Situational Analysis of Socio-Cultural Interaction of States Under Conditions of Globalization

N.I. Anufrieva[1], A.V. Kamenets[2], I.S. Kazakova[3], E.A. Morozova[4], N.S. Yushchenko[5]

Abstract:

The present article considers the possibilities of the paradigm of socio-cultural interaction when analyzing international relations. Traditional activity approaches in explaining this interaction are critically assessed, and the main situations of interstate interactions that have a socio-cultural importance are analyzed.

The offered problematisation when studying global strategies of interstate relations in terms of socio-cultural interaction makes it possible to consider desirable strategies and scenarios for improving intercultural communication and international cooperation. Possible prospects on changing the basic benchmarks of the globalization processes based on socio-cultural interaction for its further humanization are outlined.

The revealed mechanisms of the dynamics of socio-cultural interactions when moving from one situation of interaction to another, as well as the role of the cultural reality formed for this purpose and overcoming the one-sidedness of economism in international relations can provoke the researchers' interest. The offered analysis of the situations of socio-cultural interaction enables the authors of the article to clarify some positive opportunities of the globalization in the overall civilization development and intercultural dialogue of all countries of the world community.

The results given in the article in relation to studying the main reasons of the discrimination in interstate relations and offers on overcoming it by using the spiritual and moral potential of the world culture are also of great importance.

Keywords*: Culture, interaction, globalization, civilization, situation.*

JEL Classification: *Z10, Z19*

[1] *Russian State Social University (RSSU)*
[2] *Russian State Social University (RSSU)*
[3] *Russian State Social University (RSSU)*
[4] *Russian State Social University (RSSU)*
[5] *Russian State Social University (RSSU), n.yushenko@list.ru*

1. Introduction

Solving the problem on developing and improving socio-cultural interactions in interstate relations supposes relevant methodological grounds for understanding the process of interaction as a special social phenomenon in the global cultural space. Due to this, in scientific researches and real social practice, it is necessary to refuse from the traditional *impact* scheme that supersedes the *interaction* processes, which causes the inevitable inequality of its subjects (Kamenets. 2015; Kamenets and Urmina, 2011). In this case one of them positions himself as a "subject", while the other one loses its own subjectivity and becomes the object of the first one's impact. In interstate relations such socio-cultural interaction turns into the aspiration of states that have extensive resources (information, financial, military, etc.) as compared to other states, to "cultural colonization" of weaker partner states.

There is one more substitution found when studying socio-cultural interactions. The study of socio-cultural *interaction* processes is replaced by studying intercultural *communications* (Schutz, 1994; Shchedrovitsky, 1995; Havlíček *et al.,* 2013). This is due to the virtualization of intercultural and interstate interactions imposed internationally as a universal cultural norm.

At the same time it is necessary to note that the above *"right of the strong one"* in interstate relations has the boomerang effect: states that are stronger in terms of civilization and economics lose their opportunities of the real intercultural dialogue and interaction with representatives of other cultures, ethnic groups and peoples which causes the inevitable cultural stagnation and dehumanization of the cultural space of developed countries. Due to this, it is especially urgent to study the potential of socio-cultural interactions when solving the problem of the real rather than imitated socio-cultural interaction and relevant cultural communications in interstate relations (Orlova, 2004).

2. Methodology

Studying the socio-cultural interaction in interstate relations can be estimated as productive subject to singling out the main types of situations of this interaction that are significant for the survival, self-preservation and development of representatives of various ethnic groups and peoples involved in this process. These types of situations are substantiated by levels of the social reality where it is possible to single out the microlevel (the level of small informal groups, informal interpersonal relations), the mesolevel (the level of production, training collectives, public organizations, etc.), the macrolevel (the national level), and the megalevel (the planetary, general civilization level) of the socio-cultural interaction (Hobbes, 2001).

Singling out these levels of the socio-cultural interaction allows us to estimate the appropriately formed basic approaches to its study in sociological and cultural researches. These researches were divided between two irreconcilable groups of

researchers – microsociologists, phenomenologists (Giddens, 2005; Goffman, 2000; 2004), and researchers of "large" social systems (Parsons, 2002). Accordingly, the first ones tend to study the microlevel of sociocultural interactions (in the context of small social groups), and the latter – the macrolevel of this study (in the context of the whole society). To a large extent, this confrontation is artificial because here we deal with essentially different interaction situations that cannot be compared since they belong to different social realities (Berger and Luckmann, 1995). It is also important to study the possibilities of productive transition of subjects of the socio-cultural interaction from one level to another in order to avoid the deactivation of the society's "atomization" (microlevel) or its totalitarization (macrolevel).

It is important to make the situational analysis of the socio-cultural interaction a process of role-playing by using the possibilities of the theatrical acting communication that becomes especially important in international diplomacy. Goffman studied theatricalization of social interactions in details (Goffman, 2000; 2004). However, at the same time, the ethical aspect of this interaction becomes significant. Misuse of "masked" behavior can be expressed in the desire of one of the subjects of interaction to use the other one by acting as a "friend", "well-wisher", and "partner", which often happens in the interstate relations. It would be naive to believe that an element of pragmatism and practicality may disappear in the socio-cultural interactions of various states. However, here is its own "red line". Crossing it may cause a threat of armed confrontations, the destruction of a particular people or ethnic group. This line is found not in economic but purely in cultural reality. The latter means that as soon as any participant of the interaction is thought to be only a source of profit (a source of raw materials, natural resources, cheap labor, sales market, etc.), this participant is deprived of the right to subjectivity that presupposes such properties as the sense of national dignity, full cultural and technological development, cultural identity, etc. The international behavior based on the principle of "getting benefits at any cost" becomes unacceptable, which often leads to catastrophic social, economic, environmental, cultural costs for a particular people, ethnical group, state that are influenced by global economic interests.

This requirement to the socio-cultural interaction can also be set in relation to interstate socio-cultural interactions; otherwise, one state constantly attempts to impose its interests on another state and ignores its interests. To justify its actions, the "aggressor state" often uses a pseudocultural factor and represents its interaction partner as an "enemy", a "rogue state", a cultural underdeveloped subject one cannot negotiate with, and that can only be viewed as an object of social, economic and cultural expansion. For this reason, Russia's attempts to pursue a positive constructive dialogue with Western countries are complicated.

Thus, the intercultural communication should become an alternative to the dominance of "economism" in interstate relations as a guarantee of a way out of the endless "production-consumption" cycle as the main civilizational value.

These are the disastrous consequences of the endless natural resources' consumption for the mankind as a consequence of the material consumption cult that the last report of the Rome Club ("Come on") (it performs many years' work on global forecasting) is focused on.

Accordingly, when researching any real process of the socio-cultural interaction, it is necessary to take into account that always contains two realities – ideal (internal intentions, ideal patterns, cultural norms of interaction) and physical, behavioral reality in the form of real actions, deeds, counteractions, behavioral acts, etc. The ideal reality that is significant for socio-cultural interactions of states is cultural memory, mentality, national and cultural self-actualization of peoples from these states. This reality is fixed in the form of relevant cultural symbols, spiritual practices, in language, art, national ideals, etc. The ideal reality fulfills the function of cultural normalization of various socio-cultural interactions both within states and in interactions among them (Hegel, 1977; Psychology of Social Situations, 2001). The role of the ideal (spiritual and cultural) reality is different on various social levels. Let us consider these levels and the corresponding situations of the socio-cultural interaction in this aspect.

Microlevel of socio-cultural interactions: Social and cultural communities where interpersonal informal relationships predominate are the main subjects in this case. These are communities of friends, close relatives, beloved, co-religionists, etc. This is a *situation of consent* where the main mechanism of socio-cultural interaction is the manifestation of sympathy, empathy, mutual attraction, feelings that are non-rational. If there are no cultural standards, sustainable cultural values and patterns in this interaction (ideal reality), there may be a threat of their "physiological" nature, irrational uncontrollability, when instincts and unconscious drives that can destroy these communities due to the dominance of the biological selfhood of the interaction subjects play an important role. This is the lack of sustainable generally accepted cultural norms and patterns that can explain the imposition by some countries of unconventional sexual orientation in interstate relations as a new biological norm, which denies the traditional family values and traditions in informal interpersonal interactions that were formed among the majority of the world's inhabitants. The denial of gender as a cultural and anthropological universal causes, in fact, a rejection of the spiritual and humanistic values that make up the basis of the world artistic culture (the main fiction plot was formulated by philologists as "Will Hans find his Gretchen"), as well as the refusal to recognize the importance of religious spiritual values in the *situation of consent* in the socio-cultural interaction. All world religions are known to pay special attention to the spiritual relationship between the man and the woman.

Meanwhile, imposing of "transgender" relations as a cultural norm reflects global interests of transnational corporations that as stated above are not interested in the national and cultural sovereignty of the majority of countries where the cultural

traditions of inter-gender relations are largely determined by the national art, cultural and religious traditions, peculiarities of family relationships, etc.

It is also possible to include side effects of the juvenile justice imposed by globalists. It allows interfering in the internal social and cultural life of families on the plea of protecting the child's rights. And, finally, the underestimation of the spiritual and cultural basis in the "consent situation" of states that is often proclaimed as tolerance causes the expansion of the "corporality" cult in interstate relations through the communication of the relevant mass culture as a tool of globalization that destroys the institution of the family in the name of global interests of service producers and goods produced by the sex and entertainment industry aimed at maintaining a high level of the consumers' desire for sensual pleasure.

Mesolevel: This level corresponds to the *situation of confrontation*. In the context of interstate relations, this is primarily the activity of various non-profit organizations (NPOs) that often perform the function of a "ram" aimed at destroying the existing state power in a particular country. These NPOs are most often managed externally by the states that are interested in changing the political regime, changing the power and, ultimately, in the economic subordination of countries where coups are carried out under the slogans of asserting democracy. At first glance, it seems that the aggravation of the confrontation in the interests of stronger states brings the desired dividends to the latter (the regimes are overthrown, the situation of civil war in the conquered countries is created, etc.). However, in the end the desired goal of the conflict initiators is not achieved and causes the effect of a "Pyrrhic victory" because the subsequent economic, political and social costs of maintaining the new regime start outweighing the benefits from the obtained victory. Here, the well-known pattern of any protracted conflict is triggered: the longer conflictual conflict continues, the smaller chance it has for a successful resolution for either side. It is impossible to win in a long-term conflict, and, consequently, it is important for the conflicting parties to be able to negotiate with each other on mutually beneficial terms. However, to do this, the conflicting parties must have the appropriate transaction experience in achieving a compromise in a particular conflict situation. If there is no such experience (for example, there is only the experience of the "conqueror", the colonizer, etc.), such country moves to the usual "warpath" in any form (hot, cold, informational, hybrid, etc.).

Thus, studying the existing conflicts by referring them to the *situation of confrontation* that arises on the mesolevel makes it possible to diagnose the real state of many state relationships and to make forecasts about the further development of this situation. The ability to achieve reasonable compromises in the interstate socio-cultural interaction is that very ideal reality (availability of cultural samples, standards and norms of the compromise interaction) that must define the civilized logic of the occurring interstate confrontations.

Macrolevel (national level of interaction): The situation of partnership is appropriate for this level. This situation means negotiations and achievement of agreements, contracts, and dialogue between states, primarily through diplomatic means. It is also necessary to take into account that underestimation of the cultural factor, even subject to the consent of both interacting parties to compromise, can cause "trading of national interests", national and cultural sovereignty, because traders' predictions and the above pragmatics prevail in interstate relations. That is why it is not surprising that the international policy pursued by leaders of various states is quite often opposite to the interests of their people who become hostages of economic interests that are strange for them. Consequently, in the situation of partnership, the recognition of one's own national and cultural interests is especially important. One cannot relinquish these interests under any conditions. One way or another, they allow maintaining one's own national and cultural identity of partners in this situation of interaction.

Megalevel of sociocultural interaction: As stated above, this level is planetary and general civilization. The *situation of coexistence* is preferable on this level. In due time the Soviet state proclaimed a famous principle of international relations – "peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems". Despite the fact that even then it was often violated, it is still important in terms of civilizational now. To maintain this principle, the cultural factor also becomes decisive. The opportunities of such international relations were studied by A. Schweitzer, the famous humanist, Nobel laureate, in his work "Culture and Ethics" (Schweitzer, 1973; Kalinina *et al.,* 2015). In this work, the thinker proposed a new ecological ethic that remains demanded at the present time. It is based on the "principle of the will to live and reverence for life." It is necessary to emphasize that it means reverence for any life. In its turn, it means that there are no more or less significant peoples and states. Each of them should be considered as unique in the general civilizational space. In terms of human communities (ethnos groups, people and countries), the principle of "the will to live and reverence for life" can be interpreted as maintaining the distinctiveness of cultures, mentalities, psychologies, and the self-consciousness of peoples and countries as the main condition for their biological survival as members of the human race. This principle should also be fundamental in the socio-cultural interaction of states on the megalevel, i.e. in the general civilization scale.

3. Results

The situational analysis of the globalization's impact on interstate socio-cultural interactions made it possible to identify the main mechanisms of transferring from one situation to another, which were objective in nature.

Situation of consent: In this situation, the subjects that have a global impact on countries and peoples, position themselves as generally interested in mutual understanding, cooperation, and collaboration to achieve a common result that satisfies everyone. In fact, within this situation there is an *exploitation mechanism*

that arises from the fact that, subject to the general proclaimed equality of all members of the consent situation, some of them become "more equal" than others as having greater economic resources, impact, status, etc. Stronger partners in this situation most often realize various global interests of those countries and structures behind them that implement a global project. Such dependence brings economic, military, political and other advantages to the countries, leading in "groups (or situations) of consent" as compared to other participants in this situation that become an object of "stronger" countries' exploitation; for example, the European Union where it is possible to observe inequality and infringement of the rights of those countries that do not enter the Great Europe and remain as a periphery depending on the more developed European countries. As a result, in the situation of consent the conflict potential accumulates. It inevitably causes the *mechanism of alienation* of some members of the consent group from others, which leads to the *situation of confrontation* within the situation of consent and making up an image of the "enemy" in relation to the consent group to rally all members of the group in spite of the existing disagreements (Glebov, 1930; Lefebvre, 1973; Osipov, 2003; Lipina *et al.,* 2017). At the same time, such agreement directed and organized by the relevant authors of the globalist project makes more and more damage to the participants of the "consent situation" artificially created by these authors. Moreover, the people of the most important subjects of the globalization process also suffer losses, because they have to constantly spend their own resources on the economic and military support of those countries that implement globalist strategies and projects in the relevant "consent groups" that are specially created for this purpose.

The further logic of developing the situation of confrontation must inevitably be replaced by the *situation of partnership* based on compromises that are necessary in the modern world of the threat of global conflicts fraught with complete self-destruction of the world civilization. This situation is created through the mechanism of "mutual isolation" where all its participants are connected primarily by pragmatic mutual interests while paying attention to their own national interests and a certain level of sovereignty.

If there are no common national and cultural interests, there is a wish to more and more autonomation of own interests by a country, and a *mechanism of the complete disunity* of the interaction subjects starts being realized in the *situation of coexistence* where the interacting participants can be connected only by the fact of their joint physical coexistence in space. The first case in this disunity was the UK's exit from the European Union. The only way to maintain the European solidarity in this situation is to persistently maintain the image of Russia as an "external enemy" in the European Union and the corresponding economic sanctions imposed on Russia. However, such policy becomes less efficient and does not lead its subjects to the desired result. Contradictions and conflicts among European countries get merely more and more complicated instead of being efficiently solved.

The *symbolization mechanism* strengthens this position. It fixes the *situation of coexistence* instead of the real interaction of countries that previously made up a common group of consent. This mechanism is realized through the appropriate cultural codes and is represented in official ideological doctrines, political documents, programs, various normative documents, etc. that in one way or another state the exclusivity of any country, people, nation opposing the trend of leveling countries captured by globalization. In fact it often turns into cultural isolationism that prevents full social and economic development of these countries and peoples.

The above mechanisms of transferring from one interaction situation to another can exist and maintain the relevant state of interstate relations for quite a long period of time, which leads to larger stagnation and degradation in the economic, social, political and cultural state of countries.

4. Discussion

Situation of consent: In the socio-cultural context it should be interpreted as the possibility for all parties to search for the interaction of a common spiritual and cultural space formed on the basis of maintaining the national and cultural identity of all countries in the interests of maintaining the world cultural heritage and world culture in general. This approach to the situation of consent makes it possible to use the creative potential of modern globalization by using Internet technologies, various cultural exchanges, cultural tourism, etc. In this case, it becomes possible to more efficiently take into account the economic interests of all interaction participants, unlike wide-spread tendencies of economic competition, trade wars, economic exploitation of some countries by others under the "right of the strong", etc. The economic confrontation existing in international relations is artificial to a great degree because a reasonable international division of labor among different countries can be carried out in the interests of all countries based on cooperation and mutually beneficial collaboration. There is an additional argument – the outrunning importance of cultural factors in the developed recommendations of leading marketing specialists where the consideration of mentality, cultural needs and interests determines the nature of supply and demand in the system of market relations.

In the socio-cultural aspect *situation of confrontation* should be seen not as a conflict of interests where there can be participants in interest – global writers and directors of "managed chaos", but as an opportunity to search for compromises when there is a common interest that is important for maintaining the world culture, civilizations and private socio-cultural interests satisfied through this compromise. For example, using information resources of globalization, various countries can demonstrate their cultural and social achievements world-wide and form their own cultural image in the world community. It is possible to show an appropriate typological example. This is the practice of international exhibitions and festivals that can be assessed as a confrontation situation that has the nature of a creative competition where all parties are winners (Berne, 1988; Huizinga, 1992).

Situation of partnership: As mentioned above, if this partnership is based mainly on economic interests, the compromise achieved here is temporary, and in the end it causes selfish interests of some partners when the common goals have already been achieved. This compromise can be easily broken if it contradicts somebody's global interests. It happens quite often because there is a self-interested principle in the managerial practice – "Divide and rule" – involving self-serving interests. It is possible to offer an alternative to such a partnership based on the socio-cultural analysis. This is the maintenance of fundamental boundaries for partnership relations the violation of which may cause the loss of the national-cultural identity of the participants in the partnership situation. It means that in the national and state cultural policy of partner countries, the maintenance of such identity must become a nation-wide priority. In this case, participants in this interaction situation will have the necessary immunity from certain agents of influence defending somebody's global interests (Selezneva, 2009; Nikolova *et al.,* 2017).

Situation of coexistence: In the real globalization process there is a tendency of a consistent, increasingly dominance of economic interests of individual subjects of market relations as compared to the opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation. As a rule, major players of globalization are interested in this tendency. They support the maximum state of economic "war of all against all" to maintain their dominant positions on the world market. Socio-cultural orientation in the *situation of coexistence* supposes other rules of the game. Here, the interaction participants are looking for opportunities for non-state relations where the general cultural interests of these countries' people become the most important ones, and economic interests are not of decisive importance. Recently, the situation of coexistence interpreted in this way has become especially important. Otherwise, it is necessary to acknowledge that interstate relations turn into a "shop" where globalizers become the main beneficiaries.

5. Conclusion

The situational analysis of the possibilities of the states' socio-cultural interaction in the context of globalization shows that today the pursuit of economic interests in international relations pulled away from their cultural context actually brings the creative potential of the majority of global projects to nothing. Here the real interaction is actually replaced by the impact of some actors on others to obtain their own material benefits.

The socio-cultural interaction situations studied in this regard are possible guidelines for changing the general paradigm of globalization processes towards the humanization of international relations where the most important elements include respect of the national and cultural sovereignty of all countries that are members of the world community and the formation of the common civilization cultural space. Accordingly, the strategies of the socio-cultural interaction of states should exclude someone's cultural hegemony and cultural colonization in international relations.

The above situations of socio-cultural interaction form a single cycle where each phase (agreement, opposition, partnership, and coexistence) is a stage of progressing to more and more humane international relations that presuppose the necessary level of mutual understanding and cultural cooperation of states in order to prevent threats of global conflicts and destructive armed confrontations.

References:

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. 1995. Social Construction of Reality. Moscow, Medium, pp. 324.

Berne, E. 1988. Games People Play. People Who Play Games. Moscow, Progress.

Giddens, A. 2005. Organization of Society. Moscow, Academy Project.

Glebov, I. 1930. Musical Form as a Process. Music, The Music Sector.

Goffman, E. 2000. The Presentation Self in Every Day Life. Moscow, Canon Press Ts.

Goffman, E. 2004. Analysis of Frames. Moscow, Institute of Sociology, RAS.

Havlíček, K., Thalassinos. I.E. and Berezkinova, L. 2013. Innovation Management and Controlling in SMEs. European Research Studies Journal, 16(4), 57-70

Hegel, G.W.F. 1977. Philosophy of Spirit. Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences, 3, Moscow, Thought, pp. 471.

Huizinga, J. 1992. Homo Ludens. In the Shadow of Tomorrow. Moscow, Progress.

Hobbes, T. 2001. Leviathan. Moscow, Thought, pp. 478.

Kalinina, A., Petrova, E. and Buyanova, M. 2015. Efficiency of Public Administration and Economic Growth in Russia: Empirical Analysis. European Research Studies Journal, 18(3), 77-90.

Kamenets, A.V. and Urmina, I.A. 2011. Technologies of Social Interaction in Solving Actual Problems of the Youth. Tutorial. Moscow, RGSU Publishing House, pp. 120.

Kamenets, A.V. 2015. Introduction to the Theory of Social Interaction. Monograph, Moscow, RGSU Publishing House, pp. 464.

Lefebvre, V.A. 1973. Conflicting Structures. Moscow, Soviet Radio, pp. 159.

Lipina, S.A., Lochan, S.A., Fedyunin, D.V. and Bezpalov, V.V. 2017. Government Promoting Communication Tool in Innovation Development of Companies. European Research Studies Journal, 20(4B), 536-547.

Nikolova, L.V., Rodionov, D.G. and Afanasyeva, N.V. 2017. Impact of Globalization on Innovation project Risks Estimation. European Research Studies Journal, 20(4B), 396-410.

Orlova, E.A. 2004. Cultural (Social) Anthropology. Moscow, Academic Project, pp. 480.

Osipov, G.V. 2003. Sociology: Fundamentals of the General Theory. Moscow, Norma, pp. 912.

Parsons, T. 2002. About the Structure of Social Action. Moscow, Academy, The project.

Psychology of Social Situations. 2001. Moscow, St. Petersburg, PETER.

Schweitzer, A. 1973. Culture and Ethics. Moscow, Progress, pp. 342.

Selezneva, E.N. 2009. Problems of Spiritual and Moral Education in Education Strategies of the 21st Century. Scientific and Methodical Manual. Moscow, RGSU, pp. 45.

Shchedrovitsky, G.P. 1995. Selected Works. Moscow, Shk. cult. Policy, pp. 800.

Schutz, A. 1994. Formation of the Concept and Theory in Social Sciences. American Sociological Thought: Texts. Moscow, Publishing House of Moscow State University, 481-496.