THE PROBLEM OF THE SYSTEMIC CONCEPT OF A CIVILIZED SOCIETY

Liana Malkhasyan, PhD in Law, Associate Professor,
Director of the Institute of Law and International Relations,
Yerevan Haybusak University
ORCID iD: 0009-0000-5495-8829
(email: malkhasyanliana@gmail.com)

Manuscript has been submitted on 02.11.2025, sent for review on 04.11.2025, accepted for publication on 01.12.2025.

Abstract

Analyses and judgments on civilizations give grounds to conclude that each type of civilization corresponds to its state-legal component (state and law), both in the past, present and in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the state-legal institutions, institutions and their practical activities of each country (people) are directly conditioned by the historically formed degree of civilization of a given society.

The category of civilization is an important prerequisite for understanding and assessing the essence of existing statehood and the main trends in development.

Over the centuries, numerous directions of science have tried to reveal the main characteristics of human society – society, the patterns of existence and development, and the qualities of rational self-expression. Social society has been mainly considered as a system of mutual, permanent and necessary relationships between rational individuals. It is the form and means of rational life that ensures the preservation, reproduction, self-knowledge, formation of a common value system and individual self-expression of the human species. The structural elements of society – political, economic, legal, social, cultural, etc. – are simply organic components of the system that form the necessary prerequisites for human life.

Keywords: Society, state, civilization, doctrine, primitive communal systems.

Introduction

Civilizational problems, their historical fact, modern stages of development, comprehensiveness, and uniqueness occupy a significant place in the social sciences, including jurisprudence. And this is not accidental. The processes of civilizational development, neutralizing the formative approach to the study of

social phenomena, make it possible to present a more comprehensive picture of the world, to reflect the diversity and differences of different cultures, the invaluable contribution of each of the latter to the knowledge and forecasting of the development of world civilization.

The primitive scheme of "base-superstructure", which establishes the decisive role of the material factor in the development of the spiritual life of peoples, reduces the role of its components – religion, law, politics, state structure, morality, tradition, customs, science, art, in all its diversity of the civilization and socio-cultural system in the process of civilized development of mankind.

Research in this direction is aimed at the human factor, human activity, needs, values, principles, especially the behavior of people characteristic of a given historical-cultural type of society or self-sufficient civilization. This is perceived as a broad understanding of culture that goes beyond the generally accepted approach, which includes the concept of culture as art, literature, and law, in accordance with the behavioral standards accepted in society.

Definitions and Comments on Civilized Societies

Civilized society is considered a comprehensive phenomenon, a system of socio-normative regulation, with all the complex expressions of the interaction of its components, the activity of people and the objects and existence that are the result of this activity.

Important components of a civilized society are the presence of a socio-normative value system conditioned by the social cooperation of people. The subjects of cooperation can be either individuals (interpersonal cooperation) or organized groups of people (intergroup cooperation). They cooperate in a certain social space not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the socio-cultural system of norms and values established in a given society, objectifying this cooperation in the material and intangible values of culture.

At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, the need arose to interpret the functioning of social systems and the general principles of world history, the latter being more pronounced as a complex picture of the cooperation of human communities according to their organization, cultural style, symbols (symbolism) and historical destiny. In the research devoted to these processes, comparative historical studies played a dominant role. For a long time, comparative studies had a pro-European character, expressed in the value priority of European culture over all other cultures.

1. In the literature (broadly speaking) and scientific research, the following socio-cultural conceptual approaches are noted: Polymorphism, that is, multiformity, which is characteristic of each culture that possesses heterogeneous variants that have not undergone

uniform development. Already at the ethnic level, culture is quite diverse in order to give different reactions to external challenges or the requirements of the internal structure. The greatest diversity of culture is determined at the national and cultural levels. Within the framework of national cultures, as is known, there are also different subcultures of classes or classes, the relations between which are either cooperative or contradictory, and sometimes even primitive in nature.

2. Each component of a civilized society (language, tradition, religion, science, literature) acts as a subsystem correlated with the whole culture (national or pan-civilizational level) and with other components of social existence.
3. In comparative research, it is difficult to take into account the mobility of spiritual phenomena. Comparison of early versions of Christianity, Buddhism, Confucianism or Islam leads to results that differ from those obtained in the case of observation systems and versions formed at later stages of evolution (Yerasov, 1995, pp. 22-23).

That is why it is important to study the internal movement of civilization, the cooperation of its components, the mobility or stability of civilization and its components that respond differently to external challenges.

Such an approach has contributed to the diversity and self-sufficiency of existing civilizational societies, both Eastern and non-Eastern, and to the rejection of the extreme "Eurocentric" approach, as demonstrating the "only true path" for the development of all cultures and civilizations. This approach implies a rejection of the theory of "regressive monism" in favor of the establishment of a multilateral socio-cultural and civilizational approach. From the very beginning, I would like to note that the author of this study, while not at all excluding the significant contribution of European civilization to the development of world civilization, including the state and law, nevertheless accepts a multi-layered, multi-faceted socio-cultural conceptual approach – a conceptual approach to the emergence and development of world society, state and law. This turn in the development of science was not global, since a significant part of scientists adhering to the world systems theory maintained their loyalty to Western comprehensiveness. And this is understandable, since it was precisely the "civilizational thinking" that formed the extensive justifications for European hegemony in the world (Yerasov, 2001, p. 17).

The civilizational approach rejects the theory of the inevitable transition of all "supersystems" through the developmental stages of European civilization. The uniform path of development of all world civilizations is not applicable to the developments of both historical and modern reality. It impoverishes the richness and uniqueness of cultures, the principles of cooperation of people, and the societies and states included in this or that historical and cultural

community. Comparative analyses, which occupied a certain place in scientific research on states, nations, and regions, constructed a single linear process of social development, confirming the regularity that takes place in it, according to which all states must inevitably pass through the stages of development characteristic of European civilization: slavery, feudalism, capitalism. Modern research rejects this pattern, noting the specificity of the historical paths of development of socio-cultural communities, the nature of the cooperation of man, society, and the state, the specificity of the norms, values, traditions, and symbols that define the principles of organization and development of different civilizations. They express "first of all, the aspirations to isolate the dynamic, anthropological, or practical principle in the social structure as an expression of human subjectivity, activity, and vital activity, in order to overcome the "objective" comparative formula of the historical process with its impersonal sociological conduct" (Yerasov, 2002, p. 66).

Such an approach does not lead to a bifurcation or rupture of the socio-cultural and material components of the historical process. P. Sorokin (1992) noted that "it is wrong to speak of sociocultural phenomena as if they consist exclusively of people; in addition to people, they include intangible values and, as equally valuable and comprehensive components, are their material carriers. Music, fine arts, sculpture, and such material objects as tools, machines, weapons, clothing, buildings, monuments, cultivated fields, roads, reservoirs, all material phenomena essential for valuable human cooperation are carriers of sociocultural phenomena" (p. 200).

P. Sorokin (1992), revealing the structure of sociocultural cooperation, notes its three inseparable aspects: 1) the individual as a subject of cooperation, 2) society as a group of individuals cooperating through their sociocultural processes and relations, and 3) culture as a set of values, norms possessed by cooperating individuals, and a set of bearers that objectify socialize and reveal these values (p. 218).

Introducing the concept of "value" in culture, P. Sorokin essentially understands norms and values endowed with higher power (symbols of Christian faith, values of religion, science, education, music, democracy or health). In this way, sociocultural cooperation of people, objectified in real objects and subjects of the external world, is a historical-cultural type of society or self-sufficient civilization, which is characterized by the peculiarity of material and spiritual culture.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the term "society" originated from the Latin word "societas", the synonyms of which are the concepts of friend, companion, ally. Here the emphasis is on positive, friendly relationships, which, to put it mildly, is not very characteristic of the past history of mankind.

In the matter of revealing the essence of civilized society, scientific thought has developed in different directions. The previous millennium was characterized in particular by the likening of society to an organism, when an attempt was made to explain social life by biological regularities. The conceptualization of society as the result of voluntary interaction of individuals was also put forward, in which, however, the uncertainty of the relationship between voluntariness and necessary coercion is vulnerable.

According to the principle of the anthropological view of civilized society and man as a part of nature, only that society is considered worthy of existence which corresponds to the real, noble, unchanging nature of man, which, however, is more of an abstraction than a reality.

According to the sociological theory of civilized society, the idea of perceiving the "meaning" of each other's actions, goals, and intentions is at the heart of social relations. The most important elements in the interaction of people are their perception of common goals and problems, the commonality of the value system, the correct perception of each person's self-expression by other participants in social relations.

Regardless of the emphasis given to this or that criterion, a civilized society is a community of rational beings, whose vital activity is possible only within the framework of systemic integrity, interaction and legality.

The concept of a civilized society implies the discovery of objective regularities of the common life of people. Since ancient times, the following main problems of understanding the essence of society have been important:

1. To what extent does a civilized society differ from nature (some intellectuals generally excluded the boundary between nature and society, while others absolutized the differences between them)?
2. What is the relationship between group and individual principles in social life (in one case, considering it as a group of individuals, in the other case, as a self-sufficient whole)?
3. How are conflict and solidarity interconnected in the development of society (is the engine of society's development internal conflict or the desire for internal alliance of interests)?
4. How does society change (is there improvement, progress, or does society develop in cycles)?
5. Does civilized society, as a system, have the necessary and sufficient internal self-defense tools to identify, evaluate, restore and guarantee development for every manifestation of a disturbed systemic balance?

In this regard, it is also necessary to reveal the historical diversity of historical and cultural types of society (civilization).

The civilizational approach arose not only as a general methodological approach to the study of the development of different regions of the world

with their specific symbols, values, and material carriers. N.Ya. Danilevsky and O. Spengler consider the division of history according to the "Ancient World – Middle Ages – Modern Times" scheme to be erroneous. As O. Spengler (1998) notes, "only with the addition of the third era on a Western basis, our "Modern Times", did this picture manifest itself as a tendency to movement." The Eastern picture is calm, closed, petrified. This limits the volume of history, but what is worse is that it narrows its scope. In such a case, a Chinese historian would be entitled to design a world history in which the Crusades, Hellenism, and the Renaissance would be ignored as something insignificant. Why is the 18th century morphologically more important than each of the six decades that preceded it? Were Egypt and Babylon not ignored for the sake of the established scheme, are they only closed systems that balance the so-called world history from Charlemagne to the world war, interpreting them as preludes to antiquity? Were not the powerful Indian and Chinese cultures reduced to some kind of "closed civilizations" and were they not American great culture should be ignored in general, since in some places it is devoid of historical (i.e. ancient and medieval) connections (p. 77).

That is why the separation of civic education as special formations with socio-normative systems and material carriers allows each civilization to occupy a worthy place in the general historical process, not being oriented towards borrowings from other civilizations of those spiritual and material components that are not organically included in the principles forming a stable system of a given civilization. The forced imposition of other cultural norms and values is not useful for a society based on other traditions and spiritual values. As B.S. Yerasov (2002) rightly notes, "the assumption of the world-historical process as a certain comprehensive and objective path of development deprives science of the ability to reveal national or local peculiarities, the peculiarities in which the life of society proceeds. The objectivity of the process neutralizes the human dimension in history and leads to the individual's place in his ability to correspond to this objectivity" (p. 65).

The American scientist Z. Mull rightly notes that the theory "should avoid causality, assuming the inevitability of the passage of all civilizations through similar stages. These similarities become a source of efforts to include historical events in certain periods in order to establish the proportionality of processes and results attributed to different societies" (Kashanina, 2012, p. 17).

Although the problem of civilization has attracted much attention of researchers in the last century, there is still no unity in their scientific classification. And this is understandable, since there are no unified criteria conditioned by clearly defined historical and cultural types of society. Neither the state and its territorial borders, nor the nation or ethnos, nor any social

culture can be placed at the basis of such a classification. According to N.Ya. Danilevsky (1995), "the natural system of history should be summarized in the identification of historical and cultural types of development as the main basis for separating them from the stages of their development, according to which only these types (and not the set of historical phenomena) can be subdivided." He distributes post-cultural types, or self-sufficient civilizations, in chronological order: 1) Egyptian, 2) Chinese, 3) Assyrian-Babylonian-Finnish, Chaldean, or ancient Semitic, 4) Indian, 5) Persian, 6) Jewish, 7) Greek, 8) Roman, 9) New Semitic or Arabic, 10) Romance-Germanic or European. "Only the peoples that make up these historical and cultural types are the positive driving force of human history, each developing the beginning in its own way, which is summed up both in the peculiarities of its spiritual nature and in the external conditions of life, and thereby making its contribution to the treasury of the history of mankind" (p. 88).

Of course, it is difficult to agree with the scientist here, because he leaves out the "Armenian civilization", which has made a significant contribution to both the formation and development of world civilization. N.Ya. Danilevsky's civilizational typology was rightly subjected to sharp criticism, in particular, by V.S. Soloviev (1989, pp. 350-396). The grounds for this criticism were weighty, since according to Danilevsky, the following principles were considered to form a civilization: everyday life, political independence, particularism, the need for unification in a federation or political system, growth and inevitable decline. In practice, none of these features constitutes an element of the socio-historical type structure. It is enough to recall the linguistic and cultural diversity of a particular civilization, the long period of colonialism, which could not be overcome in India, Africa and other countries, the traditional beginning of major civilizations from the territory of a single state or political system. N.Ya. Danilevsky's criticism of the characteristics of historical and cultural types of society can be continued point by point. However, it is also possible to carry it out in the process of further research into the properties of civilization. O. Spengler (1998) noted "types of simultaneous spiritual eras (civilizations): Indian, Chinese, European, Arabic, ancient, Western" (pp. 189-197) (the "Armenian" civilization is omitted here too).

A.J. Toynbee (2011) distinguished 32 types of civilizations, dividing them into developed, developing and undeveloped civilizations (pp. 233-234). Differences in typologies and criteria of civilizations are reflected in the literature, which defines a great dispersion in the definition of the names of civilization types and their number. The famous American researcher R. Wescott, in the article "Enumeration of Civilizations", gives a list of 66 civilizations, which are distinguished by the ten most famous historians. Only

three (Chinese, Indian, Western) were agreed upon by all nine. As B.S. Yerasov (2002) notes, to this day there are great disagreements among researchers on these issues (p. 113).

Great disagreements exist not only on the number of civilization types, but also on their names. As already noted, N.Ya. Danilinsky calls such communities "historical-cultural types", N. Berdyaev "great cultures", O. Spengler – "high cultures", P. Sorokin – "large cultural supersystems with a special way of thinking". In our opinion, regardless of the name, the main civilizations are: the civilization of the Ancient East, the ancient Greek and Roman civilizations, the Armenian civilization with its historical past and present, the civilizations of Western Europe and America, and the Slavic (Western and Eastern) civilization.

A civilized society, as a systemic whole, is also characterized by a number of other features that are important from the point of view of the presented material. We would like to highlight the following among them:

1. There is a social division of labor, which implies that each member of society must have his or her role and contribution to any work of common benefit in the systemic whole. The latter is realized on the basis of the harmonization of behavior achieved by social consensus and the individual characteristics of each person;
2. Each member of a civilized society is transient, while the system is permanent. Individuals are born and die in a regularity that ensures the dynamic continuity of society, the formation of historical memory;
3. A civilized society is characterized by internal unity, a certain social structure, and qualities that guarantee systemic integrity, a common historical memory, culture (the meaning of its existence in time), traditions, customs, laws, other rules, or, as it is defined, a system of civilizational values;
4. Members of a civilized society interact through a wide system of social ties, which are regulated in nature, and the limits of the freedom of each individual are determined by the possibility of realizing the rights of others;
5. Each subsystem of a civilized society exists with relative independence, but is subject to general rules;
6. A civilized society is characterized by relatively stable, system-forming, as well as variable patterns. The latter are more subject to the influence of situational factors in space and time;
7. A civilized society can be considered social if the basis of public and interpersonal objective relations is the socio-cultural qualities formed as a result of their meaning-making and cognition, and not biological drives.

Based on the nature of fundamental relations, societies have gone through different stages of historical development, the key difference of which was determined by the position and place of the individual in society, the prerequisites and degree of realization of his subjectivity, the harmony of the nature of social relations, and the meaning-making and level of life in time.

The norms and values developed over centuries, which constitute the "relative structure" of civilization, are stable, preserving the civilizational heritage and passing it on from generation to generation. V.S. Stepin (2004) calls the mechanism of transmission of such comprehensive values the cultural-genetic code of this or that type of sociality, and "mutations in the genetic apparatus of social organisms are changes in the worldview comprehensiveness of culture" (pp. 76-77). According to him, it is a system of morals, traditions, customs, acting images, knowledge that preserves culture. This complexly organized collection of programs exists thanks to a special structure that acts as the genome of social life (Stepin, 2004, pp. 77-78).

Along with the stable components of culture (religion, traditions, morality, customs, beliefs, customs), which are difficult to change, or mutate, there are also dynamic elements in culture, which in the process of interaction with other civilizations exchange useful norms that have proven themselves in practice. Among them, it is necessary to include law, as well as moral and religious norms. In the 20th century, informatics emerged, technologies progressed, and a new stage in the development of science began. These cultural components are subject to appropriation, borrowing, and incorporation into the structure of a previously existing culture. A historical-cultural type of modernization of society takes place.

However, such borrowing is characteristic only of "open civilizations". In the modern world, and even more so in the past, there have been closed civilizations that were hostile to any innovations for a long time. A vivid example of this is the ancient Chinese and Indian civilizations.

Along with stable (traditional) and dynamic (developing) norms, there are also coercive, imposed norms. Such a situation causes enormous damage to the socio-cultural integrity, leads to disagreement of its components, and sometimes to the destruction of civilization.

A.J. Toynbee (2011) notes, "Cultural elements, quite harmless and even favorable in one land, can be dangerous and destructive in a foreign social context. On the other hand, it is enough for foreign elements to settle in a new environment, they acquire tendencies towards the attraction of other elements of their own culture to themselves". For example, A.J. Toynbee brings up the introduction of Western institutions of democratic governance in the African world (pp. 64-65). This process was quite destructive. The introduction of foreign borrowing can be minimized if one acts gradually, correctly assesses

the existing situation, and in efforts to introduce foreign elements, the traditions and public consciousness of the peoples are invariably taken into account.

There are many such examples in history. Often, the socio-cultural community is opposed to even the most harmless foreign influences. An uncompromising policy of self-preservation and self-isolation is quite common, although it does not lead to success. A classic example of a closed policy is the development of relations between Japan and the Western world in the late 16th-early 17th centuries. This period covered half a century and lasted until 1638. The policy of isolation was also characteristic of China in the 20th century, especially during the "cultural revolution" (Toynbee, 2011, p. 66).

In the modern world, it is difficult for different civilizations to oppose the advancement of Western and especially American culture, which aggressively penetrates all regions of the world. However, in the conditions of globalization, contacts between civilizations are inevitable, as they were inevitable in ancient times. R. Ihering (2013) rightly emphasizes that "the life of peoples is not an isolated opposition to each other, but the life of individuals within the state – contact, a system of mutual contacts and influences – friendly and hostile, appropriation and provision, borrowing and transmission, which covers all aspects of human existence" (p. 6).

R. Ihering (2013) declares isolationism a mortal sin of peoples, since the "highest law" of history is contact. It is a universal law of the spiritual and material world: life is an external exchange and internal appropriation, assimilation and adaptation – two main functions, on the existence and balance of which the existence and health of any living organism depend. Contact includes not only the economic and technological aspects of the life of people, but also cultural, language, customs, religion, ideas, prejudices, superstitions, science, and art (p. 5).

These conclusions of R. Ihering are indisputably correct, since they are derived from the study of Western civilization. However, they are difficult to apply to various civilizational contacts, especially when it comes to the assimilation and adaptation of such cultural components as religion, traditions, customs, etc. The origin of the difficulties is determined by the civilizational differences traditionally rooted in the world's public consciousness and their unequal status in the general system of historical and cultural types of society.

European civilization is considered a unique model of development and transformation for all countries and regions; the latter, according to the pro-European approach, must necessarily pass through the stages of development characteristic of the European historical and cultural type of society and ultimately move toward the direction of "real" civilization. And in the 30s-40s of the 20th century, the Soviet Union acted as the builder of communism,

since it followed from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine that imperialism was the last stage of capitalism, which by its nature contains destructive elements.

The pro-European approach did not give rise to open opposition during the colonization period. However, after the collapse of the colonial system, the process of "self-affirmation" of civilizations began – civilizations that insisted on their own way of life, ethnic identification, and disagreement with being labeled as backward or undeveloped by European standards, which required their transformation.

The idea of the superiority of Western civilization has become deeply rooted in the public consciousness. N.Ya. Danilevsky (1995) spoke out against such an approach, stating that "the apparent advantage of progress is not a distinctive feature of Europe". He noted that "the European peninsula is endowed with the ability to civil development, although Asia, which includes the majority of cultural states, is not devoid of it either" (p. 72). Using the example of the ancient civilization of China, he demonstrated the enormous achievements in agriculture and animal husbandry.

Printing, the compass, and paper were known to the Chinese for a long time, and, most likely, they introduced all of these to Western Europe. The Chinese have literature and a unique philosophy that we can characterize as a healthy and high system. Isn't this a high level of civil, industrial, and scientific development, which largely leaves behind the civilizations of the ancient Romans and Greeks? Have these people survived the old for four or five millennia without moving forward? A similar picture is observed in Byzantium, even a thousand years after its separation from the Roman Empire. N.Ya. Danilevsky emphasizes that the idea of the origin of a civilization other than European seems strange to the majority of educated people not only in Europe, but also among the Slavs. This is due, according to him, to the perception of ideas about the national as universal ones (Danilevsky, 1995, pp. 72, 74).

N.Ya. Danilevsky's ideas are consistent with the concept of O. Spengler (1998): "I note the scheme, common to the North-Europeans, in which developed cultures revolve around us as the center of the world perfection of the proletarian system of history, and consider as a Copernican discovery in the field of history what in this book ("The Sunset of Europe") takes the place of the old order – the system in which antiquity and the West, India, Babylon, China, Egypt, Arab and Mexican cultures – separate worlds of formation, having in parallel an identical significance in the general picture of history and surpassing antiquity in spiritual concepts, by the power of flight occupy a corresponding and non-privileged status" (pp. 146-147).

In contrast to this position, M. Weber (1990) tries to clearly define the course of other circumstances that led to the fact that only in the West did

cultural phenomena arise that developed in a direction that acquired comprehensive significance (p. 44). He studied in detail such components of culture as science, art, legal and administrative systems, state structure and "rational bourgeois capitalism", and came to the conclusion that the variations of these factors create a unique socio-cultural system, endowed with enormous adaptive capabilities. T. Parsons (1998), agreeing with M. Weber's position, emphasizes that the modern type of society "emerged in a single evolutionary zone in the West. The society of Western Christendom was the starting point from which what we call the system of modern societies "began" (p. 11).

Above we mentioned the points of view of the founders of the theory of civilization – historians N.Ya. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, sociologists M. Weber and T. Persons, who put forward opposing claims. It should be noted that historians were more far-sighted, putting forward the ideas of equal value of civilizations, which was confirmed by the events of the second half of the 20th century. However, it is also known that the social structure of civilizations is changeable.

The historical excursion of human society testifies that the aspiration of individual social strata to a dominant position has always played a significant role – the factor of dominant position, which has become both the cause of social instability and the driving force of social development.

When a person was the property of another person, a clear social stratification took place: the subordinate was called a slave, and society was classified as slave-owning one. When a person was tied to the land and his labor belonged to someone else, he was called a serf, and society was called serfdom.

When free people entered into contractual legal relations, this gradually led to the fact that human rights became the axis of social relations. And at a higher stage of development, these rights were constitutionally recognized as an inalienable and supreme value, a directly applicable right. The principle of the rule of law became the cornerstone of social relations. The basic laws of modern progressive countries are built on this value foundation. At the same time, they are called to guarantee normal and harmonious development on the basis of ensuring the constitutionally necessary and sufficient balance, forming an environment equivalent to the constitution.

With all this, the social essence of a person is manifested in individual motives and expectations for entering into public relations, which are also the basis for the formation of various social institutions, which become certain links in the manifestation of human social behavior.

The value motivation of an individual, in turn, has not only a subjective but also a public objective nature and significance. The key here is what the value system orientation of the individual is, the dialectic of satisfying his needs,

with what motives for satisfying those needs a person enters the dynamic process of public relations, proceeding from the objective reality that each satisfied need gives rise to new needs. It was with this circumstance in mind that in 1995, the famous American economist Robert Lucas, who won the Nobel Prize, within the framework of the theory of rational expectations, proposed to base public management on the concept of influencing people's social expectations.

The formula for achieving satisfaction and happiness by restraining needs has also become a spiritual value for millennia.

The public significance of an individual's social interactions and behavior increases in civil society, along with the appreciation of his place and role. In such a society, a person's social behavior should be stable, predictable, and in harmony with his ideals, aspirations, expectations, and meaningful orientations of social relations. And this is possible only in the presence of a solid value-based foundation for human rational existence and the formation of a social environment corresponding to it.

The exchange and unification of comprehensive standards and values (more precisely, pro-European) becomes unacceptable for some civilizations (for example, Islamic). These processes have been intensively developing at the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st century. That is why the question of the formation of a global comprehensive civilization based on European values, about which so much was written and promised in the recent past, sounds utopian today. B.S. Yerasov (2002) believes that the concept of a comprehensive civilization is justified "both as the embodiment of a common worldview and as a network of cooperation". Noting the existence of a global civilization, which is formed on the basis of trade relations, common technologies, science and communication, B.S. Yerasov emphasizes that one cannot ignore "mutual principles of worldview, located at the base of these or those civilizations and beyond their borders, for example, American individualism, Islamic fundamentalism, and Japanese unity" (p. 100).

Of course, it is necessary to take into account the expanding network of cooperation, communication, and exchange, which reduces the local limitations of civilization in the conditions of globalization. All this would be a great boon for global social development if globalization processes proceeded in a universal legal space based on the principles of equality, justice, and common standards. Unfortunately, one cannot help but notice that globalization processes have deepened the abyss between countries belonging to different civilizations.

It becomes obvious that globalization, the main task of which is the harmonization of world economic relations, the formation of a homogeneous market economy, does not fulfill its functions, but has created, as a rule,

favorable conditions for the economic development of rich powers belonging to European or American civilizations at the expense of the use of resources and the dependent state of backward countries (Simonyan, 2001, p. 37).

In this regard, an important mission is assigned to nation-states, since the sphere of economic activity of the state is narrowing with the emergence of transnational corporations. Often, the functions of the state are reduced to supporting the "general rules of the game" in certain local conditions.

Among the important factors of globalization, it is necessary to note the growth of interconnections between different regions and civilizations of the world, which has made it possible to reveal the unequal conditions in which the latter find themselves not only in economic, but also in cultural relations.

Analyzing the anti-globalization movements that are becoming more widespread, M. Weber (2001) notes that they are based on the principles of justice, ensuring social and economic rights, self-government, environmental protection, a more equitable distribution of profits, the regulation of the export and import of capital, raising customs duties, and the inclusion of labor rights and environmental protection provisions in trade agreements, as well as principles of reducing the tax burden for developing countries (p. 52).

In May 2000, the Millennium Forum was held under the chairmanship of Kofi Annan. The forum's declaration states that if the architects of globalization are not held accountable, the consequences for everyone can be disastrous. "In the end, the rich will have no salvation, as intolerance, diseases, ecological disasters, wars, social division and political instability will become widespread" (UN Doc A/54/959, 2000). The negative, and often tragic, consequences of globalization have been repeatedly emphasized by scientists, politicians, and representatives of mass anti-globalization movements. These positions on globalization cannot be ignored, just as it is impossible to cancel or stop the processes of globalization. It is important to define the principles and conditions the implementation of which will increase the positive results of globalization.

Currently, the task of the world community is to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe that can arise from the violation of the principles of equality and justice.

In the modern world, the refusal to accept the equality of civilizations is necessarily accompanied by a civilizational "breakthrough" that imposes its worldview on another cultural community and seeks to rebuild it according to the Western-American model.

History knows several examples of the collapse and destruction of civilizations in the processes of such contacts. N.Ya. Danilevsky wrote that "temporarily emerging phenomena" (Mongols, Turks), who, in carrying out their "destructive heroism", destroyed "positively acting cultural types" or

self-sufficient civilizations, are considered "negative phenomena of humanity".

In parallel, in the 19th-20th centuries, some researchers have put forward propositions about civilizations or cultural supersystems that have passed a long path of their existence, but are suspended in their development due to the force of closure or the regularity embodied in the final collapse of self-sufficient civilizations. Thus, N.Ya. Danilevsky (1995) believes that civilizations, as well as living organisms, experience a depletion or elimination of their progressive force as a result of complex reasons. For example, he refers to modern China, India, as well as Egypt and Byzantium, which have been dormant for a long time (pp. 74-75). His point of view is shared by O. Spengler. According to the latter, when a civilization forms into its full and final image, the living development of culture ends, and the last possibilities of meaningful existence become exhausted. He calls what happened in the Egyptian, Chinese, Indian, and Arab civilizations "zoological fluctuations of the simple era," even if all this is "covered with a film of religious, philosophical, and above all political forms" (Spengler, 1998, p. 52).

Such a position gives rise to an objection. History knows civilizations that have disappeared but have left behind high cultural traces (Mayans, Aztecs, Incas). However, there are powerful civilizations that have integrated religious and philosophical worldviews, and which develop in a spiral, sometimes illuminating the world with powerful cultural values, sometimes temporarily fading away, accumulating strength for new leaps. In this regard, one can recall China and India, which made a huge cultural leap at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries and in the future may represent a serious threat to American hegemony.

Modern science has substantiated a more complex path of civilization development than in the teachings of the founders of civilization theories, who considered the birth, flowering, collapse and destruction of civilizations inevitable (similar to human childhood, maturity, old age and death).

There is no irreversible destruction of civilization, since civilizations are stable communities that strive for self-preservation either as a whole or in their most stable elements. Beyond the processes of collapse and destruction of civilization, there is a universal meaning of historical development.

At the same time, in explaining the processes of civilization decline, the theory must leave room for both chance and subjective imagination, for natural disasters and for human errors (Muhl, 2001, pp. 67-68).

Preventing the destruction of civilizations implies the development of contacts between them, which in the modern world are expanding and becoming more complex. Relations between civilizations are becoming more complex, in particular because in social society (civilization) mechanisms of

transmission of cultural elements have been developed over centuries. V.S. Stepin draws an analogy with biology, where the adaptation of organisms to the environment is fixed in their hereditary DNA, and between social life, where "culture is the equivalent of such a gene pool, and the cultural foundations represented by worldview commonalities are the unique basic genes of this or that type of sociality." The origin of new types of sociality, society implies a change in the fundamental vital roots represented by cultural commonalities, their mutation (Stepin, 2004, pp. 78-79).

This mechanism of transmission of traditions, experience, people's self-consciousness strives for the preservation of their own civilization. However, the more humanity develops, the deeper and wider become the relationships, contacts, mutual exchange and interchange of cultural elements between civilizations.

As V.M. Mezhuev (2004) rightly notes, only traditions and memories connect us with culture. "Living in the modern world, it is difficult to limit ourselves only to the past. Much in it needs to be reinterpreted, and to borrow the newly created from other nations. Without it, culture is just a historical relic, the place of which is in the museum, not in life" (p. 569).

Conclusion

The process of cultural development is complex and contradictory. It is important, on the one hand, to maintain one's own self-sufficiency, not to imitate other civilizations, and on the other hand, to borrow the standards of civilization, when necessary to raise the standard of living of the material and spiritual life of the people. Without the realization of such a need, the "mutation" in public life simply will not take place, which will lead to stagnation or chaos of the socio-historical-cultural type of society, caused by the discomfort of living conditions, which is negatively perceived by humanity in the modern world.

It is also necessary to take into account that culture in civilizational formations is not homogeneous. This heterogeneity is most pronounced in European and American civilizations. The processes of globalization have given rise to a huge flow of immigrants from Asian and African countries to the countries of European civilization. They have penetrated European culture with their customs, traditions, and beliefs. Finding themselves in a foreign cultural environment, the majority of immigrants from socially vulnerable strata did not accept foreign culture. In addition, the foreign culture caused intolerance in them, and sometimes hostility. This is most likely determined by the huge differences in social conditions of life, the negative attitude towards them as a foreign-born national majority, a "lower" stratum, which is used in unhonorable work and is satisfied with insignificant salaries.

Immigrants from the Islamic world find it especially difficult to adapt, since their whole life is strictly regulated by religious norms that evaluate people's actions and behaviors from the perspective of their compliance with ethnic concepts and Sharia.

If we take into account the diversity of socio-normative regulators in any European society, and the presence of groups with different subcultural orientations, then the aspirations of a society accepting migrants representing different civilizations to impose its own value concepts lead to what A.J. Toynbee called "stratification of cultures", which is a sign of the bio-purification of civilization.

References

Danilevsky, N. (1995). *Rossiya i Yevropa* (Russia and Europe). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press, "Glagol" Publishing House.

Ihering, R. (2013). *Dukh Rimskogo Prava na* Razlichnykh Stupenyakh *Yego Razvitiya* (Spirit of Roman Law at Various Stages of Its Development), Part 1. Moscow: "Direct Media" Publishing House.

Kashanina, T. (2012). *Struktura Prava* (Structure of Law). Moscow: "Prospect" Publishing House.

Mezhuev, V. (2004). *Kultura v Zerkale Filosofskogo Znaniya* (Culture in the Mirror of Philosophical Knowledge). Moscow: "Science, Civilization" Publishing House.

Muhl, J. (2001). Kriterii Otsenki Obshchey Teorii Tsivilizatsiy (Criteria for Assessing a General Theory of Civilizations). In B. Yerasov (Ed.), *Comparative Study of Civilizations* (67–70). Moscow: Aspect Press.

Parsons, T. (1998). *Sistema Sovremennykh Obshchestv* (System of Modern Societies). Moscow: Aspect Press.

Simonyan, N. (2001). Globalizatsiya i Neravnomernost Mirovogo Razvitiya (Globalization and the Unevenness of World Development). *World Economy and International Relations*, № 3, 35–44. DOI: 10.20542/0131-2227-2001-3-35-44.

Soloviev, V. (1989). Natsionalnyy Vopros v Rossii (The National Question in Russia) Vol. 1. Moscow: "Pravda" Publishing House.

Sorokin, P. (1992). *Chelovek, Tsivilizatsiya, Obshchestvo* (Man, Civilization, Society). Moscow: "Politizdat" Publishing House.

Spengler, O. (1998). *Zakat Yevropy* (The Decline of Europe). Essays on the Morphology of World History. Moscow: "Mysl" Publishing House.

Stepin V. (2004). *Filosofiya i Tsivilizatsiya* (Philosophy and Civilization). Man, Science, Civilization. Moscow.

Toynbee, A. (2011). Tsivilizatsiya pered Sudom Istorii (Civilization before the Court of History). Moscow: "Astrel" Publishing House.

UN Document A/54/959. (2000). Millennium Forum Declaration and Programme of Action "We the Peoples: Strengthening the United Nations in the Twenty-first Century". Retrieved October 25, 2025, from: https://shorturl.at/jKT0F.

Weber, A. (2001). Antiglobalistskiye Dvizheniya – Nachalo Velikoy Smuty XXI v? (Anti-Globalization Movements – the Beginning of the Great Troubles of the 21st Century?) *World Economy and International Relations*, № 12. 50–56.

Weber, M. (1990). *Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya* (Selected Works). Moscow: Progress Publishing House.

Yerasov, B. (2001). *Sravnitelnoye Izucheniye Tsivilizatsiy* (Comparative Study of Civilization). Moscow: Aspect Press.

Yerasov, B. (2002). *Tsivilizatsii Universalii i Samobytnost* (Civilizations: Universals and Originality). Moscow: "Nauka" Publishing House.

Yerasov, B. (Ed.) (1995). *Tsivilizatsii i Kultury. Rossiya i Vostok: Tsivilizatsionnyye Otnosheniya* (Civilizations and Cultures. Russia and the East: Civilizational Relations). Scientific Almanac, Iss. 2. Moscow: Allegro-Press.