different part of their original cultural traditions. As a result, people who are likely to be part of an identifiable subculture in their new society. And members of each subcultures share a common identity, food tradition, dialect or language, and other cultural traits that come from their common ancestral background and experience too.

Addition to the third layer of culture consists of cultural universals. It's also called an anthropological universal or human universal too. And cultural universals are key ideas that groups of people have shared throughout history, it's help to define about groups of people live and act together. Furthermore, the universals that our cultures share is the location of community, family types, economics, belief systems and education.

Culture is the beliefs, behaviors, objects, and other characteristics shared by groups of people. Given this, someone could very well say that they are influenced by internet culture, rather than an ethnicity or a society! Culture could be based on shared ethnicity, gender, customs, values, or even objects. Can you think of any cultural objects? Some cultures place significant value in things such as ceremonial artifacts, jewelry, or even clothing. For example, Christmas trees can be considered ceremonial or *cultural objects*.

In addition, culture can also demonstrate the way a group thinks, their practices, or behavioral patterns, or their views of the world. For example, in some countries like China, it is acceptable to stare at others in public, or to stand very close to others in public spaces. In South Africa, if you board a nearly empty bus or enter a nearly empty movie theater, it is regarded as polite to sit next to the only person there. On the other hand, in a recent study of Greyhound bus trips in the US, a researcher found that the greatest unspoken rule of bus-taking is that if other seats are available, one should never sit next to another person. Numerous passengers expressed that "it makes you look weird". These are all examples of cultural norms that people in one society may be used to. Norms that you are used

to are neither right nor wrong, just different. Picture walking into a nearly empty movie theater when visiting another country, and not sitting next to the only person in the theater. Another person walks up and tells you off for being rude. You, not used to these norms, feel confused, and anxious. This disorientation you feel is an example of culture shock.

There are some main definitions:

- 1) According to E.B. Tylor, "Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society".
- 2) According to B. Malinowski, "Culture is the handiwork of man and the medium through which he achieves his purposes."
- 3) According to H.T. Mazumdar, "Culture is the sum total of human achievements material as well as non-material, capable of transmission, sociologically, that is to say by tradition-and communication, vertically as well as horizontally."
- 4) According to Maclver, "Culture is the expression of our nature in our modes of living and our thinking, intercourse, in our literature, in religion, in recreation and enjoyment."
- 5) According to Lundberg, Culture refers to "the social mechanisms of behaviour and to the physical and symbolic products of these behaviors."
- 6) According to S. Koenig, "Culture is the sum total of man's efforts to adjust himself to his environment and to improve his modes of living."

Thus, culture consists of values, norms, beliefs, traditions, language, ideas, customs, habits, rituals and ceremonies, taboos, codes, institutions, tools, works of art, symbols and so on that characterize a group of people in a given period of time.

Generally culture can be seen as consisting of *three elements*:

- 1) Values - Values are ideas that tell what in life is considered important.
- 2) Norms - Norms consists of expectations of how people should behave in different situations.
- 3) Artifacts — Things or material culture — reflects the culture's values and norms but are manufactured by man.

Culture is also a matter of habit, and it is habit that becomes tradition and tradition that gives rise to culture. Local people begin with habitual actions and go on to create common stereotypes. Stereotypes assign group characteristics to individual purely on the basis of their cultural membership. The cultural stereotypes affect how people think, speak, act, and interact with one another.

Symbolism leads to the "Layers of Meaning" concept. Culture is the meaning that is shared to provide guiding principles for individual meaning.

Language is the most often used form of symbolism. There are 6,912 known living languages, and the diversity is caused by isolation. Most languages have a different "symbol" for each letter, word, or phrase. The use of symbols is adaptive, that means that humans can learn to associate new symbols to a concept or new concepts with a symbol. An example may be drawn from two populations who speak different languages that come into contact with one another and need to communicate. They form a language that has a large degree of flexibility in using

(2) Culture is Social:

Culture is not individual but social in nature. As a social product culture develops through social interaction which is shared by all. Without social interaction or social relations it is very difficult and almost impossible to be cultured. Culture is inclusive of the expectations of the members of the groups. It is created or originated in society. Hence it is social.

(3) Culture is Transmissive:

Culture is transmitted from one generation to another. It passes from parents to children and so on. This transmission is a continuous and spontaneous process. It never remains constant. Man inherits or learns culture from his ancestors and passes it to his successors. In this way culture constantly accumulates.

(4) Culture fulfils some needs:

Culture fulfills many social psychological, moral etc. needs of individuals. Culture is created and maintained because of different needs. It fulfills needs of both society as well as individuals. For example, religion used to fulfill the solidarity and integrative needs of society. Our need for food, clothing, shelter, name, fame, status and position are fulfilled as per our cultural ways.

(5) Culture is shared:

Culture is not possessed by a single or a few individual. Culture is shared by majority of individuals. Hence culture is collective in nature. For example polytheism is our culture. It means majority of Indians believe in polytheism.

(6) Culture is Idealistic:

Culture is idealistic in nature. Because it embodies the ideals, values and norms of the group. It sets ideal goals before individuals which is worth attaining. In other words culture is the sum total of ideals and values of individuals in society.

(7) Culture is accumulative:

Culture is not created in one day or one year. It gradually accumulates through centuries. Beliefs, art, morals, knowledge are gradually stored up and became part of culture. Hence culture is the social heritage.

(8) Culture is adaptive:

Culture possesses adaptive capacity. It is not static. It undergoes changes. Different aspects of culture adapt with new environment or challenges posed by social and physical environment. Adaptation refers to the process of adjustment. And culture helps man in this process of adjustment.

(9) Culture is Variable:

Culture is variable and changeable. It varies and changes from society to society. Because each and every society has its own culture. It also varies within a society from time to time. Ways of living of people of a particular society varies from time to time.

(10) Culture is Organized:

Culture has an order or system. As Tylor says culture is a 'complex whole'. It means different parts of culture are well organized into a cohesive whole. Different parts of culture is organised in such a way that any change in one part brings corresponding changes in other parts.

(11) Culture is Communicative:

Man makes and uses symbol. He also possesses capacity of symbolic communication. Culture is based on symbol and it communicates through different symbols. Common ideas and social heritage etc. are communicated from one generation to another. In our society 'red color' stands for danger. In Indian culture red color symbolic danger. Hence culture is communicative in nature.

(12) Language is the chief vehicle of Culture:

Culture is transmitted from one generation to the next. It never remain static. This transmission became possible through language. Culture is learned through language.

(13) Culture is the total social heritage:

We know culture is a social product. It is linked with the past. Through transmission past continues to live in culture. It is shared by all.

3. The main structural elements of culture

A culture consists of many elements, such as the values and beliefs of its society. Culture is also governed by norms, including laws, mores, and folkways. The symbols and language of a society are key to developing and conveying culture.

Values and Beliefs

The first, and perhaps most crucial, elements of culture we will discuss are its values and beliefs. Culture's **values** are its ideas about what is good, right, fair, and just. Sociologists disagree, however, on how to conceptualize values. Values are deeply embedded and critical for transmitting and teaching a culture's beliefs. **Beliefs** are the tenets or convictions that people hold to be true. Individuals in a society have specific beliefs, but they also share collective values. To illustrate the difference, Americans commonly believe in the American Dream—that anyone who works hard enough will be successful and wealthy. Underlying this belief is the American value that wealth is good and important.

Values help shape a society by suggesting what is good and bad, beautiful and ugly, sought or avoided. Consider the value that the United States places upon youth. Children represent innocence and purity, while a youthful adult appearance signifies sexuality. Shaped by this value, individuals spend millions of dollars each year on cosmetic products and surgeries to look young and beautiful. The United States also has an individualistic culture, meaning people place a high value on individuality and independence. In contrast, many other cultures are collectivist, meaning the welfare of the group and group relationships are a primary value.

Living up to a culture's values can be difficult. It's easy to value good health, but it's hard to quit smoking. Marital monogamy is valued, but many spouses engage in infidelity. Cultural diversity and equal opportunities for all people are valued in the United States, yet the country's highest political offices have been dominated by white men.

Values often suggest how people should behave, but they don't accurately reflect how people do behave. Values portray an ideal culture, the standards society would like to embrace and live up to. But ideal culture differs **from** real culture, the way society actually is, based on what occurs and exists. In an ideal culture, there would be no traffic accidents, murders, poverty, or racial tension. But in real culture, police officers, lawmakers, educators, and social workers constantly strive to prevent or repair those accidents, crimes, and injustices. American teenagers are encouraged to value celibacy.

Symbols and Language

Humans, consciously and subconsciously, are always striving to make sense of their surrounding world. Symbols—such as gestures, signs, objects, signals, and words—help people understand that world. They provide clues to understanding experiences by conveying recognizable meanings that are shared by societies.

The world is filled with symbols. Sports uniforms, company logos, and traffic signs are symbols. In some cultures, a gold ring is a symbol of marriage. Some symbols are highly functional; stop signs, for instance, provide useful instruction. As physical objects, they belong to material culture, but because they function as symbols, they also convey nonmaterial cultural meanings. Some symbols are valuable only in what they represent. Trophies, blue ribbons, or gold medals, for example, serve no other purpose than to represent accomplishments. But many objects have both material and nonmaterial symbolic value.

A police officer's badge and uniform are symbols of authority and law enforcement. The sight of an officer in uniform or a squad car triggers reassurance in some citizens, and annoyance, fear, or anger in others.

It's easy to take symbols for granted. Few people challenge or even think about stick figure signs on the doors of public bathrooms. But those figures are more than just symbols that tell men and women which bathrooms to use. They also uphold the value, in the United States, that public restrooms should be gender exclusive. Even though stalls are relatively private, most places don't offer unisex bathrooms.

Norms

So far, the examples in this chapter have often described how people are expected to behave in certain situations—for example, when buying food or boarding a bus. These examples describe the visible and invisible rules of conduct through which societies are structured, or what sociologists call norms. Norms define how to behave in accordance with what a society has defined as good, right, and important, and most members of the society adhere to them.

Formal norms are established, written rules. They are behaviors worked out and agreed upon in order to suit and serve the most people. Laws are formal norms, but so are employee manuals, college entrance exam requirements, and “no running” signs at swimming pools. Formal norms are the most specific and clearly stated of the various types of norms, and they are the most strictly enforced. But even formal norms are enforced to varying degrees and are reflected in cultural values.

There are plenty of formal norms, but the list of *informal norms*—casual behaviors that are generally and widely conformed to—is longer. People learn informal norms by observation, imitation, and general socialization. Some informal norms are taught directly—“Kiss your Aunt Edna” or “Use your napkin”—while others are learned by observation, including observations of the consequences when someone else violates a norm. But although informal norms define personal interactions, they extend into other systems as well. In the United States, there are informal norms regarding behavior at fast food restaurants. Customers line up to order their food and leave when they are done. They don’t sit down at a table with strangers, sing loudly as they prepare their condiments, or nap in a booth. Most people don’t commit even benign breaches of informal norms. Informal norms dictate appropriate behaviors without the need of written rules.

Every culture is made up of two aspects, namely, **material culture** (any cultural matters that we can see and touch) and **nonmaterial culture** (any cultural practices that we cannot see or touch unless actions taken). Major examples of the former (material culture) include food, shelter, and clothing. Those of the latter (nonmaterial culture) include "norms and values" (discussed below), the language, religion, music, dance, cooking, art, and so on.

Both material and nonmaterial culture are related to "a set of rules, know-hows, and tools that support social life and survival both on the individual level and on the group level," the definition of culture. This means that they summarize, or succinctly stand for, what cultures are for.

Thus, there are **8 main structural elements of culture**:

Culture's values are its ideas about what is good, right, fair, and just. Sociologists disagree, however, on how to conceptualize values.

Customs and Traditions: rules for behavior/how a society expects people to behave = social controls. Ways to express ideas, emotions, and pass on information. Examples: ways you eat, sleep, greet, wear, food. Vary in importance from daily behavior to right and wrong (written law).

Social Groups. Rank people by status: ways: money, education, job, heritage relative to culture and economy.

Language: ways to communicate/express thoughts, feelings, emotions, and knowledge. Basic way to pass on culture. Helps unify and strengthen culture. Issues of dialects. All culture have language but not all develop forms of writing. Verbal/Non-Verbal. Digital Language.

Arts: ways to express ideas information and emotions, teaches cultural values; performing arts. Strengthens a cultures identity. Express cultural pride. Examples: literature, music, visual arts (pictures), dance, stories.

Religion: a person’s belief system that helps guide behavior and teaches basic values = social controls. Where do we come from? How to act? Where are we going?

Forms of Government: a system for making decision for a society: order, protection, education, people who hold power and make the laws.

Economic Systems: how a society obtains food, clothing, and shelter - distribute goods and services. How people use limited resources to satisfy their wants and needs.

TOPIC 2. UNIVERSALISM AS A CULTURAL PARADIGM OF THE XX CENTURY

Topics to be covered:

1. *Cultural models as concepts of cultural studies.*
2. *Cultural universals.*
3. *Universalism as a cultural paradigm.*
4. *The main trends of universalism as a cultural paradigm of the XX century.*

1. Cultural models as concepts of cultural studies.

A cultural model is a means of organizing and representing culturally relevant knowledge. Cultural models (CM) are structures and patterns of behavior that distinguish one culture from another. CM are based on joint experience and are shared by the majority of the members of a certain ethnic or social culture; they are connected with the system of values of these cultures. They are usually learned as ready-made structures, and the members of a society may not be aware of them.

Cultural models are realized through cultural artifacts, traditions, patterns of daily behaviour. There are several types of CM: explicit and implicit models (rituals, games vs. tacit features of an ethnic world view): specific and general CM (the CM of polite behavior vs. the CM of asking for something); linguistic and non-linguistic CM (counting-out rhymes vs. gestures); CM for organizing and expressing experience (theatre, scientific classification), for resolving practical problems (recipes, models of begging, giving orders, etc.). From these assumptions, we can reach the following few deductions about cultural models:

Cultural models are mostly out-of-awareness because mental models typically are. There are minimally two types of cultural models: (a) foundational, which are simpler and based on ontological domains (e.g., space, time, relationship), and (b) molar, which are complex and may include foundational ones and knowledge from other domains.

Individual variation in the construction of cultural models is a consequence of their nature and how they interact with context (ontogenesis).

Cultural variation within communities is also a result of the nature of cultural models (the core and periphery structure) and how they interact with contexts (i.e., group and/or individual experiences).

Cultural models are the units of investigation of culture.

In order to explain the dynamics of culture caused by the change in these forms of activity, A.L. Kroeber introduces the concept of "model", by which he

means a certain configuration or structure, and raises a number of questions regarding the nature of the relationship between culture and the various models according to which it develops. This concept is close to the term "cycle", which, according to its interpretation, "represents a wave or shock within a certain growth or civilization. A cycle is a return movement in the course of culture after a temporary suspension."

2. *Cultural universals*

What is cultural universals? Cultural universals are a value, norm or other cultural trait that found in every group. Anthropologists and sociologists discussed definition cultural universal as is an element, pattern, trait or institution that is common to all human cultures world wide and it's taken together. The whole body of cultural universals is known as the human condition. A ***cultural universal*** (also called an *anthropological universal or human universal*), as discussed by Emile Durkheim, George Murdock, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Donald Brown and others, is an element, pattern, trait, or institution that is common to all human cultures worldwide. Taken together, the whole body of cultural universals is known as the human condition. Evolutionary psychologists hold that behaviors or traits that occur universally in all cultures are good candidates for evolutionary adaptations. Some anthropological and sociological theorists that take a cultural relativist perspective may deny the existence of cultural universals: the extent to which these universals are "cultural" in the narrow sense, or in fact biologically inherited behavior is an issue of "nature versus nurture". Furthermore, cultural universals are present in all cultures by activities such as marriage, funerals, games, laws, music, myths, incest taboos, etc.

Often, a comparison of one culture to another will reveal obvious differences. But all cultures also share common elements. *Cultural universals* are patterns or traits that are globally common to all societies. One example of a cultural universal is the family unit: every human society recognizes a family structure that regulates sexual reproduction and the care of children. Even so, how that family unit is defined and how it functions varies. In many Asian cultures, for example, family members from all generations commonly live together in one household. In these cultures, young adults continue to live in the extended household family structure until they marry and join their spouse's household, or they may remain and raise their own nuclear family within the extended family's homestead. In the United States, by contrast, individuals are expected to leave home and live independently for a period before forming a family unit that consists of parents and their offspring. Other cultural universals include customs like funeral rites, weddings, and celebrations of births. However, each culture may view and enact these rituals and ceremonies quite differently.

Anthropologist George Murdock first recognized the existence of cultural universals while studying systems of kinship around the world. Murdock found that cultural universals often revolve around basic human survival, such as finding food, clothing, and shelter, or around shared human experiences, such as birth and death or illness and healing (Table 1). Through his research, Murdock identified

other universals including language, the concept of personal names, and, interestingly, jokes. Humor seems to be a universal way to release tensions and create a sense of unity among people (Murdock 1949). Sociologists consider humor necessary to human interaction because it helps individuals navigate otherwise tense situations.

Researchers have identified more than 70 traits in all cultures	
Economy	Clothing, Food, Shelter, Communications, Transportation, Business, Jobs, Services, Goods, Technology, Tools, Trade
Institutions	Economy, Religion, Education, Government, Family
Arts	Folk Tales, Crafts, Music, Theater, Dance, Literature, Art
Language	Words, Expressions, Pronunciations, Alphabet, Symbols
Environment	Communities, Geography, Geology, Habitat, Wildlife, Climates, Resources
Recreation	Games, Toys, Arts, Media, Holidays, Festivals
Beliefs	Values, Traditions, Ethnicity, Customs, Religions, Morals

Table 1. Cultural universals

The sociology of culture considers culture usually understood as the ensemble of symbolic codes used by a society — as it is manifested in society. The elements of culture include symbols (anything that carries particular meaning recognized by people who share the same culture); language (system of symbols that allows people to communicate with one another); values (culturally-defined standards that serve as broad guidelines for social living); beliefs (specific statements that people hold to be true); and norms (rules and expectations by which a society guides the behavior of its members). While these elements of culture may be seen in various contexts over time and across geography, a cultural universal is an element, pattern, trait, or institution that is common to all human cultures worldwide. Taken together, the whole body of cultural universals is known as the human condition. Among the cultural universals listed by Donald Brown (1991) are abstract speech, figurative speech and metaphors, antonyms and synonyms, and units of time.

The concept of a cultural universal has long been discussed in the social sciences. Cultural universals are elements, patterns, traits, or institutions that are common to all human cultures worldwide. There is a tension in cultural anthropology and cultural sociology between the claim that culture is a universal (the fact that all human societies have culture), and that it is also particular (culture takes a tremendous variety of forms around the world). The idea of

cultural universals—that specific aspects of culture are common to all human cultures—runs contrary to cultural relativism. Cultural relativism was, in part, a response to Western ethnocentrism.

Ethnocentrism may take obvious forms, in which one consciously believes that one people's arts are the most beautiful, values the most virtuous, and beliefs the most truthful. Franz Boas argued that one's culture may mediate and thus limit one's perceptions in less obvious ways. He understood "culture" to include not only certain tastes in food, art, and music, or beliefs about religion but instead assumed a much broader notion of culture.

Among the cultural universals listed by Donald Brown, some of these were investigated by Franz Boas. For example, Boas called attention to the idea that language is a means of categorizing experiences, hypothesizing that the existence of different languages suggests that people categorize, and thus experience, language differently. Therefore, although people may perceive visible radiation the same way, in terms of a continuum of color, people who speak different languages slice up this continuum into discrete colors in different ways.

Symbols are the basis of culture. A symbol is an object, word, or action that stands for something else with no natural relationship that is culturally defined. Everything one does throughout their life is based and organized through cultural symbolism. Symbolism is when something represents abstract ideas or concepts. Some good examples of symbols/symbolism would be objects, figures, sounds, and colors. For example in the Hawaiian culture, the performance of a Lua is a symbol of their land and heritage which is performed through song and dance. Also, they could be facial expressions or word interpretations. Symbols mean different things to different people, which is why it is impossible to hypothesize how a specific culture will symbolize something. Some symbols are gained from experience, while others are gained from culture. One of the most common cultural symbols is language. For example, the letters of an alphabet symbolize the sounds of a specific spoken language.

As a result of cultural universals is a layer of culture and in globalization world, children could study about it for more knowledge understanding in everyday experiences. So children are learned behavior patterns of cultural universals that are shared by all of humanity collectively and share these universals traits, no matter where people live in the world. Examples of such "human cultural" traits include:

1. communicating with a verbal language consisting of a limited set of sounds and grammatical rules for constructing sentences.
2. using age and gender to classify people (e.g., teenager, senior citizen, woman, man)
3. classifying people based on marriage and descent relationships and having kinship terms to refer to them (e.g., wife, mother, uncle, cousin)
4. raising children in some sort of family setting.
5. having a sexual division of labor (e.g., men's work versus woman's work)
6. having a concept of privacy.
7. having roles to regulate sexual behavior.
8. distinguishing between good and bad behavior.

9. having some sort of body ornamentation.
10. making jokes and playing games
11. having art
12. having some sort of leadership roles for the implementation of community decisions.

While all cultures have these and possibly many other universal traits, different cultures have developed their own specific way of carrying out or expressing them. And for learning and teaching about cultural universals, we can take a list of cultural universals for examples there are 10 topics include: 1. Theme: a) Values b) Ethics c) Symbols 2. Economics: a) Trade and money b) Division of labor c) Technology: i) Communication systems ii) Transportation iii) Inventions 3. Geographic setting: a) Influence of civilizations b) Resources c) Topographical characteristics 4. Food, Clothing, and Shelter: a) Food (method of production and animal domestication) b) Clothing and adornment c) Shelter, dwelling, and architecture. 5. Political Organization: a) Government b) Law enforcement c) War and Peace. 6. Family and Kin: a) Marriage and type of family grouping b) Child training and rites of passage c) Roles and responsibilities 7. Attitude toward the “Unknown”: a) Religious beliefs b) Religious practices c) Death rituals 8. Esthetic Values: a) Art b) Music c) Dance, drama, literature 9. Communications: a) Language b) Number systems 10. Recreation: a) Games and sports b) Use of leisure time (Source: Adapted by Jennifer HanZak) As follows cultural universals is a value or norm that found in every group and it is a layer of culture in globalization world. So children must has studied all traits and topics of cultural universals for getting knowledge and applied it nowadays’s life.

3. Universalism as a cultural paradigm

Cultural universalism the view that the values, concepts, and behaviors characteristic of diverse cultures can be viewed, understood, and judged according to universal standards. Such a view involves the rejection, at least in part, of cultural relativism. Universalism implies that it is possible to apply generalized norms, values, or concepts to all people and cultures, regardless of the contexts in which they are located. These norms may include a focus on human needs, rights, or biological and psychological processes and are based on the perspective that all people are essentially equivalent. As an example, the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights asserts various rights to all people – e.g., to marry, own property, and access equal protection under the law – regardless of culture or nationality.

Universalism and particularism are value standards that may guide behavior of persons or of whole cultures (Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars, 1996). The distinction has been made since at least the early 1950’s (Parsons and Shils, 1951), and has gained visibility with the work of Trompenaars and his associates (Smith, Dugan and Tompenaars, 1996; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). Universalism implies that correct behavior can be defined and always applies, while particularism suggests that relationships come ahead of abstract social codes.

Universalism - one of the Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1997) dimensions describing the preference for rules over relationships (or vice versa). In a Universalist culture, a rule cannot be broken and is a "*hard fact*", no matter what the relationship with the person is. People in universalistic cultures share the belief that general rules, codes, values and standards take precedence over particular needs and claims of friends and relations.

The concept of universalism is prevalent across the social, political, and physical sciences. In the field of psychology, universalism conventionally refers to the idea that the range of human experience – from basic needs and psychological processes to core values – is intrinsic and therefore similar across humans and cultures.

Religious dimension of cultural universalism.

Universalism is the philosophical and theological concept that some ideas have universal application or applicability. A belief in one fundamental truth is another important tenet in universalism. The living truth is seen as more far-reaching than the national, cultural, or religious boundaries or interpretations of that one truth. As the Rig Veda states, "Truth is one; sages call it by various names." A community that calls itself *universalist* may emphasize the universal principles of most religions, and accept others in an inclusive manner. In the modern context, Universalism can also mean the pursuit of unification of all human beings across geographic and other boundaries, or the application of universal or universalist constructs, such as human rights or international law.

Universalism is the religious doctrine that every created person will sooner or later be reconciled to God, the loving source of all that is, and will in the process be reconciled to all other persons as well. Insofar as Christianity is a historical religion and includes substantive beliefs about the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, Christians are indeed committed to the view that anyone who denies this historical event is mistaken and anyone who does not understand its theological significance has not yet grasped the full truth of the matter. John Hick, the best-known proponent of universalism among twentieth-century philosophers of religion, has also been one of the most outspoken defenders of religious pluralism. This article discusses universalism and other Christian doctrines, including salvation. It also examines free will and the problem of hell, libertarian free will, and the role of human freedom in universal reconciliation.

Universalism has had an influence on modern day Hinduism, in turn influencing modern Western spirituality. Christian universalism refers to the idea that every human will be saved in a religious or spiritual sense. This specific idea being called universal reconciliation.

Moral universalism (also called moral objectivism or universal morality) is the meta-ethical position that some system of ethics applies universally. That system is inclusive of all individuals, regardless of culture, race, sex, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, or any other distinguishing feature. Moral universalism is opposed to moral nihilism and moral relativism. However, not all forms of moral universalism are absolutist, nor do

they necessarily value monism. Many forms of universalism, such as utilitarianism, are non-absolutist.

4. *The main trends of universalism as a cultural paradigm of the XX century.*

The scientist notes that O. Spengler's contribution to the history of culture is to recognize the importance of fundamental cultural models (in contrast to the prevailing notions of the significance of individual actions in which empirical cultural phenomena are given) and the remarkable strength of their characteristics. At the same time, he points to an important difference between O. Spengler's approach and his own, which is that if O. Spengler tried to present the fundamental cultural models as such, ie, in its final form, AL Kroeber himself stopped only on the examination and analysis of some of the models, namely, on the period that characterizes their flowering. In addition to this feature in the approach to the analysis of cultural models, AL Kroeber points to a number of other differences between his own concept and the concept of O. Spengler. Thus, he does not support him by the fact that the German thinker insists on isolating individual cultures, rejecting the factors of continuity and mutual influence; he does not share the point of view of O. Spengler, according to which all cultures pass through fixed parallel stages of development, and then inevitably die. Noting a number of merits of this author, AL Kroeber at the same time writes that the shortcomings of O. Spengler as a scientist-researcher are well known that "the analysis of his work reveals at every step unjustified exaggeration, dogmatism, prejudice, misses, inability to reconcile evidences" . Proceeding from this, the author sets himself the task not to expand the negative criticism of O. Spengler, but to try to formulate the real problem posed by the German culturologist to the court of history, and to show in which direction it is possible to seek its solution.

Configurations of cultural growth AL Krobera

The American culturologist and anthropologist Alfred Louis Kreber (1876-1960) in the breadth of his horizons is comparable, perhaps, not with colleagues ethnologists, but with the philosophers of history. Interest in ancient and modern civilizations distinguished this author from many other contemporary anthropologists. He himself acknowledged that the main trend in anthropology is cultural and historical. This is confirmed by his texts, in which he turned to a thorough and serious scientific analysis of the concepts of N. Ya. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, A.J. Toynbi, P.A. Sorokin.

A major place among his creative heritage in the study of civilization is the capital work "Cultural Growth Configurations", where his methodological principles were most consistently embodied, with a very concrete and laconically submitted factual material. In this work, as well as in the later "Style and civilization" (1957), A.L. Kroeber reviews the previous approaches to the analysis of civilizations, illuminating the views of his predecessors, especially considering the concept of O. Spengler, proceeding from the fact that the approach to which he himself follows has some similarity with the approach of the German thinker , although there are fundamental differences.

This problem A.L. Kroeber sees in the identification of the degree of coherence and consistency between many parts, organs, elements, regions, i.e. all components of culture. O. Spengler emphasized the ultimate interconnectedness of all the components of culture and the permeability of each culture with a single prazimvol: for example, sensuality, corporeality are symbols of classical antiquity; eternally closed space - a symbol of magical culture; the boundless space is symbolized by the West, and the endless plain is the unborn United States culture. This principle, which lies at the base of the Spenglerian approach, A.L. Kroeber defines as a certain style, which gives an originality to culture and characterizes it. As an example, he cites the written language that exists in all the cultures that belong to O. Spengler, and specifies that they are distinguished by the style of writing, and the main thing is this, and not just the availability of writing. Thus, some ideas of O. Spengler were in demand and processed by A.L. Kroeber, as evidenced mainly by the late period of his work.

AL Kroeber's views were also close to some of the provisions of the civilizational concepts of P.A. Sorokin. In the work "Style and civilization" A.L. Kreber writes: "I agree with Sorokin that the point of view of Danilevsky and Spengler, which Toynbee shares to a great extent, and according to which civilizations with necessity have only one life cycle, with one non-renewable creative phase, this viewpoint is unacceptable & quot ;. The culture's adaptation to the biological organism, which was reduced to the fact that every culture, like any living organism, has periods of birth, maturation and death, it does not share, although it notes that the biological situation is very similar, however, "the fact that individual organisms die, can not serve as proof that individual cultures must also die."

A.L. Kroeber does not share the opposite point of view, according to which cultures do not die, do not grow old or weaken with necessity on their own, but are overcome by other cultures. Such a point of view unprovenly affirms the internal tendency of culture to progress. The American culturologist adheres to the third point of view, according to which "cultures necessarily grow old or progress, are simply subject to fluctuations in strength, originality and level of generated values". He noted that the duration of the development of culture and the trend towards growth are related to the degree of consolidation of values in it, which can be promoted by each successive generation.

Along with Kroeber and his predecessors, in particular with PA Sorokin and AJ Toynbi, the recognition of the role of the creative minority - in other words, geniuses - in the development of civilization and in the possibility of its evaluation. "Geniuses are indicators of the consistent development of models with high cultural value." The highest flowering of culture is expressed through higher personalities.

Three Principal Types of Culture Integration by P. Sorokin

In his *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, his magnum opus, Sorokin classified societies according to their 'cultural mentality', which can be "ideational" (reality is spiritual), "sensate" (truth is material), or "idealistic" (a synthesis of the two).

He suggested that significant civilizations evolve from a conceptual to an idealistic, and eventually to a sensate mentality. Each of these phases of cultural development not only seeks to describe the nature of reality, but also stipulates the nature of human needs and goals to be satisfied, the extent to which they should be satisfied, and the methods of satisfaction. Sorokin has interpreted the contemporary Western civilization as a sensate civilization, dedicated to technological progress and prophesied its fall into decadence and the emergence of a new ideational or idealistic era. In *Fads and Foibles*, he criticizes Lewis Terman's *Genetic Studies of Genius* research, showing that his selected group of children with high IQs did about as well as a random group of children selected from similar family backgrounds would have done.

Thus, evolutionists insisted on the obligatory linear progress from simpler cultures to more complex ones, on a unilinear progressive development scheme, as opposed to the idea of the uniqueness and originality of cultures. Moreover, they believed that the only possible way for the development of "primitive" communities was to unite on the basis of European values. This contributed to the formation of a new worldview model. Let's call it Eurocentric universalism.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, universalism and particularism remain polar attitudes. The most prominent universalists of the twentieth century are V. Soloviev, K. Jaspers and A. J. Toynbee. The starting point for their analysis is religion. Thus, V. Soloviev put forward the thesis of the unity of peoples on the basis of Christianity. He believed that the coexistence of different nations in a single space is possible only on the basis of Christian commandments ("to love other people's nationalities as your own").

However, K. Jaspers, for example, reasonably assumed that Christianity cannot introduce all peoples into the common human family. He argued that any religion is based on revelation, which separates believers from unbelievers, thereby hindering mutual understanding and creating a claim to exclusivity among believers. According to Jaspers' beliefs, such a claim has always served as a source of fanaticism, intolerance ("The origins of history and its purpose"). Therefore, he put forward the thesis about philosophical faith as the basis of all-human unity ("Philosophical Faith"). Philosophical faith, as Jaspers thought it, is on the border between religious faith and scientific knowledge, and therefore can be significant for everyone, since it is based on experience available to everyone. Philosophical faith, according to Jaspers, appeared in the "axial time", which marked the transition from the tightness, contributing to the "extinction" of cultures, to unity on the basis of common existential meanings. According to Jaspers, the main conditions for the unification of mankind are: 1) unlimited communication, contributing to the understanding of the Other through "uniting one's own consciousness with someone else's"; 2) the interchange of knowledge, on the basis of which a universal truth is created. Boundless communication has the meaning of a world-historic task. If humanity renounces universal spiritual values, then the possibility of universal human communication will be cut off, and this can lead to a global catastrophe. A. Toynbee came to the conclusion that world-historical development appears as a movement from local cultural communities to a single

common human culture. The main driving force behind the unification, according to the author, is religion, which in the future will become one, uniting all of humanity. Here we see a new type of universalism, which can be called "spiritual-planetary". It is based on the idea of a tolerant combination of different cultural values in the face of a common human existential situation. However, the question of the attainability of this type of universality remains open.

TOPIC 3. PARTICULARISM AS THE CULTURAL MODEL OF THE XX CENTURY

Topics to be covered:

1. *Historical particularism.*
2. *Cultural particularism in the XX centuries.*
3. *The main trends of universalism as a cultural paradigm of the the XX centuries.*
4. *Main trends of global culture during the XXI century.*

Particularism (Lat. *Particularis* - partial, private) is characterized by the idea of an independent, separate development of cultures.

Particularism, also called historical particularism, school of anthropological thought associated with the work of Franz Boas and his students (among them A.L. Kroeber, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead), whose studies of culture emphasized the integrated and distinctive way of life of a given people. Particularism stood in opposition to theories such as cultural evolution, *Kulturkreis*, and geographical or environmental determinism, all of which sought to discover for the social sciences a series of general laws analogous to those in the physical sciences (such as the laws of thermodynamics or gravity).

Boas's own work emphasized studies of individual cultures, each based on its unique history. He held that the anthropologist's primary assignment was to describe the particular characteristics of a given culture with a view toward reconstructing the historical events that led to its present structure. Implicit in this approach was the notion that resolving hypotheses regarding evolutionary development and the influence of one culture on another should be secondary to the careful and exhaustive study of particular societies. Boas urged that the historical method, based on the description of particular culture traits and elements, supplant the comparative method of the evolutionists, who used their data to rank cultures in an artificial hierarchy of achievement. He rejected the assumption of a single standard of achievement to which all cultures could be compared, instead advocating cultural relativism, the position that all cultures are equally able to meet the needs of their members.

Under Boas's influence, the particularist approach dominated American anthropology for the first half of the 20th century. From World War II through the 1970s, it was eclipsed by neoevolutionism and a variety of other theories. However, the particularist approach, if not the term itself, reemerged in the 1980s as scholars began to recognize that distinctive historical processes differentiate peoples even in the era of globalization.

Franz Boas and his students developed *historical particularism* early in the twentieth century. This approach claims that each society has its own unique historical development and must be understood based on its own specific cultural and environmental context, especially its historical process. Its core premise was that culture was a "set of ideas or symbols held in common by a group of people

who see themselves as a social group” (Darnell 2013: 399). Historical particularists criticized the theory of the nineteenth-century social evolution as non-scientific and proclaimed themselves to be free from preconceived ideas. Boas believed that there were universal laws that could be derived from the comparative study of cultures; however, he thought that the ethnographic database was not yet robust enough for us to identify those laws. To that end, he and his students collected a vast amount of first-hand cultural data by conducting ethnographic fieldwork. Based on these raw data, they described particular cultures instead of trying to establish general theories that apply to all societies.

The Historical particularists valued fieldwork and history as critical methods of cultural analysis. At the same time, the anthropologists in this theoretical school had different views on the importance of individuals in a society. For example, Frantz Boas saw each individual as the basic component of a society. He gathered information from individual informants and considered such data valuable enough for cultural analysis. On the other hand, *Alfred Kroeber* did not see individuals as the fundamental elements of a society. He believed a society evolves according to its own internal laws that do not directly originate from its individuals. He named this cultural aspect superorganic and claimed that a society cannot be explained without considering this impersonal force.

Historical particularism was a dominant trend in anthropology during the first half of the twentieth century. One of the achievements of the historical particularists was that they succeeded in excluding racism from anthropology. The nineteenth-century evolutionists explained cultural similarities and differences by classifying societies into superior and inferior categories. Historical particularists showed that this labeling is based on insufficient evidence and claimed that societies cannot be ranked by the value judgment of researchers. Historical particularists were also responsible for showing the need for long-term, intensive fieldwork in order to produce accurate descriptions of cultures. One important part of doing that was to learn the language of the study group.

2. Cultural particularism in the XX centuries

In the 21st-century, the idea of departing from the evolutionary universalism is nothing new. In the late 19th and early 20th century, Franz Boas (1858–1942), a German-born “father of American anthropology” (Stocking, 1960) insisted on the research of particular cultures instead of armchair anthropology searching for “general rules of human society development”. As he established the first PhD programme in anthropology in the US, he was also responsible for establishing the “four-field” concept of anthropology, physical anthropology, linguistics, archaeology, and cultural anthropology that dominated 20th century American anthropology. For our purposes, the main concepts of his cultural anthropology are of interest. He emphasised that a given group of people represents an integrated and distinctive way of life that cannot be reduced to a phase in the cultural development of humankind. As a consequence, it is necessary to study individual cultures as separate entities based on their unique history. Anthropologist’s primary assignment should then be to describe the characteristics of a particular

culture accurately and reconstruct “historical events that led to its present structure.” (Encyclopaedia Britannica/ biography/Franz-Boas). The Boasian programme was then quite straightforward in its premises and very rigid in its methodology, at least in theory. Cultures are independent structures that develop according to their own “inner logic”. This is not to say that they are isolated one from another. Quite to the contrary, the exchange of values and ideas does happen, in a process that Boas called “diffusion”. However, due to the uniqueness and complexity of every system, the origin and the sequential order of the process cannot be properly determined and it should not be anthropologist’s primary concern to do so. An anthropologist should focus on the culture as an independent entity and research it through direct contact (fieldwork) instead of making unjustified judgements about the level of development of a certain culture. Only in this way, one can understand the real meaning of the customs, rituals and even language. In other words, even if from the perspective of another culture they might be meaningless, elements of culture are meaningful in terms of a particular culture and can only be properly understood from that particular culture’s point of view. A similar approach was presented not much later by Polish anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942) who believed that only through long-time participation in the life of a certain group one can properly understand the culture and the meaning of the individual cultural elements. (1967). Boas’s students developed and often modified Boas’s programme, making his approach a dominant stream in American studies on cultures. Works by Alfred Louis Kroeber (1876–1960), Ruth Benedict (1887–1948) and Margareth Mead (1901–1978) marked the way towards a more profound understanding of cultures as individual and comprehensive entities. In this respect, Ruth Benedict’s *Patterns of Culture* (first published in 1934) is particularly worth mentioning. The main argument of Benedict’s work is the emphasis on the individual character of every culture. For her, there is a “more or less consistent pattern of thought and action” (p. 46) underlying any culture. Culture is then, on the one hand, a product of human’s creativity that is built of “characteristics” chosen from “the great arc of human potentiality”. On the other, these few characteristics form an independent constellation of values, predispositions and preferences that have a great impact on personalities of the people living in the specific culture. In other words, as a group of people creates a culture, the culture shapes the way they live, perceive and experience the world around them. Culture is then a unique product of a unique selection, transformation and appropriation of a certain set of characteristics, that in reverse shapes minds of those who belong to a certain culture. As products of human potentiality, those IAFOR Journal of Cultural Studies Volume 3 – Issue 2 – Autumn 2018 67 characteristics might be accessible or even understandable for another group of people. However, the way they have been “selected” and transformed is a product of a certain unique situation, and the outcome comprises a unique, comprehensive and “more or less consistent” structure, that cannot be thoroughly understood if not taken as an independent whole. As a consequence, every culture has its unique moral system, a way of perceiving and acting that might not only be difficult to understand for someone from another culture but can

be at odds with the principles of the latter's cultural system.³ However, this does not mean that even the strangest or most unacceptable values and practices for an outsider do not comprise an intelligible and coherent system in which they have their functions and meaning. As such, instead of being “judged” and classified as fitting a certain pre-established standard or not, they should be recognised as proper values of a particular system. Culture as a coherent whole is then a crucial factor shaping individual personalities, and through these personalities culture finds its way of expression. The main findings of the Culture and Personality School (Benedict and Mead) are worthy of reconsideration in times of the increasing encounters between cultures. Despite all declarations about the necessity to embrace differences, proponents of multiculturalism largely failed to provide a coherent theory that fully recognises the sociohistorical uniqueness of a particular system and prevalence of certain moral and behavioural structures in particular settings (Barry, 2001; Kymlicka, 2007: pp. 16–18). The universal character of human nature and humans’ needs are brought up instead. Even though, as Bronisław Malinowski for instance proved, some specific psychological complexes are not universal (1927). This belief in the universality of humans’ needs has been elevated to the position of moral principle, and its rejection might lead to dire consequences. As the motivation behind such an approach might in all respects be worthy of acknowledgement, the results of such thinking are quite severe. In short, it is a clear return to the old social evolutionism and a display of Western cultural colonialism. After all, the very idea of multiculturalism is a product of Western societies and is virtually unknown to any other cultural circle.

Multicultural particularism is the belief that a common culture for all people is either undesirable or impossible. In discussions of multiculturalism, historian and educator Diane Ravitch draws a distinction between what she terms “pluralistic” and “particularistic” varieties and suggests that other writers often blur or ignore this distinction. In a long essay about multiculturalism in American education, Ravitch praises the inclusiveness of multicultural pluralism while decrying what she sees as multiple flaws and failures of multicultural particularism.

3. The main cultural change in the in the XX centuries

Following these multiple facets of culture, we shall now briefly go through some outstanding developments in related fields such as the sciences, arts, entertainment, values, religion and education which were witnessed in the twentieth century.

Perhaps the most remarkable achievement of the twentieth century was the *phenomenal growth of science and technology* which affected and transformed every aspect of life from entertainment and education to transport and communication at a very rapid pace during the period. Cars and aeroplanes, radio and transistors, movies and television, calculators and computers, satellites and mobile phones and lasers and organ transplants are only some of the new products and services made available by modern technology during the preceding century.

Behind this spate of technological innovations lay very intricate developments in various scientific realms such as sub atomic physics, genetic and molecular biology and space research. Some of the famous scientists who made major discoveries in these fields were Marie Curie, Albert Einstein, Fyneman and Homi J. Bhabha.

But by and large recent scientific advancements have not been a product of individual genius so much as of large teams of scientists drawn from various countries of the world and concentrated in heavily funded research centers in advanced countries, specially the USA. It is also important to note that while contemporary science and technology have offered numerous benefits to people, at the same time, the apprehension and fear of science amongst people has also grown simultaneously. Partly this is due to the incomprehensibility of latest advances in modern science even to educated laymen. What makes modern science perhaps even more awesome is its power to manufacture evermore destructive weapons and to threaten the delicate ecological balance on the earth. Obviously, social accountability and responsibility of scientists and governments promoting and guiding scientific research is high in the present epoch.

The Arts and Literature Besides science, the twentieth century has also been a time of considerable growth of art forms such as painting, music and literature and of the emergence of some totally novel artistic media such as cinema and recorded music. Some of the major art movements which shaped new creative work in this period across countries were modernism, socialist realism and postmodernism. In fact modernism evolved as ‘avant garde’ or leading art trend in Europe in the last quarter of nineteenth century and became a worldwide influence in the twentieth century. Although modernism had diverse streams such as symbolism, impressionism and surrealism, one major tendency common to them all has been the urge to uncover the deeper world of subconscious feelings and thoughts instead of portraying the apparent world of objects and persons as they appear. Further, to give expression to this modernist concern with subjective and subconscious elements, conventional modes of artistic expression had also to be transcended and new and bold experiments tried repeatedly which often look extremely abstract and incomprehensible to an untrained viewer.

Some of the great modernists who evolved their own styles in this vein were the Spanish painter Pablo Picasso famous for introducing ‘cubism’ or multi dimensional view of figures in paintings and the famous Irish writer James Joyce who introduced the technique of ‘the stream of consciousness’ in his work called Ulysses.

Ironically, while most modernists were extremely bold and experimental in evolving new modes of artistic expression, in their social and political outlook, many of them remained apathetic to political challenges of their time and deeply pessimistic about modern civilization or even the human condition as a whole. In the same period, however, another branch of artists expressed a more forward looking and hopeful vision of social transformation in their works through the genre of socialist realism. Playwrights like Bertold Brecht in Germany and George Bernard Shaw of Britain and novelists like Maxim Gorki and poets like Alexander

Blok in Russia can be counted as the leading lights of this trend. These poets and writers were inspired by the ideals of an egalitarian transformation of society. The Bolshevik Revolution and the creation of the Soviet Union inspired many and socialist realism as an art trend continued to inspire considerable creative work in many non communist countries caught in the fierce trap of colonial, feudal and capitalist exploitation simultaneously. In India, for example, the Progressive Writers' Association was formed by master poets like Majaz and Josh in 1940s with explicit left sympathies, and other masters such as Premchand reflected deep social concerns in their realist accounts of rural life of their times. Similarly, in China, great realist writing with socialist leanings was penned by a genius like Lu Hsun while in Latin America the anti US resistance inspired the poetry of Pablo Neruda.

Philosophy and the Human Sciences In terms of students, faculty positions in universities and publications, the Human Sciences (Social Sciences and Psychology) have seen a phenomenal expansion in the twentieth century and specially after the Second World War in most countries of the world. However, along with expansion and the growing race for publications and promotions amongst social scientists has come a growing tendency for specialization and jargon which characterizes lots of academic writing today. In fact, the birth of specialized disciplines from a comprehensive and unspecialized approach to social and philosophical enquiry can be traced back to early nineteenth century in Europe when economics, political science, sociology, anthropology and psychology gradually emerged as distinct disciplines with their own specific methods and delimited concerns. Meanwhile, philosophy under the influence of thinkers like A.J. Ayer and Wittgenstein itself shifted focus increasingly from probing broader questions about ethics and politics to a narrower and rigorous concern with clarifying the nature of language and symbols through which issues are posed.

This does not imply that broader questions about causation, human nature and change are not being posed today. Great thinkers like Bertrand Russell, Noam Chomsky and Louis Althusser continued to write on a broad range of concerns.

While changing concerns and achievements of scientists, philosophers and artists are important aspects of cultural history, changes in cultural institutions such as religions, folklore, language, education systems and the mass media are also extremely significant to note in any study of cultural change. Anthropologists refer to these as cultural institutions or symbol systems which represent coherent patterns of values and worldview to the participants. Such cultural symbols are of historical significance not only because they address basic human needs for information, entertainment and faith or 'meaning' in life but also because they have a major role in shaping popular values, beliefs, emotions and behavior patterns commonly observed in different social groups.

But it is important to note here that in most societies, the regulation and control of cultural institutions such as education and the mass media is mostly in the hands of the dominant elites who control property as well as centres of power. You are familiar with the Brahmanical influence on Hindu beliefs regarding caste system, sati etc. which enabled the upper castes especially in ancient India to

monopolise the fruits of labor performed by the Sudras. Similarly, in modern times, the capitalist class exercises vast influence on the mass media and seeks to mould popular beliefs and attitudes in such a way as to facilitate its dominance over the exploited masses with or without the use of force. Within this general model of the operation of cultural institutions, numerous variations can be seen in their characteristics or 'meaning'. The past century was indeed a time of rapid transformation when fundamental changes occurred not only in the message and content of education, religion and folklore etc. but also in the balance between these major cultural institutions across countries.

One of the principal ingredients of any culture is its *language*. The twentieth century witnessed a dramatic transformation of the linguistic map of the world as local dialects spoken by the masses as well as classical languages like Sanskrit and Latin, which had been the privileged media of learning amongst scholars for centuries, gave way to select national languages adopted by regions to express their emerging national identities. It has been estimated that nearly 6500 languages are still spoken in the world today. Nearly half of these are spoken by tiny communities and are in the process of becoming extinct already. Ten major languages are mother tongues of more than half of world's population already. Another interesting feature of the changing language pattern of the globe in recent times has been the growth of bilingualism or familiarity with at least two languages amongst a growing number of educated people across the globe. The English language has particularly emerged as the second adopted language with the growth of globalization and the emergence of the internet. While the Chinese remain the biggest linguistic group in the world still, the number of people knowing English (about 10% of global population) is second and the number knowing English as second language is the highest. Another major development amongst languages in the twentieth century under the impact of growing education and mass media has been the growing mixture between them. While English itself has adopted a number of new words from other languages including French and Hindi, the evolution of Hinglish or the spoken mixture of Hindi, Urdu and English amongst educated Indians is also noteworthy in this context.

The twentieth century also saw a major transformation in the position of *folklore in popular culture across societies*. Dozens of traditional arts and modes of entertainment such as puppet shows, story telling, mythological drama, folk dances etc have quietly but surely got marginalized within the past century over most of the developing world. Age old songs, tales and fables which had been used by communities to both transmit ideas and values to succeeding generations rapidly lost ground to professionally produced entertainment and news programs broadcast through the modern mass media Yet some effort is being made by states as well as civic agencies, as in India, to preserve them through financial and institutional support now.

Mass media. On the other hand radio, cinema, gramophone records, television, cassettes and CDs and computers and mobile phones arrived in quick succession and revolutionized the way we receive information, entertain ourselves, relate to each other or even think and respond to social and political issues.

Though some of the new media like cinema and television have been used for producing highly artistic and educational programs also by great artists of the century such as Charlie Chaplin, Satyajit Ray and Steven Spielberg yet, the logic of advertising and the competition for a mass audience which is the driving force behind these media has encouraged more and more sensationalism, sex and violence in their programs. The attention commanded by these new channels of mass communication and entertainment has been historic. Thus it was found during a survey that in the USA a majority of families already had two TV sets in 1980 and that an average child there spent twice as much time before television as in study or sports.

Besides traditional art forms and folklore, another major cultural institution whose role in most societies has got delimited over the past century is *religion*. In both the developed and the developing world, predominantly secular outlooks and loyalties such as humanism, nationalism and democracy have inspired vast movements and commitment amongst people over the past century. This is not to say that nationalists (who profess a strong loyalty to a nation state) or the humanists (who value human life more than the after life) can't be religious at the same time. Indeed, in almost all the countries, most people (specially women) continue to count themselves amongst believers to this day. In a 1981 survey of religious beliefs in the USA, for example, only about 10% of people described themselves as atheists. Moreover, pilgrimages and the production of devotional literature and songs etc has actually grown phenomenally over the past century. Yet, the shrinking influence of religion in everyday life is also evident in the fact that religion does not permeate daily practices ranging from greetings, meals, celebrations, public ceremonies etc specially in the cities in the manner it did only a hundred years back. Secondly, religious values and outlook do not entirely encompass other major social institutions such as the state, arts etc. as they did earlier and a vast number of our practices today are actually carried on in a manner quite contradictory to common religious beliefs. Thus, only a century ago, most marriages even in the west were solemnized in the church and baptism for every new born was almost mandatory. By 1990, it was discovered in France that only 30% of couples got married in church. Divorce and abortion which were prohibited by the church have become not only legalized in most countries in the west but also increasingly accepted and destigmatised. Similar trends are visible in many Asian and African countries too.

While religion has ceased to define, in recent times, the rules and ideals operative in a growing number of social realms, modern education based on secular and scientific knowledge has grown phenomenally over the same period. The requirements of modern educated citizens proficient in reading, writing and calculations and proud of their

national history and heritage was strongly felt not only for manning the modern posts in the state and industrial and service sectors of the economy but also for creating a homogeneous body of citizens intrinsically loyal to their nation states. Most western countries had made school education compulsory and affordable or free in the nineteenth century itself. In the previous century, the

newly liberated nations in Asia and Africa also made efforts in the same direction though with less success due to limited resources and the heavy burden of the colonial and alien pattern in their education systems. In our country, more than half of the population remained non literate as late as 1980 and only in the preceding two decades has the proportion of non literates come down to 25% approximately. Meanwhile university education expanded rapidly from the middle of the twentieth century. Thus, in 1939, in advanced countries like Britain and France, less than 0.1% of the population were enrolled in colleges. By late 1990s, however, nearly 2% of the population in most of these nations could be receiving college education (a twenty fold increase). Indeed, between 1960 and 1980, higher education expanded phenomenally in the developing world too and similar proportion of students in these poorer countries got enrolled in universities soon even though their vocational and primary education still remained undeveloped. Further, due to a much smaller organized sector in their economies the problem of educated unemployed was also stupendous in these countries. University students have been active in social and cultural protests. The large scale and simultaneous student protests which spread like wild fire from New York and San Fransisco to Paris and Prague in 1968 are still remembered for their radicalism since they sought to not only oppose repressive state policies and educational elitism within these countries, but also spawned robust internationalism and anti war anti imperialist sentiments by challenging US intervention in Vietnam. In the more recent decades, however, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union and the proliferation of escapist entertainment channels, student protests seem to be in a state of lull worldwide.

The rise of modern education, mass media and secular political ideologies have contributed to another significant development of the twentieth century, namely, **globalization**. The process of globalization may be defined as the emergence of a more and more integrated world with growing networks of multi-national trade, manufacturing and finance as well as political and welfare agencies such as the United Nations and professional bodies such as the World Social Forum uniting an overwhelming number of people in ties of interdependence though on unequal terms favoring the rich. The growth of multi national corporations, the availability of goods and services from across the globe in city malls and over the internet, cheap and instant communication of ideas, news and information across the globe, the emergence of global trends and markets in fashion, food and entertainment are all indications of the extent of globalization apparent today. Here it is important to understand that globalization did not suddenly emerge in the twentieth century. Global trading networks and flow of medical and technical knowledge can be traced back to earlier periods too. The process of colonization of non European countries by European powers from the beginning of the sixteenth century stepped up the unequal integration of the world in a phenomenal way. But the growth of powerful and far reaching transnational corporations and associations and global media networks are more specific to the preceding century only. While these new channels enable global flows of goods, services and information and may be expected to bring greater choice and possibly

prosperity to some regions, the reality is that not only have they suddenly disrupted age old cultural patterns and social customs but are also moulding the entire world in western habits and values generally, besides further sharpening inequalities between the rich and the poor across the globe. Unfortunately, within this advance of western ideas and habits across the globe again, the migration of the great ideals of liberty, equality and democracy into the non western world have been much more difficult than the contagion of western individualism, materialism, break up of the joint family and community ties, loneliness, neurosis etc. On top of this, in many developing countries, the problems of rampant poverty, corruption, criminalization, lawlessness or dictatorships still complicate the situation ominously. In this scenario, great responsibility falls on the shoulders of the young to make the right choices between enticing options and steer their countries through the whirlwind of cultural and social change expected to accelerate in the new century.

The concept of *cultural relativism* should be mentioned here as an attempt to find ways to bring universalism and particularism closer together. The semantic core is the idea of equality of different cultures, regardless of their level of complexity and originality, and does not abandon a universal (single) integral culture, but at the same time stands in sharp opposition to the doctrine of Eurocentrism. One of the brightest representatives is M. Herskovitz, who argued that when comparing the cultures of different peoples, it is necessary to take into account the equality of cultural values, their originality without opposing them with the Euro-American culture as a model. The general historical and cultural process appears to him in the form of the sum of cultures developing in different directions. However, this attempt at unity was not successful because it emphasized the isolation and isolation of cultures.

As a result, at the beginning of the twentieth century. universalism and particularism remain polar attitudes.

The particularism of that time is represented by the names of N.Y. Danilevsky and O. Spengler. N.Y. Danilevsky in his work "Russia and Europe" put forward his theory of the structure and dynamics of cultural-historical types (ie civilizations), which do not have a common chronology, as they develop in isolation from each other. The author assesses the closeness of cultural and historical types rather positively, since, in his opinion, this contributes to the preservation of originality. However, according to Danilevsky, peoples can adopt foreign cultural values if they correspond to their "disposition" (do not affect the core of the cultural type). This idea is very significant, since we are convinced that it is precisely the conflict-free exchange of values that corresponds to the very "spirit of nations" that makes possible the embodiment of modern multicultural practices.

O. Spengler is much more radical. In his work "The Decline of Europe" he argues that the path of development of culture is not straightforward, but cyclical. Investigating civilizations of the past, he tried to find in each of them something special, unique ("soul", first phenomenon, primordial symbol). For example, Spengler considered the body, its beauty, to be the proto-symbol of the Greek

civilization; the primordial symbol of the East called the boundless steppe; the cave is the primeval symbol of Arab culture. As a living organism with a unique soul, each culture goes through its own circle of life (from birth to death). In each individual case, the circle of life develops according to its own laws, which are different for each of the cultures. Hence the thesis about the impossibility of community (universality) of cultures due to their tightness: culture is born on a special landscape, lives in the circle of its own thoughts, develops original types and genres of art.

Due to the described attitudes of particularism (both in ancient and in more modern forms), the idea of finding common foundations for their existence and non-conflict coexistence does not find a place in this discourse, despite the fruitful idea of cultural diversity. In general, it should be noted that the tough historical confrontation between universalism and particularism gave impetus to the formation and development of a fundamentally new concept - multiculturalism, where their positive qualities are combined and negative ones are eliminated. In this regard, we can speak of multiculturalism as a historical consensus of universalism and particularism.

4. Main trends of global culture during the XXI century.

This chapter represents nine of the most significant trends in the global culture which have greatly accelerated since 2000.

Communication. The most significant acceleration can be observed in communication technologies. According to the latest data, in 2015 the number of mobile communications users exceeded 7 billion people while in 2000 their number was just about one billion. Not only urban but also rural residents use WiFi. They can reach any place in the world from the comfort of their own homes. The 2000s saw the emergence of technologies able to strengthen our relations. In 2010, Facebook became the most visited website, even though in 2000 it simply did not exist. Look at your friends list—if you are not a celebrity, most of them are people you meet in real life. The same trends can be observed in modern mobile communications technologies. They do not try to replace our personal communication. Instead, they aim to extend and deepen our communication opportunities for keeping in touch with people far away.

Migration. Strange though it may seem, the popularity of mobility after its intensive growth in the 20th century has significantly decreased in the early 21st century. Now only 10% of families are ready to change their place of residence. For young people, the question “Where do you live?” became more important than “Where do you work?” More and more people would agree to change their job to stay in their city, with families, friends and local culture, than to move somewhere for the sake of their work and career. The trend of the 20th century was to move far and high up, and the main trend of the 21st century will likely be to become deeply rooted. This trend may be closely connected with the previous one: thanks to the Internet and mobile communications technologies people now have huge opportunities for work and communication regardless of their place of residence.

Urbanization. The active development of cities started in the 2000s, but it is during the most recent decade that it reached its peak. And it is not just about the capitals. Even small towns previously known only for their criminal record and shadow economy transformed by some miracle into centers of trade and creativity. Naturally, city life has a lot of disadvantages; that is why the trend of working in the city and living in the suburbs has greatly intensified during the last decade. The suburbs are today the embodiment of reconciliation and tolerance as they are the places where different generations, the rich and the poor, the opposite cultures and values, become neighbors.

The end of the Majority. The majority started to disappear in the 2000s. Today we are all a minority. Orthodox Christians and Catholics, Muslims and Buddhists, radicals and democrats are all in the same position. The world has never been so homogeneous and united at the same time, in cultural, religious and political aspects. Such a diverse society has a very hard time maintaining a state of harmony, and actually only one viable model for it exists: the world should transform in a community with the same rights and rules of the game for everyone regardless of the nationality, religion and social status.

Polarization. We use communication technologies or attachment to the place of residence to create a virtual and real shelter from the diversity of contemporary society, the heterogeneity of which is felt more and more. Democrats demand more democracy, and reformers, more substantial reforms. Actually, the increase of polarity remains unnoticed as now practically any person can persuade a huge audience that they all have something important in common.

Complexity. In the 2000s, there were hopes that cultural elites would be able to change the world for the better. Today we understand that not a single elite has sufficient leverages of influence in the world of complex communications, various minorities and informal cultures. Nevertheless, all of this complexity instills hope. All in all, the human brain is also a complex, mutually related, varied and integral system, and during the recent years the world culture made several hesitant steps towards acquiring similar qualities. Facing risks and losses and expecting huge difficulties ahead, the global culture is acquiring something that can be referred to as intelligence.

TOPIC 4. MULTICULTURALISM AS A CULTURAL MODEL OF THE END XX- EARLY XXI CENTURY.

Topics to be covered:

- 1. Theoretical and methodological basis for the study of multiculturalism in the XX - XXI centuries.*
- 2. The main characteristics and trends of a multicultural society*
- 3. The trends of multiculturalism in the Republic of Belarus.*

The idea of multiculturalism in contemporary political discourse and in political philosophy reflects a debate about how to understand and respond to the challenges associated with cultural diversity based on ethnic, national, and religious differences. The term “multicultural” is often used as a descriptive term to characterize the fact of diversity in a society, but in what follows, the focus is on multiculturalism as a normative ideal in the context of Western liberal democratic societies. While the term has come to encompass a variety of normative claims and goals, it is fair to say that proponents of multiculturalism find common ground in rejecting the ideal of the “melting pot” in which members of minority groups are expected to assimilate into the dominant culture. Instead, proponents of multiculturalism endorse an ideal in which members of minority groups can maintain their distinctive collective identities and practices. In the case of immigrants, proponents emphasize that multiculturalism is compatible with, not opposed to, the integration of immigrants into society; multiculturalism policies provide fairer terms of integration for immigrants.

Modern states are organized around the language and culture of the dominant groups that have historically constituted them. As a result, members of minority cultural groups face barriers in pursuing their social practices in ways that members of dominant groups do not. Some theorists argue for tolerating minority groups by leaving them free of state interference. Others argue that mere toleration of group differences falls short of treating members of minority groups as equals; what is required is recognition and positive accommodation of minority group practices through what the leading theorist of multiculturalism Will Kymlicka has called “group-differentiated rights”. Some group-differentiated rights are held by individual members of minority groups, as in the case of individuals who are granted exemptions from generally applicable laws in virtue of their religious beliefs or individuals who seek language accommodations in education and in voting. Other group-differentiated rights are held by the group qua group rather by its members severally; such rights are properly called “group rights,” as in the case of indigenous groups and minority nations, who claim the right of self-determination. In the latter respect, multiculturalism is closely allied with nationalism.

Multiculturalism is part of a broader political movement for greater inclusion of marginalized groups, including African Americans, women, and people with disabilities. This broader political movement is reflected in the “multiculturalism” debates in the 1980s over whether and how to diversify school curricula to recognize the achievements of historically marginalized groups. But the more specific focus of contemporary theories of multiculturalism is the recognition and inclusion of minority groups defined primarily in terms of ethnicity, nationality, and religion. The main concern of contemporary multiculturalism are immigrants who are ethnic and religious minorities (e.g. Latinx people in the U.S., Muslims in Western Europe), minority nations (e.g. the Basque, Catalans, Québécois, Welsh) and indigenous peoples (e.g. Native peoples and indigenous groups in Canada, the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand).

Multiculturalists take for granted that it is “culture” and “cultural groups” that are to be recognized and accommodated. Yet multicultural claims include a wide range of claims involving religion, language, ethnicity, nationality, and race. Culture is a contested, open-ended concept, and all of these categories have been subsumed by or equated with the concept of culture. Disaggregating and distinguishing among different types of claims can clarify what is at stake (Song 2008). Language and religion are at the heart of many claims for cultural accommodation by immigrants. The key claim made by minority nations is for self-government rights. Race has a more limited role in multicultural discourse. Antiracism and multiculturalism are distinct but related ideas: the former highlights “victimization and resistance” whereas the latter highlights “cultural life, cultural expression, achievements, and the like”. Claims for recognition in the context of multicultural education are demands not just for recognition of aspects of a group’s actual culture (e.g. African American art and literature) but also for acknowledgment of the history of group subordination and its concomitant experience.

Examples of cultural accommodations or “group-differentiated rights” include exemptions from generally applicable law (e.g. religious exemptions), assistance to do things that members of the majority culture are already enabled to do (e.g. multilingual ballots, funding for minority language schools and ethnic associations, affirmative action), representation of minorities in government bodies (e.g. ethnic quotas for party lists or legislative seats, minority-majority Congressional districts), recognition of traditional legal codes by the dominant legal system (e.g. granting jurisdiction over family law to religious courts), or limited self-government rights (e.g. qualified recognition of tribal sovereignty, federal arrangements recognizing the political autonomy of Québec).

Typically, a group-differentiated right is a right of a minority group (or a member of such a group) to act or not act in a certain way in accordance with their religious obligations and/or cultural commitments. In some cases, it is a right that directly restricts the freedom of non-members in order to protect the minority group’s culture, as in the case of restrictions on the use of the English language in Québec. When the right-holder is the group, the right may protect group rules that restrict the freedom of individual members, as in the case of the Pueblo

membership rule that excludes the children of women who marry outside the group. Now that you have a sense of the kinds of claims that have been made in the name of multiculturalism, we can now turn to consider different normative justifications for these claims.

One justification for multiculturalism arises out of the communitarian critique of liberalism. Liberals tend to be ethical individualists; they insist that individuals should be free to choose and pursue their own conceptions of the good life. They give primacy to individual rights and liberties over community life and collective goods. Some liberals are also individualists when it comes to social ontology (what some call methodological individualism or atomism). Methodological individualists believe that you can and should account for social actions and social goods in terms of the properties of the constituent individuals and individual goods. The target of the communitarian critique of liberalism is not so much liberal ethics as liberal social ontology. Communitarians reject the idea that the individual is prior to the community and that the value of social goods can be reduced to their contribution to individual well-being. They instead embrace ontological holism, which acknowledges collective goods as, in Charles Taylor's words, "irreducibly social" and intrinsically valuable.

An ontologically holist view of collective identities and cultures underlies Taylor's argument for a "politics of recognition." Drawing on Rousseau, Herder, and Hegel, among others, Taylor argues that we do not become full human agents and define our identity in isolation from others; rather, "we define our identity always in dialogue with, sometimes in struggle against, the things our significant others want to see in us". Because our identities are formed dialogically, we are dependent on the recognition of others. The absence of recognition or misrecognition can cause serious injury: "A person or a group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves". The struggle for recognition can only be satisfactorily resolved through "a regime of reciprocal recognition among equals". Taylor distinguishes the politics of recognition from the traditional liberal "politics of equal respect" that is "inhospitable to difference, because (a) it insists on uniform application of the rules defining these rights, without exception, and (b) it is suspicious of collective goals". By contrast, the politics of recognition is grounded on "judgments about what makes a good life—judgments in which the integrity of cultures has an important place". He discusses the example of the survival of French culture in Quebec. The French language is not merely a collective resource that individuals might want to make use of and thereby seek to preserve, as suggested by a politics of equal respect. Instead, the French language is an irreducibly collective good that itself deserves to be preserved: language policies aimed at preserving the French language in Québec "actively seek to create members of the community" by assuring that future generations continue to identify as French-speakers. Because of the indispensable role of cultures in the development human agency and identity, Taylor argues, we should adopt the presumption of the equal worth of all cultures.

2. The main characteristics and trends of a multicultural society

Multicultural societies are characterized by people of different races, ethnicities, and nationalities living together in the same community. In multicultural communities, people retain, pass down, celebrate, and share their unique cultural ways of life, languages, art, traditions, and behaviors.

The characteristics of multiculturalism often spread into the community's public schools, where curricula are crafted to introduce young people to the qualities and benefits of cultural diversity. Though sometimes criticized as a form of "political correctness," educational systems in multicultural societies stress the histories and traditions of minorities in classrooms and textbooks. A 2018 study conducted by the Pew Research Center found that the "post-millennial" generation of people ages 6 to 21 are the most diverse generation in American society.

Far from an exclusively American phenomenon, examples of multiculturalism are found worldwide. In Argentina, for example, newspaper articles, and radio and television programs are commonly presented in English, German, Italian, French, or Portuguese, as well as the country's native Spanish. Indeed, Argentina's constitution promotes immigration by recognizing the right of individuals to retain multiple citizenships from other countries.

As a key element of the country's society, Canada adopted multiculturalism as official policy during the premiership of Pierre Trudeau in the 1970s and 1980s. In addition, the Canadian constitution, along with laws such as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the Broadcasting Act of 1991, recognize the importance of multicultural diversity. According to the Canadian Library and Archives, over 200,000 people—representing at least 26 different ethnocultural groups—immigrate to Canada every year.

Some critics contend that theories of multiculturalism are premised on an essentialist view of culture. Cultures are not distinct, self-contained wholes; they have long interacted and influenced one another through war, imperialism, trade, and migration. People in many parts of the world live within cultures that are already cosmopolitan, characterized by cultural hybridity. As Jeremy Waldron argues, "We live in a world formed by technology and trade; by economic, religious, and political imperialism and their offspring; by mass migration and the dispersion of cultural influences. In this context, to immerse oneself in the traditional practices of, say, an aboriginal culture might be a fascinating anthropological experiment, but it involves an artificial dislocation from what actually is going on in the world". To aim at preserving or protecting a culture runs the risk of privileging one allegedly pure version of that culture, thereby crippling its ability to adapt to changes in circumstances. Waldron also rejects the premise that the options available to an individual must come from a particular culture; meaningful options may come from a variety of cultural sources. What people need are cultural materials, not access to a particular cultural structure. For example, the Bible, Roman mythology, and the Grimms' fairy tales have all influenced American culture, but these cultural sources cannot be seen as part of a single cultural structure that multiculturalists like Kymlicka aim to protect.

In response, multicultural theorists agree that cultures are overlapping and interactive, but they nonetheless maintain that individuals belong to separate societal cultures. In particular, Kymlicka has argued that while options available to people in any modern society come from a variety of ethnic and historical sources, these options become meaningful to us only if “they become part of the shared vocabulary of social life—i.e. embodied in the social practices, based on a shared language, that we are exposed to... That we learn...from other cultures, or that we borrow words from other languages, does not mean that we do not still belong to separate societal cultures, or speak different languages”. Liberal egalitarian defenders of multiculturalism like Kymlicka maintain that special protections for minority cultural groups still hold, even after we adopt a more cosmopolitan view of cultures, because the aim of group-differentiated rights is not to freeze cultures in place but to empower members of minority groups to continue their distinctive cultural practices so long as they wish to.

Multiculturalism is the key to achieving a high degree of cultural diversity. Diversity occurs when people of different races, nationalities, religions, ethnicities, and philosophies come together to form a community. A truly diverse society is one that recognizes and values the cultural differences in its people.

Proponents of cultural diversity argue that it makes humanity stronger and may, in fact, be vital to its long-term survival. In 2001, the General Conference of UNESCO took this position when it asserted in its Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity that “...cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature.”

Today, entire countries, workplaces, and schools are increasingly made up of various cultural, racial, and ethnic groups. By recognizing and learning about these various groups, communities build trust, respect, and understanding across all cultures. Communities and organizations in all settings benefit from the different backgrounds, skills, experiences, and new ways of thinking that come with cultural diversity.

The Melting Pot Theory.

The melting pot theory of multiculturalism assumes that various immigrant groups will tend to “melt together,” abandoning their individual cultures and eventually becoming fully assimilated into the predominant society. Typically used to describe the assimilation of immigrants into the United States, the melting pot theory is often illustrated by the metaphor of a foundry’s smelting pots in which the elements iron and carbon are melted together to create a single, stronger metal—steel. In 1782, French-American immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur wrote that in America, “individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world.”

The melting pot model has been criticized for reducing diversity, causing people to lose their traditions, and for having to be enforced through governmental policy. For example, the U.S. Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 forced the assimilation of nearly 350,000 Indigenous peoples into American society without any regard for the diversity of their heritages and lifestyles.

The Salad Bowl Theory. A more liberal theory of multiculturalism than the melting pot, the salad bowl theory describes a heterogeneous society in which people coexist but retain at least some of the unique characteristics of their traditional culture. Like a salad's ingredients, different cultures are brought together, but rather than coalescing into a single homogeneous culture, retain their own distinct flavors. In the United States, New York City, with its many unique ethnic communities like "Little India," "Little Odessa," and "Chinatown" is considered an example of a salad bowl society.

The salad bowl theory asserts that it is not necessary for people to give up their cultural heritage in order to be considered members of the dominant society. For example, African Americans do not need to stop observing Kwanzaa rather than Christmas in order to be considered "Americans."

On the negative side, the cultural differences encouraged by the salad bowl model can divide a society resulting in prejudice and discrimination. In addition, critics point to a 2007 study conducted by American political scientist Robert Putnam showing that people living in salad bowl multicultural communities were less likely to vote or volunteer for community improvement projects.

Critics of multiculturalism often debate whether the multicultural ideal of benignly co-existing cultures that interrelate and influence one another, and yet remain distinct, is sustainable, paradoxical, or even desirable. It is argued that nation states, who would previously have been synonymous with a distinctive cultural identity of their own, lose out to enforced multiculturalism and that this ultimately erodes the host nations' distinct culture.

Sarah Song views cultures as historically shaped entities by its members, and that they lack boundaries due to globalization, thereby making them stronger than what others may assume. She goes on to argue against the notion of special rights as she feels cultures are mutually constructive, and are shaped by the dominant culture. Brian Barry advocates a difference-blind approach to culture in the political realm and he rejects group-based rights as antithetical to the universalist liberal project, which he views as based on the individual.

Harvard professor of political science Robert D. Putnam conducted a nearly decade-long study on how multiculturalism affects social trust. He surveyed 26,200 people in 40 American communities, finding that when the data were adjusted for class, income and other factors, the more racially diverse a community is, the greater the loss of trust. People in diverse communities "don't trust the local mayor, they don't trust the local paper, they don't trust other people and they don't trust institutions," writes Putnam. In the presence of such ethnic diversity, Putnam maintains that, "[W]e hunker down. We act like turtles. The effect of diversity is worse than had been imagined. And it's not just that we don't trust people who are not like us. In diverse communities, we don't trust people who do not look like us". Putnam has also stated, however, that "this allergy to diversity tends to diminish and to go away... I think in the long run we'll all be better." Putnam denied allegations he was arguing against diversity in society and contended that his paper had been "twisted" to make a case against race-conscious admissions to universities. He asserted that his "extensive research and experience confirm the

substantial benefits of diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, to our society."

3. The trends of multiculturalism in the Republic of Belarus.

The Republic of Belarus is a country that has a rich cultural heritage, because it has managed to preserve the best of the national culture and cultures of other peoples who have lived and built a common home on this land since ancient times. The long traditions of good-neighborliness, sincerity, friendship, respect and mutual help have a beneficial effect on the formation of our common spiritual wealth, the creation of remarkable works of art. We have the opportunity to see the real inflorescence of talents of representatives of different national cultures, both in our capital and in the most remote places of the country, the special art of which is obviously and naturally intertwined in our common culture.

As history shows, the culture builds the most powerful bridges of friendship between representatives of different nationalities, promotes positive information about the state to other countries. Particular attention is paid to these issues in modern sovereign Belarus. A purposeful policy of state support of the culture of representatives of different nationalities, gives them the opportunity to preserve the history and culture of their nation, their ethnic identity and originality, and compatriots abroad – to remember, defend and promote interests of their historical homeland in the countries of residence.

The people of Belarus are a kind, friendly and good humoured nation. The patience and peacefulness of the Belarusian people has been determined by the nation's history that has been darkened by endless wars which the Belarusians did not start, but fell victim to. Belarus is welcoming to all visitors and interested in sharing its culture, traditions and sense of community with them.

Ethnic Belarusians make up more than 80% of the population. But because of the history of Belarus, many other nationalities have also settled in the country, many of whom have been established for several generations.

Here are the main minority groups that make up the people of Belarus:

- Russians (7.5%) have always lived in the region, with a large influx into the country after the Second World War
- Poles (3.1%) have lived in the western side of the country for centuries
- Ukrainians (1.7%) – the largest influx came in the 18th and 19th centuries
- Jews (0.1%): the first Jews settled in Belarus in the 15th century, but emigration to Israel and other states since the 1980s means that the Jewish population of Belarus is now less than 30,000

Other significant minority groups in Belarus include Tatars, Roma, Lithuanians and Letts.

Languages of Belarus. Belarusian and Russian are the official languages of Belarus. Other languages such as Polish, Ukrainian and Hebrew are spoken within

local communities (Source: Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus, <https://www.belarus.by/en/about-belarus/nationality>).

The cultural identity of Belarusians has been shaped by supreme spiritual values celebrating morality and humanity. For centuries these values have been passed over from generation to generation. These are high ideals of good and justice, respect for others, strong rejection of evil and violence. These values have been materialized in architectural and artistic traditions, unique works of music and literature.

The main principles of state policy in culture are described in the Code on Culture of the Republic of Belarus. The document has set the legal, organizational, economic and social framework of cultural activities. It regulates legal relations in the preservation and development of cultural values, and the protection of historical, cultural and archaeological heritage; library and museum affairs; cinematography; folk art craft, amateur art groups; cultural events and recreation; rewards for people of culture.

The Culture of Belarus state program for 2016-2020 is currently in progress. Its main goals are to preserve the historical memory of the Belarusian people and their national and cultural identity and traditions; to ensure active involvement of people in the cultural life of the country, to unlock the creative potential of the nation; preserve the national and cultural identity of the Belarusian diaspora. The modern cultural life of Belarus is dynamic and diverse. The country hosts a lot of art exhibitions, music, theater and film festivals. They draw national and international audiences.

Today, there are about 5,600 state-run cultural institutions in Belarus (taking into account interdependent structural units and branches). These include clubs (2,536), public libraries (2,552), museums (150), theater and entertainment organizations (49, including 28 theaters, 19 concert organizations, 2 circuses), parks (12), zoos (5), methodological centers of folk art (12). Preservation and successful development of the integrated system of cultural education is viewed as an important achievement. Belarus has a three-tier education system in the field of art, including 405 children's art schools, 20 post-secondary vocational education schools and three higher education institutions. (Source: President of the Republic of Belarus, <https://president.gov.by/en/belarus/social/culture>).

According to the instruction of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus, the Republican Center of National Cultures (hereinafter – the Center) was established by the order of the Minister of Culture N 291 of 22.12.1994 to coordinate the activities of national cultural associations and compatriots abroad, as well as to provide them with organizational and methodological assistance.

Nowadays, representatives of 141 nationalities live in the Republic of Belarus, more than 200 public organizations and their branches operate in our country. More than 3.5 million Belarusian compatriots, natives from Belarus and their descendants live outside the Republic of Belarus, over 220 public associations of Belarusians have been created and have been operating in the countries of the former USSR, Europe, America, Australia, Argentina, Great

Britain, etc. The main activity of the Center includes work with national and cultural public associations, public associations of Belarusians abroad, methodical support of club organizations and non-professional (amateur) creativity, library activities. The Center provides information, methodological, advisory assistance on cultural issues to national communities and Belarusians abroad; organizes the work of collectives of artistic creativity, circles and other club formations with the participation of representatives of national communities; organizes and conducts cultural events aimed to show the results of the creative activity of art collectives, circles and other club formations with the participation of representatives of national communities; conducts cultural and entertainment events with the participation of groups of artistic creativity, individual performers and authors. (Source: The Republican Center of National Cultures, <http://en.nationalcultures.by/history/>).

Promotion of the Belarusian culture internationally. Key objectives of the measure: The Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus has been actively engaged in the work of the International Committee for Organizing Folklore Festivals, the International Folk Art Council, and the International Council of Museums. Cultural institutions have been involved in both UNESCO and IFESCCO (The Intergovernmental Foundation for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation of the Commonwealth of Independent States) projects.

During 2013-2015, Belarus opened a number of cultural centers in other countries: the Belarus Information and Cultural Centre in Latvia (2013), the Cultural Center in the Republic of Moldova (2014), the Business And Cultural Complex at the Belarusian Embassy in Russia (2015), the Belarusian Cultural Center (as a public association) France (2015), the Belarusian Information And Cultural Centre at the National Library of Pakistan (2015).

Days of Culture of the Republic of Belarus and the Days of Cinema of the Republic of Belarus in more than 20 countries around the world are held.

Representatives of almost 140 nationalities live in the Republic. The Festival of National Cultures, held in Hrodna since 1996, unites Belarus, gathering the best national-cultural association groups (of which there are more than three dozen) every other year. Hosted by the city on the River Nioman, they present the art of their nations, under state patronage.

3. PRACTICAL SECTION

3.1 Educational-methodical card of the discipline (full-time)

Topic	Number of class hours	
	Lectures	Seminars
Topic 1. Introduction	2	
Topic 2. Universalism as a cultural paradigm in the XX century	2	4
Topic 3. Particularism is a cultural model in the XX century	2	4
Topic 4. Multiculturalism as a cultural model in the late XX-early XXI centuries	2	6
Topic 5. Cultural models in the XXI century		6
Total	8	20

3.2 Educational-methodical card of the discipline (Extramural)

Sections and Topic	Number of class hours	
	Lectures	Seminars
Topic 1. Introduction	2	
Topic 2. Universalism as a cultural paradigm in the XX century	2	
Topic 3. Particularism is a cultural model in the XX century	2	
Topic 4. Multiculturalism as a cultural model in the late XX-early XXI centuries	2	2
Topic 5. Cultural models in the XXI century		3
Total	8	4

3.3 List of seminars topics

Seminar 1.

Topic. Universalism as a cultural paradigm of the 20th century

Issues to be considered:

1. Historical foundations of the formation of universalism.
2. The main stages of the formation of universalism.
3. Approaches to the study of universalism.
4. Universalism as a cultural model.

References

1. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. - Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
2. Chartier, R Cultural history: between practices and representations / Roger Chartier. - Ithaca : New York : Cornell University Press, 2011. – 209 p.
3. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. – XV, 234 p.
4. Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. - New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. – 301 p.
5. Literature, culture, identity: introducing XX century literary theory / Lena Petrovic. - [Nis] : Prosveta, 2004. - 414 p.

Seminar 2.

Topic. Universalism as a cultural paradigm of the 20th century

Issues to be considered:

1. Universalism as a strategy of a conflict-free world.
2. The principles of universalism. Historical and modern concepts of universalism.
3. Historical and modern concepts of universalism.

References

1. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. - Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
2. Chartier, R Cultural history: between practices and representations / Roger Chartier. - Ithaca : New York : Cornell University Press, 2011. – 209 p.

3. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. – London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. – XV, 234 p.
4. Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. – New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. – 301 p.
5. Literature, culture, identity: introducing XX century literary theory / Lena Petrovic. - [Nis] : Prosveta, 2004. – 414 p.
6. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. – 310 p.

Seminar 3.

Topic. Particularism – as a cultural model of the 20th century

Issues to be considered:

1. Theoretical studies of particularism as a model of cultural development in the XX century.
2. Historical preconditions for the formation and development of ideas of particularism.
3. The main features of particularism.

References

1. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. - New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. – 272 c.
2. Chartier, R Cultural history: between practices and representations / Roger Chartier. - Ithaca : New York : Cornell University Press, 2011. – 209 c.
3. Chinese clothing: costumes, adornments and culture / Hua Mei. – Beijing : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 160 c.
4. Countries and their cultures / Ed.: M.Ember, C.R.Ember. – New York etc.: Macmillan Ref. USA, 2001. – 246 p.
5. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. – Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 234 c.
6. Discover China. Cultural icons / [text:] Guo Xiangying, Lan Xilin. – Chongqing : Chongqing Publishing, 2008. – 272 c.
7. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. – XV, 234 c.
8. Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. – Paris : UNESCO, 2009. – XIII, 402 c.
9. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. – XIV, 236 c.
10. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. – 310 p.

Seminar 4.

Topic. Particularism – as a cultural model of the 20th century

Issues to be considered:

1. Modern trends in the development of particularism
2. Principles of particularism
3. Particularism as a strategy for the local development of cultures in the world space.

References

1. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. - New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. – 272 c.
2. Chartier, R Cultural history: between practices and representations / Roger Chartier. - Ithaca : New York : Cornell University Press, 2011. – 209 c.
3. Chinese clothing: costumes, adornments and culture / Hua Mei. – Beijing : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 160 c.
4. Countries and their cultures / Ed.: M.Ember, C.R.Ember. – New York etc.: Macmillan Ref. USA, 2001. – 246 p.
5. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. – Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 234 c.
6. Discover China. Cultural icons / [text:] Guo Xiangying, Lan Xilin. – Chongqing : Chongqing Publishing, 2008. – 272 c.
7. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. – XV, 234 c.
8. Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. – Paris : UNESCO, 2009. – XIII, 402 c.
9. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. – XIV, 236 c.
10. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. – 310 p.

Seminar 5.

Topic. Multiculturalism as a cultural model of the XX - early XXI centuries

Issues to be considered:

1. Theoretical and methodological prerequisites for the study of multiculturalism in the XX - XXI centuries.
2. Pluralism of ethnocultural groups is the basic principle of a multicultural society.
3. Typology of multiculturalism (examples for each type).

References

1. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 c.

Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. - New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. - XX, 301 c.

2. Multiculturalism in education and teaching: the selected works of Carl A. Grant. - London : New York : Routledge, 2015. — 247 p.

3. Multiculturalism in Europe / [coordinators: John W. Berry and David L. Sam]. — Göttingen : Hogrefe, 2013. — C. 152—219.

4. Production culture: industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television / John Thornton Caldwell. — Durham : London : Duke University Press, 2008. - 451 c.

5. Religious identity and dialogue as opinion forming constituent of national culture. The experiences of Belarus, Ukraine and Poland / edited by Karol Klauza. - Lublin : The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 2008. - 100 p.

6. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue — Living together Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2008 — 124 p.

7. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. — Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. - 310 p.

Seminar 6.

Topic. Multiculturalism as a cultural model of the XX - early XXI centuries

Issues to be considered:

1. The multicultural model as a program for the integration of groups in a single multicultural space.

2. Historical stages of the development of multiculturalism in Belarus.

3. Trends of multiculturalism in the Republic of Belarus at the present stage.

References

1. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 c.

Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. - New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. - XX, 301 c.

2. Multiculturalism in education and teaching: the selected works of Carl A. Grant. - London : New York : Routledge, 2015. — 247 p.

3. Multiculturalism in Europe / [coordinators: John W. Berry and David L. Sam]. — Göttingen : Hogrefe, 2013. — C. 152—219.

4. Production culture: industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television / John Thornton Caldwell. — Durham : London : Duke University Press, 2008. - 451 c.

5. Religious identity and dialogue as opinion forming constituent of national culture. The experiences of Belarus, Ukraine and Poland / edited by Karol Klauza. - Lublin : The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 2008. - 100 p.

6. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue — Living together Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2008 — 124 p.

7. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. - 310 p.

Seminar 7.

Topic. Multiculturalism as a cultural model of the XX - early XXI centuries

Issues to be considered:

1. Multicultural strategy for the development of modern Belarusian society.
2. Trends and prospects for the development of a multiculturalist model of culture in the context of globalization.

References

1. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 c.
Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. - New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. - XX, 301 c.
2. Multiculturalism in education and teaching: the selected works of Carl A. Grant. - London : New York : Routledge, 2015. — 247 p.
3. Multiculturalism in Europe / [coordinators: John W. Berry and David L. Sam]. — Göttingen : Hogrefe, 2013. — C. 152—219.
4. Production culture: industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television / John Thornton Caldwell. — Durham : London : Duke University Press, 2008. - 451 c.
5. Religious identity and dialogue as opinion forming constituent of national culture. The experiences of Belarus, Ukraine and Poland / edited by Karol Klauza. - Lublin : The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 2008. - 100 p.
6. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue — Living together Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2008 — 124 p.
7. Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. - 310 p.

Seminar 8.

Topic. Cultural models in the XXI century

Issues to be considered:

1. The main factors and features of culture in the XXI century
2. Information Culture. Virtualization of culture.
3. Technology as factors in the development of culture in the XXI century.

References

1. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. - Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access:

http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf

2. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 p.
3. Cultural diversity / [editor: John Crowley]. — Oxford. — Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell ; [Paris] : UNESCO, 2010. — 197 p.
4. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. - New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. - 272 p.
5. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. - Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. - 234 p.
6. Insights into Chinese culture / Ye Lang, Zhu Liangzhi. - Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2008. - 266 p.
7. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. - XV, 234 p.
8. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. - XIV, 236 p.

Seminar 9.

Topic. Cultural models in the XXI century

Issues to be considered:

1. Mass culture and standardization.
2. Forms of culture in the XXI century.
3. The main styles and features of culture in the XXI century.
4. Postmodern interpretation of cultural models of the XXI century.

References

1. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. - Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
2. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 p.
3. Cultural diversity / [editor: John Crowley]. — Oxford. — Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell ; [Paris] : UNESCO, 2010. — 197 p.
4. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. - New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. - 272 p.
5. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. - Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. - 234 p.
6. Insights into Chinese culture / Ye Lang, Zhu Liangzhi. - Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2008. - 266 p.
7. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. - XV, 234 p.

8. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. - XIV, 236 p.

Seminar 10.

Topic. Cultural models in the XXI century

Issues to be considered:

1. Modern globalization processes.
2. Typology of modern cultural models.
3. Contemporary cultural models (examples).
4. The specifics of the implementation of modern cultural models (examples).

References

1. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. - Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
2. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. - 168 p.
3. Cultural diversity / [editor: John Crowley]. — Oxford. — Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell ; [Paris] : UNESCO, 2010. — 197 p.
4. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. - New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. - 272 p.
5. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. - Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. - 234 p.
6. Insights into Chinese culture / Ye Lang, Zhu Liangzhi. - Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2008. - 266 p.
7. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. - XV, 234 p.
8. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. - XIV, 236 p.

4. ASSESSMEN SECTION

4.1 Assignments for supervised work of students. Topics for multimedia presentations.

1. Different definitions of culture
2. The main features of Chinese culture in XX century
3. Art culture in the XX century
4. Music culture in the XX century
5. Technology as factors in the development of culture in the XXI century.
6. Digital Culture.
7. Virtualization of culture.
8. Modernism and postmodernism in culture in the XX-XXI centuries.
9. The main factors of cultural development in the XXI century.
10. The main trends in Chinese culture in XXI century.
11. The main styles and features of culture in the XXI century.
12. Main trends in culture of the XXI century.
13. The trends of multiculturalism in the Republic of Belarus
14. Multicultural model as a program of integration of groups in a multicultural environment

4.2 List of exam's topics

15. Culture as a system and phenomenon of society
16. The concept of culture
17. Different definitions of culture
18. The most important characteristics of culture
19. The structure of culture
20. Cultural universals
21. Main definitions of cultural models
22. Interpretation of cultural models of the XX century
23. The main features of culture in the XX century
24. Universalism as a cultural model
25. The main features of Chinese culture in XX century
26. The main principles of universalism
27. Particularism as a fundamental model of culture in the XX century
28. Art culture in the XX century
29. Main features of particularism
30. Music culture in the XX century
31. Multiculturalism as a Cultural Model
32. Technology as factors in the development of culture in the XXI century.
33. The trends of multiculturalism in the Republic of Belarus
34. Multicultural model as a program of integration of groups in a multicultural environment
35. Digital Culture.
36. Virtualization of culture.
37. Modernism and postmodernism in culture in the XX-XXI centuries.
38. The main factors of cultural development in the XXI century.
39. The main trends in Chinese culture in XXI century.
40. Mass culture and standardization. Forms of culture in the XXI century.
41. The main styles and features of culture in the XXI century.
42. Globalisation and global culture.
43. Interpretation of cultural models of the XXI century.
44. Main trends in culture of the XXI century.

5. AUXILIARY SECTION

Main literature sources

1. Coombes, A. Belarus / Anne Coombes. - London : Kuperard, 2008. – 168 c.
2. Intercultural spaces: language, culture, identity / edited by Aileen Pearson-Evans and Angela Leahy. - New York [etc.] : Peter Lang, 2007. – XX, 301 c.
3. Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown. Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review / J.D. Carnwath, A.S. Brown. – Manchester: Arts Council England, 2014. – Mode of access: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/downloadfile/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
3. Chartier, R Cultural history: between practices and representations / Roger Chartier. - Ithaca : New York : Cornell University Press, 2011. – 209 c.
4. Countries and their cultures / Ed.: M.Ember, C.R.Ember. – New York etc.: Macmillan Ref. USA, 2001. – 246 p.
5. Kim, Y. Critical intercultural communication strategies in the age of glocalism / Young Mi Kim. - Seoul : Hankook munhwasa, 2012. – 236 c.
6. Religious identity and dialogue as opinion forming constituent of national culture. The experiences of Belarus, Ukraine and Poland / edited by Karol Klauza. - Lublin : The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 2008. – 100 p.
- Xin, Q. A Brief History of Human Culture in the 20th Century / Q. Xin. – Beijing: China Association for International Friendly Contact, 2019. – 310 p.

Complementary literature sources

1. 100 cultural symbols of Korea: 100 windows showcasing Korea: [translated from the Korean / authors: Yoo Myeong-jong, Lee Ji-hye. – Seoul : Discovery Media, 2008. – 167 c.
2. Ancient Chinese inventions: 3000 years of science and technology / Deng Yinke. - [Beijing : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 134 c.
2. Cultural globalization and language education / B. Kumaravadivelu. – New Haven [etc.] : Yale University Press, 2008. – 272 c.
3. Chinese arts & crafts: history, techniques and forms / Hang Jian & Guo Qiuhui. - Beijing : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 153 c.
4. Chinese clothing: costumes, adornments and culture / Hua Mei. - Beijing : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 160 c.
5. Cultural diversity / [editor: John Crowley]. – Oxford. – Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell ; [Paris] : UNESCO, 2010. – 197 c.
6. Cultures and politics of global communication / edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond and Alison M. S. Watson. - Cambridge [etc.] : Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 234 c.
7. Discover China. Cultural icons / [text:] Guo Xiangying, Lan Xilin. – Chongqing : Chongqing Publishing, 2008. – 272 c.

8. Education for shared values for intercultural and interfaith understanding: education towards preventing extremism and terrorism, curriculum design: innovative and effective strategies, 28 November – 3 December 2004, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia. Religion in peace and conflict: responding to military and fundamentalism, 12-14 April 2005, Outlook International, Melbourne, Australia. – Paris : UNESCO, 2005. – 544 p.
9. Insights into Chinese culture / Ye Lang, Zhu Liangzhi. – Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2008. – 266 c.
10. Intercultural dialogue: involving young people around the world. – Paris : UNESCO, 2010. – 28 c.
11. Intercultural communication for managers / Michael B. Goodman. - New York : Business Expert Press, 2013. – 286 c.
12. Intercultural contact, language learning and migration / edited by Barbara Geraghty and Jean E. Conacher. - London [etc.] : Bloomsbury, 2014. – XV, 234 c.
13. Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. - Paris : UNESCO, 2009. – 402 c.
14. Literature, culture, identity: introducing XX century literary theory / Lena Petrovic. – [Nis] : Prosveta, 2004. – 414 p.
15. Lynching and American culture / guest editors: Amy Louise Wood, Susan V. Donaldson. — Mississippi State, MS : College of Arts and Sciences of Mississippi State University, 2008. – 301 p.
16. Meetings of cultures in the Black Sea region: between conflict and coexistence / edited by Pia Guldager Bilde and Jane Hjarl Petersen. – Aarhus : Aarhus University Press, 2008. – 422 c.
17. Multiculturalism in Europe / [coordinators: John W. Berry and David L. Sam]. — Göttingen : Hogrefe, 2013. – C. 152–219.
18. Multiculturalism in education and teaching: the selected works of Carl A. Grant. - London : New York : Routledge, 2015. –247 p.
19. Production culture: industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television / John Thornton Caldwell. – Durham : London : Duke University Press, 2008. – 451 c.
20. Religious identity and dialogue as opinion forming constituent of national culture. The experiences of Belarus, Ukraine and Poland / edited by Karol Klauza. – Lublin : The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 2008. – 100 p.
21. The art of Chinese painting: capturing the timeless spirit of nature / Lin Ci. — [Beijing] : China Intercontinental Press, 2008. – 153 c.
22. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue – Living together Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2008 – 124 p.

6. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Acculturation. The ability to ‘go on’ in a culture requires the learning and acquisition of language, values and norms through imitation, practice and experimentation. The concept of acculturation refers to the social processes by which we learn the knowledge and skills that enable us to be members of a culture. Key sites and agents of acculturation would include the family, peer groups, schools, work organizations and the media. The processes of acculturation represent the nurture side of the so-called ‘Nature vs Nurture’ debate, and are looked to by cultural theorists as providing the basis on which actors acquire a way of life and a way of seeing.

Code. The customary usage of the term code refers to a set of signs that stand in for another set of signs and their meanings. Thus a code involves translation and concealment. Within cultural studies a code is understood to be a system of representation by which signs and their meanings are arranged by cultural convention and habituated to the extent that meaning is stabilized and naturalized. Here the concept of code draws from the semiotic argument that the relations between signifiers and the signified, or signs and their meanings, are arbitrary but temporarily ‘fixed’ by convention.

Cultural imperialism. Cultural imperialism is said to involve the domination of one culture by another and is usually thought of as a set of processes involving the ascendancy of one nation and/or the global domination of consumer capitalism. This argument stresses a loss of cultural autonomy for the ‘dominated’ nation and the worldwide growth of cultural homogeneity or ‘sameness’. The principal agents of cultural synchronization are commonly said to be transnational corporations and particularly those of US origin. Consequently, cultural imperialism as domination is regarded as the outcome of a set of economic and cultural processes implicated in the reproduction of global capitalism.

Cultural studies. The domain of cultural studies can be understood as an interdisciplinary or post-disciplinary field of inquiry that explores the production and inculcation of culture or maps of meaning. However, ‘cultural studies’ has no referent to which we can point; rather, it is constituted by the language-game of cultural studies. That is, the theoretical terms developed and deployed by persons calling their work cultural studies constitutes that which is ‘cultural studies’. These are concepts which have been deployed in the various geographical sites of cultural studies and which form the history of the cultural studies tradition as it emerged from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and proliferated across the globe from the 1960s onwards.

Ethnocentrism The general use of the term ethnocentrism refers to the process by which values and ways of seeing the world that are founded in one culture are used

to comprehend and judge another. Ethnocentrism therefore asserts the centrality and implied superiority of a particular cultural identity over others. Here the concept describes how subjects constitute the 'Other' as alien and impose a worldview upon them. The use of the term in this way can be seen in the work of Edward Said on Orientalism and in the critique of anthropology and other forms of intellectual inquiry that seek to place themselves outside of and apart from their culture of origin. In particular the idea of ethnocentrism has been used to critique the assumed privilege of white European ethnic groups and as such has been taken to involve a critique of racism.

Globalization. The concept of globalization refers us to the increasing multi-directional economic, social, cultural and political connections that are forming across the world and our awareness of them. Thus globalization involves the increased compression of the world and our growing consciousness of those processes. The compression of the world can be understood in terms of the expansionism of the institutions of modernity while the reflexive intensification of consciousness of the world can be perceived beneficially in cultural terms.

Identity. The concept of identity became a central category of cultural studies during the 1990s. It pertains to cultural descriptions of persons with which we emotionally identify and which concern sameness and difference, the personal and the social. For cultural studies, identity is a cultural construction because the discursive resources that form the material for identity formation are cultural in character. In particular, we are constituted as individuals in a social process that is commonly understood as acculturation without which we would not be persons. Indeed, the very notion of what it is to be a person is a cultural question (for example, individualism is a marker of specifically modern societies) and without language the very concept of identity would be unintelligible to us.

Liberalism. Classical Liberal philosophy is founded on the work of John Locke and J.S. Mill and involves consideration of the principles of individual freedom of action and an equality of rights. Here the purpose of government is to protect individual liberty while not itself transgressing that freedom. Thus Liberalism addresses what it sees as the inherent tension between the spheres of liberty and authority, between individual freedom of thought and collective opinion. Thus Liberalism is a political and cultural philosophy concerned with the balancing act between individual freedom and the reduction of suffering through community action.

Mass culture. Mass culture is a pejorative term developed by both conservative literary critics and Marxist theorists from the 1930s onwards to suggest the inferiority of commodity-based capitalist culture as being inauthentic, manipulative and unsatisfying. This inauthentic mass culture is contrasted to the authenticity claimed for high culture (as well as to an imagined people's culture).

In this context high culture is understood to be the peak of civilization and the concern of an educated minority. Further, both the authentic culture of the people and the minority culture of the educated elite are said to have been lost to the standardization processes of industrialized 'mass culture'.

Modernity Modernity can be understood as a post-traditional historical period marked by industrialism, capitalism, the nation-state and increasingly sophisticated forms of social surveillance. The institutions of modernity are said by **Giddens** to consist of capitalism, industrialism, military power (of the nation-state) and surveillance. The institutions of modernity are inherently dynamic and expansionist.

Multiculturalism. The idea of a multicultural society has become official policy in many Western cultures and represents a liberal democratic attempt to promote ethnic/racial equality. It is premised on the idea of displaying tolerance towards a range of cultural practices within the contexts of the nation-state. As a policy approach it has been influential in the education and cultural spheres where it has underpinned attempts to introduce people to a range of different beliefs, values, customs and cultural practices. For example, the teaching of multi-faith religious education, the performance of rituals and the promotion of ethnic food became facets of educational policy. As such, multiculturalism aims to express respect for and indeed celebration of difference.

Myth. In general terms a myth is a story or fable that acts as a symbolic guide or map of meaning and significance in the cosmos. In cultural studies, the concept of a myth refers more to the naturalization of the connotative level of meaning, a use that is somewhat similar to the notion of ideology. Thus myth makes particular world-views appear to be unchallengeable because they are natural or God-given.

Popular culture Traditionally, the idea of popular culture has referred to that which remains after the canon of high culture has been established and/or as the massproduced commodity culture of consumer capitalism. Here popular culture has been regarded as inferior both to the elevated cultures of Art or classical music on the one hand and to an imagined authentic folk culture on the other.

Postmodernism. The contemporary emergence of the concept of postmodernism is not simply an academic fashion but also, and more significantly, it marks a response to substantive changes in the organization and enactment of our social worlds. However, a degree of perplexity surrounds the notion of postmodernism because it has become confused with the concept of postmodernity as well as having acquired a number of different uses of its own. We may understand postmodernism to be a notion that refers us to questions of culture and knowledge while the idea of postmodernity relates to historical patterns of social organization.

Relativism. Epistemological relativism is the argument that one cannot judge between forms of knowledge that have radically different grounds of validity. That is, one cannot identify absolute and universal forms of truth, but rather knowledge is true only within the domain of its formation and operation. Thus relativism involves the rejection of overarching universal rules or procedures for deciding between truth-claims. Cultural relativism is the extension of that argument to different cultures leading to the suggestion that beliefs that appear to be invalid in the context of one culture are not so in another. Thus, the claim that ‘X is an act of witchcraft’ will not hold up within the confines of Western science but can be said to be valid within a culture for which witchcraft is a truthful practice.

Self-identity. The concept of self-identity refers to the way we think about ourselves and construct unifying narratives of the self with which we emotionally identify. That is, self-identity can be grasped as a reflexive and discursive construction of self, a story we tell ourselves about our self. Stuart **Hall**’s influential conceptualization of identity conceives of it as the suturing or stitching together of the discursive ‘outside’ with the ‘internal’ psychic processes of subjectivity. That is, one’s identity refers to points of temporary emotional attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us.

Simulacrum. A simulacrum is an imitation or copy without an original (or referent) in which the simulation becomes more real than the real, indeed, the apparent reality of the simulation is the measure of the real. The widespread appearance of the simulacrum as a central feature of contemporary culture is associated with the idea of postmodern culture in the work of **Baudrillard** and **Jameson** in particular.

Structure A structure can be understood in terms of regularity or stable patterns. Thus the structures of language are said to be the secure and predictable rules and conventions that organize language (*langue*). A social structure is constituted by the recurrent organization and patterned arrangement of human relationships. Social and cultural structures are often said to be constraining and determining of actors and action and as such are often contrasted to the notion of agency. For example, class structure can be understood as a classification of persons into groups based on shared socio-economic conditions who are a part of a system of relations involving other classes in the context of an overall stratification system. As such, a class structure is a relational set of patterned inequalities with economic, social, political and ideological dimensions. However, in both the linguistic and social sense structures are ‘virtual’ in that they do not exist as things or entities that one can find. Rather, a structure exists in the mind of the beholder and is deployed as an analytic tool for specific purposes.

Style. The idea of style played an important part in the early youth subculture theory developed within cultural studies and in the work of Dick Hebdige in

particular. In this context, style was constituted by the signifying practices of youth subcultures, including the display of codes of meaning achieved via the transformation of commodities as cultural signs. Here style involves the organization of objects in conjunction with activities and attitudes through active bricolage to signify difference and identity.

Subculture. The signifier 'culture' in subculture has traditionally referred to a 'whole way of life' or 'maps of meaning' that make the world intelligible to its members. The prefix 'sub' has connoted notions of distinctiveness and difference from the dominant or mainstream society. Hence a subculture is constituted by groups of persons who share distinct values and norms which are held to be at variance with dominant or mainstream society and offers maps of meaning that make the world intelligible to its members.

Symbolic. A symbol is a mark that appears to stand in for another object or meaning. Thus, symbolism is a form of representation founded on signs. As with all sign systems, meaning is not generated because the object of symbolic reference has an essential and intrinsic meaning but rather is produced because signs/symbols are different from one another. The use of metaphor, which involves the replacement of one signifier by another, is a symbolic act. Indeed language is clearly a symbolic system that relies on metaphor to the point that all language use is metaphorical. The relationship between the sounds and marks of a symbolic system and its meanings is not fixed or eternal but rather is governed by the cultural conventions of usage within particular contexts.

Synergy. The idea of synergy is a concept drawn from political economy that refers to the bringing together of previously separate activities or moments in the processes of production and exchange to produce higher profits. Synergy, in the context of the communications industries, involves the assembling of various elements of production and distribution so that they complement each other to produce lower costs and greater profitability. In particular, the preoccupation with combining software and hardware can be seen when films are marketed simultaneously with pop music soundtracks and virtual reality video games all owned by the same company. This is now not so much the exception as the rule.

Text. The everyday use of the concept of a text refers to writing in its various forms so that books and magazines are understood to be texts. However, it is an axiom of cultural studies that a text is anything that generates meaning through signifying practices. That is, a text is a metaphor that invokes the constitution of meaning through the organization of signs into representations. This includes the generation of meaning through images, sounds, objects (such as clothes) and activities (like dance and sport). Since images, sounds, objects and practices are sign systems which signify with the same fundamental mechanism as a language we may refer to them as cultural texts. Hence, dress, television programmes, images, sporting events, pop stars etc. can all be read as texts.

Theory. Theory can be understood as a form of narrative that seeks to distinguish and account for the general features that describe, define and explain persistently perceived occurrences. It can also be grasped as a tool, instrument or logic for intervening in the world through the mechanisms of description, definition, prediction and control. Theory is not an unproblematic reflection or discovery of objective truth about an independent object world. Rather, theory construction is a self-reflexive discursive endeavour that seeks to interpret and intervene in the world. It involves the thinking through of concepts and arguments, often redefining and critiquing prior work, with the objective of offering new tools by which to think about our world.

Theoretical work has maintained a high profile position within cultural studies and can be thought of as a crafting of the cultural signposts and maps of meaning by which we are guided or, as argued in the introduction to this dictionary, as a toolbox of concepts. Cultural studies has rejected the empiricist claim that knowledge is simply a matter of collecting facts from which theory can be deduced or against which it can be tested. That is, ‘facts’ are not neutral and no amount of stacking up of ‘facts’ produces a story about our lives without theory.

Theory permeates all levels of cultural studies, which can itself be understood as a body of theory generated by thinkers who regard the production of theoretical knowledge as a political practice. Here, theory is not held to be a neutral or objective phenomenon but a matter of positionality, that is, of the place from which one speaks, to whom, and for what purposes. Within the domain of cultural studies there are a variety of theoretical perspectives that compete for ascendancy, the most prominent of which are Marxism, structuralism and poststructuralism.

Urbanization. The idea of urbanization refers to the social, economic and cultural practices that generate metropolitan zones and involves turning parts of the countryside into a cityscape as one of the features of capitalist industrialization. Urban life is both the outcome and symbol of modernity and is indicative of the ambiguity of modernity itself. The city can also be understood in terms of representation, that is, it can be grasped as a text. Representing urban life involves the techniques of writing – metaphor, metonymy and other rhetorical devices – rather than a simple transparency from the ‘real’ city to the ‘represented’ city. Representations of cities – maps, statistics, photographs, films, documents etc. – summarize the complexity of the city and displace the physical level of the city onto signs that give meaning to places. Representations of the spatial divisions of cities are symbolic fault lines of social relations and a politics of representation needs to ask about the operations of power that are brought to bear to classify environments. By revealing only some aspects of the city, representations have the power to limit courses of action or frame ‘problems’ in certain ways.