

UDC 008

Space policy as a factor of cultural exchange and formation of cultural paradigm

Lyudmila K. Kazakova

Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: kazakovalk@mail.ru

Elena A. Zeveleva

PhD in History, Professor,
Academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences,
Head of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: aleksandr.sapsai@yandex.ru

Sergei V. Lepilin

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: kaffilos@yandex.ru

Natal'ya M. Tret'yakova

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: natalia.tretyakova@mail.ru

Tat'yana S. Karandaeva

PhD in Philosophy,
Associate Professor of the Department Philosophy and Law,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: tkarandaeva@yandex.ru

Lyudmila E. Denisova

Master of Public Administration,
Head of the Youth Policy Department,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: denisovale@mgri.ru

Abstract

This article presents the brief analysis of the evolution of culture. The authors notice that the emergence of culture has raised the evolutionary process to a new level. For man there was no need to master nature and technology as the extremely slow process of biological change; he had an extrasomatic mechanism of adaptation and control, which developed on the basis of its own laws and potentials. Moreover, progress in one aspect of culture is easily transferred to others, so that each area benefits from the development of one. Consequently, the history of man becomes an account of the history of his culture. Cultural systems, similar to biological organisms, develop, multiply and spread to other territories. Technology builds, but it can also destroy. The hope that a civilization so painstakingly and expensively created simply cannot be destroyed, because such an end would be too terrible and meaningless – is nothing more than a naive anthropocentric pain. The cosmos has nothing to do with what man has created on this tiny planet. The final destruction of the human race – and sooner or later it will happen – will not be the first time that a species is completely extinct.

For citation

Kazakova L.K., Zeveleva E.A., Lepilin S.V., Tret'yakova N.M., Karandaeva T.S., Denisova L.E. (2019) The origin and evolution of the concept of culture. *Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiya* [Culture and Civilization], 9 (1B), pp. 253-263.

Keywords

Culture, structure, development, opportunity, becoming.

Introduction

At the international level, an interesting trend can be traced: the movement towards greater and greater political unity. Agricultural technology has replaced the village, cities, tribes, nations and empires. Modern fuel technology similarly contributes to the creation of larger political groupings, fewer centers of concentration of power. The unification of Germany and Italy in the nineteenth century is a relatively recent phenomenon of the tendency to unite Nations. The Treaty of Versailles attempted to "balkanize Europe," to counteract the century – old trend of social evolution, and to divide the continent into smaller parts. One of the most remarkable and important aspects of the Second World War, especially at the initial stage, was the desire to unify Europe. Half a dozen world powers fought in the First World War; only two emerged victorious from the Second. The arena of the struggle for the state is narrowing as its participants are destroyed. The logical outcome will be not just the domination of one state – this is a transitional stage, but a single political organization that will protect the entire planet and all peoples. To such a denouement is quickly leading us but new powerful technology.

However, a new and ominous element complicates the prospect: the use of atomic energy for military purposes. Again, this factor did not arise by chance, and due to the fact that the energy extracted from of the new source of steel to convert in such bad shape. Once again, we are on the verge of a technological revolution. The consequences of this new technological breakthrough may be fundamentally different from those of the agrarian and fuel revolutions. In the past, the emergence of new technologies abolished old social systems, but replaced them with new systems. Nuclear technology, on the other hand, threatens to destroy civilization itself, or to disfigure it to such an extent that it will take a hundred, a thousand, perhaps ten thousand years to reach the level of development of today again. At least, this is what prominent scientists and the military assure us; we, the uninitiated, like children, live in ignorance, because all the important circumstances associated with the use of atomic energy are kept secret from us. The destruction of several dozen scientific and industrial centers in Europe and the United States will be fatal to Western civilization, and the powers that be assure us that this is quite possible, if not likely. The hope for the future and for the future of humanity and civilization in the event of a new war is linked to a winner – not just a survivor-with a winner who has the strength and resources to unite the entire human race on our planet into a single social system.

Thus, the emergence of culture has raised the evolutionary process to a new level. For man there was no need to master nature and technology as the extremely slow process of biological change; he had an extrasomatic mechanism of adaptation and control, which developed on the basis of its own laws and potentials. Moreover, progress in one aspect of culture is easily transferred to others, so that each area benefits from the development of one. Consequently, the history of man becomes an account of the history of his culture.

Main part

Technology is a world of rocks and rivers, sticks and steel, air and light of stars, galaxies, atoms, molecules. Man is only a material body of a special kind, which has to perform certain actions in order to maintain its state in the cosmic material system. The means of adaptation and control, security and survival are technological means. So culture becomes first of all the mechanism of transformation of energy necessary to force energy to work for the benefit of the person, and only then-the mechanism of formation and the direction of his behavior which is not connected directly with obtaining food, protection from enemies and fight against enemies. Therefore, social systems are defined by technological systems, philosophical concepts and art reflect the experience formed by technology and refracted by social systems. Cultural systems, like biological systems, have the capacity for growth. That is, the ability to capture energy turns into the ability to capture and transform it in ever greater quantities.

Thus, cultural systems, similar to biological organisms, develop, multiply and spread to other territories. The sun is the primary engine; culture is the modynamic system that works from it. At the very least, solar energy has given rise to all the cultural systems hitherto known in history, and it will support cultural systems even when all the earth's reserves of fissile fuel are exhausted, if civilization survives to that point. Yet technology remains the main actor in this play, even if it turns out to be the villain rather than the hero. Technology builds, but it can also destroy. The hope that a civilization so painstakingly and expensively created simply cannot be destroyed, because such an end would be too terrible and meaningless – is nothing more than a naive anthropocentric pain. The cosmos has nothing to do with what man has created on this tiny planet [Langegger, 2013]. The final destruction of the human race – and sooner or later it will happen-will not be the first time that a species is completely

extinct. This will not be an event in the life of our planet. But man can survive a radioactive catastrophe even if his culture is thrown back to the level of the Neolithic age; he will start climbing again, this time maybe in a different way; and it is possible that culture will benefit from this. Culture may not be destroyed, and even not suffer much from new sources of energy. The probability of destruction is no greater than the probability of survival. When the next major arena on the international stage emerges, the devastation may be – and probably will be – great, but the creative forces of new technologies may be enough to restore what has been destroyed in a short time and unite the whole world into a single political system. Then and only then will the fatal inevitability of war be removed and the way cleared for a more interesting and rich life.

Culture is a series of interacting elements; each cultural trait affects and is influenced by others. Some elements become obsolete and are excluded from this flow; new elements are included. All the time new permutations, combinations, synthesis are created. Whether we consider a limited section of the cultural continuum, such as the evolution of mathematics or the genealogy of the steam engine, or culture as a whole, the principle of interpretation remains the same: culture grows out of culture.

Culturology is a very young branch of science. After several centuries of development of astronomy, physics and chemistry, several decades of development of physiology and psychology, science has finally turned its attention to what most determines human behavior – its culture. After many failed attempts, it has been shown that culture cannot be explained in terms of psychology; such interpretations are nothing more than anthropomorphism in scientific garb. The explanation of culture can only be culturological. The science of culture is young, but promising. It still has much to do, if only the subject of its study will remain and continue its movement-forward and upward [Frese, 2008].

The most acute problem of culturological Latin American thought (in many respects it is for Culturology as a whole) is the problem of communicative and generative possibilities of intercivilizational contacts, or, in other words, the possibility / impossibility of intercivilizational cultural-generating interaction and, accordingly, the boundaries, limits, ways of such interaction. The problem became particularly acute in European thought in connection with the discovery of the New World, when the cultural, political and economic expansion of Europe into the New World began, but it was theoretically formulated in the late XIX-early XX century, during the struggle of cultural and philosophical paradigms of positivism – antipositivism, and then developed on new philosophical grounds (N. Y. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, K. Jaspers, M. Weber, P. Sorokin, etc.). In the vast majority of European culturologists, based on different premises, gave either extremely limiting or negative answers to the question of the possibilities of intercivilizational interaction. This negativistic trend has made itself felt in Latin American studies. The situation was paradoxical: the whole world reads outstanding Latin American "new" novel, admires a great painting, architecture, generated clearly different, special "way of being", which gives a special picture, a special image of the world, and theoretically this culture is considered as if non-existent – because to admit its existence, it is necessary to allow simple, yet extremely complex fact: she was born as the result of intercivilizational interaction. In other words, the very existence of Latin American culture seems to challenge the "negative" direction of cultural thought.

This trend is not widespread in domestic Latin American thought, but should be mentioned, and not only for completeness. If traditional culturology was limited to the study of civilizational statics, "virgin" pure, "correct" cultures, then perhaps a new word can be said direction, studying the stages and forms of cultural "concubinate" moments of connection, mixing of cultures, i.e. focusing on the civilizational and cultural dynamics, which combines the historical-stadial and structural approaches [Zueva, Zashchirinskaya, 2019]. In culturological classics, inheriting from positivism distrust of mixed,

"impure" form, all moments of mixing were considered as the beginning of the death, degradation of civilizations, but this phase can also be a phase of culture-producing "conception". In any case, this ambivalent understanding of the death-birth phases is more consistent with the principles of natural and cultural metamorphosis.

The study of intercivilizational interaction, and in the first place generating forms of such contacts, brings to the fore the problem of "cultural synthesis", around it in the domestic Latin American studies have long been disputes. The debatable nature of this problem (and concept) is largely caused by their different semantic content in different authors. For some, cultural synthesis is a General characteristic of a time-long historical and cultural process that develops as a result of intercultural interaction, during which a new cultural system arises; for others, cultural synthesis is understood as specific mechanisms of intercultural interaction and generation of new cultural forms. Although between these levels of the concept, of course, there is an important and fundamental relationship, but it is not direct, they relate, but do not coincide. The concept of "cultural synthesis" indicates the General vector and meaning of development, and concrete interaction and cultural Genesis are carried out at different levels of culture and in its various forms not through any one, but through different mechanisms [Knierbein, Sezer, 2015]. From this point of view, the direct application of the concept of cultural synthesis to interpret and characterize the mechanisms of cultural Genesis is completely unacceptable. In cultural relations, it is impossible, so to speak, equal participation of the original components in the formation of a new phenomenon, and it does not arise as a result of their "non-sufficient" mixing. In civilizational-cultural relations always one of the parties acts as an initiative superstrate, and the other-as a perceiving inertial substrate, and most importantly, whose civilizational matrices are laid in the basis [Borish, Phillips, 2012].

The degree of initiative of such a central civilizing principle as world religions or world religious-mythological complexes is crucial for determining the civilizational-cultural type. The language of culture turns out to be a more important factor than language in the linguistic sense. On the European material it is possible to give such examples: East Slavic cultures keep the language, but develop on the basis of matrices of Greco-Byzantine culture, and West Slavic-on the basis of Roman; Irish culture develops in English, but retains many of the culture-producing matrices of ancient origin; or, for example, despite the fact that the basis of Serbian and Bulgarian cultures are Slavic and Greek-Byzantine matrices, the role of matrices of Turkic-Turkish origin is noticeable in them. At the same time, it is obvious that language is influenced by the process of "translation" of perceived matrices and is itself transformed on their basis (for example, the role of Greek linguistic models in the Russian literary language, and, consequently, in the type of cultural and artistic thinking).

In other words, the ways of interaction, i.e. the actual mechanisms of cultural genesis (overlay, translation, transcription, assimilation, syncretization, recoding, etc.) depend on what acts as a superstrate and what is a substrate. The emerging culture creates on one or another basis its culture-generating "field", defines the boundaries of "own" and "alien", acceptable and unacceptable in relation to the diversity of worldview, ethical, aesthetic, genre, style, etc. models with which it has to come into contact in relations with foreign cultural worlds.

You should of course distinguish at least three major period of inter-civilizational / inter-cultural interaction, the difference of which is determined by the degree of removal of originality towards greater humanization: 1) interaction "doosey" (according to Jaspers) cultures of antiquity; 2) the period when the main civilizing force be "axial" culture; 3) extension of Christian civilization as the main dynamic force in world history (New time).

In European civilization, the type key is an overlay of Greco-Judeo-Roman matrix, serving as a

superstratum on "pagan", i.e. non-Christian cultural worlds, and the separation of the Christian matrix for two species (Western and Eastern) and the difference of their interactions with culture substrate generates within a single civilizational circle many variants of cultures. Each of them has as a basis our cultural "code," which embodies in itself all the peculiar connection of the leading matrix (and its basis in fact – a particular type of metaphysics, or different type of interpretation of the dynamic context, the earthly and the transcendental planes of existence) with the pre-Christian cultural material, and it is embodied in a stable, not dependent on socialhistorical and ideological situation paradigmatic (sustainable series of key locations, myths, oppositions...).

As a continuation of this process, which captured in Europe I – the beginning of the II Millennium ad, it is necessary to consider those cultural processes that begin with the discovery and conquest of the New World and the campaign of Christianization of the indigenous population. Although the gap in time between the completion of the Christianization of the outskirts of Europe (Russia, Scandinavia) and the beginning of the Christianization of the New World from the point of view of historical scales is small (five to six centuries), but the nature of intercivilization interaction at the dawn of the New time is significantly different. Because the transfer of European cultural traditions in the New world occurs in the beginning of the decay of the religious and mythological traditions of the European West, washing out her new cultural mythologism, the humanization of culture, the rapid growth of her identity that strongly responds to the very essence of the new cultural type that will emerge in Latin America with the growth of this process. Another important factor that caused the fundamental difference between culture-producing processes in Latin America is a huge historical gap in the historical age of substrate (autochthonous) and superstrate (European) material.

As a result, we have a unique cultural situation, which is determined by the maximum tension at the poles of historical age (the meeting of modernity with antiquity / youth), moreover, did not previously have any intercivilizational ties outside its habitat. (In the Old World, the factor of long-standing previous intercultural relations, direct and indirect, seems to relieve such a sharp tension when meeting different-aged cultures, for example in the zone of Russian expansion in Siberia.)

In this general context, the process of cultural education in Latin America appears as an open-to-read history of intercivilizational interaction. Some of the major problems that it puts forward can be defined as follows: the study of the conditions and nature of the Latin American version of intercivilizational interaction; the study of the specific mechanisms of this interaction at different stages and in general; the emergence of a new civilizational cosmos, its structure and its logos, ideology, type of civilizational consciousness. At the same time, it seems that it is extremely important to have a clear awareness that the specificity and uniqueness of the Latin American civilizational type are related both to the nature of the initial components and to the special time of their connection.

Conclusion

Thus, culture is a series of interacting elements; each cultural trait affects and is influenced by others. Some elements become obsolete and are excluded from this flow; new elements are included. All the time new permutations, combinations, synthesis are created. Whether we consider a limited section of the cultural continuum, such as the evolution of mathematics or the genealogy of the steam engine, or culture as a whole, the principle of interpretation remains the same: culture grows out of culture.

Culturology is a very young branch of science. After several centuries of development of astronomy, physics and chemistry, several decades of development of physiology and psychology,

science has finally turned its attention to what most determines human behavior - its culture. After many failed attempts, it has been shown that culture cannot be explained in terms of psychology; such interpretations are nothing more than anthropomorphism in scientific garb. The explanation of culture can only be culturological. The science of culture is young, but promising. It still has much to do, if only the subject of its study will remain and continue its movement-forward and upward.

The emergence of culture has raised the evolutionary process to a new level. Progress in one aspect of culture is easily transferred to others, so that each area benefits from the development of one. Consequently, the history of man becomes an account of the history of his culture. Cultural systems, similar to biological organisms, develop, multiply and spread to other territories.

References

1. Borish L.J., Phillips M. G. (2012) Sport history as modes of expression: Material culture and cultural spaces in sport and history. *Rethinking History*, 16(4), pp. 465–477. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2012.728382>
2. Chekha V.V. (2010) Sozдание innovatsionnoi infrastruktury v obrazovatel'nom uchrezhdenii [Creating an innovative infrastructure in an educational institution]. *Spravochnik rukovoditelya obrazovatel'nogo uchrezhdeniya* [Directory of the head of an educational institution], 11, pp. 40.
3. Chekha V.V. (2011) Gosudarstvennoe (munitsipal'noe) zadanie obrazovatel'nym uchrezhdeniyam: kommentarii k federal'nomu zakonu ot 8 maya 2010 g. № 83-FZ "O vnesenii izmenenii v otdel'nye zakonodatel'nye akty Rossiiskoi Federatsii v svyazi s sovershenstvovaniem pravovogo polozheniya gosudarstvennykh (munitsipal'nykh) uchrezhdenii" [State (municipal) task for educational institutions: commentary to the Federal Law No. 83-FZ of May 8, 2010 "On amendments to certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation in connection with the improvement of the legal status of state (municipal) institutions"]. *Ezhegodnik rossiiskogo obrazovatel'nogo zakonodatel'stva* [Yearbook of Russian educational legislation], 6, pp. 127-142.
4. Dement'ev K.N., Zashchirinskaya O.V., Pristav O.V. (2016) Vozmozhnosti ispol'zovaniya fitnes-tekhnologii v sisteme spetsial'nogo i inkluzivnogo obrazovaniya detei [Possibilities of using fitness technologies in the system of special and inclusive education for children]. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoi kul'tury* [Theory and Practice of Physical Culture], 7, pp. 41-43.
5. Demirli M.E., Gürel, M.Ö. (2018) Opening up a space for women: matinees in Izmir Culture Park. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 25(10), pp. 1533–1556. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1484701>
6. Frese P.R. (2008) Guardians of the golden age: custodians of american military culture and the fortified “home” in time and space. *Home Cultures*, 5(1), pp. 11–26. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2752/174063108X287382>
7. He J. Yan, C., Straeubig M. Design of Virtual Public Resilience Spaces of Traditional Cultures. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 973, pp. 251–260. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20476-1_26
8. Knierbein S., Sezer C. (2015) AESOP thematic groups: Public spaces and urban cultures. *DISP*, 51(2), pp. 80–87. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2015.1064652>
9. Lamminpiya A., Zashchirinskaya O.V., Shelepin Yu.E. (2014) Ponimanie morali skazok na primere izucheniya glazodvigatel'nykh reaktsii [Understanding of the moral of fairy tales through the study of oculomotor reactions]. *Sbornik statei Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii "Neironauka v psikhologii, obrazovanii, meditsine"* [Proc. Int. Conf. "Neuroscience in psychology, education, and medicine"]. Saint Petersburg, pp. 16-22.
10. Lamminpiya A.M., Zashchirinskaya O.V., Shelepin Yu.E. (2015) Psikhofiziologicheskie analiz protsessov chteniya i ponimaniya tekstov [Psychophysiological analysis of reading and understanding of texts]. *Fiziologiya cheloveka* [Human Physiology], 41 (2), pp. 23-28.
11. Langeegger S. (2013) Emergent public space: Sustaining Chicano culture in North Denver. *Cities*, 35, pp. 26–32. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.013>
12. Low S. (2012) *Spatializing Culture: Embodied Space in the City. The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444395105.ch41>
13. Lu J., Zhang T., Zheng W. (2008) Advanced space facilities for higher plant culture and animal embryo culture in microgravity. *Microgravity Science and Technology*, 20(2), pp. 121–126. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12217-008-9015-6>
14. Ma M., Song Y. (2009) Sugar-free culture system of tissue culture plantlet for large space based on environmental control. *Nongye Gongcheng Xuebao/Transactions of the Chinese Society of Agricultural Engineering*, 25(6), pp. 192–197. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-6819.2009.06.036>

15. Poletaeva Yu.G. (2011) Problemno-al'ternativnyi kharakter metoda testirovaniya [Problematical and alternative character of the tested method]. *Vestnik gumanitarnogo nauchnogo obrazovaniya* [Bulletin of the humanities scientific education], 8, pp. 11-13.
16. Zashchirinskaya O.V., Belobrykina O.A. (2018) Ponimanie kak mezhdistsiplinarnaya kategoriya [Understanding as an interdisciplinary category]. In: Belobrykina O.A. et al. *Ponimanie i kommunikatsiya: kognitivnyi kontekst soderzhatel'no-smyslovyykh konstruktov* [Understanding and communication: the cognitive context of meaningful constructs]. Saint Petersburg: Russian State Pedagogical University named after A.I. Herzen, pp. 8-16.
17. Zashchirinskaya O.V., Lapteva A.V. (2017) Spetsifika predstavlenii o družeskikh otnosheniyakh u mladshikh shkol'nikov s narusheniyami intellekta [Concepts of friendship among primary school children with intellectual disability. Introduction]. *Nauchnoe mnenie* [Scientific opinion], 7-8, pp. 74-79.
18. Zashchirinskaya O.V., Nikolaeva E.I., Rybnikov V.Yu., Byzova V.M. (2017) Vliyanie vnutrisemeinoi kommunikatsii na spetsifiku vospriyatiya zhestov det'mi mladshego shkol'nogo vozrasta s legkoi umstvennoi otstalost'yu [The influence of intra-family communication on the specifics of the perception of gestures by children of primary school age with mild mental retardation]. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University], 7 (5), pp. 81-93.
19. Zashchirinskaya O.V., Nikolaeva E.I., Rybnikov V.Yu., Byzova V.M. (2017) Vliyanie vnutrisemeinoi kommunikatsii na spetsifiku vospriyatiya zhestov det'mi mladshego shkol'nogo vozrasta s legkoi umstvennoi otstalost'yu [The influence of intra-family communication on the specifics of the perception of gestures by children of primary school age with mild mental retardation]. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University], 7 (5), pp. 81-93.
20. Zueva V.S., Zashchirinskaya O.V. (2019) Vospriyatie doskol'nikami reklamnykh obrazov skazochnykh personazhei [Perception of promotional images of fairy-tale characters by preschool children]. *Nauchnye issledovaniya vypusknikov fakul'teta psikhologii SPbGU* [Scientific research of graduates of the faculty of psychology of the Saint Petersburg State University], 6, pp. 53-57.

Пространственная политика как фактор культурного обмена и формирования культурной парадигмы

Казакова Людмила Константиновна

Доцент
кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: kazakovalk@mail.ru

Зевелева Елена Александровна

Кандидат исторических наук,
профессор,
академик Российской академии естественных наук,
заведующий
кафедрой гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: aleksandr.sapsai@yandex.ru

Лепилин Сергей Владимирович

Старший преподаватель кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: kaffilos@yandex.ru

Третьякова Наталья Мизаировна

Старший преподаватель кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: natalia.tretyakova@mail.ru

Карандаева Татьяна Сергеевна

Кандидат философских наук,
доцент кафедры философии и права,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: tkarandaeva@yandex.ru

Денисова Людмила Евгеньевна

Магистр государственного управления,
начальник Управления молодежной политики,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: denisovale@mgri.ru

Аннотация

В статье представлен краткий анализ эволюции культуры. Авторы отмечают, что культурология является очень молодой отраслью науки. После нескольких столетий развития астрономии, физики и химии, нескольких десятилетий развития физиологии и психологии данная наука, наконец, обратила внимание людей на то, что больше всего определяет поведение человека, – его культуру. После многих неудачных попыток было показано, что культуру нельзя объяснить с точки зрения психологии; такие интерпретации – не что иное как антропоморфизм в научном одеянии. Объяснение культуры может быть только культурологическим. Наука о культуре – молодая, но перспективная. Появление культуры подняло эволюционный процесс на новый уровень. Для человека отпала необходимость осваивать природу и технологию по мере чрезвычайно медленного процесса биологических изменений; у него появился экстрасоматический механизм приспособления и контроля, который развивался, исходя из собственных законов и возможностей. Прогресс в одном аспекте культуры легко переносится на другие, поэтому развитие каждого из них приносит очевидную пользу. Следовательно, история человека становится историей его культуры.

Культурные системы, подобные биологическим организмам, развиваются и распространяются на другие территории. Сделан вывод о том, что технология строит, но она также может и разрушать. Надежда на то, что современная цивилизация не может быть разрушена, потому что такой конец был бы слишком ужасным и бессмысленным, – это не что иное, как иллюзия. Космос не имеет ничего общего с тем, что человек создал на этой крошечной планете.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Казакова Л.К., Зевелева Е.А., Лепилин С.В., Третьякова Н.М., Карандаева Т.С., Денисова Л.Е. Space policy as a factor of cultural exchange and formation of cultural paradigm // Культура и цивилизация. 2019. Том 9. № 1B. С. 253-263.

Ключевые слова

Культура, структура, развитие, возможности, становление.

Библиография

1. Дементьев К.Н., Заширинская О.В., Пристав О.В. Возможности использования фитнес-технологий в системе специального и инклюзивного образования детей // Теория и практика физической культуры. 2016. № 7. С. 41-43.
2. Заширинская О.В., Белобрыкина О.А. Понимание как междисциплинарная категория // Белобрыкина О.А. и др. Понимание и коммуникация: когнитивный контекст содержательно-смысловых конструкторов. СПб.: Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А.И. Герцена, 2018. С. 8-16.
3. Заширинская О.В., Лаптева А.В. Специфика представлений о дружеских отношениях у младших школьников с нарушениями интеллекта // Научное мнение. 2017. № 7-8. С. 74-79.
4. Заширинская О.В., Николаева Е.И., Рыбников В.Ю., Бызова В.М. Влияние внутрисемейной коммуникации на специфику восприятия жестов детьми младшего школьного возраста с легкой умственной отсталостью // Вестник Новосибирского государственного педагогического университета. 2017. Т. 7. № 5. С. 81-93.
5. Заширинская О.В., Николаева Е.И., Рыбников В.Ю., Бызова В.М. Влияние внутрисемейной коммуникации на специфику восприятия жестов детьми младшего школьного возраста с легкой умственной отсталостью // Вестник Новосибирского государственного педагогического университета. 2017. Т. 7. № 5. С. 81-93.
6. Зуева В.С., Заширинская О.В. Восприятие дошкольниками рекламных образов сказочных персонажей // Научные исследования выпускников факультета психологии СПбГУ. 2019. Т. 6. С. 53-57.
7. Ламминпия А., Заширинская О.В., Шелепин Ю.Е. Понимание морали сказок на примере изучения глазодвигательных реакций // Сборник статей Международной научной конференции «Нейронаука в психологии, образовании, медицине». СПб., 2014. С. 16-22.
8. Ламминпия А.М., Заширинская О.В., Шелепин Ю.Е. Психофизиологический анализ процессов чтения и понимания текстов // Физиология человека. 2015. Т. 41. № 2. С. 23-28.
9. Полетаева Ю.Г. Проблемно-альтернативный характер метода тестирования // Вестник гуманитарного научного образования. 2011. № 8. С. 11-13.
10. Чеха В.В. Государственное (муниципальное) задание образовательным учреждениям: комментарий к федеральному закону от 8 мая 2010 г. № 83-ФЗ "О внесении изменений в отдельные законодательные акты Российской Федерации в связи с совершенствованием правового положения государственных (муниципальных) учреждений" // Ежегодник российского образовательного законодательства. 2011. Т. 6. С. 127-142.
11. Чеха В.В. Создание инновационной инфраструктуры в образовательном учреждении // Справочник руководителя образовательного учреждения. 2010. № 11. С. 40.
12. Borish L.J., Phillips M. G. Sport history as modes of expression: Material culture and cultural spaces in sport and history. *Rethinking History*. 2012. No. 16(4). P. 465-477. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2012.728382>
13. Demirli M.E., Gürel M.Ö. Opening up a space for women: matinees in Izmir Culture Park. *Gender, Place and Culture*. 2018. No. 25(10). P. 1533-1556. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1484701>
14. Frese P.R. Guardians of the golden age: custodians of american military culture and the fortified "home" in time and space. *Home Cultures*. 2008. No. 5(1). P. 11-26. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2752/174063108X287382>
15. He J. Yan, C., Straeubig M. Design of Virtual Public Resilience Spaces of Traditional Cultures. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*. No. 973. P. 251-260. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20476-1_26
16. Knierbein S., Sezer C. AESOP thematic groups: Public spaces and urban cultures. *DISP*. 2015. No. 51(2). P. 80-87.

-
- URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2015.1064652>
17. Langegger S. Emergent public space: Sustaining Chicano culture in North Denver. *Cities*. 2013. No. 35. P. 26-32. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.013>
18. Low S. *Spatializing Culture: Embodied Space in the City*. The New Blackwell Companion to the City. 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444395105.ch41>
19. Lu J., Zhang T., Zheng W. Advanced space facilities for higher plant culture and animal embryo culture in microgravity. *Microgravity Science and Technology*. 2008. No. 20(2). P. 121–126. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12217-008-9015-6>
20. Ma M., Song Y. Sugar-free culture system of tissue culture plantlet for large space based on environmental control. *Nongye Gongcheng Xuebao/Transactions of the Chinese Society of Agricultural Engineering*. 2009. No. 25(6). P. 192-197. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-6819.2009.06.036>