

**TRADITIONAL VALUES AS A NATIONAL
SECURITY FACTOR IN THE AGE OF
GLOBALIZATION**

Victoria KOTLYAROVA

*D.Sc. (Philos.), Professor, Department of Social-Humanitarian Disciplines,
Branch of the Don State Technical University
(Shakhty, Russian Federation)*

Andrei RUDENKO

*D.Sc. (Philos.), Professor, Head of the Department of
Social-Humanitarian Disciplines, Branch of the Don State Technical University
(Shakhty, Russian Federation)*

Petr PONOMAREV

*D.Sc. (Philos.), Professor,
Department of Social-Humanitarian Disciplines,
Branch of the Don State Technical University
(Shakhty, Russian Federation)*

ABSTRACT

The authors have undertaken an in-depth investigation of traditional values as factors of national security of states in the age of globalization and the changes in the axiological system of society and value orientations of its members, caused by globalization. The authors relied on a wide spectrum of methodological and theoretical approaches, used in philosophy, political science, sociology and globalistics. In the context of the unfolding civilizational evolution, globalization can be described as a relatively recent and, at the same time, highest development stage of the familiar process of internationalization (transnationalization) of many aspects of social life. In the last thirty-odd years, globalization has been unfolding as cultural and axiological impacts of Westernization and expansion of Western values to non-Western countries. In many cases, the destroyed traditional values and traditional foundations of life activi-

ties are not replaced with adequate axiological principles of development and modernization. The branching off of contemporary culture into two directions (globalization and regionalization) can be felt at all levels and, according to the present authors, have already created two paradoxes—preservation of the cultural heritage and coexistence of cultures. In Russia, globalization is spreading the easiest in the sphere, affected by the motives and symbols of material consumption. The multiplying signs of inefficiency of state regulation in market economy and the widening gap between the rich and poor can be considered as another powerful impetus for the spread of globalization. On the other hand, the fact that the traditional values are gaining popularity is the most important evidence that in Russia globalization is negatively assessed. In the epoch of globalization, traditional values keep the flood of unification and homogenization within certain limits.

KEYWORDS: *globalization, unification, traditional values, homogenization.*

Introduction

The rapidly unfolding technological processes, stratification of social space and modernization of social relationships are the most obvious signs of the post-industrial epoch in which we all live today. The risk society has spread across the world and demands that the value orientations of lost security should be sought for and recovered at the global level.¹ This adds special importance to the

¹ See: U. Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, Sage, London, 1992, 260 pp.

key questions about the place and role of traditional values in the globalizing world. As could be expected, this creates certain problems of institutionalization of the mechanisms of global security and their axiological-normative legitimation.

It takes any culture a long time to create its own system of values that determines its specifics and originality, as well as its ability to oppose sociocultural changes. The problem of values crops up when they come under the pressure of sociocultural transformations. The age of globalization is characterized by transformations, unfolding in all social spheres; this means that axiological dynamics is no exception: it is subjected to considerable transformations and modifications. It is highly important to study the role of traditional values in the life of society, since values are changed under the pressure of global processes, while the nature and meaning of these processes in society depend, to a great extent, on its value orientations. The problem of changes of traditional values that make society socially and culturally unique is fraught with a dilemma: either preserve the old values or adjust to new ones.

The authors have concentrated on the processes, related to the importance of traditional values as a factor of national security in the age of globalization and the changes in the axiological system of society, and value orientations of its members, caused by globalization. This calls for a discussion of a correlation between the values of multiculturalism and national values, the end of the “end of history” epoch, announced by Francis Fukuyama at one time, and a greater role of traditional values.

Methods and Materials

We selected the methodology that would make it possible to identify the specifics of traditional values as factors of national security in the epoch of globalization. To achieve this, we relied on a wide range of methodological and theoretical approaches used in philosophy, political science, sociology and globalistics, and a comprehensive inter-disciplinary approach—culturological, axiological, philosophic, sociological and the approaches used by political science.

Philosophical works of all ages—from Antiquity to our time—that created axiology as a special subject of the science of philosophy can be described as a vast theoretical and methodological basis of philosophic reflection on the values that proved to be singularly important for our studies. A more detailed analysis of the methodological basis can be found in several works, dealing with the development of axiology.² This theoretical-methodological heritage is highly important: it demonstrates a huge variety of the attempts at systematization, providing structure and explication of values that help define the axiological foundations as a social and cultural prerequisite of Russia’s security in the age of globalization.

We have relied on the fundamental epistemological principle of unity of the historical and the logical and used the formal logical methods of abstraction, formalization, systemic-structural analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, as well as the categories and laws of dialectical logic.

The method of historicism presents the object of study in retrospect, which helps understand our traditional values. In practice, it was used to establish levels of trust in traditional values and compare them.

To observe the principle of concreteness, we combined the variety of facts and processes with the need of further generalization. It is highly important, likewise, to compare statistical data and information of any other kind, since scientific generalizations are impossible without specific conclusions.

² See: V.V. Kotlyarova, A.M. Roudenko, M.M. Shubina, Y.A. Shestakov, “Explication of the Methodological Difficulties of Modern Axiology,” *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 2015, p. 478.

Results

Global changes, unfolding in the contemporary world, have brought to the fore serious contradictions in all spheres of social life; they invigorated confrontation between the worldwide integration/disintegration trends. The sphere of culture, as highly varied and spiritually free, proved to be especially responsive to these contradictions: each cultural entity constructs its own spiritual world, consolidates its own authority as the key principle of the world outlook. As the cornerstone of primary importance for a social being, values, “as norms and ideals in the system of functioning social relationships, are important as purposeful regulators.”³ Deprived of its universal axiological system that relies on the supreme spiritual and moral absolutes, society becomes highly vulnerable to the threat of self-destruction.

Today, many scholars speak about the world’s spiritual crisis. According to Vladislav Kelle, globalization revealed the specific sides of the far from new problem of the correlation between the European and American cultures and the cultures of the rest of the (mainly developing) world. He pointed out that Western, mainly American culture, that contradicts the local traditional and spiritual cultures, penetrates these cultures together with the technologies these countries needed very much.⁴

Fredric Jameson, who criticized globalization as a “political strategy of late capitalism,” pointed to Americanization and deemed it necessary to add: “globalization means the export and import of culture” with export of cultural products of the United States to other countries occupying the central place. Acceptance of American cultural products by other countries is the central element of Americanization. For many years, America has been exporting its culture to many countries, which have become adapted to it. American culture is spreading everywhere and its direct impact distorts the ideas and values of national cultures. Cultural development of the United States is perceived as a pattern to be followed. In the course of time, countries are losing their identity to become an appendix to American society, while their national cultures gradually move into the past to become cultural heritage.⁵

In Russia, globalization is affecting the axiological orientations in the realm of motives and symbols of material consumption. In the 1990s, Russia’s population that for a long time had been living amid shortages and very limited choices and trailing behind the most developed countries, where the levels of consumption had been concerned, was mesmerized by opened economic borders and a strong demonstrative effect of foreign markets. In no time, new ideas about the meaning of life conquered the minds and spread to all strata of society. Moral landmarks and the aims of life were replaced with the pursuit of material wellbeing. The spiritual dimensions of life—love, religion, beauty and kindness—acquired quantitative attributes to become objects of consumption. The values of pragmatism, individualism and hedonism moved into education and science. It should be said that even the most confirmed preachers of Western liberalism, George Soros being one of them, perceive these phenomena as a threat to be fought against.⁶ Ardent desire to grow rich coupled with aggression, individualism and egoism gradually spread to become common features among common people, the fact regularly confirmed by all sorts of sociological polls.⁷ The market of goods and services stimu-

³ V.V. Kotlyarova, *Tsennosti: traditsii i aksiologicheskaya paradigma sovremennosti*, Monograph, GOU VPO YuRGUES, Shakhty, 2009, p. 16.

⁴ See: V.Zh. Kelle, “Protsepsy globalizatsii i dinamika kulturny,” available at [http://www.zpu-journal.ru/zpu/2005_1/Kelle/9.pdf].

⁵ See: F. Jameson, *Valences of the Dialectic*, Chapter 17 “Globalization as a Philosophical Issue,” Verso, London, New York, 2009, pp. 435-455.

⁶ See: G. Soros, *The Crisis of Global Capitalism, Open Society Endangered*, Public Affairs, 1998, 245 pp.

⁷ See: “Lichnoe blagopoluchie vs. velichie strany,” Press release, LEVADA-TSENTR, 14 December, 2016, available at [<http://www.levada.ru/2016/12/14/lichnoe-blagopoluchie-vs-velichie-strany/>].

lates the emergence of the media that plants all sorts of cultural practices and synthesizes them. As Herbert Marcuse wrote at one time, members of a consumer society become dependent on their craving for variety and enjoyment. “We are again confronted with one of the most vexing aspects of advanced industrial civilization: the rational character or its irrationality, its productivity and efficiency, its capability to increase and spread comforts, to turn waste into need, and destruction into construction.”⁸

The gradually mounting inefficiency of state regulation of market economy became especially obvious in the early 1990s, to become another powerful channel, through which globalization challenged the axiological culture of Russian society. In the post-Soviet period, the value of economic freedom, one of the cornerstones of market economy, was discredited in the broadest circles of the Russian population. No wonder, many elements of the Western axiological structures, having been adopted by alien cultural environments, suffer extensive transformation to the extent that a lot of their contexts are lost. Freedom becomes unlimited permissiveness; free enterprise develops into the freedom of criminal activities amid widely spread corruption; democracy degenerates into arbitrary rule of state bureaucracy, operating behind the screen of quasi-democratic procedures.⁹

Neoliberal globalization has widened the gap between the rich and poor. There is nothing new in this, yet in Russia, this negative effect appeared at a much earlier stage than in other countries and, as could be expected, negatively affected the morals.¹⁰ The reason is obvious: globalization of axiological foundations destroys the axiological principles inherited from the past much faster than it creates new and higher, in the strict observance of the measurement of civilization, forms of public consciousness, which reflect the conditions of existence of mankind.¹¹

It seems that gradual reemergence of traditional values is the most important evidence that in Russia globalization is negatively perceived. Traditional values transfer from one generation to another historical social experience, accumulated in the form of patterns, norms, principles and ideas about what is the most precious in culture. According to VTsIOM, in 2016, the absolute majority of Russians were proud of the history of Russia (90%), its culture (88%), its strong army (90%) and science (82%); they were also proud of sports victories (75%) and Russia’s international status (72%).¹²

Traditional values and corresponding behavior are reproduced practically unchanged in the course of several generations or, for a long time, within the frameworks of the same society—in the last few years people have been gradually recapturing their confidence in traditional values—from 72% in 2004 to 86% in 2016.¹³ Traditional values have survived and continue to exist as a firm foundation of social identity and national character. One generation after another perceives traditional values as the cornerstone of historical memory; they help people find their bearings in life and make decisions.

Introduction of alien cultural elements, values in particular, might cause conflicts. In his book *The Crash of Civilizations*, the American political scientist and sociologist, Samuel Huntington, described the dynamics of contemporary international relations and possible conflicts between the

⁸ H. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, Second edition, Beacon Press, 1991, p. 9.

⁹ See: V.V. Kotlyarova, *Dinamika tsennostey molodezhi Rossii v postsovetkiy period*, PhD thesis, Rostov State University, Rostov on Don, 2005, p. 87.

¹⁰ See: V.V. Kotlyarova, “Traditsionnye tsennosti v sovremennoy kulture,” *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i iuridicheskie nauki, kulturologiia i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, No. 1 (5), 2010, pp. 84-86.

¹¹ See: A.M. Roudenko, V.V. Kotlyarova, M.M. Shubina, “Philosophical Analysis of the Values Influence of the Western World in the Socio-Cultural Space of Russia,” *Paradigmata poznani*, No. 1, 2015, pp. 20-27.

¹² See: “Rodina—eto zvuchit gordo!” VTsIOM, Press release, No. 3201, 16 September, 2016, available at [<https://wciom.ru/index.php?id=236&uid=115866>].

¹³ See: V.V. Kotlyarova, *Dinamika tsennostey...*, p. 87; “Problemniy fon strany: itogi goda,” VTsIOM, Press release, No. 3277, 28 December, 2016, available at [<http://wciom.ru/index.php?id=236&uid=116014>].

Western and non-Western countries. Having admitted that each civilization is unique and, having recognized the rights of each of them to self-determination, he never doubted that the Western values and morals were superior.¹⁴ The conflict between contemporary Western (hedonistic) and Eastern (traditionalist) cultures is one of the main reasons for alienation between nations. According to the polls carried out in 2016 by Chicago Council Survey and a series of polls, conducted by the Levada Center, only 23% of Russians think positively about Western values;¹⁵ the meager share of 8% wholeheartedly support them.¹⁶

Hence the question: Why does the gradually increasing number of politicians, public figures and scholars hold forth about the crisis of liberalism, about revived national preferences and stronger positions of traditional values amid the fast spreading of Western lifestyle and values and a lot of talk about a unified cultural space? It seems that deliberate unification is one of the greatest dangers of globalization: on the one hand, it allegedly facilitates communication and management of the global unified system, while on the other, however, it deprives mankind of the autonomous nature of its component parts and its variety, thus making the system highly vulnerable. It has become clear that the dominant neoliberal globalization (understood as Westernization in the cultural dimension) needs an alternative—the world is growing more and more tired of Western values.

In its 2011 report, the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos, defined two major risks—rising income and wealth disparity inside countries and between them, as well as blunders of global management, caused by inadequacies of global institutions, agreements and networks. In a similar report, published two years later, WEF identified five most probable risks: severe income disparity, chronic fiscal imbalances, rising greenhouse gas emissions, water supply crises, mismanagement of population ageing. In 2017, WEF identified four groups of main risks: *environmental*, *socio-political*, *economic*, *technological* and the risks connected with globalization.¹⁷ Socio-political risks are perceived as much more important than the rest taken together. Anatoli Chubays put this in a nutshell: “The most precise formula that describes Davos of this year is the horror of a global political disaster.” The “horror” is caused by the transformation of the axiological systems that began after Fukuyama’s *The End of History and the Last Man*, a crisis of liberalism and its basic values—democracy, globalization, multiculturalism and others. They are gradually replaced by opposing values: priority of national cultures, national identity, and national interests.

In conditions of globalization, traditional values prevent a flood of unification and homogenization that might negatively affect national communities and dilute national identities. Societies rely on traditional values to arrive at adequate strategic responses to civilizational challenges, to be involved in integration processes and be able to influence them in full conformity to their own national interests. This means that societies rely on their cultural identity not so much as to oppose globalized economics but to be actively involved in it. At all times, greatness and power of any state have been determined, to a great extent, by the level of morality and spirituality of its citizens. As is rightly registered in Point 8 of the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation till 2020 “Values and models of development have become the subject of global competition.” This means that the value systems of states and peoples have become the main target of attacks, including mounting information

¹⁴ See: S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Touchstone Books, 1997, 357 pp.

¹⁵ See: “SShA i Rossia: otsutstvie doveria i oshchushchenie bezopasnosti opredeliaiut otosheniya stran,” Press release, LEVADA-TSENTR, 7 November, 2016, available at [http://www.levada.ru/cp/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/USA_Russia_Levada_Chicago-2016_rus.pdf].

¹⁶ See: V.A. Anikin, “Krizis i natsionalnoe samosoznanie rossiiian,” *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniia: Ekonomicheskie i sotsialnye peremeny*, No. 5, 2016, p. 207.

¹⁷ See: *World Economic Forum. Global Risks 2017*, available at [<https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2017>].

pressure.¹⁸ Indeed, if the core of any axiological system crumbles, the country loses its uniqueness, while people start emulating behavior models initially alien to them. Today, any wrongly formulated axiological principles exercise a direct effect on national security of states. This means that there is a partial inversion of the movement of Abraham Maslow's models along the hierarchy of human needs toward a gradual increase in traditional values as the foundation of national security.¹⁹

The system of spiritual values and moral norms is one of the most important conditions of political and social stability, a sort of an "immune system" of social organism that protects it against all sorts of infectious deceases (violence, xenophobia, radical nationalism, separatism, moral permissiveness, etc.).²⁰ The highest values constitute the core of society's spiritual potential and the spiritual backbone of a personality that makes it stronger spiritually and morally, and strengthens the will-power to focus on defending national interests, protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Russian State.

Discussion

In the last decades of the twentieth century and later the peoples and their cultures were exposed to a strong world process now called globalization, the term first used by American sociologist Roland Robertson in 1985. The idea of globalization has been studied by social and humanitarian sciences for a long time now. At one time, Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Karl Marx and Maximilian Weber wrote a lot about external ties and economic limitations that affect nation-states. The subject attracted even more attention at the turn of the 1970s: scholars and academics of different countries demonstrated that the promptly widening international trade and investments, an awareness of ecological interdependence and the increasingly strong impacts of multinational corporations would cause systemic shifts that would undermine the roles played by the nation-states.

Today, there is no commonly accepted concept of globalization; different societies and different scientific disciplines interpret the term in their own ways. It is defined, in particular, as a process of mutual drawing closer together of countries and their economic, political, cultural, technological, etc. integration. Anthony Giddens has pointed out that "globalization thus is a complex set of processes, not a single one. And these operate in a contradictory or oppositional fashion."²¹

According to Olga Zernetskaya, the approaches to globalization can be divided into two types: optimistic-utopian and critical. The followers of the former expect that the global processes unfolding in mass communication and cultural integration will resolve all contradictions of contemporary society. The followers of the latter argue that global processes create numerous problems, the main being mass culture that standardizes mass consciousness on the basis of cultural patterns created in the United States unacceptable for ethnic communities that have philosophical traditions and cultures of their own.²²

¹⁸ See: S.I. Samygin, A.M. Rudenko, V.V. Kotlyarova, "Istoriko-filosofskoe osmyslenie problemy informatsionnoy bezopasnosti," *Sotsium i vlast*, No. 2 (58), 2016, pp. 47-51.

¹⁹ See: V.V. Kotlyarova, *Chelovek i ego potrebnosti*, Teaching aid, ISOiP (branch) DGTU, Shakhty, Lik, Novocherkassk, 2016, p. 131.

²⁰ See: A. Rudenko, V. Kotlyarova, E. Polozhenkova, M. Shubina, Yu. Shestakov, G. Mogilevskaya, O. Sysoeva, "Religious Tolerance as a Factor of Spiritual Security in the South of Russia," *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, Vol. 17, Issue 2, 2016, pp. 37-46.

²¹ A. Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, Routledge, 2003, pp. 12-13.

²² See: O.V. Zernetskaya, *Globalnoe razvitie system massovoy kommunikatsii i mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia*, Prosveshchenie, Moscow, 2009, p. 351.

The attempts to move globalization into the sphere of cultural and philosophical reflection had begun before the term “globalization” was coined. Canadian sociologist of culture Marshall McLuhan is the central figure in this respect.²³ Russian theoreticians point to the weak points of his concept: technological determinism (technological evolution leading to social transformations in all societies irrespective of their types) and technological romanticism (conviction that the development and spread of “democratic” inventions in the sphere of information will lead to worldwide democratization).²⁴

The idea of cultural imperialism consistently supported by Edward Said is a theoretical foe of McLuhan and his ideas. Although Said never accepted the terms global culture, globalization and cultural globalization, in his opinion, cultural globalization is directly related to the worldwide cultural expansion of the West.²⁵ This smacks of political-economic determinism.

Thomas Friedman described 1989 as the final year of the Cold War that ushered in the contemporary epoch of globalization and pointed to its clearly outlined features. One of them is Integration that Friedman defined as network. He has avoided the categorical definitions of Fukuyama and his “end of history” verdict. Fukuyama is talking about the end of mankind’s ideological evolution and universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final stage of governance. Friedman sides with the concept of glocalization (“I believe that most important filter is the ability to ‘glocalize’”) that envisages an attempt to combine the system of globalization and localization (development of national states and cultures). In fact, he concentrates on nation-states in the context of the globalization processes.²⁶

At one time, Gherman Diligenskiy, one of the leading Russian sociologists, pointed out that globalization, as a new means of coordinating the opposites, betrayed itself in the realm of culture and personality development and intensified the uniformity and variety of mankind. Intensified variety, however, does not destroy unity, since mechanisms and principles of correlation between different parts of the global whole are taking shape in the process.²⁷

It should be said that a greater part of the studies of the problem of interconnection between globalization and evolution of axiological principles failed to pay adequate attention to the latest global challenges, organically connected with the current social transformations.

Scholarly writings abound in lacunae of in-depth theoretical analysis of the ways the latest global challenges affect the changes of axiological orientations despite the fact that the traditions of these studies are rooted in the first reports of the Club of Rome in the early 1970s. As a highly varied phenomenon, globalization attracted attention of politicians and economists and also philosophers, sociologists, culturologists, writers, journalists, and members of all sorts of public movements. No wonder, assessments and forecasts are highly ambiguous and, in fact, very much in line with the contradictory nature of this phenomenon of epochal dimensions.

Conclusion

Globalization, as a principle of organization, functioning and development of the world, is described as a homogenous economic, socio-cultural and political super system. As a process, globalization intensifies interdependence of states, decreases their sovereignty, and generates interregional and

²³ See: M. McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, McGraw-Hill, 1964, 318 pp.

²⁴ See: *Rossia v dialoge kultur*, ed. by A.A. Guseynov, A.V. Smirnov, B.O. Nikolaichev, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 2010, p. 48.

²⁵ See: E.W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, Vintage Books, New York, 1993, p. XXV.

²⁶ See: Th. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree. Understanding Globalization*, Picador, 2000, p. 295.

²⁷ See: G.G. Diligenskiy, “Globalizatsia v chelovecheskom izmerenii,” *Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia*, No. 7, 2002, pp. 4-15.

transcontinental flows that create global interconnections. This means that globalization is a qualitatively new independent and complex system of phenomena and relations. Globalization changes the world because human civilization acquires new spiritual patterns.

In the last thirty-odd years, the cultural and axiological impacts of globalization have been unfolding mainly in the form of Westernization and expansion of Western values to the non-Western countries. In many cases, this trigger negative axiological transformations, destruction of traditional foundations of life activities without offering new axiological foundations for development and modernization. Axiological matrices, shaped in different cultural and historical contexts, demonstrate survivability in qualitatively different cultural contexts; it should be said that the “cultural donors” are found at a fundamentally different stage of civilizational development than the recipient countries.

Globalization, as a new ideology and a new way of life in a cultural milieu, is based on a so-called planetary conscience, a product of Euroatlantic ideas of the world and the Westernized consumer morals. Today, the pendulum is moving in the opposite direction. Traditional ideas, norms, feelings, humanistic values, the ideas of justice, freedom and human rights make moral culture a part of the sphere of aims and interests of men. Traditions, independence and sovereignty have not lost their importance in the context of globalization. Traditional values are filled with a new content; they are gradually perceived as a social and political ideal of a nation that harmonizes, to the greatest extent, with its traditions, desires, cultural and psychological attitudes that ensure its further development. It should be said that today, the growth of traditionalism can be regarded as a program of revival of many nations and a sort of a project of national and state construction, as opposed to liberalization and globalization.

The question is: How can mankind overcome the “horror of Davos”; what should people do to achieve security in the world—move toward unification or preserve cultural variety in the context of global, economic, political and social shifts; should they maintain the dialog for the sake of development or concentrate on variety for security? No answer is evident so far.